

INTRODUCTION

1. Study Objectives

In the history of human civilization, since the emergence of dynasties and nations, secession and separation have existed. At the end of the twentieth century, secessionist groups existed in many places, for example the Basque secessionist movement in Spain, the Northern Irish secessionist movement in Britain, the Quebec separatist movement in Canada, the Kashmir separatist movement in Pakistan and the Taiwanese political Cross-Straits policy which was really a secessionist concept. However, the Taiwanese secessionism has been the most significant. It triggered the 1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis, which caused a military confrontation between Mainland China and the United States (US). During this crisis, Mainland China mobilised its nuclear submarines and the US mobilised two aircraft carrier battle groups.

However, the reason that Taiwan is one of the most significant secessionist examples, is based on current international relations and the geopolitical importance of Taiwan. In the early twenty-first century, Mainland China is an emerging power in Asia. However, the US is the global super power and international relations have entered into the unipolar era of the American century. In order to maintain its hegemony, the US deterred the emergence of Mainland China. According to the *Defence Planning Guidance for the Fiscal Years 1994-1999*, the first priority of the US' defence strategy objectives was "to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival." This document further indicated that "there are other political nations or coalitions that could, in the further future, develop strategic aims and a defence posture of region-wide or global domination. Our strategy must now refocus on precluding the emergence of any potential future global competitor" (USA 1992:1-2). However, its previous Cold War enemy, the Soviet Union, had disintegrated in 1991. Germany, France, Britain and Japan were not big countries territorially and could not dominate globally. Obviously, in the eyes of the US in the 1990s, the objective of US prevention and deterrence was Mainland China. Taiwan lies to the south of the Japanese Ryukyu Islands and north of the Philippine Islands, to the centre of the first island chain. In the US view, Taiwan was a strategically important island over which it was prepared to threaten the security of southeastern China in order to block the Mainland's access to the Pacific Ocean.

For Mainland China, the unification or separation of Taiwan and Mainland China involved national security considerations, integration or disintegration and nationalism. Taiwan is so close to the southeastern coast of Mainland China that if it seceded from Mainland China successfully and was controlled or partially controlled by other countries, it would mean that Mainland China's national security would be compromised in part of its southeastern territory. On the other hand, the Taiwanese are of the same race, culture, religion and share the use of Chinese characters with the Han people, who are the absolute majority in Mainland China. If Taiwan seceded from Mainland China successfully, minorities such as the Kazakhs, the Uighur in Xinjiang province and the Tibetans in the Tibetan Autonomous Region (TAR) might also seek secession from Mainland China (Lin, Y. K. 1991:2). That is to say, if Taiwan successfully gains its independence from Mainland China, it would trigger a domino effect amongst the minority people and cause Mainland China to disintegrate like the former Soviet Union. Therefore, the secessionist Cross-Strait movement is a life-and-death issue for Mainland China. From a nationalist perspective, Hong Kong and Macao were returned to Mainland China in the 1990s. Taiwan is the last piece of territory of Mainland China that it was forced to cede when invaded and which has not yet been recovered. Therefore, if Taiwan secedes from Mainland China, the only option for Mainland China would be to launch a unification war. Because the national strategic interests of Mainland China and the US overlap in Taiwan, the impact of the Taiwanese secessionist Cross-Strait movement on global strategic interaction is far more significant than other secessionist movements in the world.

From 1950 to 1988, relations between Taiwan (the Republic of China, ROC) and Mainland China (the People's Republic of China, PRC) were severed, hostile and antagonistic, however, except for the 1958 Quemoy (Kinmen) artillery battle, the Cross-Strait relationship was peaceful for nearly thirty years (1958-1988). Despite the increasing people-to-people interaction between Taiwan and Mainland China since 1987, the Cross-Strait relationship was poised for a showdown during the 1990s, and almost triggered a military clash between Mainland China and the US in 1996. The main reason for the change between 1988 and 2000 from peaceful, although antagonistic, conditions toward being on the brink of war was Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy. The influence of Lee Teng-hui's political

Cross-Straits policy was so profound that it provoked the strongest reaction from Mainland China, and will continue to dominate present and future relations in Asia. Looking forward, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, one of the international issues that has the potential to cause a major clash is the Cross-Strait relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China, and this clash might be further ignited into a military confrontation, even a nuclear war, between Mainland China and the US. The objectives of this study are therefore to: (1) explore the background and life experience of Lee Teng-hui and his real political ideology and intentions; (2) study the evolution of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy from the original one-China policy, toward a policy of secession; (3) analyse the reaction of Mainland China towards Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy and; (4) examine Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy in the cultural, economical and military fields.

2. Research Problem

In January 1988, Lee Teng-hui became President. Subsequently, in September 1990, the Presidential Office set up the National Unification Council, and in February 1991, Lee's administration passed the *Guidelines for National Unification*. In so doing, Lee Teng-hui supported the unification policy superficially. However, the political Cross-Straits policies he adopted favoured secessionism substantively. Therefore, this gap between the nominal support for unification and the actual operation of secessionism made it difficult for many residents to believe that Lee Teng-hui was not a secessionist. On 30 September 1995, Lee Teng-hui publicly stated that he was absolutely not a secessionist, and he repeated that he was not a secessionist over 130 times (Yuan 1995:2). However, from 2001 to 2003, when Lee Teng-hui was a civilian, he publicly and frankly admitted that he was a secessionist (Su 2001:4), and stated that the ROC should change its name to Taiwan (Lin 2003a:1), and further indicated that the ROC had not existed (Lin 2003b:A4). Lee Teng-hui had only been paying lip-service to supporting Cross-Strait unification and really implemented a secessionist political Cross-Straits policy.

Therefore, the main research issue is that Lee Teng-hui in reality implemented a secessionist Cross-Strait policy which was completely opposite to Chiang Ching-kuo's Cross-Strait unification policy. However, Lee Teng-hui was handpicked

by Chiang Ching-kuo. What caused Lee to betray Chiang Ching-kuo's unification route? Furthermore, why did he have to support unification while adopting a substantive secessionist policy? How was he able to instigate Taiwanese hostility toward Mainlanders, and to transform this hostility into a sense of Taiwanese identity and upgrade it to Taiwanese secessionist ideology? This study is not only based on the hypothesis that China will go to war if Taiwan secedes, but also based on the following propositions: (1) the main cause of Taiwanese secessionism was ethnic conflict; (2) Lee Teng-hui's secessionist ideology reflected a hatred of Mainlanders and; (3) Lee Teng-hui disguised his secessionist aims as unification.

3. Research Methodology

The main research methods used in this study are both description and analysis, and focuses on the period between 1988 and 2000. President Chiang Ching-kuo passed away on 13 January 1988, and Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency. After 12 years, the tenth presidential election was held on 18 March 2000. Because of restrictions on presidential terms, Lee Teng-hui retired from politics and his term as president ended. However, from 1988 to 2000, as a result of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy, great changes occurred in Cross-Strait relations. A historical approach was employed to explore the origins of secessionism, and descriptive and analytical methods to review the political development of the ROC and its civil war, to study Lee Teng-hui's life, to study the national identity of Taiwan and Mainland China in-depth, and to study the implementation of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy and the reactions of Mainland China systematically and comprehensively.

Although Lee always officially supported unification with Mainland China, for example, in documents and speeches, he mentioned unification superficially and placed many technical barriers in the way of unification. Lee Teng-hui and many senior officials had received advanced education in the US, therefore, to some extent they understood the operation of the US democratic system, and utilised this. In order to influence US leaders, including think tanks and academics, Lee's administration spent huge amounts of money on them in various ways, such as paying counsel fees, providing sponsorships and donations, or by inviting them to Taiwan as guests (Lampton 2002:103-104). By reasonable inference, the inclination of these US

political and intellectual leaders, including think tanks and academics, might be to agree with Lee's standpoint. Therefore, scholars of China might easily have been influenced by the information, articles and papers that supported Lee Teng-hui's Cross-Straits policy, and it would be difficult for them to understand Mainland China's view and seek the truth. In order to study this in depth, the author analysed the primary material concerning Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy comprehensively, not only government publications, but also the talks between Lee Teng-hui and a Japanese friend, current speeches and the updated book he wrote, and analysed their significance and the feasibility and logic of Lee Teng-hui's statements. The author also supplemented the study of the political historical change in Taiwanese society and the development of ethnic relationships with an exploration of the truth behind Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy. Similarly, this thesis also looked at the Taiwanese administration's unilateral actions and strong lobbying in the US, and the demonisation of Mainland China by the Taiwanese and US mass media. Generally speaking, Taiwanese and US scholars seem to have had difficulty studying the viewpoint of Mainland China in depth. However, by implication, 'Cross-Straits' means that two sides are involved, hence, Mainland Chinese material was used to explore the viewpoint of Mainland China in the Cross-Strait issue, and the reaction of Mainland China to Lee's secessionist Cross-Strait policy.

4. Structure

The structure of this thesis consists of an introduction, a body of seven chapters, an evaluation and a bibliography. The chapter division is as follows:

Chapter 1: Secession and Separatism: A Conceptual Framework.

This chapter attempts to construct a conceptual framework of secession and separatism that underpins this study. Secession and separatism are not purely theoretical concepts, but manifest in challenges to the existing state and the sacrifice of separatists' lives to achieve their goals. Secession, therefore, has its own traits. This chapter not only deliberates the definition of secessionism but also examines the basic components, types, motivations and methods of secession and separatism. Lastly, this chapter discusses the settlement of secession and separatism, which includes negotiation, improving the circumstances of disadvantaged minorities, adoption of asymmetric federalism, and the fates of nations divided by war in the

twentieth century, namely China, Vietnam, Korea and Germany.

Chapter 2: An Historical Overview of Political Developments in the Republic of China (ROC) up to 1988.

This chapter provides an overview of political developments in the ROC. After a great revolutionary movement, the Kuomintang (also known as the KMT), led the Chinese people to overthrow the Qing Dynasty, and established the ROC on 1 January 1912. Subsequently, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) was established in 1912. Both the KMT and the CCP ruled modern China, and the KMT collaborated with the CCP twice and experienced civil war twice. During the second civil war in 1949, the KMT was defeated by the CCP. The Mainlander-led KMT central government retreated to Taiwan, and survived there. Therefore, the history of the ROC can be divided into the ROC on Mainland China and the ROC on Taiwan since 1949. Between 1949 to 1988, the Mainlander-led KMT government still alleged that the ROC represented the whole of China, thus, the national goal was Cross-Straits unification.

Chapter 3: A Background Study of Lee Teng-hui.

Lee Teng-hui held definite pro-secessionist views. In 1990, Lee was 70 years old, and if he had been merely a scholar, then the influence of his secessionist ideology would have been limited. But Lee Teng-hui, not only as president, but also as Taiwan's first indigenous president, had strong influence on Taiwan in the 1990s, especially on the Cross-Strait relationship. Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy was strongly based on his personal views regarding Mainlanders and the KMT. This chapter explores the background and life experience of Lee Teng-hui, including the latter period of Japanese colonisation; Taiwan's return to the ROC; social chaos during this transition; and the totalitarian rule during the State of Emergency in the 1950s and 1960s, and reveals Lee Teng-hui's true political views of Mainlanders and the Kuomintang (KMT or Nationalist Party).

Chapter 4: Taiwan and Mainland China's National Identity.

This chapter focuses on the development of national identity in Taiwan and Mainland China. It shows that due to the fact that Taiwan was a part of Mainland China for over 200 years (1683-1895), the Taiwanese ancestors who emigrated from Mainland

China, have a primordial link with southern Mainland China, and identify with Mainland China. However, due to particular historical factors, such as the strict rule by the Mainlander-led KMT government, some of the Taiwanese national identity shifted away from wanting a united China, to wanting to secede from China. The Mainland Chinese national identity is absolutely associated with China, and with regard to the Taiwan issue, the only desire of the Chinese people is Cross-Straits unification.

Chapter 5: The Development of Lee Teng-hui's Political Cross-Straits Policy.

In addition to studying the Cross-Strait relationship from the 1950s to the 1980s, this chapter is an in-depth study of the implementation of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy through a series of important events, such as the declaration of the *Guidelines for National Unification* (1991); the ADB event (1993); the Chingdao Lake Incident (1994); Lee Teng-hui's unofficial dialogue with Japanese novelist, Shiba Ryotaro (1994); the Six-point proposals (1995); and the special State-to-State relationship theory (1999). This chapter analyses the purpose of the implementation of Lee's political Cross-Straits policy through these events, and shows Lee's secessionist political Cross-Straits policy and its consequences.

Chapter 6: The Reaction of Mainland China.

This chapter studies the views and reactions of Mainland China regarding Cross-Straits developments from the 1950s to the 1970s as well as the unification methods of Mainland China – the “one country, two systems” policy, and Mainland China's reaction to Lee's secessionist policy, as evidenced by his guidelines for secessionist policy, his visit to Cornell University, and the two state theory. In particular, it looks at the strong reaction of Mainland China to Lee's address at Cornell University. It launched missile exercises in 1995 and 1996, and caused the 1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis between Mainland China and the US. The outcome of the 1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis showed Mainland China that its only option was to improve its military power to prevent the next US intervention in the Cross-Straits issue.

Chapter 7: An Analysis of the Political Cross-Straits Policy.

This chapter analyses Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy from the cultural, trade and military aspects. It shows that the cultural Cross-Straits policy involves Taiwanese identity, the trade Cross-Straits policy affects the commercial interests of the Taiwanese, and the acceptability to Taiwan of the "one country, two systems" policy proposed by Mainland China. This chapter also studies the Lee administration's pursuit of its secessionist goal by increasing military procurement. Simultaneously, this chapter focuses on the reaction of Mainland China to Lee's cultural, trade, and military Cross-Straits policy, especially Mainland China's achievements in its military modernisation.

Chapter 8: Evaluation.

This chapter evaluates the outcome and effects of Lee Teng-hui's secessionist political Cross-Straits policy. Apart from betraying Chiang Ching-kuo's unification route, Lee supported the unification policy superficially, but adopted a secessionist Cross-Strait policy substantively, and he instigated Taiwanese hostility toward Mainlanders and used this to foster Taiwanese secessionist ideology. Furthermore, this chapter analyses the importance of the Cross-Strait secessionist movement in the international context, especially how the strategic interests of Mainland China and the US overlap on Taiwan Island, and how the Taiwan issue is not only the last remaining national humiliation of Mainland China, but a life-and-death issue. Lastly, this study analyses future possible developments in the Cross-Strait problem.

CHAPTER ONE

SECESSION AND SEPARATISM : A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In the history of civilization, secession and separatism are enduring issues, and have occurred in both the East and West. Be it the Qing dynasty in the East, or the Ottoman Empire in the West, both faced and suffered the effects of secession and separatism, including wars during which an innumerable number of people died.

In this chapter, secessionism and separatism, including how they differ from autonomy, self-determination and independence, are described. Secondly, the components of, and types of secession and separatism are analysed. Thirdly, this chapter explores what motivates secessionist movements. Fourthly, an overview is given of how separatists achieve their goal, in other words, what are the methods used by secessionist and separatist movements. Finally, the resolution of secessionist and separatist disputes are analysed.

1. A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SECESSIONISM IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

After World War II, Western colonial powers suffered from the effects of war, and their ability to rule over their colonies was weakened, diminished and even disintegrated. A wave of anti-colonialism emerged, and nationalists struggled for independence and established their nation states. With the consent of previous colonial rulers, Korea, the Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Malaysia, through Burma, India, Iran, Jordan, Jamaica, Guyana, to Ghana, Sudan, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Botswana, Lesotho and Mauritius, achieved independence during the 1950s and 1960s. Undoubtedly, during this wave of independence, many nationalists achieved their desire for independence, leading to a gradual decline in secessionism and separatist movements.

The Cold War between the Soviet bloc and the West created relative stability in the international state system. In the Communist bloc, headed by an autocratic Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (the Soviet Union), secessionist and separatist movements were not permitted by the ideals of Communism and strict political control. In the Capitalist bloc, led by the United States (US), secessionist and

separatist movements also had difficulty in emerging, because in the political atmosphere of anti-Communism, as long as governments maintained good diplomatic relationships with the US, they could use their national power to quell domestic secessionist and separatist movements under the flag of anti-Communism without eliciting the intervention from the US.

Another unprecedented experience in the history of humankind, has been that the world has entered a modernised age in which governments have become huge, sophisticated and more efficient, with greater ability to suppress secessionist and separatist movements. This is partly because of factors such as widespread education; the communication media; and economic development that affect the entire nation, including different ethnic groups, resulting in similar lifestyles, and therefore, resulting in similar identities. All of these factors might reasonably result in a decrease in the number of secessionist and separatist movements.

This is a double-edged sword. There are simultaneously advantages and disadvantages. Widespread education; the communication media; and economic development can accelerate the mixing of ethnic groups, but can also provoke ethnic awareness. Particularly in democratic societies, the élite amongst the separatists may instigate ethnic hostility, and might even launch movements aimed at the establishment of a new state. Therefore, global trends of rebellion have increased steadily from 1950 to 1989. A study by Gurr (1993:100), shows that the worldwide extent of violent protest increased fourfold and rebellion also increased almost fourfold from the early 1950s to the late 1980s.

In 1989, the Cold War ended. At that time, Communist regimes in Eastern Europe fell and the bipolar structure of international relations disintegrated. The Soviet President, Mikhail Gorbachev, adopted significant political-economic reforms towards Capitalism from Communism, and adopted a pro-US diplomatic policy. Cooperation between the global superpowers, the US and the Soviet Union, increased. The developing world saw a decline in regional conflict and many analysts were of the view that this was the beginning of a new peaceful era (Nixon 1992: 14-15).

From the 1950s to the late 1980s, the ideal of Communism transcended borders and

nationalities. Autocratic rule suppressed the emergence or growth of secessionism, concealed the facts of historical hostility between old rivals, and bound hostile ethnic groups together. However, the autocratic Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. Accompanying the collapse of Soviet hegemony and the end of the Cold War, the strict political control of the governments in the Soviet bloc was eased, and censorship of the media was also relaxed.

In this more open society, the tragic ethnic memory of modern history was recalled. For example, Stalin killed five million peasants during the collectivization of agriculture, and ten million through forced famines in the Ukraine; 100,000 people were killed in purges and repression in the 1930s in Byelorussia; 100,000 Azerbaijanis; 30,000 Georgians, and tens of thousands of Armenians were imprisoned, tortured and killed; more than 150,000 Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian guerrilla fighters died resisting Soviet rule after World War II, while another 540,000 were killed in purges or were exiled to Siberia (Nixon 1992:57). Therefore, the historical hostility between different ethnic groups re-emerged, ethnic awareness was fostered, and the old Soviet Union was doomed to disintegration. At the same time, the disintegration of the Soviet Union triggered a wave of secession and separatism in other regions.

To this day, secessionist and separatist movements exist in many countries, advanced and backward; rich and poor. For example, Canada has the Quebec separatist movement; Britain has the Northern Ireland secessionist movement; Spain has the Basque secessionist movement; Pakistan has the Kashmir separatist movement; Tamil separatists have established the Liberation Tigers fighting for secession from Sri Lanka; and Kurdish separatists exist in Turkey, Iraq and Iran. This has caused long-term social and economic instability.

2. A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF SECESSION AND SEPARATISM

Before discussing secessionism and separatism, a definition of these terms is required. In general, the concepts of secessionism and separatism are often connected to or confused with popular concepts of autonomy, self-determination, and even independence. In order to further understand secession and separatism, this

chapter will develop a definition that will conceptualise secession.

2.1. Definition of secession

Secession, simply put, is one part of a country attempting to be an independent new nation. Robertson (1993:429-430) defines secession as “the attempt by some region in a political system to become independent of the rest of the state and rule itself as an autonomous nation.” Hechter (2000:78) states that “secession is the formal withdrawal from a central political authority by a member unit on the basis of a claim to independent sovereign status.” Beran (1984:21) also states that secession is “the withdrawal, from an existing state and its central government, of part of this state, the withdrawing part consisting of citizens and the territory they occupy.” Buchanan (1991:10) further indicates that “the secessionist’s primary goal is not to overthrow the existing government, nor to make fundamental constitutional, economic, or sociopolitical changes within the existing state”. The definition of secession is usually related with the concepts of autonomy, self-determination and independence. Therefore, the relationship between secession and autonomy, self-determination, and independence must be further clarified. Separatism, as a concept, refers to some or other form of own identity or exclusiveness, and if linked to secessionism, implies independence in an own state.

2.2. Autonomy and secession

It is not always easy to distinguish between autonomy and secession, and in particular between full autonomy and secession. However, some analysts hold the view that autonomy should not be categorized as separatism (Abedin 1989:223).

Bealey (1999:23) states that some political scholars regard autonomy as a type of “half-way stage to full independence for regions and provinces.” Gurr & Harff (1994:189) indicate that “autonomy is a political arrangement in which an ethnic group has some control over its own territory, people, and resources but does not have independence as a sovereign state.” Bugajski (1994:104) further states that “autonomy may be cultural or political. Cultural autonomy implies control by an ethnic group over its own educational institutions, mass media, and various social and cultural activities. Political autonomy is more far-reaching, involving every aspect of

social, economic, and administrative life short of national defense and foreign affairs.”

As for the relationship between autonomy and secession, full autonomy almost equals secession. Premdas (1990:13) states that “a secessionist movement legitimates its claim to an autonomous territorial survival on the ‘natural right’ as a unique nation to determine its own destiny.” Bugajski (1994:104) indicates that “demands for autonomy or ‘self-determination’ can range from modest campaigns for linguistic rights to calls for outright self-rule within a federal or loose confederal structure, or even a separate and sovereign state. Campaigns for secession are more likely to develop when previously acquired privileges are under threat or when underprivileged groups seize an opportunity to redress their grievances and push for separate statehood.” Esman (1994:222) further points out that “the ultimate autonomy is de jure separation from the polity, the achievement of political independence and hegemony in a new state.”

However, autonomy is not completely similar to secession. The similarity of autonomy to secession depends on the degree of autonomy. For example, absolute autonomy is almost equivalent to secession, on the other hand, diminished autonomy means there is no attempt to secede from the central government. Irrespective of whether there is greater or diminished autonomy, it still means that the central government has jurisdiction. Secession, however, means the establishment of a new state.

2.3. Self-determination and secession

At the end of World War I, the concept of self-determination prevailed in the world. At that time, the German, Russian and Astro-Hungarian empires collapsed, and new states were created. President Woodrow Wilson used the principle of self-determination to settle the problem of the succession of new states in 1918 (Bealey 1999:296).

Until the Second World War the principle of self-determination was still a political concept. In the post-war period, the theory of self-determination developed legal

status from being a theoretical concept (Musgrave 2000:62). The principle of self-determination was recognized in the Charter of the United Nations (UN), which was signed on 26 June 1945. Chapter I Article 1(2) of the *UN Charter* stipulates that the purpose of the UN is “to develop friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace” (UN 1945a:1). Chapter IX Article 55 also contains the phrase “self-determination of peoples” (UN 1945b:1). Another significant recognition of self-determination is General Assembly Resolution 1514(XV), of 14 December 1960, entitled the *Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*. The second paragraph of the Resolution declares that “all peoples have the right to self-determination.” On 16 December 1966, the UN General Assembly adopted the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)* (OHCHR 1966a:1) and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*. Part I, article 1 of the latter Covenant states that “all peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development” (OHCHR 1966b:1).

Therefore, the principle of self-determination is generally understood to apply when people deprived of the right to determine their own political, social and economic structure by colonial powers, attempt to pursue freedom from colonisation (Bhalla 1991:91-92); the right of self-determination not only exists in international law, and is also not restricted to being a political or civil right. It is also seen as an important requirement for economic, social and cultural rights (Castellino 2000:31). In other words, in international law, the principle of self-determination accepts that people even have the right to direct their own political philosophies and forms of government (Akomolafe 1996:1235).

A secessionist movement regards the right of self-determination as “God-given and natural” (Premdas 1990:15), but the principle of self-determination also has defects. In reality, the problem of self-determination is by which people, under what conditions, with what measures and at what time it should be exercised. This problem appears simple, but it is complicated and difficult to solve.

2.4. Independence and secession

Generally speaking, the ultimate purpose of most secessionists is to secede from the jurisdiction of the existing central government, and establish an independent state. Nevertheless, in some special cases, secessionists may attempt to secede from one state in order to become part of another (for example, some Transylvanians endeavour to secede from Romania and become part of Hungary)(Buchanan 1991:10).

The concept of secession, therefore, has a link with autonomy, self-determination, and independence. Strictly defined, they mean different things, but they also share common characteristics. For example, full autonomy may only differ from secession in name, and it is difficult to distinguish between the purpose of self-determination and the purpose of secession. Because the present situation of de facto secession between Taiwan and Mainland China resulted in civil war, and the present state of affairs between Taiwan and Mainland China resulting from Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy, it belongs in the domain of secession. This thesis, therefore, does not use terms such as autonomy, self-determination or independence, but rather uses the term 'secession'.

3. COMPONENTS OF SECESSION AND SEPARATISM

Secession and separatism entail the withdrawal of a group from an existing state. Secessionist movements challenge the central government, which often results in disastrous civil war. Secession has particular characteristics and fundamental elements, such as people and territory, and less tangible elements such as leadership, organized movement, and motivation. If these fundamental elements are absent, secession cannot be successful. These fundamental elements also have particular meanings in the context of secession.

3.1. People

Secession is the withdrawal of a group of people from an existing state to establish a new state, so one basic element of the new state is that it must have people, and the number of people must be sufficiently large for the new state to exist independently.

Most secessionists belong to the same ethnic group, one that differs from the dominant ethnic affiliation of the people of the existing state.

3.2. Territory

Since secession is the withdrawal of a group of people from an existing state, an essential characteristic of secession is that it must have a concrete object – land. The basic element of the state is land which provides the resources needed by a nation, such as a labour force, tax revenue, minerals etc (Hechter 2000:78). This land has to be under the jurisdiction of the state's existing government, because secession necessarily involves challenging the central government. On the other hand, a potential secessionist territory should possess historical roots and be able to survive as an independent state (Heraclides 1991:14). However, if the secessionists only pursue a separate territory, but do not attempt to govern themselves, they cannot be regarded as a bona fide separatist movement (Premdas 1990:15).

3.3. Leadership and an organized movement

Because secession and separatism challenge an existing central government, the process of secession represents a dynamic struggle for people and territory against the central government. Premdas (1990:14) states that "if there is no struggle, there is no need for a movement. A secessionist struggle embodies action, tension and resistance." Therefore, secessionists not only have leaders who lead supporters against the central government in order to withdraw from it, but also have a movement organized against the national structure of the existing state.

3.4. Motivation

Secession exists in both the developed and underdeveloped world and often triggers bloodshed or wars of secession. Therefore, if there is no strong motivation for secession, it is difficult to let people risk and sacrifice their lives. Since motivation is such an important and sophisticated part of secession, it will be discussed more fully later on.

The above-mentioned characteristics of secession and separatism are their basic traits. Since the successful outcome of secession is the establishment of a new nation,

these characteristics can also be described as the traits of a nation. However, without people and territory, the object of secession no longer exists. Furthermore, because the pursuit of secession is a dynamic process, it needs a leader, even a heroic leader, to instigate and maintain the principal motivation towards secession, and to transform the motivation into a strength that encourages people to struggle and make sacrifices for secession. If these characteristics are absent, secession cannot be said to exist, or possibly to be successful.

4. TYPES OF SECESSION AND SEPARATISM

Depending on the situation, the era and the place, there are different types of secession. Secession can be categorized as majority versus minority secession; central versus local; voluntary versus coerced; rental versus long-term; and divided versus de facto secession. These different types of secession are always mixed. The secessionist group may be local, minority and voluntary.

4.1. Majority versus minority secession

As a general rule, secessionists are the minority in their pursuit of secession from an existing central government. However, in fact, the secessionists might be in the majority. Because the majority possesses the most national resources, these actions should not be classed as secession, but as exclusion.

For example, in September 1963 Singapore was merged with Malaya to form the Federation of Malaysia. At that time, the Chinese population in the federation was 42.2 per cent, while the indigenous Malay people made up 40.6 per cent of the whole Malaysian population (Means 1976:429). Approximately 75 per cent of all Singaporeans are Chinese (Chua 1957:68), therefore, if Malaysia excluded Singapore city, Chinese people formed 35.7 per cent of the population while indigenous Malay people made up 45.9 per cent of the population (Means 1976:429). Hence, the relationship between the Chinese and the indigenous Malay people was very sensitive, and the indigenous Malay élite leaders wished to establish a Malay-majority society. The Malaysians negotiated with Singapore, and excluded and compelled Singapore to be independent and to secede from Malaysia in August 1965 (Wang, K.C. 1997:88-89). Therefore, minority groups and majority groups can

be relative concepts. In the above case, Malay people were a minority in the whole of Malaysia, but were a majority if Malaysia excluded Singapore city.

4.2. Central versus local secession

Depending on the extent of the secession, it could be categorized as national secession or local secession. With the exception of mini-states, all medium or large states have central governments and local governments. For example, the US has a federal government and fifty state local governments. In each state there are varying numbers of counties, which in turn contain numbers of municipalities (Buchanan 1991:15). Similarly, Mainland China has a central government and thirty-four administrative areas including provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities.

Generally speaking, secessionist movements occur in local regions, and their goal is to withdraw from the control of the existing central government. However, in the case of the secession of Malaysia and Singapore, the central Malaysian government compelled Singapore city to secede from Malaysia. It is also possible for two or more parts of a seceding area to be separated from each other by all or part of the existing central government's territory. For example, Pakistan was geographically split into East and West Pakistan by India until the eastern portion seceded to become Bangladesh (Buchanan 1991:15).

4.3. Voluntary versus coerced secession

In general, minorities voluntarily desire to secede from an existing state, and the central government is then forced either to allow or to suppress the secessionists. However, due to domestic political factors, an existing state can also play a role in compelling a local area to separate. In other words, central government is not always coerced to accept the separatists' demands. Sometimes, central government itself is also secessionist.

For example, in the case of Malaysia and Singapore, the central government of Malaysia was secessionist and compelled Singapore to secede from Malaysia. Therefore, Lee Kuan-yew (2000:243), ex-prime minister of Singapore, states that "we had not wanted separation. It had been thrust upon us."

4.4. Rental versus long-term secession

Territory is one of the most basic elements of sovereignty, which cannot be infringed. However, territory may be forcibly leased to another nation over the longer term under unequal treaties between two countries. In fact, this is another kind of secession, or at least semi-secession.

The lease of Hong Kong from China to Britain was a famous case involving the forced cession of Hong Kong by China for 99 years. Hong Kong has more than 200 islands, including Hong Kong island, the Kowloon peninsula, and New Territory. The whole area of Hong Kong is 1,066 sq km. Hong Kong island is 77.5 sq km, the Kowloon peninsula is 11.5 sq km, and the New Territory is 977.4 sq km (Tang 1989:3-4). Between 1840 and 1842, China rejected the purchase of opium from Britain, and the Opium War broke out with Britain. China was defeated and was forced to cede Hong Kong island to Britain in 1842. Following the period 1856 to 1860, Britain and France in alliance, attacked China, occupied Beijing and burnt the Imperial Summer Palace. China was forced to cede Kowloon peninsula to Britain and, in 1898, China was forced to lease the New Territory to the British for 99 years. Their treaty made no provision for rental and can, therefore, be regarded as an unequal treaty (Liang & Cheng 1993:370-371). Therefore, due to the above cession and lease, Hong Kong effectively seceded from Mainland China for one hundred years.

4.5. Divided versus de facto secession

Divided nations are homogenous nations divided into two or more separate political entities. The cause of the division is artificial, usually imposed by outside powers after war. They have the same racial, religious, cultural and historical heritage, such as China, which was divided into Taiwan and Mainland China; and Korea, which was divided into North Korea and South Korea. Partitioned countries, on the other hand, are usually divided because of internal causes, such as racial, religious, linguistic or ethnic conflicts (Henderson & Lebow 1974:434). For example, in the whole Ireland, 54 per cent of the population is Protestant, 31 per cent of the population is Roman Catholic in Northern Ireland, and 94 per cent of the population is Catholic in the

Republic of Ireland (Elliott *et al* 1992:574-576). Due to the religious conflict, Ireland is divided into two states. In the 1920s, pursuant to the distribution of religious groups, Britain gave dominion status to Southern Ireland. In 1949, Southern Ireland became an independent nation – the Republic of Ireland, but Northern Ireland still remained part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain (Boyce 1990:38). Therefore, Ireland is divided into two parts.

In the middle of the twentieth century, some countries such as China, Korea, Vietnam and Germany, were divided. However, these divisions were chiefly imposed by the US and Soviet Union during the Cold War. According to Schaeffer, Washington and Moscow believed that the division of the above nations would accommodate the needs of majorities and minorities, satisfy the demands of independence movements, and prevent the outbreak of regional war whilst also protecting their interests in these regions (Schaeffer 1990:3). However, in spite of the origin of these divided states, they are de facto secessionist entities, either temporary or long-term.

Different types of secession and separatism have their own specific attributes. Because secession is an attempt to withdraw from an existing central government, most modern secessionist movements have a number of elements such as minority secession, local secession, voluntary secession, long-term secession, and even divided or de facto secession.

5. MOTIVATIONS FOR SECESSION AND SEPARATISM

Different views exist regarding the motivations for secessionism and separatism. Spencer (1998c:308), for example, concludes that economics, resentment and humiliation, propaganda, and political/constitutional impasse may be reasons for ethnic separatism. Morris-Jones (1986:129-138) explains that separatism is associated with ethnicity, nationalism, decolonisation, democracy or economic factors. Chang Ling-chen (1994:64-76) points out that the main factors underlying secession are language, religion, extent of development, influence of inner psychology and external circumstance, and political belief. According to Crawford Young (1975:60-67), the distinction can be made between those issues which may

be primary causes of separatism such as ethnicity, religion, territorial contiguity, injustice, and neglect, and catalysts. In order for these primary causes to give rise to separatism, certain events or catalysts must take place and the envisaged separate state must appear viable. Premdas (1990:15) divides the causes of secession into two broad categories, namely primordial and secondary. Primordial causes include common language, religion, race and values. Secondary factors include discrimination, neglect, exploitation, repression or domination. Five of these motivations or causes are discussed below:

5.1. Religion

Religion is a belief, a culture, and a way of life. The difference in culture and lifestyles between various religions is enormous, and the dispersion of religion provokes religious conflicts. Misunderstanding and discrimination among various religions trigger religious clashes. Religious paradox is difficult to resolve. Believers have a common religion and culture, and sometimes wish to set up a religious state. Hence, in both the East and the West, religion is still a vital motivation. For example, in the contemporary history of the West, the classic example is the Northern Ireland secessionist movement. The inhabitants of the whole Ireland are largely the same race, but the religious conflict not only triggered the division of Northern Ireland and Southern Ireland, but also triggered a secessionist movement in Northern Ireland. Thus even differences between similar religions, the Catholics and the Protestants, can trigger secessionist movements, and the differences between less similar religions might trigger even more serious secessionist movements.

In multi-religious nations, religion is an important factor underlying secessionist movements. Particularly, government officials often promote some religions and derogate others, such as Islamisation or Catholicisation. The perception of suffering religious discrimination could be utilized by secessionists to ignite religious resentment, ethnic conflicts and launch further secessionist movements.

5.2. Language

Language differences are one of the core considerations for most secessionist movements, such as the Welsh, the Quebecois, the Flemish, the Catalans and the

Basques (Vincent 2001:593). Hence, the handling of the language issue is a difficult challenge for any nation. In order to carry out national integration, modern nations, such as Japan and Korea, adopted a single-national language policy, and the US also has an English-only movement. Therefore, in the early stages of secessionist or irredentist movements, language policy is one of the tools to awaken mass sentiments of identity (Weinstein 1991:117).

Language is a sophisticated and sensitive problem for most states that consist of multi-race or multi-ethnic groups. In multi-race or multi-ethnic nations, the use of standard languages acts as a de facto restriction on political participation by most of the other races or ethnic groups (Schaeffer 1990:173). For example, in the Soviet Union, which consisted of fifteen Union Republics, the Russians formed the majority constituting 52.4 per cent of the population, while Ukrainians were the second largest nationality in the Soviet Union, comprising 16 per cent of the population in 1979. From the beginning, the secessionists in the Soviet Union were considered counter-revolutionary. The Russian language was adopted as a compulsory subject in all Soviet schools for almost half a century from 1938. In the mid-1970s, the language issue became heated in the non-Russian republics. In 1978, the Soviet government decreed the improvement of the teaching of the Russian language. Non-Russians immediately responded strongly to this proposal. Several thousand demonstrated in Georgia against a proposal to make Russian an official language, whilst in Estonia, demonstrators opposed Russification and called for non-Estonian troops to be withdrawn (Duncan 1990:153-157).

Therefore, if the existing central government adopts a single language as the national language, secessionists could use this to foster rumours that the government discriminates against the other races or ethnic groups and so cause resentment between other races or ethnic groups and central government. They agitate that it is a basic human right to speak their mother tongue and promote their dialect to the level of a national language in order to build a new national identity.

5.3. Ethnic conflicts

Ethnic conflict is, in fact, one of the very important factors underlying secession. In fact, secession is a special form of ethnic conflict. Although secession is an element of international politics, it reflects ethnic demands for the creation of a new state separate from the existing central government. Therefore, the emergence of separatism basically belongs to the field of domestic ethnic politics (Horowitz 1985:230-231).

In the 1990s, ethnic conflicts spread through Europe quickly. From the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia in 1991 and 1992, to the Kosovo conflict, separatism spread like a contagious disease (Ayres & Saideman 2000:91). In most cases, separatism was caused by, and resulted in ethnic conflicts.

5.3.1. Ethnic group

According to Morris (1968:167), “an ethnic group is a distinct category of the population in a larger society whose culture is usually different from its own. The members of such a group are, or feel themselves, or are thought to be, bound together by common ties of race or nationality or culture.”

An ethnic group is a group in which the people have their collective identity based on shared historical heritage, life experience and cultural traits, such as lifestyle, religious beliefs, language, physical appearance, region of residence etc (Gurr & Harff 1994:191). Race and ethnicity are often interchangeably, but they are not similar. Ethnic groups are defined by cultural characteristics within the same race, whereas race is based on physical characteristics (Kammeyer *et al.* 1997:276). For example, in the US, White, Black, and Asian Americans belong to racial groups, while Puerto Ricans, Jews, Chinese Americans and Polish Americans are considered ethnic groups (Schaefer & Lamn 1998:297).

5.3.2. Ethnic identity shift to secession

Ethnic identity relates to how individuals feel about their identity: some people identify with the state, some people identify with their race, some people identify with their ethnic kindred (Gurr & Harff 1994:2). Others, such as the Chinese, identify strongly with the province in which they were born. In other words, birth establishes

the basic ethnic identity, hence, the myth of collective ancestry creates ethnicity (Horowitz 1985:52). Ethnic groups are, therefore, characterised by attributes such as race, language, religion, history (fact plus myth), and homeland territory (Morris-Jones 1986:130).

Any one of the above attributes of ethnic groups may interact with each other, and even act on their own to convert ethnic identity to a secessionist movement. In other words, ethnic affiliation, as a factor motivating secession, includes the factors of religion, language and history. Generally speaking, ethnicity is the most important factor underlying secessionism. Some secessionists stir hatred between various ethnic groups through electoral processes, and even portray ethnic identity as national identity during the preparatory stage of secession.

5.4. Ideology

An ideology is a systematic set of ideas and beliefs concerning the specific nature of political, economic and social affairs (Elliott *et al.* 1992:554). Apart from religion, resentment and differing political views are the two major ideological motivations for a secession movement.

5.4.1. Resentment

One of the motivations of secessionist groups pursuing complete independence from the existing central government may be their strong sense of grievance (Horowitz 1985:231). Grievances may have resulted from long-term historical factors or present policy, including the sense of being victims of discrimination, inequality, oppression, and ethnicity. These are powerful motivations for secession and separatist movements (Heraclides 1997:699).

In fact, some legacies of antagonism and inequality are left over from historical processes, such as holocaust events between two ethnic groups or the return of land to original indigenous people, and will lead to contemporary ethnic conflicts (Gurr 1993:17). Some results of antagonism and inequality created by present policies, such as a single-language policy and racial discrimination, also generate contemporary ethnic conflicts. The above ethnic resentment usually develops into

secession movements.

5.4.2. Political and economic systems

During the twentieth century, various political and economic systems have evolved, such as Capitalism, Socialism and Communism. These political and economic systems have also been at the root of various secessionist movements. Some nations are not only divided, but have also adopted Capitalism and Communism respectively, such as North-South Korea; and Taiwan and Mainland China. These states are not only in a state of separation, but are also separate according to their political and economic systems. This has also resulted in different standards of living and the governments of those states with a better standard of living use this situation against their divided entity to create further ideological separation. Thus, political and economic systems become the explanation for the motivation behind secession.

5.5. Nationalism

In modern history, in both the East and West, nationalism has proven to be the main factor behind the rise and fall of many nations. In the West, one of the main elements behind the expansion, collapse or revival of the British Empire, France, Germany and Spain, has been nationalism. In the East, nationalism aroused the national consciousness of the Chinese élites who mobilised themselves against the aggression of Western colonialism, restoring Chinese national sovereignty and recovering national pride.

5.5.1. The nature of nationalism

Around the eighteenth century, the phenomenon of nationalism first appeared in Europe (Guibernau 1996:45). However, nationalism has many dissimilar meanings, which muddles the accurate concept of nationalism (Hechter 2000:5). Nationalism is difficult to satisfactorily define, since it concerns the belief in a shared historical heritage, common interests and cultural sentiment (Longyear 1996:872). It can signify a feeling and sentiment of belonging to the nation or it can mean a social and political movement to attain the nation's goal (Smith 1991:72).

Esman (1994:28) states that "nationalism is the ideology that proclaims the

distinctiveness of a particular people and their right to self-rule in their homeland.” Therefore, nationalism means a belief about the character, interests, rights and duties of nations, and also represents an organized political movement, which can protect and enhance the interests of nations (Seton-Watson 1977:3). It is Guibernau’s (1996:43) view that “nationalism is a sentiment that has to do with attachment to a homeland, a common language, ideals, values and traditions, and also with the identification of a group with symbols (a flag, a particular song, piece of music or design) which define it as ‘different’ from others.” For example, the Taiwan government is adopting a pro-secession Cross-Straits policy, hence, the lyrics of the national anthem of the ROC were done away with in 2002.

Nationalism’s nature is sophisticated and difficult to define precisely, and from different historical or social angles, nationalism has different faces. State-building nationalism is the nationalism that attempts to embody the cultural identity of the people in a given state for the purpose of pursuing a nation (Hechter 2000:15). Similarly, nationalism can be categorised as liberal nationalism, conservative nationalism, cultural nationalism, fascist nationalism, totalitarian nationalism, ethnic nationalism and so forth.

5.5.2. The shift from ethnic nationalism to secessionism

In fact, nationalism is a double-edged sword. It awakens the self-consciousness of a nation, and lets the élite nationalists devote themselves to reviving their nation and to using their nation to establish further prosperity and increase strength. On the other hand, however, nationalism, especially ethnic nationalism, believes its culture, language or race is superior to others, and can shift from nationalism to secessionism.

In the early 1990s, the unifying force of the Cold War and of bloc-defined politics waned due to the fall of communist regimes in Europe and the disintegration of the bipolar structure of international relations. At the same time, as the nations of Eastern Europe began the process of transforming their communist systems to democracies, their political élite gained national power and controlled their populations quickly and effectively through the use of ethnocentric nationalism. For

example, former communist leaders portrayed themselves as nationalists to enable them to use national sentiment to gain power (Pesic 1994:132-133). Ethnocentric nationalism then developed into secession and separatist movements, and eventually led to the disintegration of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

However, in reality, these motivations or causes of secession and separatism are sophisticated, and not only vary from phase to phase, but may also be combined. For example, the motivation for ethnic conflict includes elements of religion, language and nationalism. During the early stages of a secessionist movement, the secessionists may often overemphasize the value of speaking their mother tongue in order to establish a common consciousness. During the violent stages of a secessionist movement, the secessionists may instigate strong emotions amongst their followers by reminding them of tragic historical events involving different ethnic groups in order to establish a common consciousness through ethnic hatred. They may also stress the differences between the ethnic groups in order to establish a common consciousness, or may emphasize both language issues and ethnic hostility simultaneously. During the stage of international intervention, secessionists may stress the differences between political and economic systems. Therefore, different motivating factors may play various roles at different developmental stages of secession.

6. METHODS OF SECESSION AND SEPARATISM

It is not easy for secessionism and secessionist movements to emerge overnight, and they often follow certain processes. When provoked by factors such as religion, language, ethnic identity, ideology, or nationalism in the early stages, separatists often adopt the strategy of non-violence towards the national government of an existing state. The non-violent approach creates conflict between separatists and the rest of the population. At a later stage, the non-violent secessionist movements eventually use violence. Externally, secessionists exploit international intervention to achieve their goal. Of course, international intervention also includes non-violent and violent elements.

6.1. Non-violence

The process of non-violent secessionism can be categorised as explicit and implicit. The explicit non-violent mode of secessionism includes civil disobedience, negotiation and plebiscite. For instance, the civil disobedience movement led by Gandhi was non-violent, and the goal of Gandhi's civil disobedience was to achieve Indian independence, namely, only the secession of India from the British Empire, and not the overthrow of the British government (Buchanan 1991:10).

With regard to the implicit non-violent mode of secession, as Ayoob's (1995:181) study on self-determination pointed out, "the separation of self-determination and secession can be boosted by constitutional guarantees to protect minority rights and to preserve or bestow autonomy on regions populated by minority ethnic groups." In other words, under the protection of constitutional guarantees, or where there is political tolerance for minority groups, the implicit non-violent mode of secessionism allows for elements such as pro-secession political articles, editorials and news; the establishment of pro-secession law and language policy; the changing of perspectives in history books; the building of pro-secession public opinion under a democratic system, such as the promulgation of pro-secession ideology during election periods; and even the internationalization of the problem of secession through the diplomatic route.

As for the outcome of secession through non-violence, some secessionists have achieved their goals. For example, Singapore seceded from Malaysia through negotiation.

6.2. Violence

Land is the basic goal of secession and separatism, hence, state élites believe that they have the responsibility to preserve the territorial integrity of their state. This means that if the existing central government may lose land, it will attempt to quash the secessionist movement with violence (Esman 1994:222). Once conflicts develop into the violent stage, there is not only hatred for members of opposing groups, but also fear of hatred and retaliation by opposing groups (Hardin 1995:32). Therefore, in many cases of disputes or conflicts between two communities or governments, both parties use violence, not negotiation in order to settle issues because of mutual

distrust (Morries-Jones 1986:135). In the case of secession, which concerns the core national security of the existing central government, it is difficult to have mutual trust between the secessionist group and the existing central government, and therefore, both eventually tend to resort to violence to solve the separation issue.

Once a non-violent secessionist movement becomes violent, it may become out of control, leading from street violence to a war of secession, such as guerrilla warfare, terrorism or conventional war. According to statistics, 40 to 50 per cent of the ongoing wars in the 1990s involved secessionist movements (Spencer 1998b:18). Even if secessionists achieve their goal, they usually pay the price of devastating war (Gurr 1993:295). However, the success or failure of secession through violence depends upon the success or failure of the secessionist war. A classic example of secessionism is that of the American South, comprised of eleven states, attempting to secede from the Union (Magill *et al.* 1996:1232). This famous secession eventually led to the American Civil War, which was waged from 1861 to 1865 (Motyl *et al.* 2001:466). In this war, roughly 359,000 soldiers from the Union (the Northern States) and 258,000 soldiers from the Confederate States of America (the Southern States) died, either on the battlefield or in military hospitals (Brogan 1985:355). In other words, the US sacrificed 617,000 soldiers for the unification of the nation.

6.3. International intervention

By the twenty-first century, technology, electronic communication and air transportation have progressed markedly, also facilitating communication between nations, and as a result, international intervention is often inevitable in cases of secessionism. With regard to the importance of the international factor, Horowitz (1985:230) has observed that “whether a secessionist movement will achieve its aims, however, is determined largely by international politics, by the balance of interests and forces that extend beyond the state.” External assistance has a significant impact on secessionist movements, and the success or failure of a secessionist movement is often decided by external support (Ayoob 1995:52).

In fact, secessionist wars often involve third parties as intermediaries, and whether the third parties support either the secessionist movement or the central government,

is a decisive factor for the secessionist movement (Heraclides 1991:46). If the secessionist group falls into a stalemated conventional war, and does not have the ability to defeat the existing central government, the only way to assist in solving the predicament might be through international intervention or international diplomatic recognition (Heraclides 1990:378).

International intervention basically has two forms: intangible involvement and tangible involvement. Basically, intangible involvement goes hand-in-hand with the non-violent method, while tangible involvement can embrace either non-violence, or violence (including military involvement) .

6.3.1. Intangible international involvement

Intangible involvement includes media propaganda, political contacts, and political-diplomatic support. In the case of media propaganda, Western powers, such as the US, which have global media instruments, can invite élite secessionists to participate in television programmes and provide the opportunity to promote their views; or establish specific radio stations to broadcast pro-secession programmes to specific nations. The external power can arrange political fora discussing and indirectly recognising the right of secessionism to encourage the secessionists; the president or secretary of state can invite the secessionist leaders and arrange for them to make speeches at famous universities; or can award political prizes to them in order to increase their legitimacy; and political asylum can be given to élite secessionists in order to protect them.

As for political-diplomatic support, it includes verbal statements, such as the expression of humanitarian concern, the recognition of a secessionist entity; and diplomatic pressure on the existing central government and its allies, such as voting in International Governmental Organizations; or official contacts with the secessionists (Heraclides 1991:49).

6.3.2. Tangible international involvement

Tangible involvement is where international powers provide the secessionist movement with substantial support. It could be categorised into three types, namely

material aid, access aid, and assistance by way of services (Heraclides 1991:46). Material aid includes funds, food, medicines, and weapons. Access aid includes communication and transportation networks and access to world media. Assistance by way of services includes, for example, offers of sanctuary, asylum, base of operations, arms purchase, and the provision of military advisers (trainers) in the secessionist territory (Heraclides 1991:248) .

A recent classic example of military involvement is the case of the attempted secession of Kurds from Iraq. The total population of the Kurds is approximately 25.8 million people. At present, 53 per cent of Kurds live in Turkey, 26 per cent in Iran, 17 per cent in Iraq, and only 4 per cent in Syria. The ratio of Kurds as a percentage of country population is 24 per cent in Turkey, 12 per cent in Iran, 23 per cent in Iraq and 9 per cent in Syria (Izady 1992:117). During the 1990-1991 Gulf War, when Iraq plunged into a military predicament, the Kurdish leaders mobilised widespread resistance to attack Iraq again, but these rebellions were squashed by Iraqi forces within a month. This triggered a million or more Kurdish refugees fleeing toward neighbouring countries. In order to safeguard the Kurds, the US-led government coalition unilaterally announced a protected zone in the area of Iraqi Kurdistan in October 1992 (Gurr & Harff 1994:29-30) .

The above-mentioned methods of secession and separatism are basically categorised as non-violent and violent. However, if the secessionist movement is still in the non-violent stage, such as peaceful negotiation, it is difficult to predict the outcome of the bid for secession, because non-violence involves many uncertainties such as domestic ethnic conflict or international intervention. Once the secessionist movement adopts violence, however, the outcome depends on victory or failure in a war of secession.

7. SETTLEMENT OF SECESSION AND SEPARATISM

When secessionists use force successfully, the relationship between the separatists and the central government is totally severed, and the outcome is very simple, secession or unification. If non-violence is chosen, different ways to resolve the issue exist, and the outcomes can vary from total independence to national unification.

7.1. Negotiated secession

A central government often does not want to pay, or does not have the ability to pay, the enormous price of a war of secession, which may lead to national disintegration. Therefore, the leaders of the existing central government may consider that the cost of the war against a secessionist movement may exceed its capacity and the symbolic value of unity. They may as a result accept negotiated secession (Gurr 1993:295).

When both the secessionist movement and the central government are at the brink of a war of secession, both parties might agree to adopt a confederation or commonwealth system in the secessionist area (Spencer 1998a:6). If this is still not acceptable, the existing central government may accept the separatists' demands in order to prevent bloodshed (Spencer 1998a:5).

On the other hand, a central government may grant a province or state independence through negotiation if it is under pressure or threat from other sources. For example, at the end of World War II, the ruling Chinese Party, the KMT (frequently referred to as the "Nationalist Party") was facing a serious national crisis after a long-term war with Japan, and with the possibility of civil war against the CCP. Under strong pressure from Stalin, China signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on 14 August 1945, accepting that there could be a referendum regarding the independence of the Mongolian Province after the war. Japan surrendered on 15 August 1945. After a peaceful referendum in Mongolia in 1945, China recognised Mongolia's independence (Lee, A. 1987:214-230).

7.2. Responding to secession

When the central government of a multi-ethnic nation faces a challenge from separatist organizations, it means that the central government may lose part of its land and people, so they usually do not accept the separatists' full demands. Gurr & Harff (1994:112-113) distinguish four response patterns – containment, assimilation, pluralism and power sharing – that have been attempted, particularly in the last half of the twentieth century. Spencer (1998a:5-6) states that the government can

improve the circumstances of disadvantaged minorities, adopt asymmetric federalism, let minorities win under certain circumstances, and even settle for a confederal or commonwealth relationship. Basically, the four responses of Gurr and Harff represent a pro-technical view, while Spencer's method is more based on principle and is comprehensive. Spencer's view of responding to secession is, therefore, explored further below.

7.2.1. Improving the circumstances of disadvantaged minorities

As long as the disadvantaged minority population protests, attempts must be made to improve their circumstances (Spencer 1998a:5). For example, the US adopted the containment policy, which kept minorities "separate and unequal" (Gurr & Harff 1994:112). In the face of strong protest from Black Americans, particularly the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the US began school desegregation in the 1950s and set up the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in 1962 (Brogan 1985:645-651).

Another way of improving the circumstances of disadvantaged minorities is the implementation of an assimilation policy, which was long the preferred alternative to merging with other ethnic groups. Assimilation offers incentives and opportunities to minorities and encourages or forces them to adopt the language, values, and behaviours of the dominant society (Gurr & Harff 1994:112). For example, Kurds in Iraq have been strongly encouraged to play a role in the ruling party and in bureaucratic structures. The Turkish government has also attempted to assimilate the Kurds in a similar fashion (Gurr & Harff 1994:113). However, minority resentment and ethnic conflicts are usually provoked by forced assimilation. In fact, if minorities do not accept the forced cultural and political assimilation with the majority, they usually resist strongly (Entessar 1992:81-111).

The success or failure of assimilation depends on the race and region of the minorities and majorities. If the minorities and majorities belong to the same race, it is easy to assimilate as part of a natural process, for example through marriage. If the distinction between the regions occupied by the minorities and majorities is too big, it is difficult to assimilate. For example, in China, the Han people and most of the

minorities, such as Manchurians, belong to the same yellow race, so it is easy to assimilate through marriage. However, this is not the case with the Tibetans and the Han people, since the Tibetans live on the 5,000 meter high plateau of Tibet, while the Han people live on the common plain. The Han people could not become accustomed to living on the 5,000 meter high plateau in the long-term. For physical reasons, it is very difficult for the Han people to immigrate to the Tibetan Autonomous Region (TAR) en masse and marry Tibetans. Therefore, even though the Han people and the Tibetans belong to the same yellow race, it is still difficult for them to assimilate through mass marriage.

7.2.2. Adoption of asymmetric system or letting the minorities win

In order to accommodate the particular realities of minorities, the central government could implement an asymmetric system, namely, adopt a unique relationship with the provinces or republics where the minorities live (Spencer 1998a:6). Another alternative is to give minorities advantages under certain circumstances, namely, to adopt unusual arrangements that provide special opportunities to let the minorities win a particular political contest (Spencer 1998a:6). In other words, it means that the central government could adopt a pluralist policy which gives greater interest to the minorities, namely, a power-sharing approach (Gurr & Harff 1994:113). For example, Mainland China has increased Tibet's financial allocation and social welfare relative to other provinces of China. From 1994 to 2001, the central government and other provinces allocated 62 mammoth aid programmes to TAR, including industries, agriculture, cultures, schools, hospitals and television receiver stations (XNA 2001:1).

The approach implemented in Hong Kong by Mainland China of one country with two systems, is perhaps the classic modern example of an asymmetric system. In China, the Hong Kong area was leased to Britain for 99 years. The lifestyle and political ideology in Hong Kong is certainly different from that of Mainlanders as a result of the long-term colonial control of Britain. Mainland China has accepted the realities and history of Hong Kong, has adopted an approach of asymmetric centralism and has constructed power-sharing arrangements. A Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) was established, which possesses a high degree of autonomy,

except in foreign policy and defence; possesses executive, legislative and independent judicial power, including that of final adjudication; and has independent finance. The central government of Mainland China does not levy taxes on the HKSAR, and possesses the right to issue travel documents for entry into and exit from Hong Kong (China/Britain JD 1984:1-2).

7.3. Pathways of divided nations

In the middle of the twentieth century, four divided nations emerged. Taiwan and Mainland China, North and South Vietnam, North and South Korea, and East and West Germany. With respect to the processes of unification, Henderson & Lebow (1974:439-441) point out that there were four stages in the resolution of secession or unification, namely: stage one: initial division, where the defining characteristic is intense hostility between entities; stage two: middle-term division, where the defining characteristic is declining hostility between entities; stage three: rapprochement, a stage that none of the divided nations had yet entered; and stage four: unification.

However, in April 1975, North and South Vietnam, following a war to unite their nation, established the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The violent unification of Vietnam was not predicted at that time. In March 1990, East and West Germany completed non-violent unification with the acceptance of the US and the Soviet Union. This non-violent unification of Germany was also not predicted. In reality, there are almost no politicians who would have predicted the unification of Germany until a year before it happened, but some of the characteristics of stage one and stage two submitted by Henderson *et al* are certainly close to the development of the divided nations of Taiwan and Mainland China, and South and North Korea. For example, as outlined in the first stage, there has been intense hostility between the two divided entities, and attempts to subvert the opponent entity. As outlined in the second stage, there has been a decrease in the ideological confrontation between the divided entities, and they have permitted the exchange of people (Henderson & Lebow 1974:439-440).

At present, Taiwan and Mainland China, and South and North Korea are still divided nations. The settlement of the secession of the two divided nations could either

require the use of force or not. If the divided nations do not use force to resolve the secession issue, they may resort to negotiated secession or unification.

8. CONCLUSION

The final outcome of secessionist aspirations depends on certain conditions. Firstly, general objective factors come into play. Success or failure of the secessionist movement depends on the general objective elements which are the differences between the secessionist minorities and other ethnic groups, such as population size, population distribution, and the geographical location of the minorities. If minorities are the same as, or are close to other ethnic groups with respect to race and culture; if the population ratio of the minorities is low in the existing state; if the minorities live amongst other ethnic groups, even dispersed in vast areas of the existing state; or if the secession of minorities will affect the national interests of the existing state, secession will succeed with difficulty.

Secondly, subjective factors also play a role. Success or failure of a secessionist movement also depends on the determination of the role players. If the central government takes a decision to suppress secessionist movements, the secessionist movement might fail. For example, in the 1860s, the American central government (the Northern States) launched a brutal civil war, spending four years and sacrificing roughly 359,000 soldiers (258,000 Southern soldiers died), in order to quell the southern secessionists. However, in the early 1990s, the central government of the Soviet Union, influenced by the Western ideologies of democracy and human rights, accepted the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania), which then triggered the independence of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgystan, and led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

International intervention is a third factor. During the Cold War, both the US and the Soviet Union intervened in secessionist and separatist struggles. A good example is what happened in Korea after the end of World War II. North Korea launched a unification war with the support of the Soviet Union, and almost occupied the whole Korean Peninsula, and completed national unification. However, due to direct military intervention by the US, they were thwarted. Mainland China also participated in the

war on the side of the North. Finally, in July 1953, the Korean War ended with the Armistice Agreement and Korea divided into North Korea and South Korea again (Chang, W.Y. 1991:14-28). From a macro perspective, the division of Korea was largely dominated by the US and the Soviet Union. As previously stated, generally speaking, the success of minorities will affect the national interests of the existing state, and, therefore, the secession will succeed with difficulty.

The success or failure of the secessionist movements in the early twenty-first century, either peacefully or by force, depends on a number of factors as discussed. The outcome of secessionist attempts may be secession or unification. Forms of secession include a commonwealth of independent states, and complete separation with the secessionist group becoming an independent nation. Forms of unification include autonomous regions; one country, two systems; and one country, one system. The approaches of countries depend on the factors discussed.

Since the early twentieth century, China, with a long history of multi-ethnicity, has been troubled by various secessionist movements. Some external powers have encouraged secessionist activities by the Chinese minorities in order to weaken China. For example, in the 1910s, Britain instigated Tibetan secessionists to seek the independence of Tibet (Kuo 1986:424-425); Japan established a puppet state in Manchuria, in 1932, and created the Mongolia-Sinkiang Consolidated Autonomous Government in 1937 (Chang, Y.F. 1998:249). However, these independent nations and governments ended with the defeat of Japan in World War II.

Nevertheless, China still could not escape temporary secession. When World War II came to an end, the civil war between the KMT and CCP broke out. As a result, the KMT-led government of the Republic of China (ROC) fled to Taiwan in 1949, and the CCP came to power in Mainland China. At that time, CCP-led China was confident about taking over Taiwan by force to achieve national unification. However, the Korean War broke out on 25 June 1950. US President, Harry Truman, ordered the US Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Strait to deter an attack from Mainland China on 27 June 1950 (USA/Truman 1950:1). Hence, as a result of historical events, the Republic of China was divided into the ROC on Mainland China and the ROC on

Taiwan. Therefore, in the next chapter, an historical overview of political developments in the ROC up to 1988 will be provided.

CHAPTER TWO

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE ROC UP TO 1988

Throughout Chinese history, the conflict between secessionists and unionists always occurred in so-called 'Dynastic Cycles'. In the early twentieth century, the last Qing dynasty was replaced by the KMT-led ROC. At that time, another very significant party, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), had emerged. By the middle of the twentieth century, the KMT-led ROC was defeated by the CCP in a civil war, and the party and its supporters fled to Taiwan in 1949. A great recession began in China. The history of the ROC has been divided into the ROC on Mainland China and the ROC on Taiwan since 1950. At the end of the twentieth century, the ROC adopted a secessionist policy toward the CCP on Mainland China. In order to explain the background, this chapter will focus on political developments in the ROC and its historical relationship with the CCP.

1. THE RISE OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

By the nineteenth century, modern science had begun to evolve in the West. For example, German chemist, Friedrich Wohler, synthesized the first organic compound in 1828 (Elliott *et al.* 1992:1204); US inventor, Samuel Finley Breese Morse, produced the first adequate electric telegraph in 1835 (Elliott *et al.* 1992:765); and English scientist and astronomer, John Frederick William Herschel, discovered thousands of close double stars, clusters and nebulae in 1847 (Elliott *et al.* 1992:521). As a result of the inventions of modern science, the industrial revolution began in the West, and the traditional craft-based economy was replaced by machines, with a resulting increase in productivity and efficiency. George Stephenson built the first public railroad in England in 1825, the first US-built locomotive serviced the South Carolina Railroad in 1830, the US transcontinental railroad was completed in 1869, and the trans-Canada continental railroad was completed in 1885 (Elliott *et al.* 1992:929).

China ignored the unprecedented progress of science and the industrial revolution in the West, still remaining a pre-modern society. When East met West, the extent of

Western power led to the defeat of China at the hands of Great Britain during the Opium War (1840-1842). As a result, China was forced to sign the *Treaty of Nanjing*, which was its first unequal treaty with a Western power. The *Treaty of Nanjing* not only forced the Chinese to buy opium from the British, but also ceded Hong Kong to the British, and preceded a series of invasions by Western powers and Japan. Therefore, the Treaty began a long and tragic period in Chinese history that lasted 150 years.

1.1. The Japanese invasion

After the Opium War, the weakness and backwardness of China became clear to the Western powers. France, Germany, Russia and the US invaded or oppressed China in succession. Finally, close neighbour, Japan, also joined their ranks and invaded China.

In July 1894, Japan launched a massive attack on China, starting the First Sino-Japanese War and defeating China. In the following year, China was humiliatingly coerced into signing the *Treaty of Shimonoseki*, ceding Taiwan, the Penghu (Pescadores) Islands and the Liaodung Peninsula to Japan. Due to strong pressure and intervention from Russia, Germany and France, Japan returned the Liaodung peninsula to China, but still kept Taiwan and the Penghu Islands, and made China pay huge reparations (Kuo 1986:262-274).

1.2. The Joint Expedition of eight foreign powers

After the First Sino-Japanese War, the Western powers further took advantage of China's weakness and underdevelopment, and escalated their invasions. For example, Germany occupied and forced the lease of the Bay of Jiaozhou, in the Shandong Province, in 1898. The leasing period was 99 years. Russia seized and leased Port Arthur (Lushun), in Liaodung Peninsula, in 1898, for a period of 25 years. Britain occupied and leased the Weihaiwei, in Shandong Province, for 25 years; and leased the New Territories, neighbouring Hong Kong, in 1898, for 99 years. France leased the Bay of Guangzhou, near Hainan Island, for 99 years (Wang 1983:253-255).

By the end of the nineteenth century, as a result of the many unequal treaties signed with Western imperialist powers, China could not set its own tariffs, but had to legalise the opium trade and give special rights to protect European businessmen and Christian missionaries. In other words, China was required to discriminate against Chinese people. This humiliation aroused Chinese nationalism. Popular discontent and xenophobia permeated society and triggered the Boxer Uprising.

The Boxers were a group who studied traditional martial arts that they believed would protect them from bullets. In 1900, the Boxers laid siege to the foreign legation in Beijing. The legation's united troops resisted for over a month until an expeditionary force of Russian, British, German, French, American, Japanese, Italian and Austrian troops marched into Beijing (Peking). Then, the expeditionary force lifted the siege and looted Beijing. In the following year, China was again humiliatingly forced to accept another treaty, the *Treaty of Beijing*. This treaty also forced China to pay huge reparations (GIO 2001:56-57).

1.3. The Republic of China

By the end of the nineteenth century, as a result of the government's weakness caused by a series of invasions by foreign powers, China was in an unprecedented predicament. The Chinese élite established secret organisations and launched a revolution to overthrow the Qing dynasty. One of the well-known members of the élite was Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

Dr. Sun Yat-sen organized the Revive China Association, with approximately a hundred Chinese living in Hawaii, in 1894. Furthermore, Dr. Sun gathered a few thousand members overseas and established the Revolutionary Alliance, in Tokyo, in 1905. When the Empress Dowager died in 1908, and a child succeeded to the throne (Long 1991:35-39), the power of the Qing dynasty evaporated.

On 10 October 1911, some imperial army officers of the "New Army" staged a mutiny and occupied Wuchang, the capital of Hubei Province, declaring this province independent from the Qing Empire. This mutiny inspired the Chinese people, and within two months, most of the provinces had followed suit. The ROC was

established (Roberts 1999:206). Simultaneously, Dr. Sun Yat-sen learnt this news in the US, and came back to China. He was elected Provisional President of the ROC, in Nanjing, on 1 January 1912, and the last Qing emperor officially abdicated on 12 February 1912 (Kuo 1986:403-408).

The most significant result of the revolution of 1911 was that China ended rule by the monarchies, which had lasted over 2,000 years, established a Republic, and began a new era. Secondly, because the Qing dynasty was established by the minority Manchu people (approximately only 0,87 per cent of the whole population of China in 1990), the revolution also ended Manchu rule and transferred the regime to the majority Han people (approximately 92.0 per cent of the whole population of China in 1990) (MIB 1991:1-66). In other words, this revolution resulted in majority rule in China and prevented future majority/minority struggles. Thirdly, due to the collapse of the Qing, the revolution of 1911 dismantled the authority of the central government and caused the Chinese to enter into internal political struggles. Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet and some provinces were in a situation of de facto secession or semi-secession.

2. THE FIRST CIVIL WAR BETWEEN THE KMT AND THE CCP

In the first half of the twentieth century, two important parties emerged in China, the KMT and the CCP. Both of them ruled modern China. In reality, the KMT dominated many central and southern provinces, and the CCP controlled some southeastern and northern provinces. The KMT collaborated with the CCP twice, and fought civil wars against them twice. During the second civil war, the KMT-led government was defeated by the CCP-led forces and fled to Taiwan in 1949. The CCP then governed Mainland China. Due to the intervention of the US, China entered an era of the Great Secession between Taiwan and Mainland China.

2.1. The warlord period

The revolution of 1911 began when a mutiny by the New Army officers in Wuchang city caused a series of provinces to declare independence, and the ROC was established. In other words, the ROC was not established by Dr. Sun Yat-sen with forces that conquered all the provinces. Therefore, Dr. Sun Yat-sen did not have the

necessary political power to dominate the huge nation, and passed the presidency on to the previous Qing General, Yuan Shi-kai. However, General Yuan betrayed the democratic system by making himself emperor, provoking strong resistance. He died in 1916 (GIO 2000:40).

After General Yuan Shi-kai's death in 1916, the central power further weakened, and Yuan's old army, warlords, local strongmen and gangsters created for themselves regional power bases from north to south, even fighting each other until the KMT completed the nominal reunification of China in 1928. This period (1916-1928) is frequently known as China's warlord period (Ebrey 1996:267). During this period, two far-reaching events occurred in China, one was the founding of the KMT, and the other was the birth of the CCP.

2.2. The founding of the Kuomintang (KMT)

After Yuan Shi-kai became the president of the ROC, he overstepped the bounds of parliament and aspired to dictatorship. Yuan's intention to impose authoritarian rule generated strong objections. In opposition, Song Jiao-ren, one of Dr. Sun's comrades, expanded the "Revolutionary Alliance", which included other small parties, to form the Kuomintang, in August 1912. Song opposed President Yuan strongly, and was assassinated by Yuan in March. As a result of this assassination, Dr. Sun launched the "Second Revolution", which generated insurrection by the seven southern provinces in the summer of 1913. President Yuan sent troops and squashed the insurrection quickly. Then, Dr. Sun and his comrades fled to Japan (Kuo 1986:410-419). In Japan, Dr. Sun Yat-sen re-established the "Chinese Revolutionary Party" (Lee, A. 1988:12-14).

On 4 May 1919, more than 3,000 students demonstrated in Beijing against the decision at the Versailles Peace Conference that Japan was allowed to take over the German concessions in Shandong Province (GIO 1987:457). This was frequently referred to as the May Fourth Movement. In order to oppose the Beijing government, in October 1919, Dr. Sun Yat-sen re-organised the "Chinese Revolutionary Party" as the "Chinese Kuomintang", which differed from the Kuomintang established in 1912 (Lo *et al.* 1969:769), known as the Kuomintang, KMT or Nationalist Party (GIO

1987:457).

2.3 The birth of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP)

In March 1919, the Communist International (Comintern, also known as Third International) was established by the Soviet Union in Moscow. In July-August 1920, the Second Congress of the Communist International was held, where the “Theses on the National and Colonial Question”, primarily authored by Lenin, was presented. The “Theses” identified China as being very important to the future of the world revolutionary movement. In China, at that time, Lee Ta-chao, a professor at Beijing University, organized a society amongst a small group of his students to study Marxism (Rodzinski 1983:11-12).

In 1920, the Far Eastern Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI) was established in Irkutsk. G.N. Voitinsky, who was sent to China by the ECCI, helped to develop the Chinese Communist movement. He went to Beijing where he was in contact with famous pro-Communist Lee Ta-chao. He took Lee’s advice to proceed to Shanghai to promote Communism (Rodzinski 1983:12).

At that time, some pro-communist groups were organized in Wuhan, Changsha and Canton cities, and abroad in countries such as Japan and France. In order to develop a more concrete Communist organisation, in the summer of 1921, twelve delegates, representing 57 members, held the First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in Shanghai. Maring and Nikolski, two representatives of the Communist International, also attended this meeting (Rodzinski 1983:12-13). This meeting is regarded as the birth of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

2.4. The first cooperation and civil war between the KMT and the CCP

In August 1917, Lenin founded the Soviet Union and in March 1919, he established the Communist International. In order to protect the interests of the Soviet Union in the Far East, the Communist International devoted attention to developing Communism in China after its Second Congress in 1920 (Li 1996:105). Against this backdrop, the CCP was established in the summer of 1921. However, in the initial development stage of the CCP, it was small and weak, and the KMT was relatively

strong. Therefore, the Communist International acted as intermediary between the KMT and the CCP.

At that time, China was under internal and external threat. There were conflicts between warlords and threatened imperialist invasions. The KMT was at a low ebb, and also needed assistance from the Communist International.

2.4.1. The first cooperation between the KMT and the CCP

In October 1919, Dr. Sun Yat-sen re-organized the “Chinese Revolutionary Party” as the KMT at Shanghai. In October 1920, a military leader, Chen Chiung-ming, a previous supporter of Dr. Sun, captured Canton. Dr. Sun Yat-sen then went back to Guangzhou (Canton) in November 1920, and was elected as President of the newly-formed southern government in May 1921. In the following year, Dr. Sun Yat-sen ordered the Northern Expedition to unite China. Because military resources were weak and this was not feasible, Chen Chiung-ming organized a mutiny and attacked Sun’s headquarters in Guangzhou, on 16 June 1922. Dr. Sun was forced to flee from Guangzhou to Shanghai on 8 August (Rodzinski 1983:7-8).

Joffe, a Soviet diplomat, arrived in Beijing on 12 August 1922, when Dr. Sun’s power was at a low ebb. Joffe met Dr. Sun in Shanghai and promised to give him military assistance. Dr. Sun and Joffe issued the “Sun-Joffe Communique”, in Shanghai, on 27 January 1923, as an expression of the friendly relationship between them. Dr. Sun then returned to Guangzhou on February 1923, and made an effort to re-establish his power (Li 1996:164-226). At that time, Sun regarded the Soviet Union as an ally, and allowed the Chinese Communists to join the KMT as individuals. As a result, many Chinese Communists joined the KMT during 1923 (Rodzinski 1983:25).

In January 1924, the First Congress of the KMT was held in Guangzhou, where cooperation between the KMT and the CCP was further promoted. The Chinese Communists had one-sixth of the seats of the Central Executive Committee of the KMT. In the same year, with the assistance of a group of the Soviet Union’s military advisers, the formal military school, Huangpu (Whampoa) Military Academy, was

established in Guangzhou city (Franke 1970:133-134). On 8 October 1924, the Soviet Union shipped the first arms, including 8,000 rifles and abundant ammunition, to aid the KMT's Huangpu Military Academy. Further sizable arms shipments also took place in 1925 and 1926 (Rodzinski 1983:29).

2.4.2 The Northern Expedition

Sun revived the KMT party, and planned to resume his Northern Expedition to eradicate the warlords and strike at their imperialist supporters (Hsu 1995:523). However, before the Northern Expedition could take place, Sun died on 12 March 1925 (Lo *et al.* 1969:1197).

Chiang Kai-shek, the former commandant of the Huangpu Military Academy, carried out Sun's will and proceeded with the Northern Expedition (GIO 2001:60). With the CCP's assistance in advance by mobilizing peasants and workers and instigating strikes and sabotage in the cities, and with Soviet supplies, the Northern Expedition conquered the southern half of China, from Guangzhou to the Central region, within nine months (Hsu, C.Y. 1995:525).

2.4.3. The first war between the KMT and the CCP

On 12 April 1927, military commander, Chiang Kai-shek, staged a coup. He ordered soldiers and gangsters to attack and massacre the workers (Han 1995:93-94). The Green Gang, a Shanghai underground organization, slaughtered thousands of workers with the aid of special troops, and almost 5,000 people were killed within a few days (Rodzinski 1983:71-72). In those days, not only were Communists and workers killed in Shanghai, but countless Communists and workers were also slaughtered in Guangzhou (Han 1995:93-101). Then, on 18 April 1927, Chiang Kai-shek established a "National Government" and declared Nanjing city the capital of the ROC (Chu *et al.* 1993:2-3).

After the great massacre and purges of 1927-28, surviving Chinese Communists were coerced underground in major cities and rural areas. Mao Zedong established rural bases on the Hunan and Jiangxi provincial border, where they created a 'Soviet Government' in 1928 (Ebrey 1996:286-287). From 1930 to 1933, Chiang Kai-shek

launched four massive military attacks to destroy the Jiangxi Soviet and failed (Kuo 1986:597-623). Having learnt from the previous attacks, Chiang Kai-shek launched a fifth massive military action. This battle forced the CCP to give up the Jiangxi Soviet base. In October 1934, 80,000 Chinese Communists and their forces, the Red Army, broke out of the KMT's besiegement, and began the famous Long March. After one year, Chinese Communists and the Red Army had crossed the south and southwest of China, and marched almost 6,000 miles. Only 8,000 people eventually arrived at Yanan city in Shaanxi Province, which became their new base. The group of 8,000 people who survived the Long March became the cadres of the CCP. They made Yanan their base and developed the CCP (Ebrey 1996:287).

The decision of the KMT to cooperate with the CCP was made by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. After he passed away, the main support for cooperation between the KMT and the CCP disappeared. However, their mutual need – for example, the KMT needed Communist International military aid, and the CCP needed to use the KMT to expand their organization – outweighed their differences, including ideology and the struggle for power. As cooperation developed, the CCP held many top posts in the KMT organization, particularly in the military and the military school. When the Northern Expedition succeeded, the KMT no longer needed the aid of Communist International and felt the subversive threat from the CCP. Chiang Kai-shek staged a great massacre to purge the CCP's influence, and proceeded to launch five massive military attacks in order to wipe out the CCP completely.

3. THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR

On 18 September 1931, Japanese forces, in an event known as the Shenyang (Mukden) Incident, quickly occupied Manchuria, the northeast area of China. Japan then engaged in further aggression, when on 7 July 1937, Japanese troops attacked Chinese troops at the Marco Polo Bridge, beginning the long Second Sino-Japanese war, that lasted until August 1945 (GIO 2000:41).

In the face of the Japanese invasion, Chinese nationalism heightened and swept through the whole of China. In order to resist the Japanese aggression, the Chinese people wanted the KMT to cooperate with the CCP again.

3.1 The second cooperation between the KMT and the CCP

Facing Japanese invasion, the priority of Chiang Kai-shek was, nevertheless, to wipe out his internal enemies – the CCP. At the end of 1936, the Northeastern Army, forced out of Manchuria by Japan, strongly opposed this policy and staged a mutiny, aimed at kidnapping Chiang Kai-shek in Xian city. Finally, Chiang was forced to agree to set up a 'united front' with the CCP to resist Japan and he was then released (Ebrey 1996:282).

The KMT ceased military actions against the CCP in 1937, and cooperated with the CCP again. The CCP changed the name of the "Soviet Government", which they created in 1928, to the "Special Administration of the ROC", and changed the name of the Red Army to the "National Revolutionary Army". The KMT and the CCP established the united front to fight against Japan. However, the CCP still substantially controlled the Northwest area of China and its army and military strength developed quickly. For example, the Eighth Route Army of the CCP expanded from about 30,000 men in 1937 to 150,000 by August 1938 (Rodzinski 1983:161-163), and the New Fourth Army from about 12,000 men in 1938 to 100,000 by 1940 (Chang, Y.F. 1998:336).

There was some real cooperation between the KMT and the CCP. However, the rapid expansion of Communist forces threatened the KMT's power and eventually triggered a new struggle between the KMT and the CCP. In January 1941, the CCP's New Fourth Army was attacked by KMT troops, about 3,000 Communist soldiers were slaughtered, and many were shot after arrest or sent to prison camps. This massacre signaled the end of the second cooperation between the KMT and the CCP (Ebrey 1996:285).

3.2 The long-term Sino-Japanese War

The Second Sino-Japanese War was divided into three stages. The first stage began on 7 July 1937, the second stage began in late 1938, and the final stage lasted from when China joined the Allies after Japan bombed Pearl Harbour until the Japanese surrender (GIO 1987:102).

In the first stage, Japan won an overwhelming victory and occupied many Chinese major coastal cities, such as Beijing, Shanghai and Nanjing, the capital city of the ROC. In order to resist the Japanese invasion, the KMT-led government moved to Chongqing city in Sichuan Province, surrounded and shielded by mountains. The second stage was a stalemated war. The final stage began on 7 December 1941, when Japan bombed Pearl Harbour, and the US declared war on Japan. China joined the Allies and received abundant military aid from the US as a result (GIO 1987:101-104). Under massive attack by the US, the war in the Far East began to disadvantage Japan dramatically.

4. THE SECOND CIVIL WAR BETWEEN THE KMT AND THE CCP

After the US dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on 6 and 9 August 1945, according to the *Potsdam Declaration* of July 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allies on 14 August. The Japanese troops in China surrendered to the ROC government on 9 September 1945, in Nanjing (GIO 2001:63).

After the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, the Soviet Union immediately declared war on Japan and occupied Manchuria (Robert 1999:249) dismantling the Japanese factories, taking as much as they could back to the Soviet Union, and helping the Communist forces to obtain Japanese weapons (Ebrey 1996:290). On 10 August, Zhu De, the commander of the Chinese Communist armies, issued a general offensive order that all Communist-led forces should proceed to Central and North China. They achieved considerable initial results. However, Chiang Kai-shek ordered the Communist-led forces to cease actions and to stay where they were (Rodzinski 1983:216). Simultaneously, the US assisted and airlifted the KMT troops to cities in Northeast China and Manchuria, but when they arrived, the Communist-led forces had already occupied the rural area (Roberts 1999:249).

4.1. The second war between the KMT and the CCP

Chiang Kai-shek believed that, due to its absolute political and military superiority, the KMT had to control the whole of China. On October 1945, Chiang Kai-shek issued a secret order to launch a civil war against the CCP. On the other hand, Mao

Zedong advised the Chinese Communists that they had to learn their lesson from the past and that they could not let the tragic disasters of 1927 be repeated once again (Rodzinsk 1983:216-219).

It was inevitable that a second civil war between the KMT and the CCP would break out immediately. In order to prevent the war, US President Harry S. Truman sent George Marshall to China, in December 1945, to attempt to mediate several cease-fires (GIO 2001:64). At the beginning of the civil war, the KMT controlled major cities and industrial bases, and they had more than twice as many troops as the Communists. They also possessed an air force and a small navy (Roberts 1999:250). In the second stage, from July 1947, the KMT-led government declared an all-over offensive to root out the CCP. However, the Communist forces conquered the area of Manchuria and north China (Kuo 1986:750-752).

4.2. The KMT-led government flees to Taiwan

From the middle of 1947 to January of 1949, the KMT troops had lost 1,500,000 soldiers and the cities of Beijing and Tianjin. Finally, on 21 April 1949, Mao Zedong ordered the People's Liberation Army to cross the Yangtze River, and they occupied Nanjing, Wuhan and Shanghai within 40 days. After this overwhelming succession of victories, Mao Zedong declared the establishment of the new China in Beijing on 1 October 1949 (Crespigny 1992:182-183) and the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan from Mainland China on 8 December 1949 (Chu *et al.* 1993:1138). Taiwan Islands are about 36,000 square kilometer, 220 kilometers from the southeastern coast of Mainland China's Fujian provinces at the widest part of the Taiwan Strait, but only 130 kilometers at its narrowest (GIO 2001:10).

The KMT-led government after fleeing to Taiwan, divided from Mainland China by the Taiwan Straits, de facto seceded from Mainland China. Objectively, the civil war between the KMT and the CCP resulted in the historical tragedy of China, namely the division between Mainland China and Taiwan. However, at that time, if the KMT had not collapsed; if the CCP had not been too strong; or if Mao Zedong had not decided to defeat the enemy thoroughly and complete radical reunification, the civil war would have been prolonged. The US and the Soviet Union would have exerted

their influence and the KMT and the CCP would have been forced to divide China at the Yangtze River, and establish a CCP-led northern regime and a KMT-led southern regime (the former supported by the Soviet Union, and the latter supported by the US), resulting in intense hostility between the divided Chinese entities. As for the super nation of a billion people, the pain and torture imposed on the Chinese people had the division taken place would have been far worse than it has been as a result of today's Cross-Straits separation between Taiwan and Mainland China, and Chinese reunification would be unthinkable in the twenty first century.

5. DE FACTO SECESSION AND THE DARK PERIOD

When the KMT-led government of the ROC fled from Mainland China to Taiwan, 910,000 Mainlanders, along with the KMT-led government of the ROC, moved to Taiwan (Lee, D.M. 1969:249).

The KMT-led government of the ROC legally represented all Mainland China between 1911-1947, and de facto ruled many provinces at different times. Therefore, the withdrawal of the central government of the ROC meant the movement of the entire disintegrating central government to Taiwan. Many legislators, Ministers, professors, intellectuals, entrepreneurs, military officers and soldiers moved to Taiwan. The move also involved the nation's whole secret police structure, including the Secret Police Bureau and the Investigation Bureau.

In the middle of the twentieth century, the most secretive and frightening secret organization in China was the Secret Police Bureau of the Ministry of National Defence, which was commanded by Chiang Kai-shek. In 1948, the total number of members in the Secret Police Bureau was 10,238 (Shen 1989:578). For the purpose of eventual withdrawal, Chiang Kai-shek secretly ordered the general headquarters of the Secret Police Bureau and its documents to be moved to Taiwan in January 1949 (Shen 1989:641). At that time, approximately two or three thousand secret police reached Taiwan (Tang 1997:52-53), and another secret police organisation, the Investigation Bureau of the Ministry of the Interior, also moved to Taipei (Lee, S.J. 1988::1-7). In order to enhance security, the government of the ROC abolished the Taiwan Garrison Command and set up the Taiwan Safeguard Command on 1

September 1949 (HRCTR 1998a:284-285).

Taiwan, the smallest province of China, made up only three per cent of China's land mass, but suddenly it was home to the whole nation's secret police organisations. Thus, the ratio of secret police to Taiwan residents was quite high at that time. On the other hand, the civil war between the KMT and the CCP was a war between people of the same culture and race. The KMT lost the confidence of the people and the support of the military troops, and fled to Taiwan, triggering a crisis of legitimacy. In order to strengthen its political power and legitimacy, the Mainlander-led KMT ruled Taiwan cruelly. Of course, the presence of the secret police institutions, and particularly their competition for results, exacerbated their cruelty.

5.1. Chiang Kai-shek rules the ROC again

1949 was the turning point of the civil war and a number of events led up to the KMT's eventual withdrawal to Taiwan as set out above. In January, the CCP forces occupied the northern part of the Yangtze River, the KMT fled, keeping the southern part of the Yangtze River. At that time, Chiang Kai-shek had prepared to flee Taiwan. He not only ordered the general headquarters and its documents to be moved to Taiwan (Shen 1989:641), but also appointed Chen Cheng, as governor of Taiwan Province, and commander of the Taiwan Garrison Command. On 5 February 1949, the KMT-led government moved to Guangzhou city, Guangdong province, in the southern region of China (Chu *et al.* 1993:1090-1098).

On 21 April 1949, Communist forces launched an all-out attack. They crossed the Yangtze River, and achieved an overwhelming victory. On 26 May, Chiang Kai-shek fled to Taiwan (Chiang 1949:262). Subsequently, Communist forces occupied most of southern China, and some of the KMT troops fled to Taiwan from Shanghai and Amoy (Lee, A. 1990:313-314). On 15 October 1949, the KMT-led government was forced to move from Guangzhou to Chongqing city, Sichuan province, in the central region of China (Chu *et al.* 1993:1132). In this military predicament, on 14 November, Chiang Kai-shek travelled to Sichuan from Taiwan to launch a counter-attack. On 29 November, he moved the government to Chengdu City, also in Sichuan province, but Communist forces still triumphed in battle. On 8 December 1949, Chiang Kai-shek

gave the order to move the KMT-led government of the ROC from Chengdu to Taipei city, Taiwan province. Two days later, he and his son Chiang Ching-kuo left from Chengdu for Taipei (Chu *et al.* 1993:1136-1138). On 1 March 1950, Chiang Kai-shek re-instituted the presidency of the ROC in Taiwan (GIO 2001:478), and dominated the exercise of political power again.

5.2. The Great Political Purge

The situation of the KMT-led government worsened dramatically. The KMT-led government lost most of the southern part of the Yangtze River. US President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson believed the KMT-led government would also lose Taiwan and planned to give up Taiwan (Chih 1992:36-44).

Subsequently, in southern Mainland China, pessimism permeated the whole KMT-led government. Some of the KMT-led troops fled or surrendered to Communist forces, and senior officials fled to other countries. In Taiwan, because Taiwan is an island, surrounded by a vast ocean, soldiers and officials could not flee, so the KMT-led government implemented a series of horrific political purges to eliminate any opposition and political dissidents.

5.2.1. The State of Emergency

On 20 May 1949, the KMT-led government implemented the *Emergency Decree* over the whole of Taiwan Province, and announced that any person who started a rumour against the government would be sentenced to death. After that, on 21 June, the Taiwan Provincial Government promulgated the *Statute on Discipline of Rebellions* aimed at curbing rebellion, which provided that any person who intended to or tried to overthrow the existing government would be sentenced to death. Any person who participated in rebel organisations or meetings, floated rumours or criticized the government, would be sentenced to at least seven years in prison (Wei 1997:27-33).

On 13 June, 1950, President Chiang Kai-shek promulgated the more strict *Provisions for Impeaching and Purging Communist Spies during the Period for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion*, which provided that: (1) secret police

could arrest those suspected of being CCP spies; (2) everyone should inform the secret police about CCP spies and suspected CCP spies, if not, they would also be arrested and sentenced and; (3) the government would confiscate CCP spies' properties, of which 30 per cent would be a reward for reporters, and 35 per cent would be a bonus for the relevant officials (HRCTRe 1998:221-222). That year, the KMT-led government also encouraged political activists to surrender themselves to justice. On 10 October 1950, the Taiwan Provincial Government even promulgated a regulation requiring Communists or their supporters to come forward and declare themselves voluntarily (HRCTRa 1998:28).

5.2.2. A great political slaughter

At the worst time for the KMT-led government, on 25 June 1950, the Korean War broke out, providing unexpected help. In order to protect US interests, US President Harry Truman declared that "(a)ccordingly I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. As a corollary of this action I am calling upon the Chinese government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done" (USA/Truman 1950:1). For Taiwan, the situation changed from being dangerous to safe overnight, and Chiang Kai-shek's KMT-led government engaged in large-scale suppression, killing any suspected political dissents.

According to existing official archives, during the Great Political Purge from 1950-1954, the Taiwan Safeguard Command arrested 7,987 suspected CCP spies, and other secret police departments also arrested a large number. In 1952, all the secret police departments together arrested 1,924 suspected CCP spies. Of these, the Secret Police Bureau of the Ministry of National Defence arrested 347 people, the Investigation Bureau of the Ministry of Interior arrested 194 people, the Military Police Command arrested 116 people, and the Taiwan Safeguard Command arrested 1,267 people (HRCTRa 1998:31-144). In other words, 66 per cent of suspected CCP spies were arrested by the Taiwan Safeguard Command.

However, these statistics are according to the existing official archives. In reality, many cases were not recorded in that dark political period. According to historians'

estimations, in the ten years from 1949 to 1958, about 50,000 people were arrested for alleged crimes of being CCP spies or traitors, of which over 10,000 people were sentenced to jail, and about 4,000 people were executed (Cheng, L.C. 1995:10). In fact, the political prisoners were almost all young or middle-aged men. The common profile of these political prisoners was that of men between 20 and 50. According to the population statistics of Taiwan in 1956, there were about 8.2 million people, of whom about 1.5 million were men between 20-49 years (Lee, D.M. 1970:70-75). In other words, at that time, of the young and middle-aged men in Taiwan with political or ideological views, 32.7 out of every 1,000 people were arrested; 6.5 out of every 1,000 people were sentenced to jail; and 2.6 out of every 1,000 people were executed.

In the 1960s, there were fewer political cases than in the 1950s, but the political atmosphere was still clouded. During this period at least 37 political court cases occurred, 208 political dissidents were arrested, of whom twelve were executed, and eleven were sentenced to life in prison (Lu 1997:32). Therefore, during the 1950s and even 1960s, Taiwan was not only under a State of Emergency, but was also strictly controlled by the secret police, and the atmosphere of fear that prevailed was inconceivable.

5.3. The dark political period

According to the memoirs of General Ku Cheng-wen, who worked for the Secret Police Bureau of the Ministry of National Defence his whole life, the secret police arrested only 2,000 authentic CCP spies. As for the others, their guilt was assumed. In other words, over 95 per cent of political prisoners were not real CCP spies (Lee, C.F. 1998:210). In reality, membership of the CCP was rare because the CCP was élite, and it was difficult to become a Chinese Communist.

However, the reason most of the suspects admitted to CCP spying crimes that could see them sentenced to death or jailed for many years, was because almost every one who was arrested by the secret police was tortured brutally and compelled to admit to spying. In those days, people had to speak discreetly. If they criticized the existing government or expressed political opinions not consistent with government

propaganda, they would be arrested. General Ku Cheng-wen recalled that the reason for so many assumed cases was the *Provision for Impeaching and Purging Communist Spies during the Period for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion* that defined that government should confiscate the properties of CCP spies, of which 30 per cent was the reward for reporters and 35 per cent the bonus for the relevant officials. This caused the secret police to pursue many political cases in order to receive bonuses (Lee, C.F. 1998:210).

6. THE PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK PERIOD

From 1951-1970, Chiang Kai-shek and his son Chiang Ching-kuo ruled Taiwan as a dictatorship, and prolonged the political rule of the KMT-led government. The government was led by the Mainlander élite. Taiwanese make up approximately 85.3 per cent of the total population in Taiwan, 1.7 per cent are aborigines and 13 per cent are Mainlanders (Huang, S.F. 1993:21), thus it was necessary to acquire the support from the Taiwanese for the Mainlander élite-led government. Therefore, the KMT-led government held elections, opened local government to participation by the Taiwanese élite, and at the same time, developed the economy in order to extend benefits to the Taiwanese. In other words, the KMT-led government was eager to gain the support of the Taiwanese and to establish the legitimacy of the regime and did so by allowing Taiwanese political participation and by making an effort to develop the economy, which would begin to create wealth for the Taiwanese.

6.1. Basis for election

In 1950, the KMT-led government allowed local political participation, holding the first elections for county and city councillors in July; and the first elections for county magistrates, provincial municipality mayors, chiefs of rural and urban townships, mayors of county municipalities, and chief administrators of districts in August and October. Furthermore, in April 1957, the first election for members of the Taiwan Provincial Assembly was also held (Ger 1999:11).

Most of the Mainlanders are concentrated in major Taiwanese cities, whilst the Taiwanese are spread over the whole of Taiwan Island. As a result, almost all of the county magistrates, provincial municipality mayors, chiefs of rural and urban

townships, mayors of county municipalities and chief administrators of districts elected under the democratic system, were local politicians from the Taiwanese élite. On the other hand, it was very difficult for Mainlanders to achieve that same position through the vote. The KMT-led government that fled to Taiwan was the original central government, and almost all of the high non-elected official positions were occupied by Mainlander élite. Therefore, local politicians of the Taiwanese élite benefited from the democratic system as they became elected leaders, such as mayors. Since the Mainlander élite were a non-elected group who, nevertheless, possessed the power of national decision-making, they benefited from this process that seemingly gave them legitimacy. Therefore, they increased their cooperation with the Taiwanese élite in electoral politics (Lerman 1977:1419-1422).

In reality, there was a form of political exchange between the Mainlander élite in the central government who were not elected and the Taiwanese élite in local government who were elected. However, the problem with the electoral system was that while Taiwanese local politicians could win elections, it was difficult for them to attain power in the central government, because the KMT-led government, which came from Mainland China, was originally a central government as mentioned above, and the high official positions were filled by the Mainlanders. In the 1960s, the influence of the secret police declined; economic growth increased; the educated second generation of Taiwanese grew up; and the need to participate in the central ruling class increased daily. The KMT-led government implemented the election of central legislators, for example, in December 1969, the KMT-led government held supplementary elections in Taiwan for elected delegates of the National Assembly, namely, 11 legislators of the Legislative Yuan, and two members of the Control Yuan. In December 1972, the KMT-led government held supplementary elections again to expand political participation by the Taiwanese élite (Ger 1999:11), and to give opportunities to the Taiwanese elite to be part of the central government.

The implementation of an electoral system not only helped the KMT-led government to gain wider popular support, but was also the basic step towards a democratic Taiwan. Along with the rise in economic power of the Taiwanese élite, the emergence of Taiwanese ethnic identity, and the decrease of the authority of the secret police,

the electoral system established the basis of democracy.

6.2. Economic miracle

On 8 December 1941, Japan initiated war in the Pacific by attacking Pearl Harbour, Malaya and the Philippine Islands simultaneously, and quickly occupying Malaya and the Philippine Islands. Japanese bombers and battleships attacked the Philippines Islands from, among others, the military bases of Taiwan and the Penghu Islands. In early 1944, the US launched a counter-attack, and occupied the Marshall Islands in February, the Marianas and the Saipan Islands in July, Guam in August, and Paulau Island in September (Chi 1998:1784-1787). In order to strike the Japanese military bases in Taiwan, the US Air Force bombed Taiwan on a large scale, including power stations, main factories and road systems, between October 1944 and July 1945. Therefore, at the end of World War II, Taiwan was severely damaged by the US bombing (Chi 1998:1826-1855). After World War II ended, Taiwan began to restore economic order. Taiwan Islands had a population of 6,130,000 Taiwanese people and 397,000 Japanese people in 1943 (TPG 1946:76-77). The latter were repatriated to Japan in 1946, and about 910,000 Mainlanders moved to Taiwan in 1949.

The influx of almost a million newcomers placed a heavy burden on Taiwan's economy, therefore as previously discussed, the KMT-led government not only established totalitarian rule, but also developed the economy. Through thirty six years of development economics, the per capita income rose from US\$ 186 in 1952 to US\$ 5,829 in 1988 (CEPD 2001:50), a 31-fold increase. The results were regarded as a "Taiwan miracle" and referred to as the "Taiwan experience". In fact, the economic miracle of Taiwan during the latter half of the twentieth century was closely connected to politics. Firstly, Chiang Kai-shek's oppressive political rule using the secret police provided a stable political environment that enabled Taiwan to complete its land reform policy. Secondly, Taiwan benefited from the modernisation that had resulted from the Japanese presence in Taiwan, for half a century. Taiwan also accepted the money, equipment, technology, and human resources that the Mainlanders had brought from Mainland China. These legacies from Japan and Mainland China offered a solid basis for developing Taiwan's economy.

6.2.1. Economic legacies from Japanese colonisation

During the 50 years of Japanese colonisation, Japan dominated and deprived the Taiwanese in many ways and in order to obtain more benefit from this control, the Japanese also developed Taiwan. For example, the number of telephone owners per 1,000 people in Taiwan was five in 1941 (TPG 1946:76-1145). In Mainland China, the average only reached five in 1983 (Chen, C.H. 1988:226). The average per capita use of electric power in Taiwan was 181.5 kwh in 1943 (Chou 1980:584). In Mainland China it only reached approximately 180 kwh in the early 1970s (Chen, C.H. 1988:224). The rice (brown) yield per hectare in Taiwan was 2,242 kg in 1938 (Chou 1980:448). In India, it was 2,050 kg; in Thailand, it was 2,079 kg; and in the Philippines, it was 2,106 kg in 1981 (Hua 1984:358). The percentage of school-aged children enrolled in elementary schools in Taiwan was 71.3 per cent in 1943 (TPG 1946:1241-1242). In Mainland China, it was approximately 70 per cent in the early 1960s (Chen, C.H. 1988:228). All of the Taiwanese statistical data included Japanese and Taiwanese. The Japanese colonial government had left a modern local government with efficient financial, postal, and judicial systems, and complete statistical data. This institutional infrastructure was even more important than the physical infrastructure for a developing country (Wang, T.Y. 2001:160-161).

Therefore, in the early 1940's, Taiwan had a 30-year lead over Mainland China in the fields of education, communication, electric power, agriculture, finance and justice. Although the industries and agriculture of Taiwan were severely damaged by the US bombing in the 1940s, the educational, judicial and administrative system still remained. Once World War II ended in 1945, after a few years of reconstruction, Taiwan's economic output was restored to the pre-war level. On the other hand, after World War II, Mainland China fell into three years of civil war. Therefore, in 1949, the economic gap between Taiwan and Mainland China would widen more.

6.2.2. Economic resources from Mainland China

In 1949, the Communists dominated the whole of the Chinese Mainland, and many capitalist élite fled from Shanghai and other coastal cities of Mainland China to Taiwan and Hong Kong. In Hong Kong, they injected dynamic commercial vigour, and built Hong Kong into a major economic centre (Hannah 1997:3). They similarly

influenced Taiwan. The influx of capitalists, entrepreneurs, professionals and intellectuals from Shanghai and other cities, proved to be an engine for economic development (Lee, K.Y. 2000:543-544).

In 1949, when the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan from Mainland China, it transferred the Central Bank reserves of the ROC, including gold, white silver and foreign exchange, valued at approximately US\$500 million to Taiwan (Tang 1989:622). They also moved many large factories, including capital, equipment, and technology, from the big cities along the coast to Taiwan. For example, from Shanghai alone, ten textile plants were moved to Taiwan. This movement of factories elevated the scale and standard of Taiwan's textile industry (Wong 1991:134-135) to such an extent that the industry supplied all the needs of Taiwan in the 1950s, and became its major export industry in the 1960s and 1970s (Wang, T.Y. 1999:341).

The 910,000 Mainlanders were also precious assets. Although the Mainlanders included secret police, there were also bureaucrats; technicians and members of the educated élite. After many Japanese technicians were withdrawn from Taiwan in 1946, many Western-educated Mainland technicians succeeded them and worked to build Taiwan (Huang, C.C. 1992:144).

Educated Mainlanders, in particular, promoted advanced education in Taiwan. For example, in 1944, Taiwan only had five universities and colleges (one university and four colleges), with a total of 319 teachers (14 Taiwanese and 305 Japanese), and 2,163 students (453 Taiwanese and 1,710 Japanese) (TPG 1946:1214-1218). After five years, many professors and intellectuals moved to Taiwan. They not only replaced Japanese professors, but also increased the number of professors. In 1955, Taiwan had 15 universities and colleges, three times as many as in 1944. The number of teachers increased to 1,662, and student figures increased to 17,997, 8.3 times more than the total number of students (including Mainland students and Taiwanese students), and 40 times more than the number of Taiwanese students (453) in 1944 (Whang 1978:234-236). Education has been one of the most important factors in the process of economic development. However, it would have been impossible for Taiwan to expand its educational facilities so fast without the

immigration of Mainlanders.

6.2.3. Hard work and thrifty habits of the Chinese people

The increase in productivity and accumulation of capital are also essential factors in the process of economic development. Simply said, the former is hard work and the latter is the result of thrifty habits. The virtues of hard work and thrifty habits are two of the pillars of traditional Chinese culture. Therefore, Chinese people, whether they live in Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Africa or Mainland China, believe that one has to work hard and to save money for unexpected eventualities.

Until the 1980s, in order to earn more money, many people in Taiwan worked overtime during holidays and weekends, and some workers even had two factory jobs (Yu 2000:35). Whereas, until 1955, the savings rate in Taiwan was only 11.2 per cent, it rose to 23.7 per cent in 1970, to 31.5 per cent in 1972, remained over 30 per cent in the 1970s, and was 26.7 per cent in 1987 (CEPD 2001:73). These high savings rates accumulated a huge amount of capital, which created the opportunity for economic development. From a macro-perspective, the success of Taiwan's economic development was thus rooted in hard work and thrifty habits (Yu 1987:366-367).

6.2.4. Aid from the US

One of the other important elements of Taiwan's economic miracle was aid from the US. Total aid from the US during June 1950 to June 1965 amounted to US\$14.8 billion (Wong 1991:137). That is to say, annual average aid from the US was US\$ 98 million.

According to statistics, during 1951-60, the amount of US aid was approximately 40 per cent of Taiwan's total imports; 50 per cent of the gross fixed capital formation in electricity; and 40 per cent of the gross fixed capital formation in transportation and communication. Therefore, US aid not only directly increased the supply of material, but also greatly helped the re-establishment or construction of infrastructure in Taiwan (Lin 1987:40-41).

6.2.5. Agricultural land reform

In the process of Taiwan's economic development, agricultural land reform was equally important as the other factors listed above, because agricultural land reform was the foundation for modern economic development in Taiwan (Yu 1987:361).

Agricultural land reform had three components. Firstly, there was the "37.5 Percent Farm Rental Reduction" policy. In 1947, tillers made up 67 per cent of the whole peasant population, and the average rent of a tiller was 56.8 per cent of the annual yield. In order to protect the interest of tillers, the government implemented the *37.5 Percent Farm Rental Reduction Act*, in March 1950, which cut the tiller's rent to 37.5 per cent of the annual yield (Wang and Chang 1954:47-71). Secondly, public land was opened to the peasants. The government sold the public lands to peasants at low prices with repayment over ten years. The public land sold to tillers totalled approximately over 80,000 acres from 1951 to 1953 (Wang and Chang 1954:182-186). Thirdly, there was the "Land-to-the-Tiller" policy, whereby landlords could keep certain acres of agricultural land and government would expropriate their excess agricultural land with stocks of public-owned industrial companies. The land expropriated from landlords was resold to the tillers (Wang and Chang 1954:224-275).

Before the implementation of agricultural land reform, the annual production of brown rice was 1,143,809 short tons in 1948. However, it climbed to 1,673,152 short tons in 1952 (Chen 1961:309), increasing by 46.2 per cent. The abundant agricultural yields were not only sufficient for Taiwanese consumption, but also provided a surplus for export.

Economics is an extension of politics. Taiwan's successful agricultural land reform was closely connected to politics. The reasons are as follows: firstly, in order to solve the serious tenant problem, the CCP implemented Communist-style land reform. Strongly contrasted with this, the KMT government used its power to implement agricultural land reform in Taiwan (Wang and Cheng 1954:25-26). Secondly, as the KMT-led government fled from Mainland China, it was completely dominated by the Mainlander élite and the individuals responsible for agricultural land reform policy

were thus people who did not own any land in Taiwan. On the other hand, the landlords were Taiwanese élite, who owned land but were not policy-makers (Huang 1995:66). Because the policy-makers were not landowners, it made implementation easy. Thirdly, only three years before, on 28 February 1947, the 228 Incident occurred and spread through major cities in Taiwan for eight days. In only one day, 28 February, over one hundred Mainlanders were killed in Taipei city (Tang 1947:93). As a result, the military subsequently quelled city uprisings brutally, and by 1949, the KMT-led government had implemented the State of Emergency and the political great purge had taken place. This restrictive political atmosphere ensured that the Taiwanese landlords cooperated with the government. The famous Taiwanese novelist Yeh Shih-tao reminded that the agricultural land reform of Taiwan was completed under the State of Emergency, a bloodthirsty and horrific era, when no landlords dared to resist (Yeh 1991:82).

6.2.6. Correct decisions in strategic economic planning

In the 1950s, the KMT-led government adopted an import substitution policy. Firstly, by implementing agricultural land reform, the government dramatically increased agricultural production, which provided for the whole island and meant that surplus could be exported. The export of agricultural surplus earned foreign exchange and allowed for the importation of industrial products and material. Lastly, the government provided these industrial products and materials to factories which produced goods for consumption (Huang, C.H. 1984:30-31).

In the 1960s, the KMT-led government encouraged exports, and implemented an export expansion policy, which encouraged economic development through exports (Lin 1981:71). At that time, the government promulgated the *Regulations for the Encouragement of Investment*, which set up export processing and industrial zones. Due to the implementation of the export expansion policy, foreign trade, including exports and imports, which had been only US\$ 461 million in 1960, rose sharply to US\$ 3,005 million in 1970 (CEPD 2001:212).

The first energy crisis occurred and the oil price soared in 1973. This increased oil price created inflation and triggered an economic recession. In order to recover from

the oil crisis, the KMT-led government expanded domestic demand to develop the economy. After December 1973, the government initiated ten major construction projects: the Sun Yat-sen National Freeway, Railroad Electrification, the North Link Railroad, the Taichung Port, the Suao Harbour, the Chiang Kai-shek International Airport, a Nuclear Power Plant, an Integrated Steel Mill, the Kaohsiung Shipyard, and a Petrochemical Industry. The total investment in these ten projects was NT\$ 300 billion (Wei 1992:70-85).

In order to develop the economy further, the KMT-led government established the Hsinchu Science-based Industrial Park in 1981, and promoted the development of the electronics and information technology industries (Yu 2000:12).

On 5 April 1975, President Chiang Kai-shek passed away, ending the old era. During the last quarter century (1950-1975), Chiang Kai-shek had adopted a dual approach towards politics and economics. On the one hand, he acted harshly to entrench his dictatorship, on the other, he implemented local elections and the vertical bi-political system, whereby “Central-Mainlander élite” and “Local-Taiwanese élite” shared political power. His KMT-led government did its best to develop the economy as well.

Under the rule of President Chiang Kai-shek, about 4,000 people were executed and approximately 10,000 people sentenced to jail terms. All Taiwanese residents lived in fear of politics. Because most of the secret police were Mainlanders, Taiwanese political prisoners hated the Mainlanders. As for the Mainlander political prisoners, they could not plead ethnic resentment because the secret police were also Mainlanders.

Ironically, authoritarian rule offered a stable society, and gave Taiwan a good opportunity to develop its economy. In 1975, per capita income reached US\$ 890, where it had been only US\$ 186 in 1952 (CEPD 2001:50).

7. THE PRESIDENT CHIANG CHING-KUO PERIOD

On 26 May 1972, Chiang Ching-kuo became Premier of the Executive Yuan. After President Chiang Kai-shek died on 5 April 1975, and Vice-President Yen Chia-kan

succeeded as the President of the ROC, Premier Chiang Ching-kuo was elected chairman of the Central Committee of the ruling KMT in the same month. Then, on 21 March 1978, he was elected sixth President (GIO 2001:482-483).

7.1. Taiwanisation

By the 1970s, the KMT-led government had ruled Taiwan for 20 years. In this period, it implemented an open and fair educational system. For example, all students passed through the various levels of the schooling system, from primary school, and through junior high school and senior high school to university, by passing a series of national examinations that were evaluated objectively, using numbers instead of provincial references as a method of identifying the students. Due to the fair educational system, the next generation of the Taiwanese-educated élite emerged. In the relaxed political atmosphere, they discussed and explored sensitive political issues, even the ethnic problems in Taiwan.

After the KMT-led government moved to Taiwan, Chiang Ching-kuo had helped his father Chiang Kai-shek to stabilise its authority. Chiang Ching-kuo was appointed the head of the Secret Police Bureau, Minister of National Defence, and Vice-Premier. He realised the strong demand for political participation by the Taiwanese élite and he understood that the KMT had to abandon the previous vertical bi-political policy, and had to adopt the policy of Taiwanisation, which would give more central political power to the new generation of Taiwanese in order to enhance the legitimacy of the KMT-led government (Peng, H.E. 1991:167-168).

Therefore, Chiang Ching-kuo launched Taiwanisation and recruited the Taiwanese élite to the central ruling group. When Chiang Ching-kuo was approved as the Premier by the Legislative Yuan in 1972, he appointed members of the Taiwanese élites *inter alia* as Vice-Premier, Minister of the Interior, Minister of Transportation and Communications, Governor of Taiwan Province, and Mayor of Taipei (Peng, H.E. 1991:169). When Chiang Ching-kuo was elected as sixth president in 1978, he handpicked a Taiwanese, Shieh Tung-min, as Vice-President. Theoretically, this created the opportunity for a peaceful transfer of national power from the Mainlanders to the Taiwanese if Chiang Ching-kuo were to pass away during his

presidential term. In 1984, Chiang Ching-kuo was re-elected as seventh president, and he again handpicked a Taiwanese, Lee Teng-hui, as Vice-President. At that time, Chiang Ching-kuo was in poor health, therefore he must have had the intention of transferring the regime to the Taiwanese peacefully (Wang, T.Y. 2001:146). By 1987, according to statistics, the ratio of Taiwanese in the Cabinet had reached 40 per cent (Peng, H.E. 1991:170).

7.2. Political reform

Since Chiang Ching-kuo's election as sixth president in 1978, he enforced the Taiwanisation policy in the administration, and adopted an open policy towards censorship. According to Hsu Ching-fu (1994:101), the political features of the middle 1980s can be characterised as follows: firstly, the whole society still functioned under the law of the *Temporary Provisions Effective During the Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion*, and the *Emergency Decree*, which limited people's freedom of speech, association, and publication. Secondly, the government insisted on the old political system, which was transferred from Mainland China, namely, it continued former parliamentary operations. Thirdly, the government held local elections in order to satisfy the Taiwan elite's demands for political participation.

However, Hsu (1994:104) further points out that the major political reforms launched and completed during the last two years of President Chiang Ching-kuo's presidency were structural reforms, which included lifting the *Emergency Decree* (State of Emergency) and the ban on registration for new newspapers and political parties; protecting the people's right to assemble and associate; and allowing Taiwan residents to visit relatives on Mainland China. For Taiwan, these reforms were landmark events.

Prior to this, although the Taiwanese élite had hoped to establish their own political parties, they were restricted by the ban on the registration of political parties. The political significance of this was that it allowed the Taiwanese, who made up 85 per cent of the population, to establish political parties and have the opportunity to seize leadership through competition.

Another very important event was that Taiwan residents were allowed to visit relatives in Mainland China, from 2 November 1987. Prior to this, private visits to Mainland China were illegal. This policy had created a chasm between Cross-Straits residents. Many visits from Taiwan to Mainland China took place and, as a result, the level of tourism was raised.

8. CONCLUSION

On 10 October 1911, the ROC was established. In 1949, the ROC leadership was defeated by the CCP and fled from Mainland China to Taiwan, the smallest province of China. Thus, in only 38 years, the ROC rose and fell dramatically. The KMT-led government co-operated with the CCP twice, but this cooperation ended in civil wars. During the first attempt at cooperation, the KMT staged a coup and attacked and massacred Chinese Communists and pro-communist workers on a large scale in Shanghai and Guangzhou, and the CCP was forced to flee to the northern area of China on foot (the Long March) in order to survive. During the second attempt at cooperation, the KMT was uprooted by the CCP from Mainland China, and fled to Taiwan. Eventually, as a result of the Korean War and the US control of the Taiwan Straits, the ROC continued to exist and de facto seceded from Mainland China. The ROC that had made up the whole of Mainland China had been condensed into Taiwan by 1950.

In Taiwan, President Chiang Kai-shek and his son President Chiang Ching-kuo adopted a bloodthirsty rule with the secret police stabilising society, and simultaneously an effort was made to develop the economy. During their 38 years of authoritarian rule, the per capita income rose 31-fold. However, due to the history of their rule, economic achievements could not resolve the ethnic conflict between the Mainlanders and the Taiwanese. When the ROC fled to Taiwan, Taiwan became home to the whole central government and 910,000 Mainlanders. Almost all high positions within the KMT-led government were occupied by the Mainlanders. This caused Taiwanese jealousy and hatred towards the Mainlanders. However, the ROC had 35 provinces (GIO 1987:36), thus the 910,000 Mainlanders came from 35 provinces. Many high officials of these 35 provinces suddenly all gathered together

in the smallest province – Taiwan. In order to have a job, many of these officials took lower positions (Lee, A. 1997:86-87). Similarly, there were 580,000 soldiers among the 910,000 Mainlanders. So many soldiers placed a heavy burden on the KMT-led government and, therefore, from 1950 to 1960, about 122,000 soldiers were forced to retire, only receiving three months salary. About 80,000 of these soldiers were from the lower ranks (Hu 1993:286). Most of them did not have the knowledge and skills to enable them get a job, and then fell into poverty. However, the Taiwanese élite ignored their suffering.

As for the political dark period, the political prisoners also included many Mainlanders. At that time, most of the Mainlanders were officials in civil administration, or officers and soldiers in military administration, and the secret police were present in every government department. Thus, the main focus of the secret police was Mainlanders, and therefore, as a ratio, Mainlander political prisoners far outnumbered the Taiwanese political prisoners. According to data revealed by Amnesty International in 1970, there were 511 political prisoners in the Tai-yuan prison of the Ministry of National Defence in Taiwan. Of these, 42.6 per cent were Taiwanese and 57.4 per cent were Mainlanders (Lee, A. 1995:126-137). Mainlanders, however, made up only 13.6 per cent of the total population in Taiwan at the time (Lee, D.M. 1970:77). In reality, political oppression of the Mainlanders by the government far surpassed that of the Taiwanese. However, the Taiwanese élite maintained that they were oppressed by the government, ignoring the suffering of the Mainlanders. Similarly, the Taiwanese élite also ignored the fact that they benefited from rapid economic development and a fair system of education.

Another big political problem was that the KMT government adopted a democratic electoral system to elect county magistrates, provincial municipalities and chief administrators of districts. Germany, France, Japan and the US are single-language nations. All the candidates use the same language to communicate with their electorates. However, China, as a major nation with the longest unbroken history, not only has multi-ethnic groups, but also many dialects and a strongly traditional provincial consciousness. Were China to adopt the American electoral system, which evolved over two hundred years, it would result in candidates' reliance upon these

differences to win office and a resultant chasm between different ethnic groups that could even trigger secessionist ideology. For the whole of Taiwanese society, the strict political atmosphere was relaxed in the 1980s. In order to win their election campaigns, Taiwanese candidates made speeches in the Taiwanese dialect to their electorates. They emphasized Taiwanese identity, such as the differences between Taiwanese and Mainlanders; the unequal allocation of political resources; and that Taiwan belonged to the Taiwanese. Some of the candidates even instigated Taiwanese resentment towards China, and said that Taiwan should be independent. Taiwanese candidates' campaign speeches and propaganda had a far-reaching influence, and some Taiwanese were gradually filled with resentment toward the Mainlanders and even began to believe that Taiwan should secede from Mainland China.

For the Taiwanese élite who survived political surveillance and/or detention, it was easy to believe they were oppressed by the Mainlanders because most of the secret police were Mainlanders. Lee Teng-hui's life experience was, in this respect, typical of the Taiwanese élite.

President Chiang Ching-kuo passed away on 13 January 1988. Vice-President Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency immediately, and led the ROC in Taiwan until 2000. During this period, Lee Teng-hui was in charge of Taiwan's political Cross-Straits policy and played a decisive role in the relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China. Therefore, the next chapter will explore the background and life experiences of Lee Teng-hui, and will discuss Lee Teng-hui's real political ideology and intentions concerning the political relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China.

CHAPTER THREE

A BACKGROUND STUDY OF LEE TENG-HUI

After experiencing 38-years (1950-1988) of authoritarian rule under Mainlander President Chiang Kai-shek and his son President Chiang Ching-kuo, Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency in 1988. Lee Teng-hui was the first Taiwanese-born President. His presidency was a turning point in Taiwan's modern history, and began the era where power in Taiwan rested in the hands of the majority – the Taiwanese. During the 12-years of Lee Teng-hui's rule, the most important change was the startling shift in the political Cross-Straits policy, from the original one-China policy towards a policy of secession. Because Lee Teng-hui was behind Taiwan's political Cross-Straits policy, this chapter will study his background. The scope of this chapter will include Japanese colonisation, the recovery of Taiwan and the 228 Incident, the Great Political Purge, and the Taiwanisation period.

1. JAPANESE COLONISATION

Taiwan was ceded to Japan under the *Treaty of Shimonoseki*, in 1895, and returned to China when World War II ended, in 1945. Thus, Taiwan experienced fifty years of Japanese colonization.

China and Japan are both ancient oriental nations and the people are from the same yellow race, but the language and culture of China and Japan are absolutely different. During the 1890s and 1940s, China suffered a revolution, civil wars and a series of invasions by other powers. Japan, however, was responsible for its modernisation and expansion. Japan defeated China in 1895, merged Korea in 1910, occupied Manchuria in 1931, launched an all-over invasion of China in 1937, and became a modern industrial military power. Simultaneously, China was more backward than Japan economically, militarily, and socially. In Taiwan, Japan massacred Taiwanese in the early occupation period between 1895 and 1910, and implemented a policy of discrimination between Japanese and Taiwanese that endured throughout the entire period of colonisation. However, through the implementation of Japanese colonial government, Taiwan's society began to modernise in the fields of education, justice, finance, communication, transportation, agriculture, and industry. By the early 1940s, it was more advanced than Mainland China. Lee Teng-hui was born and grew up in this historical context.

1.1. Lee Teng-hui and his family

On 15 January 1923, Lee Teng-hui was born in Sanchih, a small village near Tamsui Town (GIO 1998:8), in the neighborhood of Taipei City. His parents were Lee Chin-lung and Lee Chiang-chin, and he had an elder brother, Lee Teng-chin (Lee, T. H. 1999a:316).

Lee Teng-hui's family belonged to the middle class. His father, Lee Chin-lung, was a policeman and worked as a detective for about fifteen years. As a police officer, he regarded his father as belonging to the élite in Taiwanese society during the Japanese colonial period. Lee Teng-hui claimed that his mother, Lee Chiang-chin, had been the daughter of a landowning village leader (Lee, T.H. 1999b:21).

During the Japanese colonisation period, Lee Teng-hui's family sold pork (Lee, T.H. 1999a:38) and opium (Dai & Wang 2001:21). At that time, opium was a monopolised commodity. Because Lee Chin-lung worked for the Japanese Police Department, Lee Chai-shen, Lee Teng-hui's grandfather, was given a permit to be the sole opium retail dealer in the Sanchih area (Hsu, Y.T. 2000:197). According to statistics, there were only approximately 350 opium retail dealers in the whole of Taiwan from 1931-1940 (TPG 1946:1373).

1.2. The riddle of the birth of Lee Teng-hui

After 1990, it was speculated that Lee Teng-hui's real father was a Japanese, not Lee Chin-lung (Tsou, C.W. 2001:368). Chiang Yuan-lin, Lee Teng-hui's mother's brother, recalled that during Lee Teng-hui's childhood, people had expressed doubts about Lee Teng-hui's parentage (Lee, C.C. 1996:7).

1.2.1. Lee Teng-hui's parentage

Mr. Lin Cheng-fang, an old Taiwanese neighbour and acquaintance of Lee Chin-lung, recalled that Lee Chin-lung had told him that Lee Teng-hui was not his son. Mr. Lin also said that some of the old residents in Sanchih and old classmates of Lee Teng-hui from Tamsui Primary School knew about the story (Lin, C.F. personal communication, 23 Oct 1999). A former senior intelligence official revealed that Lee Teng-hui's real father was Kuri Hara, a Japanese police officer, who helped and

favoured Lee Chin-lung. Because Lee Teng-hui's mother, Lee Chiang-chin was beautiful, Kuri Hara had been drawn to her, and as a result, Lee Teng-hui had been born (Hsu, Y.T. 2000:211). Another story was that a Japanese policeman had fathered Lee Teng-hui and asked Lee Chin-lung to adopt him (Lee, C.C. 1996:2). The reason for these suspicions were that Lee Teng-hui did not resemble his father. He was tall and strong, while his father was small and skinny (Lee, C.C. 1996:3).

1.2.2. Lee Teng-hui's Japanese name

11 February 1940 was regarded by the Japanese royal family as a lucky date, and therefore, the Japanese Government declared that this day would be the day for their colonial people, the Koreans and Taiwanese, to change their names (Chen, I.C. 1994:227). From that date, the Japanese Colonial Government in Taiwan implemented a regulation that permitted the Taiwanese to change their Chinese names to Japanese names (TGG 1944:251). However, Lee Teng-hui had already changed his Chinese name to the Japanese name "Iwasato Masao" before 1940 (Kamisaka 2001:41).

During the discriminatory period of colonial rule, most Taiwanese despised and belittled the pro-Japanese Taiwanese. In the Chinese tradition of the Han people, whether educated or not, almost no one changed their name voluntarily, particular their surname. Taiwanese, therefore, resisted changing their Chinese names (Chen, I.C. 1994:227-228), and only 1,180 Taiwanese had changed their Chinese names to Japanese names by 24 December 1940 (TGG 1994:280). At that time, there were over 5,896,000 Taiwanese people (The Japanese numbered over 323,000) (TGG 1994:265). Thus, only a minuscule percentage of Taiwanese changed their Chinese names to Japanese names. What then made Lee Teng-hui, at not yet sixteen years old, and a student living in the outskirts of Taipei, have the idea and voluntarily apply to change his Chinese name before 1940, in spite of Chinese tradition and the scorn and contempt of his neighbours? Who helped him to submit his Japanese name and was it his real father?

Further adding to this mystery was the fact that, when forced to change their Chinese names by increasing pressure, the Taiwanese adopted Chinese-style Japanese names. However, Lee Teng-hui's Japanese name "Iwasato" is an elegant

Japanese–style name with profound meaning. In classical Japanese myth, “Iwasato” is a great Japanese god, who desires to wipe out evil (Lee, C.C. 1996:12). Furthermore, Iwasato was not a popular Japanese surname, for example, in the Big Japanese Dictionary, published in 1955 and 5th edition in 1988, there are similar Japanese surnames such as Iwai, Iwakura, Iwasa, Iwaki, Iwashita, Iwase, Iwata, Iwaname, Iwano and Iwami, but there is no “Iwasato” (Shinmura 1998:200-204). It is obvious that the Japanese extent of the surname “Iwasato” transcended the Japanese knowledge of his father Lee Chin-lung. Who chose such an elegant and rare Japanese surname with such profound meaning? Was it Lee Teng-hui’s real father?

In the tradition of the Chinese Han people, it is very serious if there is confusion or speculation as to one’s parentage. This is something that must be clarified or dealt with immediately. However, Lee Teng-hui has not given any clear explanation up to now. Also, generally speaking, politicians usually mention their mothers in great detail in their memoirs, but Lee Teng-hui only devoted a few words to his mother. Nobody knows what work his mother did. No one in Lee Teng-hui’s family speaks of it. All of these questions raised about Lee Teng-hui’s childhood may remain historical riddles unless Lee Teng-hui reveals them himself.

1.2.3. Lee Teng-hui’s Japanese complex

After Lee Teng-hui became President, he liked to use the Japanese language when he was together with Japanese. This was well-known in Taiwan and among Japanese political circles. When Lee Teng-hui spoke with Japanese guests, apart from using the Japanese language, he usually stated that he had been a Japanese until the age of twenty two, and enjoyed sharing his insights and political views with them. Because Lee Teng-hui was a President, it was inconceivable to many Japanese reporters that he could have such an attitude. One Japanese diplomat indicated that, during his presidency, Lee Teng-hui had not communicated with Japanese guests through a translator, which was the norm required by protocol. Comparatively, Korea also weathered long-term rule by a Japanese colonial government during the first half of the twentieth century and Korean Presidents spoke Japanese fluently. However, when they had Japanese visitors, they spoke

Korean, which was then translated by the official translator. Even in relaxed moments, Korean Presidents used Korean rather than speaking Japanese. Lee Teng-hui's pride in being Japanese was even incomprehensible to Japanese (Chen, H.H. 1994:25-26).

On 7 January 1989, the Japanese Emperor Hirohito passed away (Wu 1994:1150). President Lee Teng-hui expressed to the Japanese the sincere condolences of the Taiwanese on the death of Emperor Hirohito. He further stated that among neighbouring nations, there were no countries that sympathised so deeply and had such a common feeling with the Japanese (Wang, S.P. 1994a:22). In 1926, Hirohito had become Japanese Emperor (Elliott *et al.* 1992:526). Therefore, it was under his rule that Japan launched its invasion of East Asia. He had complete responsibility for the Japanese invasion. At that time, Japanese soldiers slaughtered and massacred many people in China (including Taiwan), Korea and the southeastern countries. This recent experience was unforgettable for these countries. Therefore, it was impossible for leaders of countries such as Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, Myanmar (Burma) and the Phillipines to make similar statements. On the other hand, it was true that the Taiwanese residents did not present their condolences sincerely and it was only an international news opportunity for them. Furthermore, on 14 October 1994, in the Japanese Weekly Post magazine, Japanese reporter Nikao Masashi stated that President Lee Teng-hui obtained a Japanese education during the period of Japanese rule. His brother was a Japanese Imperial soldier and died in the battle field. In the eyes of Lee Teng-hui, he was more like the Japanese than real Japanese, his desire to visit the place was strong (Wang, S.P. 1994a:22). This was revealed in the Taiwanese media and received criticism, however, the Presidential Office did not deny it. The issue is that Lee Teng-hui, as member of the élite whose home was ruled brutally and massacred by the Japanese colonial government, was born in Taiwan, grew up in Taiwan, developed his career in Taiwan, and only stayed in Japan for three years to study. Why did he express condolences on the death of Emperor Hirohito as he did? Why did he regard Japan as his native home? Was Lee Teng-hui's real father Japanese?

Moreover, in August 2001, Lee Teng-hui stated that he supported the Japanese

Prime Minister's paying of respects at the Japanese Blessed Shrine (Yasukuni Shrine) (Liu, L.E. 2001:1-2). Most countries have a special place to worship the soldiers who sacrificed their lives for their nation. In Japan, the Japanese Blessed Shrine houses plaques in memory of modern Japanese soldiers who made this sacrifice. But, the soldiers remembered at the Japanese Blessed Shrine where the Japanese Prime Minister worshipped were not only the invaders but also the killers during the massacres in the occupied regions, such as China (including Taiwan), Korea and southeastern Asia. Therefore, these nations were opposed to the Prime Minister's worship, and even many Japanese people objected because it symbolically legalised the Japanese invasion in World War II. (The Japanese Government had not yet apologised for the brutal crimes that the Japanese army committed, for example, countless women were raped and countless civilians were slaughtered). Taiwan was also invaded and suffered massacres by Japanese soldiers (see Chapter four). Nevertheless, Lee Teng-hui, as a Taiwanese descendant, supported the Japanese Prime Minister's paying of respects at the Japanese Blessed Shrine. It was similar to his condolences when Emperor Hirohito died, and again his reaction was different from the behaviour of other Far East nations' leaders. Furthermore, the leaders of Mainland China, Korea and the southeastern countries slammed the Japanese invasion and its brutal massacres during World War II. However, Lee Teng-hui was not only reluctant to criticize the Japanese invasion and brutal slaughters, but also stated that "although Japan once launched a major war in East Asia, it ended 50 years ago. It is of no help raising this issue again today. Many people in Japan have already published self-criticisms in newspapers and magazines, but if this goes on, Japan will lose its self-confidence" (Lee, T.H. 1999d:168). Thus he downplayed the war crimes that took place during the Japanese invasion. What caused Lee Teng-hui not only to forget the death and suffering of his Taiwanese ancestors and the East Asian people who were massacred by Japanese soldiers, but also to support the Japanese Prime Minister's showing respect to the invading soldiers? Was Lee Teng-hui's real father Japanese?

In 2002, Lee Teng-hui further expressed his extreme pro-Japanese leanings. Both Mainland China and Taiwan claimed their sovereignty over Tiaoyutai Islands (What Japanese called Senyuku Islands). Japanese authorities still regarded these islands

as their territory and there was a political argument between Mainland China (including Taiwan) and Japan. On 16 September 2002, Lee Teng-hui stated that Taioyutai belonged to Japan (Huang, C.C. 2002:1). It was astonishing news for Taiwanese residents, and the Taiwanese authorities (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) reiterated that Taioyutai belonged to the ROC (Taiwan) (Huang, M.C. 2002a:1). When one nation has a territorial dispute with another nation and a former President states the disputed territory should belong to the other nation, it is incredible. As previously suspected, was Lee Teng-hui's real father Japanese?

1.3. Middle School

Lee Teng-hui enrolled in Hsichih Primary School at the age of six (1929). He moved to Nankang Primary School at the age of eight, and then to Sanchih Primary School as his father was transferred. He graduated from Tamsui Primary School at the age of twelve in 1935 (Lee, T.H. 1999a:316-317). After graduation, Lee Teng-hui failed the entrance examination for Taipei Public Senior School twice, and had to enrol in advanced classes at Tamsui Primary School (Wakabayashi 1998:45).

Lee Teng-hui entered Taipei Junior High School at the age of fourteen and moved to Tamsui Middle School when he was fifteen in 1938. He entered Taipei Higher School when he was eighteen years old (1941), and then he graduated and went to Japan to enrol at Kyoto Imperial University at the age of twenty (1943) (Lee, T.H. 1999a:317-318).

One of Lee Teng-hui's primary school teachers encouraged him to enrol at the Tamsui Middle School when he was fifteen years old (Hsu, S.H. 1995:181). During his time at the Presbyterian Church-led Tamsui Middle School, in addition to participating in fencing and baseball, Lee Teng-hui studied very hard. He then passed the strict examination to enter the Taipei Higher School (Wakabayashi 1998:45-46).

1.4. Taipei Higher School

According to the academic system of Japan, primary school takes six years, junior high school (middle school) takes five years, and senior high school (higher school)

takes three years. University is minimum three years. A grade four student at junior high school can participate in an examination to go to 'higher school'. At that time, Japan had eight imperial universities and 38 higher schools. (there were only two higher schools in colonial China, one is the Lusun Higher School in Lushun, Liaoning Province, the other is Taipei Higher School in Taipei, Taiwan). Those students who graduated from higher school would participate in an examination to enter one of the eight imperial universities. Therefore, it was a great honour for students to study at higher school. In the discriminatory educational system, Taiwanese students made up 22.5 per cent and Japanese students made up 77.5 per cent of the total number of students at Taipei Higher School (Yang, C.C. 1996:45-49), but the Japanese only made up 6.0 per cent of the total population in Taiwan during the Japanese colonial period (TPG 1946:76-77). That is to say, the Taiwanese students in the Taipei Higher School were the Taiwanese élite (Yang, C.C. 1996:48).

During his three years at Taipei Higher School from 1941-43, Lee Teng-hui was interested in Japanese classics, and read books such as the *Kojik* (The Record of Ancient Matters), *Genji Monogatari* (The Tale of Genji), *Makura-no-soshi* (The Pillow Book), and *Heike Monogatari* (The Tale of the Heike) (Lee, T.H. 1999b:27).

1.5. Kyoto Imperial University

After graduating from Taipei Higher School, Lee Teng-hui went to Japan and enrolled in the Faculty of Agriculture at Kyoto Imperial University, in April 1943 (Lee, T.H. 1999b:31). Due to the tensions of war, the students who majored in Literature were conscripted in September 1943. Lee Teng-hui was also conscripted into the Taiwanese forces and was sent to Taiwan for military training (Wakabayashi 1998:51-52). He was assigned to Kaohsiung Artillery Troops in Taiwan in 1944, and he returned to Japan to enter the Anti-Air Raid School in January 1945, where he was accepted on a Sergeants' training course (Kamisaka 2001:51-53).

On 15 August 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allies and World War II ended. Soldiers were promoted one rank, and Lee Teng-hui was promoted to a second lieutenant of the Imperial Japanese Army on 19 August 1945 (Hsieh 2000:89).

Under Japanese colonial rule, Lee Teng-hui received a full Japanese education from primary school, through middle and senior school, through his freshman years of university, and even military training. In particular, his Japanese élite education at Higher School had a lasting influence. Lee Teng-hui afterwards stated that “Japanese culture and education were the primary influences in my childhood” (Lee, T.H. 1999b:28). At that time, Japan was a militarized nation which had invaded China. The direction and content of school education glorified Japan and belittled China. Therefore, when Lee Teng-hui was influenced by the Japanese culture of the day, he was also exposed to these views.

2. THE RECOVERY OF TAIWAN AND THE 228 INCIDENT

On 15 August 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allies and Taiwan was returned to China. At that time, Japan was a defeated nation; however, it had the capacity to manufacture various advanced fighters, warships, submarines and carriers. China, on other hand, did not have the ability to manufacture or even assemble these. Mainland China had experienced long-term imperial invasion and civil war, whereas Taiwan had been ruled by Japanese Colonial Government. In particular, there was a long peaceful period between 1910 and 1940, during which the infrastructure in Taiwan was constructed. Taiwan overtook Mainland China in the fields of education, justice, finance, communication, transportation, agriculture and industry. Furthermore, when World War II ended, the second civil war between the KMT and the CCP broke out in China, causing further hardship on the Mainland.

When Taiwan was returned to China, because the Japanese Colonial Government had encouraged communication between Taiwan and Japan, but deterred communication between Taiwan and Mainland China from 1895-1945, there was a lack of understanding about China, and the Taiwanese had illusions about China. For example, during the early stages of Taiwan’s return to the Mainland China, the Taiwanese were exultant, and they voluntarily held various celebrations to commemorate the return. However, when the KMT-led Chinese troops and civil service arrived in Taiwan, the full extent of their backwardness, such as corruption in the civil service and bad military discipline, shocked Taiwanese and shattered their illusions of the motherland (Chi 1998:2236-2242). At that time, Taiwan had been

ruled by the Japanese colonial government for half a century and, therefore, the severance between Taiwan and Mainland China had also lasted for half a century. The Taiwanese élite, such as the landowner class, who had studied classical Chinese literature, imagined China as it was portrayed in the literature. However, there was a big gap between Chinese culture in books and how it was in reality (Hsu, H.C. 1992:127). They did not understand that their motherland, China, had suffered through civil wars and the aggression of foreign powers for over half a century (Yeh 1991:41-42). Because China was more backward than Japan, there was inevitably a huge gap politically, economically, socially and culturally between the Taiwanese and the Mainlanders (Yeh 1996:43).

As a result of fifty years of Japanese colonial rule, the main cities, such as Taipei, Kuoshiung, and Taichung, had been 'Japanised' to some extent. There was also to some degree cultural conflict between the Japanised Taiwanese culture and Chinese Mainland culture in many cities. Because the administrative officers and troops, sent to Taiwan by the KMT government, were mainly not from southern Fujian Province, their dialect and habits differed from the Taiwanese, so there was also ethnic conflict. The KMT-led government did not implement a Taiwanisation policy, and they assigned too many Mainland officers to the duty of filling the empty positions left by Japanese officers. This caused a power struggle between the Taiwanese and the Mainlanders. Finally, these conflicts triggered the 228 Incident. The young Lee Teng-hui lived through all of these developments.

2.1. Lee Teng-hui's participation in the CCP

As World War II ended, there were significant developments in China. There was civil war between the KMT and the CCP, where the strength of the CCP expanded quickly, and the CCP occupied the whole of Mainland China. In this great transition, the CCP's rapid expansion and overwhelming victory in battle meant that the CCP's organization also expanded rapidly in the provinces, including Taiwan Province. The rapid expansion of the CCP, and the ideal of Communism also lured some of the youth to participate in the CCP.

2.1.1. Enrolment at National Taiwan University

Lee Teng-hui was a second lieutenant of the Japanese Imperial Army in Nagoya, Japan when World War II ended, in August 1945. At that time, it was difficult for him to decide between staying in Japan or going back to Taiwan. Finally, Lee Teng-hui returned to Taiwan and studied at the National Taiwan University (NTU) (called Taipei Imperial University in the Japanese Colonial period) in the spring of 1946 (Lee, T.H. 1999b:35).

2.1.2 Lee Teng-hui participated in and left the CCP

Lee Teng-hui was introduced to the CCP by Wu Ko-tai. Wu Ko-tai (I-Lan, Taiwan, 1925) enrolled at Taipei Higher School in 1943, then went to Shanghai the following year, and returned to Taiwan in March 1946, when he entered the Medical College of NTU (Lan 1993:41-48). Wu Ko-tai participated in the CCP before he returned to Taiwan (Wu 2002:148-150), and therefore, brought back Mainland CCP experience upon his return to Taiwan.

In order to help other classmates to adjust their pronunciation of Mandarin, Wu Ko-tai set up a “Mandarin Learning Class” in Tseng Yung’s house at Nanking E. Rd, Taipei in the summer of 1946. Because Lee Teng-hui was familiar with Tseng Yung’s elder sister Tseng Wen-fui, he lived in Tseng’s house, and he befriended Wu Ko-tai at that time (Wu 1995:201-202). In the summer holidays of 1946, Lee Teng-hui seemed carefully to read *Das Kapital*, written by Karl Marx (Japanese condensed edition), and gained much from it. At the introduction of Wu Ko-tai, Lee Teng-hui joined the CCP in September 1946 (Wu 2000:167-168).

2.2. The 228 (28 February 1947) Incident

On the evening of 27 February 1947, a few agents of the Monopoly Bureau were investigating cigarette smuggling in the commercial district of Taipei City. At that time, a Taiwanese vendor, Lin Chiang-mai, a widow, was arrested and her cigarettes and cash were also confiscated. Although she begged for clemency, the agents refused and hit her. Then, onlookers became angry and struck the agents. One of the Mainlander agents fired three times into the air as he fled. However, one unlucky shot struck a Taiwanese youth who died. This accidental death was used to show that Mainlanders killed Taiwanese. The death of the Taiwanese youth triggered

massive Taiwanese protests through the whole Taipei City on the following day, and quickly resulted in ethnic riots (Lai *et al.* 1994:48-56). According to estimates, over 100 Mainlanders were killed and 900 were beaten and injured by Taiwanese in Taipei City on 28 February (Tang 1947:93). In early March, thousands of Mainlanders were arrested and interrogated in Taichung, Chia-yi and Kaohsiung City. All of Taiwan's main cities experienced extreme urban violence and uprisings. The Taiwanese requested the disarming of the National Military and established an interim government (Chi 1998:2053-2079). On 8 March, about 13,000 reinforcements from the Mainland landed at the port of Keelung, and put down the street violence by killing Taiwanese protesters and arresting their leaders. Arrests and slaughter were out of control. Intellectual opponents of the KMT government were killed or arrested and put in jail indiscriminately (Lee, T.H. 1999b:36). According to estimates, two or three thousand Taiwanese were massacred (Chi 2000:237-239). This event became known as the 228 Incident.

On 24 December 1946, American soldiers raped Shen Chung, a student at Beijing University (So & Si 1992:445). It led to student demonstrations throughout the country. About 10,000 students of the universities and senior high schools in Taipei also demonstrated on 9 January 1947 (Lan 1993:116). On the same day, Lee Teng-hui participated in the demonstration too (Wu 2002:191), where he met Chen Peng-chi. Chen Peng-chi was a student activist who had previously been arrested and jailed for anti-Japanese activities. After Japan surrendered to the Allies, his experience made him a popular youth leader. Subsequently, disillusioned with the KMT-led government, he participated in anti-KMT government activities. For example, he mobilised senior high school students to participate in the 9 January demonstration and he also mobilised students to prepare an attack on the arsenal of a military hospital in Taipei City during the 228 Incident (Lan 1993:69-89).

Following the 228 Incident on 28 February, Lee Teng-hui even arranged for Chen Peng-chi to hide for about one week in his Sanchih country home to avoid arrest (Shieh, C.C. 1999:16). Chen Peng-chi then spent some time in the countryside and fled to Shanghai in May. He went back to Taiwan in July 1947, and joined the CCP in the same month (Lan 1993:87-92).

2.3. Lee Teng-hui joined the NDCA

In July 1947, at the instigation of Lee Tsang-chiang, Lee Teng-hui, Lee Chun-shan, Chen Peng-chi, Lin Ju-yu and Lee Tsang-chiang organized a study group and read many books concerning Marxism. They set up the “New Democratic Comrades Association-NDCA”, and held study and work meetings periodically in Lee Teng-hui’s home. Because Lee Chun-shan and Chen Peng-chi were Communists, the CCP changed the NDCA to the “Taipei City Work Committee”, a branch of the CCP, which was led by Kuo Hsiu-chung, and then by Lee Jye (original name: Hsu Mau-the, Kiangsu Province) who was assigned there by Mainland China (Lan 2000:252-255). When Lee Jye arrived in Taiwan, Lee Teng-hui decided to leave the CCP, and did so in the autumn of 1947 (Yang, T. 2000:37)

2.4. Lee Teng-hui participated in and left the CCP again

According to Lee Chun-shan, in October 1947 Lee Teng-hui applied to participate in the CCP again. His application form was handed to Liao Jui-fa by Liu Chao-kuang, then submitted to Tsai Hsiao-chien, the head of the Taiwan Work Committee, and it was approved immediately (Lan 2000:259). Yeh Chen-sung (Chia-yi, Taiwan) participated in the CCP at the introduction of Lee Teng-hui, and he then acted as leader of the CCP’s group in the Law College at NTU, under the command of Yang Ting-ji, and recruited Kuo Chang-tang, Hsu Chou-ran, and Kuo Yao-nan (HRCTP 1998d:345-346). During that period, Lee Teng-hui, Yeh Cheng-sung, Yang Ting-yi, Kuo Chang-tang, Hsu Chou-ran, Kuo Yao-nan and Chang Bih-kun participated in the study group at Lee’s lodging periodically (Lan 2000:291).

According to Lee Chun-shan, on the eve of the anniversary of the 228 Incident in 1948, the five members of the NDCA decided to disseminate letters *To Taiwanese Fellow Countrymen* to commemorate the anniversary of the 228 Incident (Lan 2000:258-259). Wu Ko-tai recollected that later, Lee Teng-hui applied to retire from the CCP again, and left the NDCA (Lan 2000:261-262). Lee Chun-shan recalled that the reason for this related to Kuo Hsiu-chung, who had apparently said that he had come back from the Kyoto Imperial University and had known more about Marxist theory than them, why should he accept their leadership? (Lan 2000:262-263)

Within only two years, Lee Teng-hui had participated in and left the CCP, then applied to participate in the CCP again, and finally retreated from the CCP. Therefore, it is obvious that Lee Teng-hui was not a firm believer in the CCP. If Lee Teng-hui did not firmly believe in the CCP, what was the real motivation behind his application to participate in the CCP twice? It is difficult to understand this, and the real reason was known only to him.

3. THE GREAT POLITICAL PURGE

The CCP won an overwhelming victory in Mainland China within short three years. The rapid expansion of the CCP encouraged the young élite of the whole of China to participate in the CCP, but as a result of the strict discipline of the CCP, only a few people actually became members. Therefore, as the CCP gained control, its members played an important role in the new government.

However, in Taiwan, when the KMT-led government fled, it had absolute control over power because Taiwan is an island. Because the KMT lost and the CCP won the civil war, the KMT instituted a great political purge to enhance its powers. Hence, Taiwan became a grave for members of the CCP. However, Lee Teng-hui survived this political crisis many times (Lan 2000:264-293).

3.1. The first crisis of Lee Teng-hui

After Lee Teng-hui left the NDCA, it changed its name to the “Taiwan Liberation League” in the summer of 1948 (Lan 2000:264-265). By 25 October 1948, the “Taiwan Liberation League” was ruined. Chen Peng-chi fled and Lee Chun-shan and Lin Ju-yu were arrested (Lan 2000:267-268). Lee Chun-shan and Lin Ju-yu were sent to the Taiwan Garrison General Headquarters (TGGH), but they did not reveal Lee Teng-hui’s Chinese Communist affiliation. Therefore, Lee Teng-hui survived his first crisis. At the end of 1948, Lee Chun-shan and Lin Ju-yu were sentenced to three years and six months in jail respectively. However, as a result of another case, Lin Ju-yu was executed on 26 December 1950 (Lan 2000:268-269).

3.2. The second crisis of Lee Teng-hui

In 1949, Wu Ko-tai who had introduced Lee Teng-hui to the CCP, went to Shanghai in March (Lan 2000:271-272), and Chen Peng-chi, who was Lee Teng-hui's close comrade in the NDCA, went to Shanghai on 10 April pursuant to CCP instructions (Lan 1993:96). On 21 April 1949, the CCP-led forces launched an all-out attack against the KMT-led forces and crossed the Yangtze River successfully (So & Si 1992:484).

Then, the TGGH implemented an Emergency Decree (State of Emergency) throughout Taiwan Province on 20 May 1949 (GIO 1997:67). Liu Chao-kung, who knew Lee Teng-hui had participated in the CCP, risked his life to flee to Mainland China in August (Yang, W.L. 1995:237). Lee Tsang-chiang, who also knew Lee Teng-hui had been a Chinese Communist, was arrested in January 1950, but never revealed the identity of his Communist comrades under brutal torture, and was executed on 14 October 1950 (HRCTP 1998b: 5-21). Thus, Lee Teng-hui survived a second crisis.

3.3. The third crisis of Lee Teng-hui

On 29 January 1950, Tsai Hsiao-chien, the head of the CCP in Taiwan, who also knew Lee Teng-hui had been a Chinese Communist, was arrested (HRCTP 1998a:60). Lee Tye, who also knew this, left Taiwan and fled to Mainland China in March (HRCTP 1998d:348).

As a result of Tsai's testimony, the secret police arrested Yang Ting-yi, who was a member of the study group and who had studied with Lee Teng-hui, and executed him on 29 November 1950 (HRTCP 1998b:367-378). Also as a result of Tsai's betrayal, Kuo Hsiu-chung, another man who knew Lee Teng-hui had been a Chinese Communist, was also arrested in Chia-yi (Lan 1992:261-264), and was executed on 3 December 1950 (HRTCP 1998b:69-73).

3.4. The fourth crisis of Lee Teng-hui

Yeh Cheng-sung, who was introduced by Lee Teng-hui to the CCP, and Chang Bih-kun, who met with Lee Teng-hui and Yeh Cheng-sun in the study group, were

arrested in 1954, and executed with other comrades on 29 April 1955 (HRCTP 1998d:345-346).

During the great political purge period, in order to protect the last frontier—Taiwan, to encourage morale, and to prevent subversion by the CCP, the KMT government clamped down on Chinese Communists. Any suspected Communist could be arrested, tortured, jailed or executed. At that time, all of Lee Teng-hui's Communist comrades who stayed in Taiwan, were arrested, jailed or executed. Closest to him were Yeh Cheng-sung, who was introduced by Lee Teng-hui to the CCP and Yang Ting-yi, who had studied with Lee Teng-hui at Lee's lodging. Both Yeh and Yang were arrested and executed. Yang Ting-yi confessed and revealed the activities of the CCP, and the fact that Lee Teng-hui was a Communist appeared in a secret document of the National Security Bureau (HRCTP 1998d:345-347). Nevertheless, Lee Teng-hui remained safe. Therefore, the famous historian, Lee Ao, suspected that Lee Teng-hui had been a traitor to his Chinese Communist comrades (Lee, A. 2000:67-78). During the great political purge, Lee Teng-hui who had been a Chinese Communist could not conceivably have remained safe unless he betrayed his comrades.

4. THE POLITICAL DARK PERIOD

In the beginning of 1950, Tsai Hsiao-chien, the head of the CCP in Taiwan, and 13 other important Communists were arrested (HRCTP 1998a:55-64). It was a heavy blow to the CCP's secret organization in Taiwan. On 25 June 1950, the Korean War broke out. In order to protect US interests, US President Harry S. Truman immediately ordered the Seventh Fleet to protect Taiwan against any attack from Mainland China (USA/Truman 1950:1). Thus, the US neutralized potential conflict in the Taiwan Straits substantially.

4.1. Lee Teng-hui surrendered himself to justice

In October 1950, the ROC government promulgated a regulation requiring Communists to surrender themselves to justice (HRCTP 1998b:64). In 1950, Lee Teng-hui went to the Safeguard Command and surrendered himself to justice. He severed his relationship with the CCP, and was bailed out by his teacher Hsu

Ching-chung (Hsu, Y.T. 2000:289-291). Due to the recommendation of Hsu Ching-chung who was director of the Taiwan Provincial Department of Agriculture and Forestry, Lee Teng-hui entered and worked for that Department. Later, with the assistance of Hsu Ching-chung, Lee Teng-hui received a scholarship from the Sino-American Cultural Foundation (Hsu, Y.T. 2000:54-58).

In March 1952, Lee Teng-hui went to study at Iowa State University in the United States. In April of the following year, he completed a master's degree and returned to Taiwan (Kamisaka 2001:87-89). Again with Hsu Ching-chung's assistance, Lee Teng-hui was promoted to section chief of the Economic Analysis Section of the Department of Agriculture and Forestry ((Hsu 2000:59), and also became a part-time instructor at NTU (Lee, T.H. 1999a:321).

4.2. Working for the JCRR

Upon his return to Taiwan from April 1953, Lee Teng-hui still worked for the Taiwan Provincial Department of Agriculture. After a short time, he resigned and joined the Taiwan Cooperative Bank as a research fellow in 1955 (Lee, T.H. 1999a:321). Two years later, in 1957, Lee Teng-hui moved to the (Sino-American) Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction (JCRR) at Hsieh Sen-chung's invitation, and wrote a book, *An Analytical Review of Agricultural Development in Taiwan/ An Input-Output and Productivity Approach* with Hsieh Sen-chung in 1958 (Huang, C.C. 1992:34-35).

4.3. Detention

In 1960, Hsiao Tao-ying, who was the head of the CCP's secret organisation in Taiwan, surrendered himself to the Investigation Bureau (IB). He not only confessed about the armed base of the CCP in Kaohsiung, but also mentioned Lee Teng-hui's Communist past. Lee Teng-hui was then arrested and detained. Ku Cheng-wen, who had participated in investigating Lee's case, recalled that during his investigations, Lee Teng-hui confessed to his participation in the underground movement of the CCP. Apparently he had claimed with sincerity that it had been the mistake of a young student and he had begged for the opportunity to make amends. At that time, Lee Teng-hui was under detention at IB for about four months (Ku 1995:243-244).

Because Lee Teng-hui worked very hard in the JCRR, his head Shen Chun-han, pleaded with the Secretary-General of the KMT, Chiang Yen-shih for clemency. Chang Ching-yin, the director of the IB, took the view that the events had occurred ten years before and that Lee Teng-hui was not a danger to national security, and agreed that Shen Chung-han could pay his bail (Wei 1997:239).

4.4. Interrogation by the TGGH

In the middle of the 1960s, Lee Teng-hui could not be promoted to chief of the rural economics division in the JCRR. Hsu Ching-chung, who was Lee's teacher, subsequently recalled that Lee Teng-hui had been emotionally unstable after his interrogation, and suspected that the Mainlanders were hampering his promotion because he was Taiwanese. As a result, he wished to go abroad for advanced studies (Hsu, Y.T. 2000:80-82).

In the Autumn of 1965, Lee Teng hui received the scholarship set up jointly by Rockefeller and Cornell University, and he went abroad and enrolled at Cornell University (Kamisaka 2001:95-97). However, due to his previous political record, he could not receive approval to leave Taiwan. His teacher, Hsu Ching-chung, pleaded with Chiang Yen-shih, Director of the JCRR, that he would co-guarantee Lee Teng-hui's return (Hsu, Y.T. 2000:86). Lee received his Ph.D. in agricultural economics from Cornell University in 1968. His doctoral dissertation, *Intersectoral Capital Flows in the Economic Development of Taiwan*, was cited as the best doctoral dissertation by the American Association for Agricultural Economics in 1969 (Lee, T.H. 1999a:322), and he was appointed chief of the ICRR's rural economics division in 1970 (GIO 1997:xv).

In June 1969, Lee Teng-hui was suddenly taken away and interrogated by the TGGH (Chang, Y.Y. 1999:301-302). During several consecutive days of interrogation, the officers of the TGGH focused on Lee's experience in the 228 Incident (Lee & Kobayashi 2001:72). This was Lee Teng-hui's last interrogation.

5. THE TAIWANISATION PERIOD

By 1971, the Mainlander élite-led KMT, headed by President Chiang Kai-shek, had

dominated Taiwan for twenty years. After peaceful and rapid economic development, a Taiwanese business and educated élite emerged and their demands for political participation increased. Inter alia, the Taiwanese educated élite published a political magazine which criticized the administration, slammed the politics, requested political reform, and sought to influence public opinion.

On 25 June 1969, Chiang Ching-kuo, the son of Chiang Kai-shek, was appointed as vice-premier of the Executive Yuan, which was the highest administrative organ of the KMT-led government, and he in reality was in control of political power. Later, on 17 May 1972, Chiang Ching-kuo was appointed Premier (Lee, S.L. 1993:356-359). Because Chiang Ching-kuo was really in charge of political affairs, he understood Taiwan's social pulse and launched the policy of Taiwanization.

5.1. Participation in the KMT

After weathering the political dark period safely, Lee Teng-hui's future was bright. In January 1970, Wang Tso-yung (Mainlander, Hupei Province) resigned his post at the United Nations and returned to Taiwan. Then, at the instruction of Vice-Premier Chiang Ching-kuo, Wang Tso-yung planned to visit Korea and Japan officially to study economics, and he requested Chiang Ching-kuo to approve that Lee Teng-hui accompany him. When Lee Teng-hui applied to go abroad, approval was complicated by his political past. Wang Tso-yung, however, wrote a letter to Chiang Ching-kuo recommending Lee Teng-hui in this regard (Wang, T.Y. 1999:413-414).

Before the fourth Plenary Session of the KMT in 1970, Chiang Ching-kuo met Lee Teng-hui briefly. It was the first meeting between Chiang Ching-kuo and Lee Teng-hui. At that time, Lee Teng-hui was not a member of the KMT, but he was invited to attend their fourth Plenary Session (Tsou, C.W. 2001:55). In 1971, Lee Teng-hui joined the KMT (Lee, T.H. 1999a:323) at Wang Tso-yung's introduction (Wang, T.Y. 1999:418).

5.2. Mayor of Taipei City

In 1972, in order to begin to implement the policy of Taiwanisation, Premier Chiang Ching-kuo appointed Taiwanese to the posts of Minister of Interior, Minister of

Communication, Governor of Taiwan Province and Mayor of Taipei City. He also appointed Lee Teng-hui as a minister without portfolio and advisor of the JCRR, in charge of establishing agriculture policy. In 1978, Chiang Ching-kuo was elected by the National Assembly as President of the Republic of China in Taiwan. He reorganized the Cabinet, and appointed Lee Teng-hui as mayor of Taipei City and advisor to the JCRR. As a result, Lee Teng-hui resigned his post as part-time professor at NTU (Lee, T.H. 1999a:323-324). At that time, Lee Teng-hui was only fifty five years old, and, therefore, this appointment surprised many people in the political arena, and made many politicians extremely jealous (Li 1988:45).

Recalling the period from 1972 to 1978, Lee Teng-hui stated that “(i) was a minister without portfolio for six years under Chiang Ching-kuo. Whenever he chaired a meeting I experienced a state of heightened tension, but those meetings turned out to be my instruction in government. If I really did grow from a mere theorist into a political leader, I give all the credit to my six years in Chiang Ching-kuo’s ‘school of politics’” (Lee, T.H. 1999b:196-197).

In 1979, Chiang Ching-kuo made Lee Teng-hui a member of the Central Standing Committee of the KMT. This Central Standing Committee, which consisted of twenty seven people, was chaired by Chiang Ching-kuo, and was the centre of power, deciding on key policy decisions which the party and government adopted. Lee had participated in the KMT only since 1971, so his sudden appointment to the Central Standing Committee again stunned many individuals in the political arena (Hsu, H. 1993:76).

5.3. From Governor to Vice-President

In 1981, the Executive Yuan was partly reorganized. At Chiang Ching-kuo’s wish, Lee Teng-hui served as the governor of Taiwan Province, and, in February 1984, President Chiang Ching-kuo chose Lee Teng-hui as his vice-presidential running mate. In the following month, Lee Teng-hui was elected vice-president of the ROC. On 13 January 1988, President Chiang Ching-kuo passed away suddenly, and Vice President Lee Teng-hui immediately succeeded to the Presidency (Lee, T.H. 1999a:325-327), and became Taiwan’s first indigenous president.

Lee Teng-hui was a university professor. At the same time, some Taiwanese élite who participated in the election had very high profiles, but were not picked by Chiang Ching-kuo as vice-president. Interestingly, Chiang chose Lee Teng-hui, who had a previous record as a Chinese Communist, to serve as vice-president. There was a rumour that Chiang Ching-kuo preferred to handpick somebody who had made political mistakes because such a person would appreciate his kindness and obey completely (Wei 1997:237). Another rumour is that Chiang Ching-kuo was influenced by the US agent, James R. Lilley, to choose Lee Teng-hui as his successor (Ku 1995:247). Lilley and Lee Teng-hui were good friends (Fu, C.C. 2000:14).

6. LEE TENG-HUI'S POLITICAL VIEWS REGARDING MAINLANDERS AND THE KMT

At present, one of the most important political problems in Taiwan is the ethnic conflict between Taiwanese and Mainlanders. The distribution of the ethnic groups in Taiwan is as follows: Southern Fujianese, Hakkas, Mainlanders and Aborigines, which make up 73.3 per cent, 12.0 per cent, 13.0 per cent and 1.7 per cent respectively of the total population (Huang, S.F. 1993:21). The total population of Taiwan stood at 22.16 million as of May 2000 (GIO 2001:22).

Aborigines are the indigenous people of Taiwan; the Southern Fujianese and Hakkas immigrated from the southern Fujian and Guangdong province during the three hundred years of the Qing Dynasty; and the Mainlanders, who spoke Mandarin and other dialects, were evacuated from the Chinese Mainland and moved to Taiwan when the KMT-led government was defeated on the Mainland, in 1949, by the CCP. All of the Southern Fujianese, Hakkas and Mainlanders belonged to the Chinese Han people and use the same Chinese characters and grammar, but different pronunciation, meaning that they cannot be understood by each other. Due to more widespread usage than other languages, Mandarin became the 'National Language' in Mainland China. When the KMT-led government moved to Taiwan, it still adopted Mandarin as the 'National Language'.

Because Southern Fujianese and Hakkas immigrated from the Chinese Mainland

during the Qing dynasty, they had a common history and shared memories. However, there are large differences between Southern Fujian and Hakka dialects and customs. Therefore, Southern Fujianese and Hakkas are both theoretically Taiwanese, but up to the present in Taiwan, the Southern Fujianese are usually regarded as so-called Taiwanese, but the Hakkas are not; and the Southern Fujian language is regarded as a so-called Taiwanese dialect, but the Hakka language is not.

6.1. Ethnic resentment over power-sharing

Ethnic resentment generated by the historical legacies of inequality in the sharing of power by the ethnic élite is one of the most important motivations for secessionism, and usually results in the development of secessionist movements.

The Mainlanders moved to Taiwan in 1949. Taiwan had been ceded to Japan since 1895, and as previously discussed, the Taiwanese had experienced 50 years of Japanese colonial rule. The historical memories of Taiwanese and Mainlanders were different. The 228 Incident took place after Taiwan had been returned to China, and subsequently, the Mainlander-led central government retreated from Mainland China to Taiwan. The Mainlander élite controlled political power and, particularly in the 1950s, they occupied almost all high positions. The Taiwanese élite believed that they were denied a fair share of political control and this developed into ethnic grievances and resentment. In particular, this inequality caused them to lose the ability or political right to determine their own destiny and many Taiwanese were killed or jailed as a result of this political suppression.

In Taiwan, during the 38 years (1950-1988) of authoritarian rule by the Mainlander President Chiang Kai-shek and his son President Chiang Ching-kuo, the ruling party was the KMT, and the ultimate main national policy decision-making organ of this

Table 1. Ethnic Composition of the KMT Central Standing Committee

	Year	Total	Taiwanese	%	Mainlander	%
The 7 th (first plenary session)	1952	11	0	0.0	11	100.0

University of Pretoria etd – Chi, C-L (2004)

(second plenary session)	1953	10	0	0.0	10	100.0
The 8 th (first plenary session)	1957	15	2	13.3	13	86.7
The 9 th (first plenary session)	1963	15	2	13.3	13	86.7
(second plenary session)	1964	17	2	11.8	15	88.2
(fourth plenary session)	1966	19	2	10.5	17	89.5
The 10 th (first plenary session)	1969	21	2	9.5	19	90.5
(third plenary session)	1972	21	3	14.3	18	85.7
The 11 th (first plenary session)	1976	22	5	22.7	23	77.3
(fourth plenary session)	1979	27	9	33.3	18	66.7
The 12 th (first plenary session)	1981	27	9	33.3	18	66.7
(second plenary session)	1984	31	12	38.7	19	61.3
(third plenary session)	1986	31	14	45.2	17	54.8
The 13 th (first plenary session)	1988	31	16	51.6	15	48.4

Source: Sung & Yu *et al* eds., 1990. *The 40 Year History of Kuomintang and Taiwan*. Jirin: Kirin Cultural and Historical Publishing Co. pp.408-413.

party was the KMT Central Standing Committee. All members of the seventh Central Standing Committee from 1952 to 1956 were Mainlanders, and there was no Taiwanese representation. From 1957 to 1971, there were only two Taiwanese included in the total 15 members of the Central Standing Committee. The tenth Central Standing Committee from 1972, included three Taiwanese out of a total of 21, and in the 11th Central Standing Committee from 1976, this number increased slightly to five out of 22. In 1979, at the fourth plenary session of the Central Standing Committee, nine of the 27 members were Taiwanese. The number gradually increased in 1984 at the second plenary session of the 12th Central Standing Committee to 12 out of 31, and to 14 out of 31 at the third plenary session of the 12th Central Standing Committee in 1986 (Table 1). On 13 January 1988, President Chiang Ching-kuo, also the KMT party chairman, passed away. Vice-President Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency and the KMT party chairmanship. On 14 July 1988, the KMT held the first plenary session of the 13th Central Standing Committee, under the control of the chairman Lee Teng-hui, and there were 16 Taiwanese on the Committee out of a total of 31 (Table 1). This meant that Taiwanese made up 51.6 per cent of the total – a majority for the first time.

The gradual change in ethnic composition of the membership of the KMT Central Standing Committee between Taiwanese and Mainlanders reflected the

Taiwanisation process. From 1976, the Taiwanese élite began to improve their influence in the KMT Central Standing Committee and in the 1980s, they began to share political power. However, in the previous 25 years (1950-1975), they had had almost no political power in the core decision-making body, despite Taiwanese forming 85.3 per cent of the total population. As a result of this, the only option for the Taiwanese élite, including Lee Teng-hui, had been to hide the ethnic resentment they felt towards the Mainlanders.

6.2. Ethnic resentment over language policy

Difference in language is another important cause of secessionism and separatism. It is a sensitive issue for most states, particularly states that consist of multi-racial or multi-ethnic groups. The 'National Language' of the ROC is Mandarin. Therefore, when the ROC ruled Mainland China, the KMT-led government promoted Mandarin for many years. In 1949, the whole central government fled to Taiwan, and 910,000 Mainlanders suddenly gathered on Taiwan Island. Coming from 35 provinces, they used many dialects. On the other hand, the Taiwanese, consisting of South Fujian, Hakka and Aborigines, also used different languages.

In order to build understanding between different ethnic groups, the KMT-led government promoted Mandarin in Taiwan, and adopted Mandarin as the 'National Language' in schools. However, Taiwanese still used Taiwanese dialects in daily life, even in elections. This language policy became a nightmare of ethnic resentment for the Taiwanese for fifty years.

From primary school to university, teachers had to use Mandarin. Therefore, some of the children forgot their mother-tongue. This included Mainlanders, such as Shanghaiese and Cantonese children and children from other provinces or places who used local dialects. The Taiwanese élite understood the common sense of the requirement to use Mandarin, but for their personal political ends, such as the desire to win an election, they misrepresented the KMT-led government's language policy. They did not mention that the result of this language policy was fair to the Mainlander children whose mother-tongues were dialects, and who might otherwise have to use a Taiwanese dialect. They represented the language policy as an example of the

Mainlanders discriminating against the Taiwanese by prohibiting them from speaking in their mother-tongue in schools.

In March 1994, when the President of ROC, Lee Teng-hui, was interviewed by the famous Japanese historical novelist Shiba Ryotaro, he criticized the KMT-led government's previous national language policy in schools and said that he encouraged people to use the Taiwanese dialect (Lee & Shiba 1994:4). Lee Teng-hui's opinions on language policy expressed in this conversation triggered tremendous disputes between Taiwanese and Mainlanders. It is rare for heads of state to encourage their people to use local dialects, therefore, this also showed how much of a problem the language issue was in Taiwan at that time.

6.3. The true political views of Lee Teng-hui

The relationship between Lee Teng-hui and Mainlanders is complex and sophisticated. Mainlanders are simultaneously foes and also intimate friends to him.

During Lee Teng-hui's ascendance to power, he was assisted and promoted by Mainlanders on many occasions. Therefore, after Lee Teng-hui became President, he appointed Wang Tso-yung, who had not only helped him but also recommended him to Vice-Premier Chiang Ching-kuo during the political dark period, as minister in the Ministry of Examination. As for the previous President, Chiang Ching-kuo, Lee Teng-hui frankly said that no matter what he may have felt as a subordinate officer, he always felt gratitude towards Chiang Ching-kuo (Tsou, C.W. 2001:62).

6.3.1. Lee Teng-hui concealed his hatred of Mainlanders for 40 years

The political dark period of the Mainlander-led government was frightening and humiliating for Lee Teng-hui, and he must have been resentful. Until the early 1990s, Lee Teng-hui had still not consolidated his presidential power and he still concealed his hatred and resentment of Mainlanders. However, he revealed this to an American, James R. Lilley.

6.3.1.1. Lee Teng-hui revealed his real views to James R. Lilley

James R. Lilley is an American diplomat. He received a master's degree in

International Relations from George Washington University, and was a professor at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies from 1978-1980. He was a Director of the American Institute in Taiwan from 1982-1984; the US Ambassador to the Republic of Korea from 1986-1989; and to the People's Republic of China from 1989-1991 (Lilley 2002:1). Although he is a former US Ambassador to Mainland China, James R. Lilley is a strongly anti-China figure. His basic political standpoint concerning China was not only critical, but also sought to foster anti-China sentiment in the world. He publicly supported two Chinas, or, in other words, the secession of Taiwan from Mainland China (Wen 1997:1).

In March 1984, Lilley was the director of the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and Lee Teng-hui was the governor of Taiwan province and vice-presidential running mate of President Chiang Ching-kuo. Thus he was political successor to the dictatorial period. In order to help Lee Teng-hui further understand the US, Chiang Ching-kuo allowed Lilley and Lee Teng-hui to undertake a two-day tour around Taiwan. In 2000, Lilley recalled that, when starting on the tour, he had immediately realized that Lee Teng-hui was well-read on the subject of the early post-war period of Taiwan. They discussed the books authored by George Kerr, which Lee Teng-hui believed were very important works (Fu, C.C. 2000:14).

George Kerr lived in Taiwan as an English teacher at the Taipei First Senior High School and the Taipei Higher School from 1937-1940 (PMM 1999:8). Then, he went to the US, and did graduate work at Columbia University from 1940-1942. He worked in the civilian service of the War Department from 1942-1943, and was commissioned in the US Navy in 1944 (Kerr 1965:Acknowledge). Before the end of World War II, he was assigned to Chungking city in China, as an Assistant Naval Attaché at the US Embassy (Kerr 1965:71). After World War II, in October 1945, he was assigned to Taiwan as the Assistant Naval Attaché and, in January 1946, he was transferred to the Foreign Service as a Vice-Consul (Kerr 1965:71-152). In May 1947, Kerr left Taiwan for the US. From then on he maintained that either the US should rule, protect or mandate Taiwan (Formosa), or Taiwan should become independent (Chen, T. L. 1999:15). Kerr favoured a United Nations Trust for Taiwan, and even declared that "the shrunken globe means that Formosa is on our frontiers so long as

we have serious interests in the Western Pacific. It is, for American purposes, a Western Pacific island, not a fragment of the continent adrift on the China coast.” (Kerr 1951:18-19)

There are two books concerning Taiwan authored by Kerr, namely, *Formosa Betrayed*, published in 1965; and *Formosa, Licensed Revolution and Home Rule Movement 1895-1945*, published in 1974 (Shihma 1991:75-76). In *Formosa Betrayed*, Kerr not only distorted the historical relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China and asserted that Taiwan should cede from Mainland China, but also instigated Taiwanese resentment toward Mainland China for the 228 Incident (Kerr 1965:1-123). Therefore, until the lifting of martial law, this book was one of the strictly prohibited books in Taiwan.

Lilley recalled that he understood that Lee Teng-hui was not a traditional KMT political leader. He abided by official opinion in public, but he identified with the Taiwanese people in private. Lilley said that he had no particular animus against China. Lee Teng-hui also candidly told Lilley that his people did not accept the control of China over Taiwan (Fu, C. C. 2000:14).

Thus, early in 1984, during the authoritarian period, Lee Teng-hui revealed his real political beliefs to Lilley. There were three significant revelations; Firstly, Lee Teng-hui had no particular ‘animus’ towards China (Fu, C.C. 2000:14), in other words, he had no particular feelings regarding Mainland China. Secondly, during the authoritarian days, all the traditional KMT-leaders identified with China and believed that Taiwan and Mainland China would be unified in the future. However, Lilley observed that Lee Teng-hui was not a traditional KMT-leader, since he identified with the Taiwanese people and not the Chinese. Thirdly, Lee Teng-hui had not only studied, but also agreed with the book supporting Taiwanese secession authored by Kerr.

These views were not allowed amongst high-ranking KMT officers during those authoritarian days. If Chiang Ching-kuo had known this, Lee Teng-hui would not have been handpicked as vice-president by him. Lilley, as a director of AIT, was in charge of diplomatic affairs, which included top secret and sensitive relations, between the

US and Taiwan. Therefore, he apparently understood that these political views were sensitive for Lee in those days, and kept this secret.

6.3.1.2. The real political beliefs and intentions of Lee Teng-hui

After Lee Teng-hui consolidated his power in early 1990s, he said publicly that even the KMT was also an outside regime (namely non-Taiwanese regime), and that in the days of old, the current generation of 70 year-olds could not sleep safely at home (Lee & Shiba 1994:4), because they experienced the great political purge period in which anyone would be arrested if they complained against the KMT-led government. Lee Teng-hui also told his good friend Hsu Wen-lung, who told the press in 1999 that in the era of the political dark period, for about 20 years, he could not sleep safely at night, because Lee Teng-hui didn't know if he would be arrested. His wife worried about this as well (Tsou, C.W. 1999:3). Lee Teng-hui also said in 1999: "I learned then (in the 1950s) that I had been under the surveillance of the secret police since the February 28 Incident" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:37).

Regarding the 228 Incident of 1947, Lee Teng-hui said in 1998 that "that incident was a tragedy, a tragic and terrible event for Taiwan. At that time, I was a senior in university and knew the details. Many of the Taiwanese people who were killed were acquaintances and personal friends...If I had gotten more involved, perhaps I would have been drawn in and gotten into a lot of trouble. In the ten years or so following the incident, thoughts of what happened often kept me awake at night" (Lee, T.H. 1999c:21-22). Lee Teng-hui repeated in 1999 that the 228 Incident "sheds light on the early postwar phase of my intellectual journey", and also that "it triggered a series of white terrorist (state of emergency) attacks against Taiwan-born intellectuals, whom the KMT authorities unilaterally labeled Communists" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:35).

In 1999, Lee Teng-hui indicated that he would not participate in the next presidential election, and frankly stated that after the Republic of China moved to Taiwan, not only was there the so-called White Terror (State of Emergency), but also there were cases where the Mainlanders suppressed the Taiwanese (Lee, T.H. 1999a:160). He also stated that: "(f)or centuries the people of Taiwan were denied the opportunity to

govern themselves. No matter how hard they might strive, their homeland was not their own.” (Lee, T.H. 1999b:19) To this Lee added that he always experienced pain that, as a Taiwanese, he could not serve the Taiwanese (Lee, T.H. 1999a:34).

In 19 April 2000, shortly before Lee Teng-hui was due to end his presidential term on 19 May 2000, he further said that Taiwan could not have an alien regime, and that it should revoke alien regimes, and establish its own regime to govern itself so that real Taiwanese could control their destiny (Lo 2000:4).

7. CONCLUSION

Up until 1945, when Lee Teng-hui was 22 years old, he had experienced the late Japanese colonial rule, as had his Taiwanese contemporaries. From 1945 to 1970, between the ages of 22 and 47 years, his experience was of being under surveillance and of the political oppression of the Mainlander-led secret police. This was also the common experience of his contemporaries in the Taiwanese élite. From 1971 to 2000, namely after Lee Teng-hui turned 48 years old, in the care of Chiang Ching-kuo, he became vice-president in March 1984, and eventually President of the ROC in January 1988. He had at one time been a Chinese Communist under political surveillance, and had been arrested and detained for four months, even if he was suspected of betraying his Chinese Communist comrades. In the eyes of the Taiwanese, his experience of being under political surveillance and of detention made him a political victim and he received their sympathy (Lei 1994:2). As for the riddle of his birth, similarly, because he is the first Taiwanese President, he is regarded as the symbol of Taiwanese glory. He was the only man who could transform Mainlander élite-rule to Taiwanese élite-rule at that time, so Taiwanese, who make up 85 per cent of the total population of Taiwan, strongly supported Lee Teng-hui, believed that he was always correct (Cheng, F.M. 2002:2), and did not care about his birth.

In the early Japanese colonial period (1895–1910), under strict censorship, the Taiwanese were not aware that the Japanese colonial government had massacred the Taiwanese on a large scale. When Lee Teng-hui was born, Japan had already occupied Taiwan for 28 years. When he entered senior high school, Japan had ruled

Taiwan for 40 years. By the end of the Japanese colonial period, Taiwanese society was at an initial stage of modernization. At that time, Lee Teng-hui accepted a completely Japanese education, from primary school to Kyoto Imperial University, and he subsequently stated that the Japanese education had a great influence on his whole life (Lee & Naka 2000:129). On the other hand, his family was a “National Language Household” of Japanisation (Huang, K.C. 1994:17). All members of the “National Language Household” in Taiwan used the Japanese language every day. According to statistical data, in April 1942, only 1.3 per cent of Taiwanese were “National Language Households” (Chi 1998:1667). In other words, the Japanese language is Lee Teng-hui’s mother-tongue. Therefore, he read four different Japanese newspapers and watched Japanese TV programmes every day and he was gradually influenced by Japanese culture (Hsiao 1997:74). Japan is, therefore, a positive image for Lee Teng-hui. In 1999, he not only praised Japan, but also stated that: “(e)ven now I read a great deal, and most of the books I pick up tend to be Japanese because I am drawn to the depth of Japanese culture that is encapsulated in books” (Lee, T.H. 1999b:149). It is strange, however, that Lee Teng-hui never, for example, strongly criticized the Japanese for their discriminatory practices such as the schooling system in the Japanese colonial period.

When he was young, Lee Teng-hui experienced and understood that Japan was a strong nation while China was backward and weak. Then, when Taiwan was returned to China, Lee Teng-hui suffered the backwardness of Mainlanders, the 228 Incident, the political great purge, the political dark period, and his own surveillance for more than 20 years. At that time, there was intense ideological conflict between Taiwan and Mainland China. The KMT-led government demonized Mainland China through propaganda. Therefore, for most of Lee Teng-hui’s life, Mainland China and Mainlanders had negative connotations.

Although Mainlander President Chiang Ching-kuo did Lee Teng-hui a big favour, it was a personal favour. The Taiwanese élite were oppressed and slaughtered, and his experience during the political purge as well as the political dark period caused resentful memories of the Taiwanese. Lee Teng-hui changed the future political direction of Taiwan and said that: “I must say, I tried to live up to Chiang’s faith in me,

but when it came to the issue of Taiwan's identity, we had our differences" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:51).

In a democratic nation, people vote in a lengthy and complicated electoral process to select their president. In authoritarian nations, the dictator handpicks his legal successor. In Taiwan, Mainlander President Chiang Kai-shek and his son Chiang Ching-kuo ruled for 34 years (1950-1985). In the politically pressing situation of the 1984 presidential election, Chiang Ching-kuo handpicked his legal successor from among the Taiwanese. Lee Teng-hui, who had been a Chinese Communist and was under surveillance for more than 20 years, concealed his real resentment toward the Mainlanders and followed the official view of the KMT, which was led by the Mainlander élite. He had friendly relations with the Mainlander élite, simultaneously defeated other Taiwanese political competitors and gained Chiang Ching-kuo's trust to become vice-president. Lee Teng-hui showed not only a strong will, but also political wisdom and tolerance.

As president, from 1988 to 2000, one of Lee Teng-hui's political priorities was to change the national identity of the Taiwanese in order to support his real desire that Taiwan secede from the Mainland. As a general rule, one of the basic elements of building a new state is to create a new national identity, namely, to change the previous national identity. The shift of the national identity of Taiwan and the consistency of the national identity of Mainland China are fundamental to the consideration of the success or failure of the secession of Taiwan from Mainland China. Therefore, the next chapter will discuss Taiwan and Mainland China's national identities.

CHAPTER FOUR

TAIWAN AND MAINLAND CHINA'S NATIONAL IDENTITY

For divided nations, one of the most sensitive issues is national identity. In Mainland China, due to thousands of years of shared history, the Chinese national identity is unique. Taiwan only had about four hundred years of written history. It was dominated by Mainland China's Qing dynasty from 1683, occupied by Japan in 1895, returned to China in 1945, and then placed under the control of the KMT-led government, which had fled from Mainland China. That is to say, within only one hundred years, Taiwan was dominated by the foreign Japanese government and Mainland China's central government. Due to these historical factors, part of the Taiwanese national identity shifted from wanting a united China, to wanting to secede from China. Therefore, it was inevitable that the differing national identities of Taiwanese and Mainland Chinese would impact on the Cross-Strait relationship. This chapter will study Taiwan and Mainland China's national identities, particularly the evolution of Taiwan's national identity.

1. THE IMMIGRANT LEADERS' IDENTITY DURING THE LATE MING DYNASTY

The Shisanhang culture developed between one and two thousand years ago in Taiwan (Liu 1992:57). Exploration of Shisanhang sites has, *inter alia*, revealed bronze coins, bronze bowls and ceramic shards which belonged to the ancient Chinese Tang (618-907) and Song dynasties (960-1278) (Tsang 1999:62-64). In 1600, many Chinese who lived in the southeast of Mainland China came to Taiwan to trade commodities with the inhabitants of Taiwan (Chen 1603:26-27). In 1623, the Dutch landed in Taiwan and discovered that there were between one thousand and one thousand five hundred Chinese living in Soulang, a small town in the southwest of Taiwan (Chiang 1985:86).

In the early seventeenth century, the Dutch expanded their commercial posts from Europe, through Cape Town and India, to the Far East. From 1624 to 1660, the Dutch occupied Taiwan. In the 1650s, the Dutch only deployed approximately nine hundred soldiers in Taiwan (Chi 1998:89-90). On 30 April 1661, General Cheng Cheng-kung (also known as Koxinga) took 25,000 Chinese soldiers to attack Taiwan, and forced out the Dutch by February 1662 (Chi 1998:181-200). In itself this was a large scale immigration of Chinese from Mainland China.

In the initial negotiations between leader Cheng Cheng-kun and the Dutch, General Cheng expressed the opinion that: “The Penghu (Pescadores) is located not far from the Islands of Chinchieu, and therefore subject to them. This Taijouan (Taiwan) is also located close by the Penghu, and therefore this country must also be under the same government of China”. He further stated that: “Chinese have possessed and tilled those estates since all ages. For in previous times, when the Netherlanders’ ships came to request trade, they didn’t have the least piece of land in any of these parts, but my father Iquan showed them this country out of friendship and only loaned it to them” (Huber 1988:21). The above opinion of General Cheng reflected the Chinese perception that Taiwan belonged to Mainland China.

2. TAIWANESE NATIONAL IDENTITY DURING THE QING DYNASTY

By the early eighteenth century, Mainland China, including the southeastern provinces, had been under cultivation for thousands of years. However, Taiwan was still underdeveloped virgin land which was more fertile than the coastal land of the Mainland. The average yield per acre was more than double that of Mainland China, and Taiwan was also rich in a valuable agricultural product – sugar. This caused a wave of emigration by people from the southern Fujian and Guangdong provinces, both being Han people, to Taiwan for a better living (Yu 1697:31). During this process, the settlers and their descendants living in Taiwan shifted away from an immigrant society to a Chinese indigenous society, and formed an indigenous ethnic consciousness in Taiwan.

2.1. Immigrant society and the ethnic identity of Taiwan

In Chinese social custom, the Han people always identified with the ethnic group, province, or even the county, in which they were born. For example, the Hakka people, one of the Han groups, identified strongly with their Hakka ethnic group. In Taiwan, almost all of the immigrants came from the southeastern coastal provinces such as south southern Fujian and Guangdong, and they identified not only with Fujian province or Guangdong province, but also with the sub-ethnic groups such as those in Chang and Chuan counties. Both these counties were part of Fujian province. On the other hand, the immigrants who came from Kwangtung province were called Hakka people. All the immigrants in Taiwan regarded the people who

came from the same county or ethnic group as members of one family and helped each other (Chou 1717:145).

Therefore, most of the immigrants lived together with their ethnic group until the early twentieth century. According to a statistical report, published by the Taiwan Government-General (Japanese colonial government) in 1926, the percentage of residents originating from the Chang and Chuan counties and the Hakka region was more than 90 per cent in many cities (TGG/IS 1926:92-103). From the early eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century, the struggle for natural resources between the immigrants of the different ethnic groups triggered many local skirmishes, causing countless fatalities (Chi 1998:657-661). This showed that the Taiwanese had developed strong local or ethnic consciousness before the middle of the nineteenth century.

2.2. The civil service examination and Taiwanese consciousness

The civil service examination system was begun during the Sui dynasty (581-618), improved during the Tang dynasty (618-907), expanded during the Song dynasty (960-1279), further developed during the Ming dynasty (1368-1644), and greatly intensified during the Qing dynasty (1644-1911). Primarily, during the Ming and Qing dynasties, senior officials such as ministers, provincial governors, and local officials (for example prefects and magistrates) were selected through the civil service examination. In general, the examination was a national examination that was also open to people from all classes (Lo 1977:47-49).

In reality, individuals with talent who were poor and non-aristocratic, or who lived far from the capital, could become senior officials and promote their social position by passing the civil service examination. In other words, the central government gave a fair and open opportunity to its people to improve their position through the civil service examination.

2.2.1. The civil service examination during the Qing dynasty

During the Qing dynasty, the service examination included civilian and military qualifications at three levels – central, provincial and local (district) examinations.

The people who passed these levels were known as Chin-shih, Chu-jen and Shen-yuan (or Hsiu-tsai). All of them were conferred political privileges such as freedom from torture by the police, and economic privileges such as free public services and exemption from paying taxes. For the Chin-shih and some of the Chu-jen, they had the opportunity to be appointed as senior and local officials (Chi 1998:1010-1013)

In the first half of the eighteenth century, the total population of China was about 402,300,000. The total number of Chin-shih was about 4,000 (2,500 civilian and 1,500 military). There were about 27,000 Chu-jen (15,500 civilian and 11,500 military) and about 740,000 Shen-yuan (530,000 civilian and 210,000 military) (Chang 1955:100-133). Therefore, the ratio per million at that time was 10 Chin-shih, 67 Chu-jen and 1,840 Shen-yuan. That is to say, the Chin-shih, Chu-jen and Shen-yuan were the Chinese élite. The average age to pass the civil service examination was 35 to become a Chin-shih, 31 to become a Chu-jen, and 24 to become a Shen-yuan (Chang 1955:93-125). In general, becoming a Chin-shih was similar to obtaining a Doctor's degree (Lo 1977:48), and becoming Chu-jen and Shen-yuan were respectively similar to obtaining Master's and Bachelor's degrees at that time.

2.2.2. The civil service examination increased local consciousness

In order to protect the rights of residents of underdeveloped regions, the Ching government not only allocated a quota of Chin-shih, Chu-jen and Shen-yuan to all provinces, but also gave a preferential quota to the underdeveloped provinces or frontier regions (Chi 1998:1013-1023). This quota system in the civil service examination undoubtedly combined with the traditional provincial system to increase and intensify the élite's provincial or local consciousness further.

In Taiwan, the Qing government not only indiscriminately implemented the civil service examination, but also gave a preferential quota to civilian Chin-shih, Chu-jen and Shen-yuan (QG 1899:79-97). By the middle of the eighteenth century, Taiwan was still underdeveloped relative to the other side of the Straits in culture and education, and large numbers of students from Fujian province therefore moved to Taiwan and assumed Taiwanese identity to enable them to participate in the civil

service examination. The Qing government repeatedly issued orders to prohibit this (QG 1764:8-10).

According to statistical data, during the Qing period (1683-1895), there were 44 Chin-shih (32 civilian and 12 military) and 649 Chu-jen (340 civilian and 309 military) in Taiwan (Wang, W.T. 1990:166-167). Under the preferential province quota system, many of the Taiwanese élite benefited from the civil service examination through their Taiwanese identity. The central government adopted an asymmetrical policy with regard to the civil service examination which gave greater preference to Taiwanese, and provided special opportunities to allow Taiwanese to succeed in a particular civil service examination. Due to the higher social status and influence of the élite, such as Chin-shih, Chu-jen and Shen-yuan, the local consciousness of ordinary Taiwanese people, and hence, their Taiwanese consciousness, increased.

2.3. Domestic trade and Taiwanese consciousness

In the middle of the seventeenth century, Cheng Cheng-kung was defeated by the Qing government in a civil war, and then fled with his soldiers to Taiwan, where his family established a regime to rule Taiwan for 22 years (1661-1683). At that time, Taiwan and Mainland China were still involved in a civil war. The Qing government severed and prohibited any trade with Taiwan (Su 1978:367-425). This forced the Cheng regime to trade with Japan and areas in South-East Asia, such as Sooloo, Manila (the Philippines), Patani, Johor and Malacca (Malaya), Brunei, Jakarta (Indonesia), Molucca, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand (Lai 1965:17).

In 1683, the Qing government defeated Cheng's regime and united Taiwan with China. Taiwan became one of the counties of the Fujian province and a part of China. The Qing government then lifted the trade prohibition between Taiwan and Mainland China (HACD 1684:134). However, Japan adopted an isolationist foreign trade policy that limited the number of Chinese ships that sailed to Japan. In 1720, Japan only allowed access to 30 Chinese ships. After that, the number decreased annually (Chu 1988:376-377), causing trade between Taiwan and Japan to plummet.

On the other hand, there was a rapid increase in immigrants from southern Mainland

China to Taiwan that expanded the demand for general merchandise from China, and the volume of Cross-Straits trade rose rapidly. By the end of the 1710s, there were thousands of merchant ships sailing across the Taiwan Straits annually (Chen 1720:67). During the 1720s, many merchant ships not only sailed from Taiwan across the Straits to places such as Amoy and Foochow in Fujian province, but also to Ningbo in Zhejiang province, Shanghai in Jiangsu province, and even to Shangdong province and Manchuria (Huang 1736:47-48). Taiwan's trade focus therefore shifted from international trade with Japan and South East Asia to Chinese domestic trade with the coast of Mainland China (Tsao, Y.H. 1991:40-41).

Due to the long-term and close trading relationship across the Taiwan Straits with other provinces, and close interaction between Taiwanese and Mainlanders, the Taiwanese not only broadened their vision, but also distinguished themselves from the Mainlanders (Chou 1832:290). This also helped to shape their Taiwanese consciousness.

2.4. Taiwanese identification with China

During the Qing dynasty, with the exception of the aborigines, all the Taiwanese residents emigrated from the southern Fujian and Guangdong provinces of Mainland China, and they formed an immigrant society (Chen, C.N. 1990:76). There were bloody ethnic conflicts on a large scale, but they were localised. Just as in Mainland China, mass rebellions also broke out in Taiwan. The objective of these was, however, to restore the Ming dynasty, i.e. Chinese rule, as the ruling Manchuria were minorities in China (Chi 1998:695-708). Therefore, the main national identity of the rebels was still focused on China. In other words, the Taiwanese ultimately identified with China.

2.4.1. Taiwanese militia in the Opium War

Between June 1840 and August 1842, the Opium War was waged between Britain and China. The British forces attacked and occupied the Chinese southern coastal cities of Canton and Amoy, and the eastern coastal cities of Dinghai, Changhai, Ningbo, Shanghai, and Zhenjiang. China was defeated and forced to cede Hong Kong (MSA/Author Team 1984:20-67).

On 5 July 1840, the Eastern Expeditionary Forces of the British occupied Dinghai City and Chusan Islands, near Shanghai (MSA/Author Team 1984:22-23). Taiwan is the largest island on the southeastern coast of China, and this strategic position put Taiwan in a military predicament. There were, however, only 2,270 enlisted soldiers based in Taiwan (Yao 1840a:67). At that time, Yao yin, the governor of Taiwan, mobilised military resources to prepare for the attack from the British. The Taiwanese responded to the recruitment drive by the Qing government, and at least 15,000 Taiwanese young men participated in the militia against the British (Yao 1840b:30-31).

2.4.2. Taiwanese militia in the Sino-French War

In the early 1880s, France expanded its colonial territory in Annam (Vietnam), and Annam requested assistance from China. In April 1882, French troops occupied Hanoi, the city in north Vietnam. In May 1883, the French troops were defeated by Chinese forces near Hanoi, and Commander Henri Riviere and 50 French soldiers died (Lung 1996:63-127). Subsequently, on 23 June 1884, Lieutenant Colonel Dugene and his 1,000 soldiers had a violent skirmish with Chinese troops in Liang San in north Vietnam near the Chinese border, and the French were again defeated. France then issued an ultimatum to China on 1 August 1884 to accept an unfair peace treaty (Garnot 1984:10).

On 5 August 1884, a French fleet bombed Keelung, a port in north Taiwan, and destroyed the fortress. On 23 August, the French fleet attacked Fuzhou in Fujian, destroying the Fuzhou shipyard and seriously damaging the Fujian fleet. On 1 October, the French fleet launched a second attack on Keelung with 1,000 French soldiers and on 4 October occupied Keelung City. On 8 October, between 600 and 800 French marines landed and were defeated by Chinese troops in Tamsui, a port near Taipei City. This failure was a serious blow to France. In the face of stubborn Chinese resistance, the French fleet imposed a blockade on the west coast of Taiwan. Between November 1884 and March 1885, French forces fell into a stalemate battle with Chinese troops in the mountainous region between Keelung and Taipei (Chi 1998:883-903).

At that time, a wealthy Taiwanese man, Lin Chan-mei, personally paid 200 young Taiwanese men to establish a militia to defend Hsinchu city, on the southwestern side of Taipei. Another, Lin Chao-tung, personally paid 500 young Taiwanese men to establish a militia which he led into the mountainous region near Keelung (Liu 1884:181-182). Between January 1885 and March 1885, Lin Chao-tung led his Taiwanese militia. They cooperated and combined with the national military troops, launched guerilla attacks against French troops (Liu 1885:191-192), and entered into violent combat with French forces on the battlefield.

2.4.3. Taiwanese militia against Japanese aggression

In 1895, Taiwan and the Penghu Islands were ceded to Japan. On 29 May 1895, Japanese troops landed in Santiao Chiao, a northeastern coastal town in Taiwan (TNH 1938:13), with the aim of taking over Taiwan. During the initial take-over of Taiwan, from 29 May to 21 October, Japanese troops occupied Tainan City in southern Taiwan, the Taiwanese militia cooperated with some Ching soldiers, who had remained in Taiwan, and fought the Japanese troops with outdated weapons. The fighting took place in Shanhsia, Hsinchu, Miaoli, Changhua, Hsilo, Tuku, Yunlin, Tounan, and from Talin to Chia-I (Chi 1998:1113-1139). According to James W. Davidson, an American war correspondent, with the Japanese troops, 6,760 Taiwanese died on the battlefield within only five months. However, this number should be increased by approximately a thousand who had died in the underbrush, thickets or streams (Davidson 1903:365).

As previously stated, during the Qing dynasty the Taiwanese had developed a local consciousness, just as in other Chinese local places, such as Shanghai and Guangdong. Therefore, when China faced invasion from foreign powers, either in the Opium War, Sino-French War or during Japanese aggression, the Taiwanese sacrificed their lives to protect Chinese territory – Taiwan. That is to say, the Taiwanese sacrificed their blood and lives to express their national identification with and loyalty towards China.

3. TAIWANESE NATIONAL IDENTITY DURING THE JAPANESE PERIOD

Taiwan was occupied by Japan for 50 years. In the view of the Japanese colonial government, it was necessary to assimilate Taiwanese as Japanese. From the Taiwanese perspective, they were not merged with Japan voluntarily through a plebiscite. They were compelled to become Japanese because their motherland, China, was defeated by Japan and forced to cede Taiwan to Japan. On the other hand, when the Taiwanese had emigrated from Mainland China during the Qing dynasty (1685-1895), they had brought their Chinese civilisation, which included their culture, customs, habits, languages and agricultural techniques, which they believed were more advanced than the Japanese at that time.

Therefore, the Japanese colonial government met various forms of resistance from the Taiwanese (including armed and non-armed), and attempted to quell it. Faced with strong Taiwanese resistance, the Japanese colonial government wanted to instill the Japanese identity into the next generation of Taiwanese by implementing a new education system, particularly primary school education. Furthermore, in order to assimilate the Taiwanese completely, the Japanese colonial government launched a radical and comprehensive Japanisation movement.

3.1. Taiwanese political identity in the early Japanese colonial period

During the early Japanese colonial period, because Japan had occupied Taiwan through aggression, the occupation ignited strong Taiwanese resistance. The Japanese colonial government met armed resistance, and quashed the Taiwanese guerrilla fighters. The Taiwanese continued to undertake clandestine anti-Japanese activities, which were also suppressed by the Japanese colonial government. Then, the Taiwanese élite changed their approach. They were, under the Japanese colonial law and regulations, able to conduct public political activities to maintain their Chinese culture and identity. However, because these political activities were in essence anti-Japanese, and exceeded the Japanese levels of tolerance, they were eventually clamped down on by the Japanese colonial government.

3.1.1. Armed resistance

As indicated, after the initial occupation in 1895, the Japanese colonial government had to deal with armed resistance by the Taiwanese militia that lasted until 1902.

According to Japanese statistics, during 1897 and 1902, 10,663 Taiwanese were massacred by the Japanese colonial government, not including those in jail. As stated previously, approximately 7,700 militia died in 1895. Therefore, according to estimates, from 1895 to 1902, approximately 20,000 Taiwanese young men were slaughtered by the Japanese colonial government. There were about 2,600,000 Taiwanese at that time and, of these, 500,000 were young men. Therefore, it could be said that one out of every twenty five young Taiwanese men were massacred by the Japanese colonial government (Hiro 1999:332-333). These are very sobering statistics.

From a macro-political perspective, the main purpose of the armed anti-Japanese militias was to overthrow the Japanese colonial ruling power in Taiwan, to restore the Qing dynasty's rule, and to return Taiwan to Mainland China. They usually mobilised the masses to participate in armed resistance in the name of the Qing dynasty (Weng 1986:139-141). At that time, the Taiwanese therefore strongly identified with the Qing dynasty and China.

3.1.2. Clandestine anti-Japanese movement

The stubborn armed resistance of the Taiwanese militia had largely ended by 1902. However, anti-Japanese resistance still broke out sporadically. One of the prominent leaders of the resistance was Lo Fu-sing (Cantonese Hakka, 1886-1914), who was born in Jakarta, Indonesia, but lived up in Guangdong province until the age of ten. From 1895 to 1903, he lived in Indonesia. In 1903 and 1907, he came to Taiwan with his grandfather and lived in Miaoli, then left for his native home in Guangdong province. In 1907, on his way back home to Amoy City, he joined the "Revolutionary Alliance" which was established by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. On 29 March 1911, Lo Fu-sing participated in the Guangzhou uprising against the Qing government. On 10 October 1911, the Qing dynasty collapsed following the Wuchang uprising, and the Republic of China was established. In August 1912, Lo Fu-sing was ordered by the KMT to engage in anti-Japanese activities in Taiwan (Chin 1981:9-11).

In December 1912, Lo Fu-sing arrived in Taiwan. He was arrested on 18 December 1913, and executed on 3 March 1914 (Chuang & Ho 1977:420-437). When Lo

Fu-sing was in Taiwan, he fomented Taiwanese anti-Japanese sentiment, and stated that the purpose of the anti-Japanese movement that he was engaged in, was to drive the Japanese out and return Taiwan to China (Chuang & Ho 1977:120-145).

While the Japanese colonial government had ruled Taiwan for eighteen years, Lo Fu-sing led the anti-Japanese movement from December 1912 to December 1913. Within this year, more than 1,500 Taiwanese had joined the anti-Japanese movement of Lo Fu-sing (Chin 1981:16). In all, six members of the movement were executed and 220 members sentenced to jail (Chin 1981:41-42). This highlights that even under colonial suppression, Taiwanese political identity remained with China.

3.1.3. Anti-Japanese political activities

In the face of a bloodthirsty massacre and political suppression by the Japanese colonial government, the anti-Japanese approach of the Taiwanese élite changed from a clandestine movement to public political activities. Between 1921 and 1934, in order to protect Taiwanese rights, the Taiwanese élite, lead by Lin Hsien-tang, launched a political movement. Every year many educated Taiwanese, ranging from hundreds and reaching 2,000, signed petitions to the Japanese Imperial Diet proposing the establishment of a Taiwan Assembly. These petitions were all rejected by the Japanese Diet (TGG/PA 1939:327-330).

On 17 October 1921, Chiang Wei-shui established the Taiwanese Cultural Association (TCA) which consisted of 1,032 members (TGG/PA 1939:138). The purpose of the TCA was to promote an ethnic Chinese consciousness of the Chinese Han race, through cultural enlightenment. To this end, the TCA; held seminars and summer training schools, published a Taiwanese People's Newspaper, set up reading rooms in major cities, and held public speeches around the island (Chi 1998:1537-1543). On 10 July 1927, the TCA became the Taiwanese People's Party (TPP) (TGG/PA 1939:427). However, on 18 February 1931, the TPP was disbanded by the Japanese Government-General (TGG/PA 1939:514).

All of the above activities were subject to close surveillance by the Japanese police. In a secret report of the Japanese colonial police, it was concluded that some of the

Taiwanese élite, and particularly those calling for the creation of a Taiwan Assembly, believed that China would rejuvenate, recover, and reclaim Taiwan in the future. They therefore believed that the Taiwanese should keep Chinese traits and preserve their strength until this time. Others among the élite, while they cooperated with the Japanese, also believed they had to strengthen themselves in preparation for the day China would become rejuvenated (TGG/PA 1939:318-319). The Japanese secret police report also focused on the TCA, and its leader, Chiang Wei-shui. He was seen as a radical pro-Chinese figure who, together with the others members and friends of the TCA, sought to extend the Chinese culture. The Japanese colonial government regarded it as a political taboo, and, even their public speeches were monitored by the Japanese police. The TCA asserted that they were Chinese and China was their motherland (TGG/PA 1939:154-157). Based on the above-mentioned Japanese secret report, the Taiwanese élite clearly identified politically with China during the middle of the Japanese colonial period.

3.2. Separate education system and Taiwanese national identity

One of the most important elements of a national identity is culture, with education being the best method of spreading culture. Through particularly a modern comprehensive school education system, a strong national identity may be instilled in people.

3.2.1. Common school (elementary school)

The Japanese colonial government implemented an ethnically based elementary school system that was divided into common and primary schools. The former was exclusively for Taiwanese children, and the latter for Japanese children. The basic purpose of the common school was to instill a Japanese identity into Taiwanese children (Du 1997:17).

In 1898, the beginning of the Japanese colonial period, there were 1,707 Chinese traditional private elementary schools with 29,941 pupils, while there were 74 Japanese modern common schools with 7,838 pupils. Also 3.8 times more pupils studied Chinese than Japanese. In order to educate the Taiwanese children, the Japanese colonial government made efforts to expand the number of common

schools. In 1904, the number of Japanese common schools increased to 153 with 23,178 pupils, exceeding the number of pupils who enrolled in Chinese private elementary schools (21,661 pupils) for the first time. In 1916, the number of Taiwanese children enrolled in Japanese common schools amounted to 75,545, while the number of pupils enrolled in Chinese private elementary schools totaled only 19,320. By 1925, the number of Taiwanese children enrolled in Japanese common schools was 220,120, and reached 365,073 in 1935 (Cheng, M.S. 1988:20). From 1920–29, only about 30 per cent of Taiwanese children were enrolled in the common primary schools (TPG 1946:1241).

With regard to the results of the Japanese common schools, in 1937, criticism was expressed that the Taiwanese childrens' Japanese language ability was low when they graduated from the common school, and progressively worsened (Kōdane 1937:2). Because the Japanese had failed to teach the Taiwanese students the Japanese language, they failed to instill their culture and identity on the Taiwanese students.

3.2.2. Post-primary school and university

Based on the history and experience of Western colonisation, secondary education would serve to stimulate the Taiwanese consciousness, self-awareness and to further trigger the Taiwanese resentment towards the discriminatory rule of the Japanese colonial government. Therefore, to prevent Taiwanese students from accepting post-primary education, the Japanese colonial government established the first middle school in 1915, after a request from the Taiwanese élite (Wu 1990:158-163). By this time, Japan had ruled Taiwan for 20 years.

Similarly, to avoid Taiwanese students from accepting advanced education, after 32 years of Japanese rule, the Japanese colonial government established only one university – the Taipei Imperial University in 1928 (Huang, T.S. 1976:224-229).

3.2.3. Discrimination against Taiwanese students

The Japanese colonial government implemented discriminatory education policies from primary school to university. In addition to separating elementary schools

according to ethnicity as mentioned above, the Japanese colonial government also introduced different textbooks into the education system. The Japanese language and ethics that were contained in primary school textbooks encouraged the Japanese children to succeed and rise in the world in order to make Japan great. However, the textbooks used in the common school encouraged the Taiwanese children to be obedient hard-working Japanese subjects with no leadership aspirations and ultimately to relegate the Taiwanese to the bottom of the Japanese social order (Tsurumi 1977:134-145).

After 46 years of Japanese colonial rule, from 1941-43, there were 13,175 secondary school students in Taiwan, of which 6,609 were Taiwanese, and 6,529 Japanese (TPG 1946:1222). Only 50.2 per cent were therefore Taiwanese. In 1943, the number of students at the only university in Taiwan – the Taipei Imperial University - was 454, of which only 69 were Taiwanese and 384 Japanese (TPG 1946:1214-1215). Taiwanese students therefore constituted only 15.2 per cent compared to 84.8 per cent of Japanese students. It should be recalled, however, that the Japanese constituted only six per cent of the total population of Taiwan at that time (TPG 1946:76-77). The above shows clearly that the Japanese colonial government discriminated against the Taiwanese by depriving Taiwanese youth of a fair opportunity to obtain a middle and especially a university education.

3.2.4. Chinese poetry societies

In view of the Japanese elementary education system, the above-mentioned Chinese cultural activities of TCA took place, and the educated Taiwanese élite also set up many Chinese poetry societies. This was done to preserve the Chinese culture and identity (Chung 1986:244-245).

In an attempt to oppose and limit the resistance of the Taiwanese élite, the Japanese colonial government permitted, and even encouraged, the establishment of the Chinese poetry society by, for instance, hosting the Conference of Taiwanese Poets (Chung 1986:230-243). Indeed, between 1851 and 1894, only ten Chinese poetry societies were established, while during the Japanese colonial period (1896-1945), over 260 Chinese poetry societies were established (Liao 1999:32-66). These poetry

societies clearly showed that the educated Taiwanese élite made an effort to preserve their Chinese identity by maintaining their Chinese culture.

As discussed, the Japanese colonial government's policy of discrimination in secondary schools and universities not only limited the influence of the Japanese culture on the Taiwanese, but also aroused the Chinese consciousness of the Taiwanese. Many Taiwanese students also went to Mainland China to obtain an advanced education, during which time some of them argued that Taiwanese was Chinese, Taiwan belonged to China, and some even joined the armed anti-Japanese activities (Chi 1998:1873-1898), namely, they used their careers to further prove their national identification with China.

3.3. Japanisation movement and the Taiwanese national identity

The strong Taiwanese identification with China was problematic for the Japanese colonial rulers. In an effort to shift the Taiwanese national identity away from China towards Japan, the Japanese colonial government in 1937 launched a Japanisation movement. The Governor-General of Taiwan, Admiral Kobayashi Seizo, stated that "the purpose of the Japanisation movement is to convert the Taiwanese into real Japanese" (Kobayashi 1940:18). To achieve this, the Japanisation movement included a series of measures such as forcing Taiwanese to accept the Japanese religion, to change their Chinese names into Japanese, and to speak the Japanese language.

3.3.1. Coercing Taiwanese to worship the Japanese god

In China, the Han people, including the Taiwanese, believed in, and had worshipped, their ancestors for thousands of years. They displayed their ancestral plaque and other miniature statues of Chinese gods in their homes. The Japanese authorities believed, however, that the worship of the Chinese family ancestors and gods would reinforce the Taiwanese and Chinese consciousness, and had to be replaced by the Japanese god in order to foster a Japanese consciousness. To this end, the Japanese colonial government forced the Taiwanese to destroy their ancestral plaques and statues of Chinese gods (Shirai & Ema 1939:449-468), and to replace them with plaques of the Japanese gods. According to Japanese statistics, at the

end of December 1941, there were 738,000 Taiwanese families that displayed plaques at the Japanese gods (TGG 1943a:97). This figure represented 77 per cent of all Taiwanese (TPG 1946:75).

3.3.2. Destroying Chinese temples and building Japanese shrines

In Taiwan, the temples were of Chinese architecture, and the gods displayed in the temples were the Chinese god. Because the gods were from China, the Japanese believed that the religious beliefs of the Taiwanese would also reinforce their identity towards China (CMWU 1938:7-8). Therefore, the Japanese authorities began to destroy Chinese temples. In 1936, there were 3,403 Chinese temples in Taiwan, but only 2,327 in 1942. 31.6 per cent of Chinese temples were therefore destroyed. Furthermore, 13,700 statues of the Chinese god were burned or destroyed (Lee 1963:737). These actions triggered strong resistance from the Taiwanese, and the practice ended gradually by 1941 (Tsai 1992:131).

Furthermore, in an attempt to influence and alter the religion of the Taiwanese, the Japanese colonial government began to build Japanese shrines. In 1934, there were only about 25 Japanese shrines, but this number increased to 68 at the end of World War II (Tsai 1992:118-121). At that time, the Japanese colonial government also forced the Taiwanese to observe Japanese religious rites (GIO 2001:67).

3.3.3. Japanising Taiwanese Chinese names

The Chinese first name was given by parents, while the surname originated from an ancestor. The surname was a particularly symbolic link to one's ancestor, past and nation. To sever the ancestral links of the colonists, the Japanese central government launched a campaign to change the name of the colonial residents, both Taiwanese and Korean, on 11 February 1940.

At the early stages of the Japanisation of Taiwanese names campaign in Taiwan, the Japanese colonial government adopted a policy of providing incentives to change one's name. For example, for Taiwanese who adopted full Japanese names, their children were allowed to enroll in the exclusive Japanese middle schools and had their daily ration increased (Liu 1982:126) (The Japanese colonial government

rationed rice, port and fish to residents in Taiwan at the time owing to war) (TGG 1944:237-320).

In the traditional custom of the Chinese Han people, whether educated or not, it was a very humiliating experience to change one's name, particularly the surname. Therefore, in spite of the incentives, most of the Taiwanese refused to change their names. Consequently, the Japanese colonial government implemented measures to force the Taiwanese to change their names. For example, Japanese authorities issued a regulation prohibiting the use of Chinese names by soldiers, and forced the Taiwanese soldiers to use Japanese names (Isomura 1996:45-46). At the end of November 1943, however, only 126,211 Taiwanese had changed their Chinese names to Japanese names (Takeda 1944:21). Of a population of 6,133,867 Taiwanese in 1943 (TPG 1946:76), only 2.1 per cent of Taiwanese changed their names.

3.3.4. Promoting the Japanese language

The most significant factor in the Japanisation movement was the promotion of the national (Japanese) language. The Japanese believed that a pre-condition for the success of the Japanisation movement was for the Taiwanese to understand the Japanese language (TGG/ID 1941:46-47). Hence, the Japanese colonial government not only prompted all Taiwanese officials but also the Taiwanese households to improve their Japanese language ability (Keya 1938:16-17).

Furthermore, the Japanese colonial government also promoted the "National Language Household", in which households were certified as a "National Language Household" by the Japanese colonial government. This certification conferred preferential rights on members of the household such as that children could enroll in the exclusive Japanese primary school, and were given preferential consideration for enrolment in middle school. According to statistics, 9,604 households (77,679 people) were certified as "National Language Households" in April 1942 (TGG 1943b:63-64). At that time, with a population of 5,989,888 Taiwanese (TPG 1946:76), this figure represented only approximately 1.3 per cent of Taiwanese.

During the 50 years of Japanese colonial government, most Japanese resided in major Taiwanese cities, and worked in the public service. A definite Japanese atmosphere, therefore, permeated the major cities, and also the relations between Taiwanese and Japanese residents. Some Taiwanese, especially those that resided in Taipei, Keelung, Tainan, Kaoshiung and its urban areas, were most probably Japanised to some extent (Chi 1998:1671). However, in the countryside, the Taiwanese did not understand Japanese. For example, at the end of the Japanese colonial period, in Ta-yu borough, Yu-li urban townships, Hualien County, there were 235 Taiwanese families (including 35 aborigine families) that kept their traditional patterns of family and community life. With the exception of a few youths, they could not speak the Japanese language and had to communicate with Japanese officials through a Taiwanese translator (Tsai 1994:77-82).

Needless to say, after 50 years of Japanese colonial rule, Taiwan was influenced in one way or the other by Japanese culture. However, on 14 August 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allies and Taiwan was returned to China. On 10 October, the National Day of the ROC, Taiwan held a grand celebration in Taipei City. On 17 October 1945, when Chinese KMT-troops landed at Keelung, about one hundred thousand Taiwanese voluntarily gathered at Keelung and Taipei to welcome the Chinese troops. The formal influence of the Japanese, including the Japanisation movement, therefore ended (Wu 1988:160-169). The joyous mood of the Taiwanese highlighted their pleasure at restoring their national identity to China.

4. TAIWANESE NATIONAL IDENTITY IN ROC ON TAIWAN

Despite the celebrations following Taiwan's return to China, China was still in the aftermath of its civil war and relatively backward. The general weakness of China in political, economic, social, or cultural terms, did not allow for the smooth incorporation of Taiwan into Mainland China. This was evidenced when a minor incident took place when a Mainlander agent unintentionally shot a Taiwanese youth which triggered a tragic incident on 28 February 1947. Hundreds of Mainlanders were killed in the first eight days, while between two and three thousand Taiwanese were subsequently massacred. Although the KMT-led government regarded this tragedy as a serious political taboo, the Taiwanese élite never forgot the 228

Incident.

Their resultant ethnic resentment was passed down to the next Taiwanese generation, and sowed the seeds of the opposition and secessionist movement in Taiwan. An example of this was Cheng Feng-ming, a Taiwanese who in 1992 became a secessionist and director of the promotion department of the first opposition party – Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) (Cheng, F.M. 1996: front page). At time of his birth in 1947, the 228 incident occurred and his father was threatened and forced by Mainland soldiers to kneel before them. Cheng Feng-ming never forgot the humiliation that his father had endured from the KMT-led government (Cheng, F.M. 1995:7). A strong ethnic resentment had been passed down from his father and he did not forgive the 228 Incident as an unintentional tragedy for the whole nation. He also appears not to recognize that the KMT-led government provided a fair educational opportunity for Taiwanese.

In 1949, the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan from Mainland China. At that time, the KMT-led government, a defeated regime, had to face strong external pressure from the CCP, as well as silent ethnic resentment from the Taiwanese people because of the 228 Incident. In order to consolidate its ruling legitimacy and authority, the KMT-led government exercised strict ideological control over the island of Taiwan.

4.1. The KMT-led Government

Although, the KMT-led government was defeated by CCP forces, and despite the fact that the original purpose of the establishment of the KMT-led government was to unite the whole of China, the basic national identity of this government was directed towards China.

4.1.1. Japanese cultural prohibition

Due to the fifty years of Japanese colonial rule, and particularly the Japanisation movement of the later period, Taiwanese society in especially the main cities and urban areas were Japanised to some extent. At the time of the 228 Incident, the language of the south Fujian province was the same as the Taiwanese dialect, and

Mainlanders from south Fujian could also speak the Taiwanese dialect. Therefore, in order to identify the Taiwanese and Mainlanders from south Fujian, some Taiwanese rioters identified the Mainlanders by forcing them to speak Japanese or to sing the Japanese national anthem. If the Mainlanders could not speak the Japanese language or sing the Japanese national anthem, they would be beaten or even killed. At that time, Taiwanese rioters wore the previous Japanese soldiers' uniforms, spoke the Japanese language, sang Japanese military songs, and spread pro-Japanese propaganda. Taiwanese society almost became Japanese. This Japanese atmosphere was unacceptable for Mainlanders who were oppressed and massacred by Japan for half a century (Jen 1947:400-401).

After the 228 Incident, the KMT-led government investigated the causes of the incident, and concluded that one of the main causal factors was that the Taiwanese were strongly influenced by Japanese colonial rule. The government believed that cultural education would be the biggest challenge for Taiwan's future, and decided to eradicate the influence of the Japanese culture by promoting Mandarin and teaching Chinese history and geography (Yang & Ho 1947:301-326). Subsequently, the KMT-led government strictly prohibited the use of the Japanese language, wiped out the Japanese culture, and strengthened the promotion of Mandarin (Hsu 1991:99-100).

4.1.2. National language policy

Mandarin is based on the regional language of Beijing which was commonly used approximately one thousand years ago in north China. In the seventeenth century, the Qing dynasty failed to establish the language of Beijing as an official language. In 1910, the idea of a national language emerged. In 1913, the Ministry of Education (MOE) established a Commission on the Unification of Pronunciation that consisted of linguistic experts from provinces in China. The commission decided that a national language should prevail over local languages. The Peking regional language formed the basis of the national language, which is now known to English speakers as Mandarin. Following the establishment of the Preparatory Committee for the Unification of the National Language in April 1919, Mandarin became the required language in primary and middle schools (GIO 2001:44-45).

On 14 August 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allies and Taiwan was returned to China. In the early return period, Taiwanese were exultant and rapturous, and many studied the Mandarin language voluntarily (Wu 1988:162). However, Taiwanese passion to learn Mandarin waned as a result of the 228 Incident.

Nevertheless, given the fact that the KMT-led government was a central government, it continued its previous national language policy after it had fled to Taiwan, particularly in schools. From 1956, in an effort to consolidate the popularity of the language, the KMT-led government launched a comprehensive campaign promoting the use of the national language. On 30 May 1956, the KMT-led government ordered that people should strive to speak Mandarin in secondary schools. On 10 July 1965, the Taiwan Provincial Government instructed that Mandarin was to be spoken in schools and official offices. Students who did not speak Mandarin would be punished. On 5 October 1976, the Taiwan Provincial Government re-issued this instruction (Huang, S.F. 1993:106-108).

The national language policy, and particularly in the education system, resulted in the next generation of Taiwanese and Mainlanders speaking Mandarin fluently by the 1980's.

4.1.3. Cultural Rebuilding Movement

Following the KMT-led government's flight to Taiwan, China was divided into two political entities, the ROC and the PRC in 1950. To oppose the Mainland regime, the KMT-led government launched many military offensives at the coast of Mainland China, but was defeated. During this time, the KMT-led government still claimed that the ROC was the legitimate representative of a sole China.

Through the KMT-led government control of the media, and the establishment of a "Cultural Rebuilding Movement", the CCP was demonized, the worship of President Chiang Kai-shek was encouraged, and the recovery of Mainland China was emphasized (Sung *et al.* 1990:50-53). Statements at the time referred to the need to "oppose Mainland China", "to destroy Chinese Communists", "to rescue compatriots

on the Mainland”, and “to restore Mainland China’s integrity”. By the 1950s and 1960s, propaganda material and political slogans were commonplace on movie theatre tickets, toys, postcards, vouchers, primary school textbooks, cigarette packs, calendars, public transport, buildings, and public radio (Lee, S. F. 1998:45-79).

4.1.4. Chinese Cultural Renaissance

In mid-1966, Chairman Mao Zedong launched the “Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution” in Mainland China (Ebrey 1996:313-315). To counter Mao’s Cultural Revolution, President Chiang Kai-shek launched a “Chinese Cultural Renaissance Movement” at the end of 1966, and in 1967 set up the Committee of Chinese Cultural Renaissance (CCCR) to manage the movement (Li 1988:406). One of the main purposes of the CCCR was to rejuvenate traditional Chinese culture, and in the 1970s, the CCCR undertook activities such as exhibiting Chinese cultural treasures, paraphrasing ancient Chinese literature, promoting Mandarin, and publishing the Chinese Cultural Series and Chinese Culture Renaissance Monthly publications (Tu 1981:301-325). At the end of the 1960s and early 1970s, encouraged by the KMT-led government, intellectuals also formed a popular wave of Chinese cultural promotion (Kuo *et al.* 1993:209).

4.1.5. Chinese cultural education

One of the most important ways to create a national identity is through the education system. Following the 228 Incident, the KMT-led government determined the need to study Chinese history and geography in Taiwan. After the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan, President Chiang Kai-shek believed that a primary cause of the KMT-led government’s failure in Mainland China was due to a strong communist and anti-KMT ideology prevalent in the Mainland education system (KMTCC 1978:86-87). Chiang Kai-shek believed that the education system should focus on nationalism (Wu 1969:84-85). Therefore, the KMT-led government emphasised Chinese culture and history in the education system in Taiwan.

The previous Taiwanese élite generation, who had endured the massacre of the 228 Incident in 1947, were silent in politics. During the 1950s and 1960s, the KMT-led government implemented oppressive measures against a few Taiwanese dissidents

who did not have the ability to challenge the legitimacy of the KMT-led government. Therefore, the previous generation of Taiwanese, together with Mainlanders, generally conformed to the KMT-led government's identification with China. According to an opinion poll conducted in 1989, 52.0 per cent of the interviewees classified themselves as Chinese, while 26.0 per cent saw themselves as Chinese/Taiwanese. Only 16.0 per cent saw themselves as Taiwanese (UDN/OPC 1989:6). This clearly showed the successful outcome of the Chinese education of the KMT-led government from 1949-1989.

4.2. Ethnic identity shift to national identity

The terms of President Chiang Kai-shek and his son President Chiang Ching-kuo were characterised by dictatorial rule and the oppression of dissidents. However, at the same time, they also implemented an electoral political system in an effort to gain popular support, particularly Taiwanese support, and to legitimise the regime. Through the process of electoral politics, the development of democratisation, and the disparity of power-sharing between Taiwanese and Mainland élites, the concepts of democracy, ethnicity and secessionism developed together.

4.2.1. Democracy and national identity

In the early democratisation period of the 1970s, in an effort to relieve the KMT-led government's tight political control, Taiwanese opposition élite cooperated with Mainlander opposition élite under the banner of democracy, human rights, and freedom. At the time, both the opposition élite and high officials of the Mainland, grew up, were educated, and developed their careers in Mainland China. They only left Mainland China 20 years ago, and could not forget Mainland China as their native home, and strongly identified with China. At the time, the objective of the Mainlander opposition élites was to pursue democracy, but also identifying with Mainland China. The real motivation of the Taiwanese opposition élites, who experienced the 228 Incident, was not only to pursue democracy, but also to pursue the secession of Taiwan from Mainland China. Therefore, in the political development of Taiwan, the rally for democratisation and secessionism were intermingled (FEOHET 1999:310-314).

4.2.2. The rise of the next generation of Taiwanese

Mainlanders that had accompanied the KMT-led government to Taiwan in 1949 constituted only 13 per cent of the total population of Taiwan. They were dispossessed of their land and assets when they left. With the exception of capitalists and entrepreneurs from Shanghai and other cities, most were soldiers or intellectuals working in the public sector. They, therefore, had little control or influence within the economy. As for the Taiwanese, they traditionally possessed land, wealth and skills. Owing to the fact that most of the Taiwanese worked in the private sector, and that most of the Taiwanese élite remained outside of politics, this group benefited largely from the rapid economic development from 1950-1980. They developed their businesses, accumulated huge wealth, and ultimately had a large influence within the private sector.

There were also, however, a large number of poorly educated Taiwanese owing to the discriminatory nature of the previous education policy. This is seen by the fact that in 1943, there was only one university – Taipei Imperial University that had only 69 Taiwanese university students (and 384 Japanese students). It was significant in that of the 69 Taiwanese students, 64 majored in medicine (TPG 1946:1214-1215). This limited the development of the Taiwanese élite in politics.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan with many educated Mainlanders who rapidly advanced education in Taiwan. The KMT-led government regarded Taiwan as one of the provinces of China. Taiwanese was regarded as Chinese, and the government implemented a non-discriminatory education policy. Taiwanese and Mainlander students had to pass the Joint University Entrance Examination to enroll in universities, and there was no limitation with regard to subject choice. Many Taiwanese students majored in subjects such as politics and law. Consequently, by the 1970s and 1980s, a new generation of well-educated Taiwanese, including many of the political élite, emerged. Some of these Taiwanese élite had adopted the legacy of ethnic resentment of the previous generation with regard to the 228 Incident, and were subjected to the actions of the secret police. They had the political knowledge and ability to question and challenge the unfair power-sharing for Taiwanese, and the inherent legitimacy of the KMT-led

government.

4.2.3. Democracy and the Kaohsiung Incident

On 25 October 1971, the ROC was forced to withdraw from the UN (GIO 2001:482), following recognition of the PRC as the sole representative of China. This event shattered the myth that the ROC represented the whole of China, and undermined the legitimacy of the KMT-led government (Wang, F.C. 1998:33).

Following the emergence of the Taiwanese democratic opposition in the mid-1970s, the new generation of educated Taiwanese élite launched an anti-KMT movement. In order to obtain support from Taiwanese in the election, the Taiwanese candidate complained of the unfair political power-sharing system, and criticized the Mainlander-led KMT government's discrimination against the Taiwanese (Wang, F.C. 1996:161-162). To further provoke the Taiwanese ethnic consciousness in an effort to win the election, the Taiwanese candidate, who could speak Mandarin fluently, intentionally spoke Taiwanese during the election campaign as the majority spoke Taiwanese in Taiwan.

In the subsequent elections for county magistrates and city mayors of the Taiwan area in 1977, the Taiwanese anti-KMT movement won an unprecedented victory, capturing 33.3 per cent of the vote. This election led to the anti-KMT movement's candidate forming the Tangwai (literally means non-KMT), whose support peaked in 1979. In the same year, the Tangwai held 14 opposition rallies, established the Central Parliamentarians Tangwai's Candidates League, and set up the Tangwai's political magazine *Formosa Magazine* as a means to spread its political ideology (Wang, F.C. 1996:150-155).

In December 1979, the supplementary elections for legislators of the Legislative Yuan and the delegates of the National Assembly were held. On 10 December 1979, International Human Rights Day, the Tangwai held a Taiwanese opposition rally in Kaohsiung City with torches and clubs to promote human rights and criticise the secret police rule. However, on the previous day, two voluntary workers were arrested and tortured by the police. This infuriated the Taiwanese opposition, and the

subsequent rally between demonstrators and the military police turned violent. Most of the Taiwanese opposition leaders of the Kaohsiung Incident were jailed (Lu 1997:116-232).

The Kaohsiung Incident was a major turning point in modern Taiwan's history. Most of the Taiwanese opposition leaders of the Kaohsiung Incident were not only jailed but also cruelly tortured (Lu 1997:237-256), despite eventually being proven innocent. During the mid-1980s and 1990, the Taiwanese opposition leaders were released (Lu 1997:8-9).

4.2.4. Democracy and secessionism

During the Kaohsiung Incident public military court case, the defence lawyers of the accused united to become new opposition leaders. In the subsequent election for legislators in 1983, and the elections for county magistrates, city mayors and Taiwan Provincial Assembly members in 1985, some of the defence lawyers and the families of the prisoners of the Kaohsiung Incident, all Taiwanese and members of the Tangwai, won the elections with mass Taiwanese support (Wang, F.C. 1996:167-168).

In these elections, one of the most important aspects of the Taiwanese Tangwai's policies was that the future of Taiwan should be decided by all Taiwan residents (Wang, F.C. 1996:203-204). This could be considered as a semi-secessionist political policy. As for the other election issues of the Taiwanese Tangwai's candidates, they questioned the legitimacy of the KMT-led government as being representative of the whole of China. Furthermore, in an effort to consolidate an ethnic consciousness, Taiwanese Tangwai's candidates interpreted historical facts selectively. For example, they criticised the system of ethnic political power-sharing for being unfair on central government level towards the Taiwanese, but did not mention the ethnic power-sharing system in local government as being unfair towards Mainlanders (see Chapter two). They criticised the fact that Taiwanese dissidents were suppressed by the KMT-led secret police, but did not mention that many Mainlander dissidents were also suppressed by the KMT-led secret police. They criticised the slaughter of Taiwanese by Mainlander troops in the later 228

Incident, but did not mention that Taiwanese had also massacred the Mainlanders in the earlier 228 Incident (see Chapter two). Furthermore, they criticised the Mandarin language policy of the KMT-led government in schools for forcing the next generation to lose their mother tongue, but did not mention that the policy also forced some of the next Mainlander generation, whose mother tongue was not Mandarin, to also lose their provincial mother tongue. Essentially, the Taiwanese opposition élite interpreted these political issues in terms of a simple political philosophy that Mainlanders suppressed Taiwanese. However, through regular election campaigns, the concept of resentment towards Mainlanders was supported by Taiwanese.

In 1986, the Taiwanese-led Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) was established. From 1986-1989, the DPP held a series of mass meetings that managed to élicit a certain amount of Taiwanese support. One of the sensitive subjects that arose out of these meetings was the issue of Taiwan's independence (Wang, F.C. 1997:261) that served to promote ethnic conflict between Taiwanese and Mainlanders.

Generally speaking, most of the members of the DPP are Taiwanese who have strong identification with Taiwan. The Mainlander members of the DPP are a small minority. In April 1987, the DPP passed a resolution stating that Taiwan was a sovereign state and not part of the PRC. This highlighted the policy of the DPP, for Taiwan to secede from Mainland China. However, in December 1988, Fei His-ping, the only Mainlander, and head of the founding members of the DPP (Feng 1992:183), did not agree with the secessionist policy and left the DPP voluntarily (Lee, A. 1989:376). The resignation of the head of the Mainlander founding members from the DPP reflects the differences between the Taiwanese and Mainlander élites in terms of national identity.

4.3. Lee Teng-hui's Taiwanese identity movement

In November 2000, former President Lee Teng-hui stated that he believed that the pursuit of identity was the central issue which would guide the political development of the future of Taiwan (Lee & Nakashima 2000:36). Lee Teng-hui indicated that his presidency (1988-2000) basically had two main objectives: one was to develop a peaceful dialogue between Taiwan and Mainland China, and the other was to

promote democratization. Lee Teng-hui further explained that the main tenets of Taiwan's democratization were "Taiwan identity" and "Taiwanisation" (Lee & Nakashima 2000:219-221), and also stated that the purpose of Taiwan's democratization was "Taiwanisation" (Lee & Nakashima 2000:35).

Given the fact that the Taiwanese constituted 85.3 per cent of the total population in the 1990s, they systematically obtained key political positions from the Mainlander élite during the electoral processes. Simultaneously, Lee Teng-hui, as the president of the ROC and the chairman of the ruling KMT party, used his political power to appoint many Taiwanese élites in the place of the Mainlander élites in key political positions. Furthermore, Lee Teng-hui also did Taiwanese opposition movement leaders favours. For example, on 20 May 1990, he announced a special amnesty for Hsu Hsin-liang and Shih Ming-teh, the famous Taiwanese political prisoners of the Kaohsiung Incident, and directed that five former political prisoners of the Kaohsiung Incident be invited to the National Affairs Conference which was held in July 1990 (Lu 1997:8-9). Conversely, President Lee Teng-hui demonized Mainland China, and condemned it as a regime of "bandits" (Chen, S.C. 1994:1).

Lee Teng-hui wanted the people to have a strong Taiwan consciousness (Lee, T.H. 1999c:33-35), and he guided and promoted the notion of Taiwanese identity and an independent Taiwan (Lin, C.L. 2001:250-254). As chairman of the ruling KMT party, Lee Teng-hui criticised the KMT-led government as an outside regime. He stated that Mainlanders had suppressed the Taiwanese (Lee, T.H. 1999a:160), and that he was sad to have been born in Taiwan (Lee & Shiba 1994:4). In order to consolidate the identity of Taiwan, he intentionally promoted the concepts of "ROC on Taiwan", "Taiwan first", "The New Taiwan" and "New Taiwanese" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:61-191). These slogans became very popular in Taiwan, and strengthened the identity of Taiwan significantly.

Table 2. Opinion Poll of Self-Identification in Taiwan

Date	I am Chinese	I am Chinese/Taiwanese I am Taiwanese/Chinese	I am Taiwanese
------	--------------	--	----------------

University of Pretoria etd – Chi, C-L (2004)

1989		52.0%	26.0%	16.0%
1992	Sept	44.0%	36.5%	16.7%
1993	Jan	48.5%	32.7%	16.7%
1994	April	23.8%	49.5%	22.5%
1995	June	23.8%	43.6%	27.9%
1996	Nov	20.5%	49.5%	24.9%
1997	May	21.8%	45.4%	32.8%
1998	April	16.3%	41.2%	42.3%
1999	April	12.7%	45.4%	36.9%
2000	April	13.6%	38.5%	42.5%

Source: United Daily News/ Opinion Poll Center. 29 November 1989 p.6
and Opinion poll investigation, requested by MAC (Mainland Affairs
Council, The Executive Yuan) April, 2000.

Lee Teng-hui believed that the previous Constitution of the ROC was based on the premise of a single China, and revised the Constitution in order to minimise the powers of the Taiwan province, and to suspend elections for the governor and members of the provincial council. Essentially he sought to abolish the Taiwan province. (The reason was Mainland China regarded Taiwan as one of its provinces). Lee Teng-hui stated that “the Constitution was amended to adjust in a reasonable manner this artificial structure and bring it in line with reality. The result has been a growing sense of belonging among the residents of Taiwan” (Lee, T.H. 1999c:23).

After Lee Teng-hui’s rule from 1988 to 2000, the national identity changed drastically. In April 2000, 42.5 per cent of Taiwanese residents classified themselves as Taiwanese, while 38.5 per cent saw themselves as Chinese/Taiwanese. Only 13.6 per cent saw themselves as Chinese (see Table 2). Undoubtedly, during the period of Lee Teng-hui, together with the development of democratization and Taiwanisation, Taiwanese identity was consolidated successfully (Nakashima 2000:26-27).

5. MAINLAND CHINA’S NATIONAL IDENTITY

The concepts of the ‘modern nation’, ‘nationalism’ and ‘national identity’ originated in the modern West. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, China did not conform to the model of a modern Western nation. It had no official national name, no definite

border, no national flag, and no national anthem. There was therefore a lack of a modern national Chinese consciousness or identity, and it did not have the ability to mobilise against foreign aggression nationally (Sheng 1996:16). Historically, however, the Chinese not only developed as a traditional nation, for example the Tang, Sung, Ming and Ching dynasties, but also established cosmopolitanism and a great Chinese civilisation.

5.1. Eternity of Chinese civilisation

Seen in retrospect, human history stretches through generations of civilisation from the ancient Sumerians and Egyptians in the Mediterranean, to modern Christianity in Europe, and through successive generations of the Sinic in the Far East to the Islamic civilisation in the Middle East and North Africa (Huntington 1996:40). Melko concludes that many of the civilisations, such as the Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Cretan, Classical, Byzantine, Middle American and Andean, no longer exist. However, existing civilisations include the Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Islamic and Western (Huntington 1996:45). Amongst these, only the Chinese civilisation has survived as a united country. Wei Chen-tung (2000:36-38) argues that two of the main reasons for China's longevity and desire to be unified are the homogeneity of the Chinese written characters and the comprehensive ideology of unification.

5.1.1. Homogeneity of the Chinese characters

Alexander the Great, Caesar, Charlemagne, Ottoman, Napoleon, Lenin and Hitler, all wanted to unify Europe on a scale such as that of China. None of them could however emulate the Chinese monarchs that established China (Tong 1995:28). One of the main causes that led to such political diversity between the East and the West was the linguistic difference. The nature of the Chinese language is embodied in the Chinese characters that have evolved from pictographic to abstract (GIO 2001:43), and are comprised of tens of thousands of ideographic characters (GIO 2001:39). The written Chinese characters are individual, and there is no multi-syllable and no alphabet in Chinese characters. It is a tonal language with monosyllabic characters which determine its pronunciation (GIO 1987:41). Since the written form of Chinese characters differs from the pronounced form, Chinese characters can be read by people from different regions, such as the Cantonese, Southern Fujianese (same as

Taiwanese), Hakkas, Shanghai dialects, as well as speakers of the common language, Mandarin. Chinese people can therefore read the Chinese characters of two thousand years ago. In other words, Chinese characters surpass the limits of space and region.

Wei Cheng-tung (2000:37) further indicates that Chinese characters reduce ethnic boundaries, develop the culture, are important in political unification, and strengthen an inner solidarity in China.

5.1.2. A comprehensive ideology of unification

The philosophy of Confucianism has had an overwhelming influence on Chinese society over the last 2,500 years. One of the popular political ideals of Confucianism is that “there are no two suns in the sky and two kings in the world”, and therefore China should be a unified nation. This philosophy supports the Chinese people’s desire for a central government, and the maintenance of a state of unification (Wei 2000:37-38).

According to the Chronological Chart of *The Ageless Chinese: A History* (Li 1971:562-567), Wei Yung examined previous Chinese dynasties and discovered that periods of Chinese unification covered 1,963 years, and that periods of a divided China covered 1,131 years, from the Chou dynasty. Taking the whole 3,094 years into consideration, China was unified for 63.4 per cent of the time, and was divided for only 36.6 per cent of the period. In other words, China as a nation experienced many stages of unification and division. In the last three thousand years, different dynasties and empires emerged, flourished, thrived, disintegrated and disappeared. China has, however, continued to exist through the ages (Wei 1985:386-387).

5.2. Chinese patriotic education

After over one hundred years of humiliating history, the CCP established the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in 1949, with the exception of the island of Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macao, and re-united China. The PRC emphasized historical courses in primary and middle schools in order to promote patriotism. In retrospect, the main ideology in history textbooks was patriotism (Chen, C. 2001:361).

In August 1991, President Jiang Zemin instructed that it was necessary to teach students the Chinese modern history, Chinese contemporary history and the national situation continuously from primary school, middle school to university (PRCNEC 1991:1-7). On 25 April 1999, President Jiang Zeming gave a letter to the famous Chinese historian Pai So-I that re-iterated that the Chinese history was the common wealth of their entire nation. What the CCP and the society had to emphasise was the learning of Chinese history. Particularly, they had to spread the basic knowledge of Chinese history to the youth. This could improve their understanding and control of the excellent Chinese tradition, firmly entrench the patriotic spirit, the correct life and value notions, and encourage them to devote themselves to the great Chinese rejuvenation (HTSCEA 1999:2).

In the 1990s, the overall objective of the ideology was to instill pride, self-respect, and confidence in Chinese culture through the education of students. This focused on teaching Chinese ancient history as a means of promoting patriotism in students through the understanding that long-term Chinese culture and history had made a great contribution to world history, and the belief in a united nation. Teaching of Chinese modern history also explored the humiliating stories of Chinese weakness caused by a series of invasions by foreign powers, and the heroic deeds that the Chinese élite had undertaken to save China. The historical lesson was that backwardness had led to the aggression (PRCNEC/BED 1996:16-44).

History books also, however, record the history of Chinese unification and events in the history of Taiwan such as Chang Cheng-kun's defeat of the Dutch, and Taiwan's return to China in 1661; China's forced cession of Taiwan to Japan by the *Treaty of Shimonoseki* in 1895 (PRCNEC/BED 1996:303-306); and intervention by foreign powers to hamper and retard the process of unification between Taiwan and Mainland China (PRCNEC/BED 1996:220-221).

5.3. Mainland China's national identity

Given the geographical size and inhospitable and inaccessible terrain bordering China (ice to the North, desert to the West, mountains to the South, and ocean to the

East), the country was largely insulated from foreign aggression. Chinese people lived and grew up in the arable and vast fertile plain through which the Yellow River and Yangtze River run. This contributed to the development of a vast united nation, the Qin dynasty, two thousand two hundred years ago (Chou 2001:392). China then fell into cycles of fragmentation and reunification but, due to geostrategic conditions, China reunified the great nations without being challenged outside of the Far East region. This allowed China to develop a Chinese culture that was more advanced than in neighboring areas, and it formed a Chinese culture that influenced Korea, Japan and Vietnam.

The Chinese strongly believed that their culture was the best culture in the world and that it could not be challenged by any other in the world. They believed that China was the centre of the world, and were proud of their perceived cultural superiority. On the other hand, one of the most important ideologies of Chinese culture was Confucianism. In fact, any dynasty had to accept the theory of Confucianism for it to legitimise its rule. As a result, the Chinese élite focused their identity not only on the dynasty, but also on the cultural ideology, particularly the spirit of Confucianism. They did not develop the ideology of 'nationalism'. However, when East met West, and throughout the history of Western aggression, the Chinese became familiar with the concept of 'nationalism', and their cultural identity was transformed into a national identity. They believed that they had to establish a modern state (Zheng 2001:372-373),

5.4. Pursuing unification in China

China has been divided for one third of its 3000 years of recorded history. Therefore, unification was always the underlying political philosophy, various regimes have struggled to unify China, and political leaders have always identified a unified China as their goal (Chang, Y.F. 1989:1-3). That is why the Chinese ultimately have been unified for most of their history. From 1272 to 1911, the Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties formed a great empire that lasted over 600 consecutive years. This was a unique achievement in world history and led to the Chinese ideal of unification.

However, by the nineteenth century, China had not kept pace with modern science

and the industrial revolution, and remained a pre-modern society. When East met West, the backwardness and weakness of China led to a series of invasions by foreign powers (see Chapter two), for example, with the Opium War against Great Britain between 1839-42; an Anglo-French expedition intruded into Beijing in 1858, the Sino-Japanese war forced Chinese cession of Taiwan and Penghu Island in 1894; the Joint Expedition of Eight Foreign Powers (Japan, Russia, Britain, the US, France, Germany, Italy and Austria) looted Beijing in 1900; the British occupied Lasa, capital of Tibet in 1904; and Japan invaded China again during the first half of the twentieth century (GIO 2001:54-62). Simultaneously, Japan granted the Manchuria and the Mongol nations independence in 1932 and 1937 respectively (Chang, Y.F. 1998:349). Over the one hundred year period (1839-1945), China experienced an unprecedented tragedy with countless numbers of Chinese people massacred, and its territory occupied and partitioned.

In the wake of this disintegration of China, members of the Chinese élite had led the Chinese people, sacrificed their families, homes, and lives, and contributed in every way possible for generation after generation, in an attempt to protect their national integrity and ultimately achieved unification again. This was also a remarkable achievement in world history.

6. CONCLUSION

In Taiwan, one of the main causes of political conflict is the issue of national identity, because some Taiwan residents identify absolutely with China, while some identify with Taiwan. This identification correlates with ethnic groups to some extent, particularly with regard to the Mainlanders. According to a study done in the early 1990s, 92.7 per cent of Mainlanders identified with China and/or Taiwan, and 7.3 per cent of Mainlanders identified with Taiwan only. On the other hand, 70.9 per cent of Taiwanese identified with China and/or Taiwan, and 29.1 per cent of Taiwanese identified with Taiwan only (Wang, F.C. 1993:87). The diversity in national identity between Taiwanese and Mainlanders is the root of a sophisticated struggle with regard to the future outcome of unification or secession, and will come into play particularly when there is a showdown over unification or secession.

In Taiwan's history, the Taiwanese voluntarily organized militia to protect China against the British, French and Japanese. Indeed, approximately 20,000 young Taiwanese young men sacrificed their lives in the anti-Japanese armed resistance, and many Taiwanese élite even undertook civil protest activities under strict Japanese surveillance. However, after the KMT-led government's 40 years of rule, some Taiwanese emerged in support of secessionism. One of the main reasons is that the KMT-led government rule divided the nation through civil war. In the Qing dynasty, China was in a normal political state – Taiwan was a part of China. Normally Taiwanese communicated with Mainlanders either through cultural exchange, trade or politics. In those days, by dominating the whole of China through significant political resources, the Qing government had the political ability to not only implement the fair power-sharing policy in Taiwan, but also adopted a preferential policy giving Taiwanese élite political advantage in the service examination. In contrast, the KMT-led government, as a defeated government which fled to Taiwan, did not have enough political resources to implement preferential political policies, but did control the central official positions occupied by the Mainlander élite (because the senior central officials moved to Taiwan with government) and implemented harsh measures to maintain its power.

The unfair allocation of political power, and harsh secret police measures, stimulated the Taiwanese élite's awareness that the Taiwanese were a subordinated people, and the unfair power-sharing system provided the Taiwanese élite with the excuse to foment Taiwanese resentment against Mainlanders. Furthermore, the subordinated Taiwanese constituted an absolute majority in Taiwan, and by the use of modern mass media, it was easy for the Taiwanese élite to mobilize the Taiwanese masses around ethnic resentment in support for the Taiwanese candidate during democratic elections. In contrast, the Mainlander élite was dominant but constituted an absolute minority that had fled to Taiwan during the civil war. The Mainlander élite promoted hostility toward Mainland China, and severed any links with the motherland. Owing to modern mass communications, however, the harsh secret police measures had to be tempered, with the result that they found themselves in a predicament during democratic elections. This situation provided sufficient conditions for the Taiwanese élite to achieve political power-sharing, and to pursue secession from Mainland

China. After Lee Teng-hui assumed the presidency, he not only legitimised the pursuit of secession advanced by the Taiwanese opposition movement, but also implemented the Cross-Straits secession policy vigorously.

For secessionists, a basic requirement in building a new state is the establishment of a new national identity. Some Taiwanese élite wanted to establish the Republic of Taiwan, and recalled the Taiwanese collective memory of the unfair political power-sharing system. To develop a new Taiwanese identity, they focused on elevating the previous Taiwanese provincial identity to a national identity. It is, however, difficult to sever the relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China, as the Taiwanese and their ancestors originated from Mainland China and have a primordial link with southern Mainland China in terms of lineage, language, religion, culture, and even in the collective historical memory when the Taiwanese had celebrated Taiwan's return to China only half a century ago. Taiwanese ancestors had used their blood and lives to prove their Chinese identity only one century ago. As for the Mainlanders, they are only first and second generation immigrants who still have strong sentiments toward their original provinces. Therefore, some of the Taiwanese residents identified with a united China, while others identified with a new independent state in present day Taiwan.

Prior to the emergence of the modern nation, Mainland China had existed for thousands of years as a large Far East nation, together with its cultural and political identity. As stated, in the early twentieth century, the Chinese adopted modern nationalism, and elevated their traditional cultural identity to a national identity. When the PRC was established in 1949, with the exception of Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao, China achieved total national unification and complete sovereignty. From an unforgettable Chinese humiliation at the hands of foreign aggression, the CCP-led government instilled the concept of a national identity and unification into students in primary school, middle school, and universities in Mainland China. In the early twenty-first century, as prosperity increasingly emerged, this provoked strong nationalistic emotions and created a strong national identity for Chinese people.

Taiwan and Mainland China's national identities reflect their respective historical

legacies. The drastic change of Taiwan's national identity was utilized by Lee Teng-hui to introduce his political Cross-Straits policy. The next Chapter will study the evolution of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy from the original one-China policy, towards a policy of secession.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEE TENG-HUI'S
POLITICAL CROSS-STRAITS POLICY

In July 1990, Lee Teng-hui met the ROC Anti-Communist and Patriotic Association, whose members were mainly Mainlanders opposing Taiwan's secession from Mainland China. He explained that his comments were distorted, and that no evidence existed that he was pro-separatism (Wang, M.Y. 1990:2). Subsequently, Lee Teng-hui restated publicly that he was not a separatist and supported Chinese reunification. Some people, however, still did not trust him and believed that the statements were official policy (Ding 1994:11). However, privately, Lee Teng-hui never mentioned the word 'unification'; and at semi-public occasions, if there were no Mainlanders, he would speak frankly. For example, when Lee Teng-hui met the members of the DPP, more than once, he expressed the view that their goal (Taiwan separated from Mainland China) was the same, but that his method to achieve this was better than theirs (Lee, H.Y. 1994:77). Therefore, what was Lee Teng-hui's true political Cross-Straits policy? This chapter will examine this topic.

1. THE CROSS-STRAIT RELATIONSHIP FROM THE 1950s to THE 1980s

Following its defeat in the civil war, the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan in December 1949. Subsequently, due to US intervention, Taiwan severed political, economic and cultural relations with Mainland China. While this event had originated from the civil war, the governments on the two sides of the Taiwan Strait, Taiwan and Mainland China, insisted that they represented China. For example, the KMT-led government claimed that Taiwan was a free China, and criticized Mainland China as "Red China". At that time, Mainland China believed that Taiwan had no intention to be independent, and that the secession was temporary. Therefore, even during the most serious of armed conflicts and war between Taiwan and Mainland China, the conflicts were restricted to the coastal area of Mainland China, and never moved over the mid-point of the Taiwan Strait. In retrospect, with reference to the classification of Ma Ying-jeou (Ma 1992:2-3), in the period from 1950 – 1987, before the time of Lee Teng-hui, the Cross-Strait relationship can be categorised as periods of armed conflict, semi-armed conflict, and peaceful confrontation.

1.1. Armed conflict period (1950-1958)

On 25 June 1950, the Korean War broke out. On 29 June 1950, the US Seventh Fleet was sent to patrol the Taiwan Strait, followed by the US Thirteenth Air Force which was sent to Taiwan to prevent an attack from Mainland China (Shen *et al.*

1990:70). In August 1953, the Taiwanese Navy and Air Force cooperated with the US Seventh Fleet and held a military exercise on the island. At that time, the US had 1,200 military advisors stationed in Taiwan. On 2 December 1954, the KMT-led government signed the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* with the US (Feng 1992:22-23). On 18 January 1955, Mainland China occupied the I-Chiang San Islands, and then prepared to attack the Tachen Islands - both the islands are very close the central coast of Mainland China. From 8-12 February, the US Seventh Fleet mobilised 132 vessels and over 5,000 flights to assist the 18,000 KMT soldiers and 14,000 civilians that were being evacuated from the Tachen Islands (Deng, L.F. 1992:212-223).

With military assistance and support of the US, from 1950 to 1957 Taiwan attacked the southeastern coast of Mainland China more than 70 times with between one hundred and ten thousand soldiers in each military action (Deng, L.F. 1992:205). In order to counter the Taiwanese attacks, from 23 August to 25 October 1958 Mainland China launched a large-scale bombing campaign of the Quemoy (Kinmen) islands which were occupied by the KMT soldiers (Peng 1958:117-118). The Quemoy islands are 150 sq km big, only 2.3 kilometers from the southeastern coast of Amoy city, Fujian province at its narrowest, but 277 kilometers northwest of Kaohsiung city, Taiwan (GIO 2001:17-18).

1.2. Semi-armed conflict period (1959-1978)

After the battle of the Quemoy Islands, there were no large-scale conflicts in the Cross-Strait. However, skirmishes continued. For example, between 1962 and 1965, President Chiang Kai-shek sent the secret police and military to attack the coast of Guangdong, Fujian, Zhejiang, Jiangsu and Shandong provinces many times, but all failed (Lee *et al.* 1992:103). Between 1962 and 1974, the US U2 surveillance planes, piloted by the Air Force of the KMT-led government, flew to Mainland China frequently. They flew from the Xinjiang and Gansu provinces in northwestern Mainland China to the northeastern area, in order to monitor the development of the Chinese nuclear weapon programme. During this period, five U2 planes were shot down by Mainland China (Yang 1990:235). According to de-classified documentation of the US Department of Defence, between 1960 and 1974, to deter Mainland China,

the US deployed nuclear weapons in Taiwan (MNIC/TR 1999:14). From 25 October 1958 to 31 December 1978, Mainland China shelled the Quemoy Islands every odd day (Hsu 1979:1). The Cross-Strait relationship was, therefore, characterised by semi-armed conflict after the prolonged civil war.

1.3. Peaceful confrontation period (1979-1987)

On 1 January 1979, Mainland China proposed that it would stop shelling the Quemoy islands, and implement a policy of peaceful reunification (SCNPC 1979:3). On 4 April 1979, President Chiang Ching-kuo proposed the “Three No’s Reaction” policy (no contacts, no negotiation, and no compromise) in response to Mainland China’s proposed policy (Lee *et al.* 1992:369). During this period, military confrontation between the two sides abated. From 1 January 1979 to 2 November 1987, the KMT-led government allowed Taiwanese residents to visit their relatives on the Mainland. The Cross-Straits relationship therefore entered a period of peaceful confrontation (Huang, K.H. 1992:2). In December 1979, Chiang Ching-kuo coined the slogan “to reunify China with the Three Principles of the People”. Subsequently, this slogan became the cornerstone of the Cross-Straits policy (Lee *et al.* 1992:238-239). The *Three Principles of the People*, a book that was written by the founding father of the ROC, Dr. Sun Yat-sun, was a political doctrine based on three pillars: nationalism, democracy and social well-being (GIO 2001:74). The slogan was abstract in nature, but had significant meaning. Peaceful reunification was allowed to be discussed, and this broke the political taboo that people could not speak of the peaceful reunification of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait.

In the spring of 1987, at the risk of being arrested by the secret police, Mainlanders Ho Wen-teh and Yang Tsu-chun launched the Mainlanders return home (Mainland China) movement. This movement appealed to the common feeling among Mainlanders (Yang, T.C. 1992:161-164). On the night of 28 June 1987, the Association for the Promotion of Mainlanders Wishing to Return Home to Visit Relatives arranged a public speech with the slogan “want to go back home, how to do it?” in the Kin-Hua secondary school in Taipei city. At the speech, legislators and scholars slammed the policy of prohibiting Mainlanders from going back home as inhumane and in violation of the ROC’s Constitution which gave citizens the right of

freedom of movement. On that night, over 3,000 people attended this speech (TR 1987:2). Under the Emergency Decree (State of Emergency), Mainlanders, who attended this public speech, were mainly old retired soldiers that were not afraid of clandestine surveillance and of being arrested by the secret police. Their strong action made the KMT-led government understand the Mainlanders' real desire (Yang, T.C. 1992:165-166).

Subsequently, on 15 July 1987, the KMT-led government promulgated the lifting of the Emergency Decree, and the political atmosphere relaxed. The appeal to go back home by the retired Mainlander soldiers was gaining extensive sympathy in Taiwan (Lee, S.L. 1993:223-224). At that time, Mainlanders had left their home and arrived in Taiwan some 40 years previously. From young to old, they had not seen their parents and families for forty years which was a great tragedy. Faced with the strong desire of going back home, on 14 September 1987, President Chiang Ching-kuo agreed to allow Mainlanders to visit their relatives on Mainland China on humanitarian grounds. On 2 November 1987, the KMT-led government formally accepted that civilians could apply to visit their relatives in Mainland China (Wang 1995:383-390). The KMT-led government allowed Taiwan residents, including Mainlanders and Taiwanese, to visit Mainland China. This was an historical event in the Cross-Strait.

2. LEE TENG-HUI'S POLITICAL CROSS-STRAITS POLICY OF SEPARATION (early period after 1988)

In the early period of Lee Teng-hui's presidency, the central power was controlled by the Mainlander élites, and Lee Teng-hui had no real power (Lee & Kobayashi 2001:83). At that time, the president was elected by the members of the National Assembly, and hence, if Lee Teng-hui wanted to participate in the next presidential election, he had to obtain the support of mostly Mainland members. According to Wu Nai-the, almost no Mainlanders opposed reunification with China (Wu, N.T. 1993:47). As discussed, from 2 November 1987, the KMT-led government allowed civilians to visit their relatives in Mainland China. Over 100,000 people applied to visit Mainland China within the first three months (Feng 1992:311). Applicants were mostly Mainlanders. According to statistics, the number of Taiwanese visitors to Mainland China was 437,000 in 1988, 541,000 in 1989, and 948,000 in 1990 (TIER 2001:35).

This showed that Taiwanese residents were eager to interact with Mainland China. Against this background, if Lee Teng-hui planned to implement the separate Cross-Strait policy, he would not have publicly given instructions that related to the political Cross-Straits policy, exemplified by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) event. Conversely, under the banner of Chinese unification, Lee Teng-hui publicly gave instructions to establish an institution to deal with Mainland affairs. The KMT-led government subsequently established three institutions, namely the National Unification Council; the Mainland Affairs Council; and an unofficial intermediary body. These were responsible for researching strategic related goals; formulating and promoting policy; and handling actual policy implementation and negotiation, respectively (Chiu 2001:13).

2.1. ADB event

In May 1989, the second year of Lee Teng-hui's presidency, the 22nd ADB annual conference was held in Beijing, Mainland China. Taiwan decided to send Finance Minister Shirley Kuo to lead the delegation to the conference (Ko 1989:1). As Kuo's visit was the first official contact for 40 years, it received wide coverage in Taiwan, with over 100 Taiwanese reporters in Beijing to cover the event. On the morning of 4 May, the opening ceremony of the 22nd ADB annual conference at the Great Hall of the People commenced. Taiwan's delegation, of 12 members led by Shirley Kuo, arrived at the Hall to attend the opening ceremony. President Yang Shang-kun of Mainland China then appeared, and simultaneously, the national anthem of Mainland China was played, and Kuo and her delegates rose to their feet and paid their respects in front of the national flag of Mainland China (Chiu 1989:21-22).

The news that Kuo rose for the playing of the national anthem of Mainland China, caused an immediate political shock in Taiwan. Much of the mass media believed that Kuo's unprecedented move had a profound meaning for Taiwan's political Cross-Straits policy (Hang 1989:48), as the act indirectly acknowledged Mainland China as a foreign country. This opposed the 40-year policy of the KMT-led government which saw Mainland China as a rebellious group of the civil war (Chen *et al.* 1989:32-36). On 4 May 1989, however, Minister Kuo explained that the ROC delegation's move had "no political implications", and denied that the move

symbolized any change in Taiwan's Cross-Straits policy (Anderson 1989:1). On 8 May 1989, the central headquarters of the DPP issued a statement which indicated that Kuo's move had showed that the KMT-led government formally acknowledged Mainland China as a legitimate regime (Hung 1987:2).

On the other hand, Kuo's move led to objections by the traditional members of the KMT, and the mass media's focus centered on the question of who was the real decision-maker for this important political event. Hsueh Yu-chi, former Ambassador to Korea and one of the members of Taiwan's delegation, told reporters that the President said that he (government) had authorized Minister Kuo to accept full responsibility (Liao 1989:32-34). On 11 May 1989, Kuo also replied to legislators, but did not give a clear answer as to who took the final decision (Ho & Hu 1989:3). However, given that this was such an important and significant decision for Taiwan's political Cross-Straits policy, it is inconceivable that there was no consent given by President Lee Teng-hui in advance (Chiu 1989:24). However, it has never been proven whether President Lee in fact gave his consent.

Subsequently, on 4 June 1989, the Tiananmen Square event occurred. At that time, in Tiananmen Square, the student demonstration continued for six weeks, and it triggered a series of major demonstrations in other cities. Finally, the demonstration was broken up by soldiers. It was big news. Therefore, the Taiwanese mass media shifted its news focus from the ADB event to the Tiananmen Square event.

2.2. NUC, MAC and SEF

On 21 September 1990, as previously referred to, the Presidential Office set up the National Unification Council (NUC). On 28 January 1991, the Mainland Affairs Council (MAC), an administrative agency of the Executive Yuan, was established. (Under the Office of the President, the central government of the ROC comprised of five branches called Yuan, namely the Executive Yuan, the Legislative Yuan, the Judicial Yuan, the Examination Yuan, and the Control Yuan) (GIO 2001:77). On 9 February 1991, the Straits Exchange Foundation (SEF), a private organization, was approved. On 23 February 1991, the *Guidelines for National Unification* were passed by the NUC (Huang, K.H. 1992:1). On 30 April 1991, President Lee Teng-hui

promulgated the termination of the Period of National Mobilization for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion and the abolishment of the *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion* (GIO 2001:489). In September 1992, the KMT-led government promulgated the *Statute Governing the Relations between the People of the Taiwan Area and the Mainland Area* (GIO 2001:115).

During the 1990s, under the direction of President Lee Teng-hui, the KMT-led government therefore established an advisory body – the NUC; a decision-making body – the MAC; an intermediary body – the SEF; and completed the *Guidelines for National Unification* as the primary principle of the political Cross-Straits policy. Simultaneously, the nominations for the heads of the bodies were accepted by Lee Teng-hui after consultation. For example, the NUC was headed by President Lee Teng-hui himself. Taiwan's political Cross-Straits policy had therefore entered the era of Lee Teng-hui.

2.3. *Guidelines for National Unification*

In the foreword of the *Guidelines for National Unification*, it was stated that “(a)fter an appropriate period of forthright exchange, cooperation, and consultation conducted under the principles of reason, peace, parity, and reciprocity, the two sides of the Taiwan Strait should foster a consensus of democracy, freedom and equal prosperity, and together build anew a unified China” (MAC 1998a:214).

The unification process was divided into the short term, the medium term, and the long term. The short term was a stage of exchanges and reciprocity, and mainly consisted of the issuing of regulations and the establishment of an intermediary body for exchanges of the people of both sides. The aim was “to establish a mutually benign relationship by not endangering each other's security and stability while in the midst of exchanges and not denying the other's existence as a political entity”. And “the two sides of the Straits should end the state of hostility and, under the principle of one China, solve all disputes through peaceful means, and furthermore respect - not reject - each other in the international community, so as to move toward a phase of mutual trust and cooperation” (MAC 1998a:215).

The medium term was a stage of mutual trust and cooperation, whereby “both sides of the Straits should establish official communication channels on equal footing”, and “direct postal, transport and commercial links should be allowed”. Furthermore, “both sides of the Straits should work together and assist each other in taking part in international organisations and activities”, and “mutual visits by high-ranking officials on both sides should be promoted to create favorable conditions for consultation and unification” (MAC 1998a:215).

The long term was a stage of consultation and unification. As for the principles of national unification, one of the main principles was that “the timing and manner of China’s unification should first respect the rights and interests of the people in the Taiwan area, and protect their security and welfare. It should be achieved in gradual phases under the principles of reason, peace, parity, and reciprocity” (MAC 1998a:214-216).

In the process of instituting the *Guidelines for National Unification*, the original draft stated that the timing and manner of China’s unification should first respect the “will” of the people in the Taiwan area. To avoid the possibility of a future referendum for Taiwan’s independence that could jeopardise unification, Mainlander Premier Hau Pei-tsun requested that the word “will” be replaced with “right and interest” (Lin, M.L. 1991:7). Even though one of the key words, “will”, was revised, the *Guidelines for National Unification* still emphasized that the unification negotiation should be conducted based on the principles of reason, peace, parity, and reciprocity. However, given that a united nation has only one central government, the concept of parity (that is separate and equal) would constitute a technical barrier to unification. Therefore, according to the *Guidelines for National Unification*, when semi-official exchanges or political conflicts between both sides of the Cross-Strait took place, Taiwanese authorities always stressed the word “parity” as opposed to unification.

2.4. The separation purpose of the guidelines and institutions

While Lee Teng-hui used the banner of unification superficially in order to curb Mainland China’s fervour and drive for unification, the real purpose of his political Cross-Straits policy was to promote a policy of separation. For example, In January

1991, the stated purpose of the MAC was to investigate the strategic goal of the government's Cross-Straits policy. However, in reality, the MAC issued sophisticated regulations such as the *Statute Governing the Relations Between the People of the Taiwan Area and the Mainland Area* that curbed the exchange between Taiwanese and Mainland China residents. On 9 February 1991, the SEF was approved as the only private institution that could get authorization from the government to deal with Cross-Strait matters (GIO 2001:115), thereby depriving other Taiwanese residents or Taiwanese organizations of the opportunity to deal with Cross-Strait matters.

On 23 February 1991, the *Guidelines for National Unification* were passed, however, and stated that both sides should be unified under the premise of “democracy, freedom and equal prosperity”. In reality, however, the KMT-led government had already implemented an electoral system 40 years ago, and enforced it by authoritarian rule that had gradually led to the establishment of the basic Western electoral democracy which was lacking in Mainland China. Simultaneously, due to various historical causes, the KMT-led government had also established the Taiwan economic miracle (see Chapter two). Thus, whether in democratic or in economic development terms, Taiwan was further advanced than Mainland China in the early 1990s. Therefore, in reality, the above-mentioned premise of unification, such as democracy and equal prosperity, was an indirect technical barrier to unification at that time.

On the other hand, however, there was no clear definition or standards for “democracy, freedom and equal prosperity” in the *Guidelines for National Unification*. In reality, no one society or nation can be absolutely democratic, free, or equally prosperous. For example, Taiwan is not an equally prosperous society, with many people poverty-stricken. The *Guidelines for National Unification* therefore established ideals which Taiwan itself could not reach. Obviously, the ideals of unification, such as the pursuit of democracy, freedom and equal prosperity would be another technical barrier to unification.

On 17 May 2002, Lee Teng-hui stated that the establishment of the NUC and the passage of the *Guidelines for National Unification* were done to request Mainland

China to obtain freedom, democracy and equal prosperity in advance of the first stage (short term). Furthermore, Lee Teng-hui indicated that the NUC and the *Guidelines for National Unification* were instruments for making Mainland China look foolish (Lin, H.M. 2002:2). Lee Teng-hui explained that at the NUC annual meeting, members of the NUC did not discuss the problem of how to unite with Mainland China, but rather Mainland China's goal and strategy regarding Taiwan (Huang, M.S. 2002:1). Lee Teng-hui thus implemented the separate Cross-Strait policy under the banner of pursuing unification. In this regard, the famous politician Lee Kuan-yew believed that "this was intended as a fixed, unbridgeable position, not a starting point for negotiations" (Lee, K.Y. 2000:565).

3. CROSS-STRAIT TALKS

On 9 March 1991, the SEF was established and operated in Taipei, Taiwan. The Chairman of the SEF was Kuo Chen-fu. The main activities of the SEF were to provide a Cross-Strait service for Taiwanese residents, and also dealt with government authorised cases (Ho 1991:2). The SEF was, therefore, an intermediary body and equivalent to a quasi-official organization that played a bridging role with Mainland China. Conversely, on 16 December 1991, Mainland China also established a counterpart organization – the Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS) (MAC 1998b:4).

3.1. "One China, with respective Interpretations"

With the establishment of ARATS, both sides had concrete bodies to conduct negotiations, and this made it possible for Cross-Strait talks to take place. It was inevitable, however, that the Cross-Strait talks of reunification had to deal with the sensitive problem of the one China principle, and how to define one China and admit or not admit to being Chinese.

From 28-30 October 1992, the SEF and ARATS negotiated in Hong Kong. At the meeting, the one-China principle was discussed, but the parties were unable to reach consensus, and the SEF suggested a statement be made on the one-China principle (Meng 2001:19-20). The full statement was as follows: "In the process of both sides of the Taiwan Strait seeking for national reunification, although each side

insists on the one-China principle, each side has a different understanding of the meaning. As a result of the increasing frequency of cross-strait exchange, to protect the rights of people on both sides, the issue of document checking and verification should be satisfactorily resolved” (Chen 2001:12).

On 3 November 1992, the SEF issued a press release, and further stated that Taiwanese authorities had agreed that verbal expression by each side (of the one-China principle) was acceptable (SEF 1992:28). On 16 November 1992, the ARATS gave a letter to the SEF, accepting the above-mentioned recommendation of the SEF (ARATS 2002:44).

Once the SEF and ARATS (namely Taiwan and Mainland China) had reached a political compromise, or vague consensus on the key problem of the one-China principle, both sides could start to negotiate (Su 2002:I-II).

3.2. The Cross-Strait Koo-Wang Talks

From 27-29 April 1993, the SEF and ARATS held a meeting, the Koo-Wang Talks (SEF Chairman Koo Chen-fu and ARATS Chairman Wang Dao-han) in Singapore. Both sides signed the following four agreements:

1. *Agreement on the Use and Verification of Certificates of Authentication Across the Taiwan Straits.*
2. *The Agreement on Matters Concerning Inquiry and Compensation for [Lost] Registered Mail Across the Taiwan Straits.*
3. *Agreement on the System for Contacts and Meetings between SEF and ARATS.*
4. *Joint Agreement of the Koo-Wang Talks* (MAC 1998b:5).

The significance of the Koo-Wang Talks was that it had opened the door for the Cross-Strait meeting. After the Koo-Wang Talks, SEF and ARATS continued to discuss the repatriation of illegal immigrants, the repatriation of hijackers, and the settlement of fishing disputes, on many occasions (Meng 2001:20). Except for the issue of the fishing disputes, which involved the very sensitive issue of Cross-Strait jurisdiction, “consensus” was reached on the other issues. In January 1995, the SEF

and ARATS held a meeting in Beijing, and prepared to sign agreements on these “consensus” issues. At this time, however, the MAC issued a secret instruction to the SEF that both sides had to reach an agreement on the topic of the settlement of fishing disputes, or the SEF could not sign the agreement on the repatriation of illegal immigrants and the repatriation of hijackers. The negotiations therefore broke down and no agreements were signed. The origins of the secret instruction to overturn “consensus” came either from the Taiwan MAC itself, or from higher officials (Ou-yang 1997:129-131). No one knows the truth.

During the Koo-Wang Talks, Taiwan’s authorities restricted the discussions to issues of non-governmental affairs and economic matters, as President Lee Teng-hui indicated that the “Koo-Wang Talks did not deal with political issues and should be limited to technical and functional issues, and an exchange of views” (Lee 1995b:567). In February 2002, Lee Teng-hui recalled that the Cross-Strait negotiations did not discuss the issue of unification, and were limited to functional issues. Only in October 1998, SEF Chairman Kuo led a delegation to Mainland China. In advance of the visit, Lee Teng-hui instructed that negotiation with Mainland China be limited to functional issues, and that there was no need to communicate (with Mainland China) on other matters. Lee Teng-hui further instructed that except for talking about freedom and democracy, there were to be no talks on other issues (Chen, S.C. 2002:4). Clearly, Taiwan’s authorities had no intention of holding political negotiations with Mainland China on unification issues.

4. CHINQDAO-LAKE INCIDENT

On 31 March 1994, a pleasure boat was burned in the Chinqdao Lake, Zhejiang province, killing 32 persons, including 24 tourists from Taiwan. In Taiwan, this tragedy became newsworthy immediately (Lai 1994:3). Owing to the deaths of 24 tourists from Taiwan, this incident shocked the Beijing central government, and President Jiang Zemin ordered the arrests of the murderers to be sped up and could not cover up the real truth. The Beijing police department sent over 300 officials to help with the case, and after 17 days, police arrested the three murderers (Tsao, C.C. 1994:22).

4.1. Taiwan authorities' manipulation behind the scenes

Owing to the seriousness of the incident, it was important that Mainland China handle it prudently. They failed, however, to release the results of their investigation to the public on a daily basis, and even blocked the news. This triggered a negative reaction from Taiwan's public (Bee 1994:5). Furthermore, secret manipulation by Taiwan's authorities led to the mass media portraying this criminal incident as an anti-China political storm (Wang, S.P. 1999:160). The Director-General of Taiwan's Government Information Office, Hu Chih-chang, stated that Taiwan should let Communist China know that they were not easy to touch (Tu 1994:14). During this time, relatives of the victims from Taiwan visited the mortuary to identify their relatives' corpses, and Mainland China's authorities provided them with the best hotels, foods and comfortable cars, and they were treated as VIPs (Whang & Hsu 1994:3). According to the Economics Minister Chiang Pin-kung, however, Mainland China did not give them "humanitarian treatment" (Sung 1994:1). When Mainland China announced that they had arrested the three murderers, the Director-General of the National Security Bureau (the head of secret police) Ying Tsung-wen stated that there were more than three murderers (eight to ten murderers) and that there were Chinese (People's Liberation Army) soldiers involved in the incident (Anonymous 1994a:18).

Furthermore, Taiwan authorities did not mention the other eight Mainlander victims intentionally, emphasizing only the 24 victims from Taiwan (Chu 1994:30). This served to incite Taiwanese residents to hate Mainland China. On the other hand, the secessionists (members of the pro-independence movement) distorted the issue by stating that the Chingdao-Lake tragedy was a Chinese slaughter of the Taiwanese again and indicated that it was another 228 Incident (Liu, H. 1994:16).

4.2. Lee Teng-hui slams Mainland China

On 9 April 1994, President Lee Teng-hui slammed Mainland China's handling of this incident as criminal, and called Mainland officials 'bandits'. He stated that the people should have abandoned a government like this long ago (Lee. H.H. 1994:3), and provoked a political reaction of anti-Mainland China sentiment (Bee 1994:5). The fact that Mainland China had made every endeavour to arrest the murderers was ignored.

Ironically, in 1990, when Taiwan authorities sent back the illegal immigrants from Mainland China, Taiwanese officials forced the immigrants to the lower parts of the ship, nailed with wooden boards, and suffocated 25 people. In the same year, a ship which had 21 illegal immigrants from Mainland China on board was crashed into by the Taiwan Navy and all were killed. These events were only reported on in passing (Chao 1994:28). These 46 victims from Mainland China were therefore intentionally killed by Taiwan's authorities. Indeed, the crime was more serious than the Chingdao Lake Incident. Therefore, Taiwanese officials did not care for the victims, and nobody saw any empathy and justice from President Lee Teng-hui.

With regard to President Lee Teng-hui's accusation that Mainland China officials were "bandits", it was rumoured that Beijing detested these comments. Taipei senior officials privately informed Beijing that Lee Teng-hui's words were for domestic consumption in Taiwan, and were unprepared. It was hoped that Beijing would forgive this (Tsao, C.C. 1994:25-26). However, according to Lin Ching-chih, Taiwanese authorities elevated this accidental tragedy into a political event, in order to use this incident to make Taiwan move away from China. Lee Teng-hui's comments were not extemporaneous, but were by precise political design that was a great setback in the relations between Mainland China and Taiwan (Lin, C.C. 1994:2). Lee Teng-hui told a Japanese correspondent of *Sankei News*, Yushidano Muyuki that after deliberation, he made a decision to lash out at Beijing (Hsu, C.L. 2001:77). This was true, as the day before the Chingdao-Lake Incident, on 30 March 1994, Lee Teng-hui met the famous anti-Mainland China Japanese novelist Shiba Ryotaro for a long and frank dialogue. Lee Teng-hui expressed his abhorrence of China and a strong anti-China belief.

President Lee Teng-hui demonised Mainland China officials as "bandits". Given his presidential position, his criticism toward Mainland China was reported by the mass media and quoted by political figures repeatedly, particularly the pro-secessionists. This accusation triggered waves of anti-Mainland China sentiment which allowed Taiwanese to feel distanced from Mainland China. After Lee's criticism, in an opinion poll, the ratio of Taiwan residents that identified themselves as Taiwanese rose from 16.7 per cent in January 1993 to 22.5 in 1994. The ratio of residents identifying

themselves as Chinese dropped from 48.5 to 22.5 per cent. This ratio decreased annually, and did not rise again (Table 2). The Chingdao-Lake Incident was, therefore, a turning point in the ethnic identity of Taiwanese residents.

5. SORROW AT BEING BORN TAIWANESE

Lee Teng-hui recalled that in his presidency, “during my first two years in office, I was unable to assume a full leadership” (Lee, T.H. 1999c:18). In March 1990, Lee Teng-hui was elected by the National Assembly as President. Through a four-year power struggle, essentially pro-unification politicians and high officials were purged out of the power core by Lee Teng-hui, and he was able to express his real political intention, a secessionist policy, during a private dialogue between himself and Japanese novelist Shiba Ryotaro.

5.1. Private dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro

On 30 March 1994, Lee Teng-hui had a long private discussion with Japanese anti-Mainland China novelist Shiba Ryotaro (Anonymous 1994b:18). The dialogue was conducted completely in Japanese (Lee & Shiba 1994:4). The full text of this dialogue was subsequently translated into Chinese and released to the Chinese newspapers – *Commons Daily* and *Independence Evening Post*. It astounded the mass media (Anonymous 1994c:19). The key statements that Lee Teng-hui made in this dialogue were as follows:

---The word ‘China’ was vague.

---The CCP classified the Taiwan province as one of the provinces of the People’s Republic of China. This was a strange dream as Taiwan and Mainland China had different governments.

---Up until then, all regimes that controlled Taiwan were from the outside (namely non-Taiwanese). Even the KMT was also an outside regime. It was only a party that ruled the Taiwanese and, therefore, it was necessary to convert the KMT into a Taiwanese KMT.

---Being born Taiwanese, Lee was sad that he could not endeavour to contribute to Taiwan.

---Lee Teng-hui once thought of the 228 Incident that had sacrificed many Taiwanese. Exodus was a means to an end (Lee & Shiba 1994:4).

When reviewing the full text of the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro, Lee Teng-hui, as President and Chairman of the KMT, slammed the Mainlanders, the ruling KMT-party, and Mainland China from the premise of being born Taiwanese. He did not mention 'unification', however, rather hinting at secessionism of Taiwan from Mainland China.

5.2. Reaction to the dialogue of Lee Teng-hui

After the text of the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro was released, it triggered different reactions from Taiwanese and Mainlanders. For Taiwanese, particularly the old generation élite, they had previously stated some of Lee Teng-hui's secessionist ideas, but were arrested or even executed at the time. Therefore, the expression "Sorrow at being born Taiwanese" by Lee Teng-hui had a special meaning (Hu 1994), and highlighted the Taiwanese élites' real thinking. As far as Mainlanders are concerned, Lee Teng-hui's anti-China and anti-Mainlander views led to strong negative reactions. Even the Mainlander Tsiang Yien-si, Secretary-General of the Office of the President, who strongly supported Lee Teng-hui in the political struggle, also told Lee that he should not say that (Chen, T.S. 2002:6). One of the pro-Mainlander newspapers – *United Daily News* – lashed out, stating that if the KMT-led government was "an outside regime", it was ridiculous that Lee Teng-hui possessed legitimacy (Anonymous 1994d:2). If the KMT-led government was "an outside regime" and the KMT had given up the regime, it would have abrogated the national name and legitimacy of the ROC, and established a new nation (Anonymous 1994e:2). However, Lee Teng-hui did not establish a new nation and remained president of the ROC.

In fact, before the release of the dialogue, the original draft was delivered to Lee Teng-hui himself for final revision (Anonymous 1994b:18). Therefore, Lee Teng-hui intentionally released the dialogue. At that time, he allowed the Deputy Secretary-General to the President, and spokesman of the Presidential Office Tai Jui-ming, to explain his anti-China and anti-Mainlander statement. Lee Teng-hui did not, however, retract one word used in the dialogue (Anonymous 1994c:19). Furthermore, when Lee Teng-hui referred to the key concepts of "an outside regime",

he candidly stated that up until that time he did not care that he said it in that manner (Lee & Shiba 1994:4). Therefore, the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro reflected Lee's real political view, and he did not care about the negative reaction to his comments.

From 1972, Lee Teng-hui was appointed as a minister without portfolio, the mayor of Taipei city, governor of Taiwan province and vice-president, but never spoke of his true political intentions. It was not until 1994, when Lee Teng-hui had consolidated his political power, that he began to express his true views (Anonymous 1994b:19). The above-mentioned dialogue mainly focused on the political Cross-Straits policy, the key points of which were as follows:

- (a) To negate the goal of Cross-Strait unification indirectly. On 23 February 1991, the KMT-led government passed the *Guidelines for National Unification*, the purpose of which was to pursue a united China. However, Lee Teng-hui stated that the word 'China' was also vague. In other words, the goal of the *Guidelines for National Unification* was ambiguous. Lee Teng-hui therefore used a vague concept of China to negate the goal of the *Guidelines for National Unification*.
- (b) Unification was a dream. Lee Teng-hui stated that the CCP classified the Taiwan province as one of the provinces of the People's Republic of China. This was a strange dream. Chinese unification was, therefore, not only a dream, but also a strange dream, implying that Chinese unification could not exist in reality.
- (c) Secessionism is the final goal. Lee Teng-hui encouraged the Taiwanese to pursue Taiwan's independence by evoking Taiwanese hatred toward Mainlanders through the 228 Incident. He clearly stated that he once thought of the 228 Incident that had sacrificed many Taiwanese. Exodus was a means to an end. As Moses led the Israel élites from slavery in Egypt to the Promised Land of Canaan (Elliott *et al.* 1992:395), Lee hinted that he would lead the Taiwanese to establish a new nation.

From 1994, in the political Cross-Straits policy, Lee Teng-hui offered a six-point proposal which essentially amounted to asking Mainland China to recognize an independent Taiwan. During a public address at Cornell University in the US, this was interpreted as a secession speech by Mainland China. Finally, Lee Teng-hui introduced the theory that the Cross-Straits relation is a special state-to-state

relationship (see paragraph 8). From 1994 to 2000, Lee Teng-hui's true political Cross-Straits policy completely conformed to the text of the above-mentioned dialogue. The dialogue reflected Lee Teng-hui's real political intention and views on the political Cross-Straits policy.

6. THE SIX-POINT PROPOSAL OF LEE TENG-HUI

Mainland Chinese President Jiang Zemin's Chinese New Year speech, on 30 January 1995, offered an eight-point proposal for developing Cross-Strait relations. Jiang stated that the principle of one-China was the basis and premise with which to carry out peaceful unification (Jiang 1995:234-236). In response to Jiang's proposal, on 8 April 1995, Lee Teng-hui offered the following six-point proposal: (Lee, T.H. 1996a:24-27)

---"Pursue China's unification based on the reality that the two sides are governed respectively by two governments"

---"Strengthen bilateral exchanges based on Chinese culture"

---"Enhance trade and economic relations to develop a mutually beneficial and complementary relationship"

---"Ensure that both sides join international organizations on an equal footing and that leaders on both sides meet in a natural setting"

---"Adhere to the principle of resolving all disputes by peace-full means"

---"Jointly safeguard prosperity and promote democracy in Hong Kong and Macau".

Lee Teng-hui's key point was to request that Mainland China initially admit to the reality of separate rules that existed between the two sides of the Cross-Strait; to agree that the two sides participate in international organisations equally; and to abandon unifying China through force. Should Mainland China fulfill these requirements, it would acknowledge Taiwan's independence. Since Lee Teng-hui requested the above requirements, he did not agree to the unification of the Cross-Straits. In this regard, he stated in point five that "after the Chinese communists publicly state their decision to renounce the use of force against Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen (Quemoy) and Matsu, we are ready to enter into preparatory consultations at an opportune time on how to hold formal negotiations to end hostility" (Lee, T.H. 1996a:27). Thus, even if Mainland China promised to give up

using force to achieve unification, Taiwan would only agree “at an opportune time” to hold preliminary talks towards a meeting to negotiate an end to the hostilities between the two sides. It did not mention when the two sides would be unified, and when the optimal time was. In reality, therefore, Lee Teng-hui’s six-point proposal had no real intention to unify the two sides of the Cross-Straits. Two months later, at Cornell University in the US, Lee Teng-hui delivered a speech which Mainland China regarded as a secession speech.

7. THE VISIT TO CORNELL UNIVERSITY

On 1 January 1979, the US severed diplomatic relations with Taiwan, and recognised Mainland China as the legitimate government of China, and insisted on the principle of a one-China policy. The principle was that there were to be no official contacts between the US and Taiwan (Richburg 1995:4). In 1994, Cornell University offered an honorary degree to Lee Teng-hui (Lee obtained his Ph.D. in agricultural economics from Cornell University). Mainland China objected, and stated that permission of the US State Department for the Taiwanese leader to visit the US would violate the principle of one-China. Subsequently, Lee Teng-hui was initially refused entry into the US (Hahn 1995:A31).

7.1. The US allowed President Lee’s visit

Also in 1994, the “Friends of President Lee”, an organisation from Taiwan, donated US\$2.5 million to Cornell University (Fu, I.C. 1995a:2). On 27 February 1995, Cornell President Frank Rhodes invited Lee Teng-hui to return to Cornell from 9 to 11 June, and deliver a speech in the Spencer T. & Ann W. Olin Lectureship (Fu, C.C. 1995b:4). On 12 April 1995, Rhodes visited Taiwan and told a press conference that “there has been no exchange and no deal” (Bodeen 1995a:15). With regard to the nature of Lee’s visit at that time (on 3 April 1995), according to Lorna Hahn, Executive Director of the Association on Third World Affairs, Lee Teng-hui’s visit was simply to accept an honour from Cornell University, and perhaps to introduce the experience of both sides of the Cross-Strait. Lee Teng-hui would not discuss the Taiwanese issue or other political matters (Hahn 1995:A31).

It was common knowledge that Taiwan had lobby groups in the US. From September

1993 to March 1995, according to the public records of the US Justice Department, Taiwanese organisations gave 25 times more money to US “foreign agents” (‘lobbyists’ such as consultants, public-relations companies and lawyers) than China. Key expenditures in this regard by the China External Trade Development Council; BAT Services Ltd. Taiwan Branch; Board of Foreign Trade (Ministry of Economic Affairs); Coordination Council for North American Affairs; Taiwan Power Company; Institute of International Relations; Taipei Economic & Cultural Representative Office; and the Taiwan Research Institute totalled US\$5,067,419 (These expenditures did not, however, define the purposes of the funds, with some perhaps being for activities other than political matters) (Anonymous 1995c:29). For example, the Taiwan Research Institute signed a contract with Cassidy & Associates, a public-relations company, and let Cassidy & Associates take charge of lobbying the US Congress on Taiwan (Anonymous 2002a:20-22). This contract began on 18 July 1994 (Fu, C.C. 1995a:2), with an annual expenditure of US\$1.5 million until 1999 (Tseng 1995:2), paid by both the National Security Bureau and the KMT’s Party Enterprise Management Commission (Anonymous 2002a:22). Doug Bereuter, who chaired the US House of Representatives International Relations Committee Sub-committee on Asia and the Pacific, stated that the intensity of activity of Taiwan’s lobbying groups was only less than Israel’s in Washington (Wang, C.H. 1995a:2).

In mid-March 1995, Pascoe, a director of the Taipei branch of the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT), met President Lee Teng-hui, and not only stressed the US government’s stance that Cross-Straits relations and US-China relations would be seriously affected by Lee’s visit, but also told Lee bluntly that “Mr. President is pushing the US Congress” to promote the visit (Huang, W.L. 1995:1). On 2 May 1995, the House of Representatives approved a non-binding resolution in a 396-to-0 vote, that requested the Clinton administration to allow Lee Teng-hui’s visit to the US (Tsai 1995:4). According to Bereuter, the main factor was that most of the members believed that there was no reason for opposing Lee’s visit, but that the influence of Taiwan’s lobby groups was also a partial factor (Wang, C.H. 1995a:2). On 9 May 1995, the Senate passed in a 97-to-1 vote, a joint resolution of the House and Senate supporting Lee’s visit (Tsai 1995:4). *The Washington Post*, *The Washington Times* and *Chicago Tribune*, had comments that supported Lee’s visit (Wang, C.H.

1995b:4), and on 22 May 1995, the US State Department spokesman, Nicholas Burns, announced that the Clinton administration would allow President Lee Teng-hui to visit the US in June 1995 (Liu, C.Y. 1995:1). Furthermore, Burns stated that “(i)t is important to reiterate that this is not an official visit”. As to the reason why Washington changed their decision, former US Congressman John B. Anderson indicated that Clinton reversed the US State Department’s original decision as he was forced to do so by congressional pressure (Bodeen 1995b:16).

When Lee came back from the US, he told reporters that “this trip to the United States was private and unofficial” (Lee, T.H. 1996a:45). During the visit, Lee Teng-hui enjoyed the reception and protection offered by the US government. The state and local police were mobilized, and over one hundred security officers of the Diplomatic Bureau of the State Department were assigned to the visit (Fu, C.C. 1995c:2). Lee Teng-hui met with three Senators, including Senator Jesse Helms who chaired the Foreign Relations Committee, and four Congressmen, including Gary Ackerman who formerly chaired the House Asian Sub-committee, and some representatives of big companies, such as General Electric Corporation, Boeing and Lockheed Martin (Anonymous 1995b:27-28). The visit received prominent attention in the mass media, with approximately 300 reporters accompanying the President (Richburg 1995:4). *The New York Times* and *The Washington Times* reported on the visit extensively, and it was covered by various television networks. CNN provided live coverage of President Lee’s Lecture (Wang, Y. 1995:3). Although Lee Teng-hui did not meet with the US government formally (Fu, C.C. 1995c:2), more public attention was generated by the visit than most official visits by other leaders to the US.

7.2. The influence of President Lee’s speech

The highlight of President Lee Teng-hui’s trip to the US was his speech on 9 June 1995 at the Spencer T. and Ann W. Olin Lecture at Cornell University. The Clinton administration did not request to see the draft in advance, but expressed the hope that the speech during the private visit would not touch on political issues (Tsou, C.W. 2001:166-267). On 30 May 1995, in New York, the Director-General of Taiwan’s Government Information Office, Hu Chich-chang, stated that Lee’s visit to Cornell University was private in nature with no political intentions (Liang 1995:2).

The title of Lee Teng-hui's address at Cornell University was "Always is my heart" (Lee, T.H. 1995:4). Lee Teng-hui introduced the Taiwan experience: the ROC had experienced an economic miracle over forty years, and a political miracle over ten years and that the democratisation process in Taiwan was an important breakthrough in expressing the voice of 21 million people in Taiwan (Lee, T.H. 1996b:47). However, Lee Teng-hui also repeated "the Republic of China on Taiwan" many times. Many years later, in May 1999, Lee Teng-hui explained that: "(i)n my recommendations for political reform, I cited 'Republic of China on Taiwan' as the phrase that best represents the position we are establishing. Under that term, our jurisdiction covers Taiwan, the Pescadores, Quemoy (Kinmen), and Matsu, but not mainland China" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:52). He explained that "Taiwan's present status may well be defined as the Republic of China on Taiwan; it expresses our national identity and asserts our sovereignty and independence as a state" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:181), and that "it is more important for us to establish ourselves as the Republic of China on Taiwan" (Lee, T.H. 1999b:52). In reality, Lee Teng-hui's meaning was that, if Taiwan declared independence by changing its name to the "Republic of Taiwan", it would ignite Mainland China's intention to achieve Chinese unification by military action and trigger the failure of Taiwan's independence. Therefore, at the time, the best way was to retain the national name of "Republic of China," but to limit its jurisdiction to Taiwan and maintain real independent status. Former President of the Taiwanese government's Control Yuan, Wang Tso-yung, stated that Lee's ROC is Taiwan only, namely, an independent country (Wang, T.Y. 2001:90-100).

The Cross-Strait problem, and even the problem of the national name of the ROC, was so complex that only experts understood it comprehensively. Therefore, given the extensive coverage of the visit, some US officials in charge of Asian affairs read the text of Lee's address at Cornell University and were very angry (Tsou, C.W. 2001:267). Former Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord stated that "the single biggest problem with the visit was the speech itself at Cornell." Furthermore, he stated that "we told Taiwan in advance this should be a nonpolitical speech. They said it would be. They in fact said it would be reminiscences about Cornell days and about economic reform in Taiwan... But the speech itself clearly was political, and

clearly we were blindsided by it. We kept trying to get advance copies, and they didn't play straight with us...When the Chinese looked at that speech, they went bananas" (Lord 1996:327). Obviously, from the standpoint of the US, Lee Teng-hui camouflaged his real intention of visiting Cornell University and deceived the US.

During the 12-year rule of Lee Teng-hui, his public address at Cornell University was a turning point in the political Cross-Straits policy of Taiwan in that the policy moved from implicit to explicit secessionism. Before this trip, President Lee Teng-hui had publicly intimated that he preferred to unite the two sides of the Cross-Strait many times. In the address at Cornell University, however, he clearly expressed his concept of an independent Taiwan under the banner of the ROC. Mainland China studied the full text of the address, and concluded that Lee Teng-hui's real intention was secessionism (Lee, K.Y. 2000:568).

In response, Mainland China launched missiles near the coast of Taiwan in July 1995 and March 1996 (Wang, T.Y. 2001:100) which strongly expressed the intention of Mainland China to go to war if Taiwan claimed independence. Therefore, this led to a deterioration of relations between the two sides of the Cross-Strait.

8. THE SPECIAL STATE-TO-STATE RELATIONSHIP

In the final ten months of Lee Teng-hui's presidency, he proposed that the Cross-Strait should be a state-to-state relationship, or at least a special state-to-state relationship. That is to say, the eventual achievement was for Taiwan to declare its independence from Mainland China. This proposal shocked Taiwan, Mainland China, and the US. Subsequently, the strong external political pressure that was exerted on Taiwan resulted in the statement of the Cross-Strait relationship reverting from a special state-to-state relationship, back to the original "one-China, with respective Interpretations".

8.1. The design and announcement of the special state-to-state relationship

In mid-September 1998, Lee Teng-hui had a three day long discussion with Eguchi Katsuhiko, Executive-Vice President of PHP Institute, Inc in Taipei. The text of the dialogue was revised and published as a book *With the People Always in My Heart*

on 20 May 1999 (Liu, L.E. 1999:14). In this book, Lee Teng-hui stated that “before I finish my term as president, I intend to consult specialists in international law from many nations to determine a clearer definition of our sovereignty” (Lee, T.H. 1999b:182).

During 1998, the Director-General of the National Security Bureau, Yin Tsung-wen, suggested that Lee Teng-hui convene domestic experts to provide data which could prove that Taiwan was not a part of Mainland China in legal theory, and to then invite foreign scholars studying Taiwan’s sovereignty issue to review the data in terms of international law. Lee Teng-hui agreed to this suggestion. The Presidential Office summoned Dr. Tsai Ing-wen back to Taiwan from Malaysia. Tsai Ing-wen had a long discussion with Lee Teng-hui and accepted the mission, and in August 1998, the team “to fortify the ROC’s sovereignty status” was established. The mission of this team, organised by Tsai Ing-wen, was to study how to separate the ROC’s sovereignty from Mainland China’s one-China policy. In May 1999, a preliminary report was completed and presented by Tsai Ing-wen, endorsed by Director-General Yin Tsung-wen, and submitted to Lee Teng-hui for approval (Tsou, C.W. 2001:222-223).

Lee Teng-hui was satisfied with the findings of the report and immediately decided to carry out its recommendations by the end of his presidential term. The report argued that Taiwan had amended its Constitution many times since 1991, and the status of the Cross-Strait relationship should, therefore, at least be regarded as a special state-to-state relationship. The report suggested that the government should amend the Constitution, amend the law, and rescind the *Guidelines for National Unification* in order to reach the goal of secession of Taiwan from Mainland China. With regard to the amendment of the ROC’s Constitution, government had to revise the laws of the country. For example, Article Four of Chapter One of the Constitution of the ROC stated that “the territory of the Republic of China according to its existing national boundaries shall not be altered except by a resolution of the National Assembly” (GIO 2001:507). This had to be amended as follows: “the territory of the Republic of China is determined and enforced by its constitution”. Regarding the amendment of laws, terms such as “free area”, “Taiwan area”, “Chinese mainland area”, etc had to

be changed to “the Republic of China” and “the People’s Republic of China” in all laws, including the *National Security Law*, *Nationality Law* and *Copyright Law*. As for the official documents, terms such as “Communist China” and “two political entities” had to be changed to “the People’s Republic of China” and “two countries”. In the process of implementing this goal, it was not possible for the government to mention the *Guidelines for National Unification*, and they would have to rescind the *Guidelines for National Unification* by replacing it with the *Guidelines for Cross-Straits*, and would use the term “final resolution” in place of “unification” (Tsou, C.W. 2001:223-226).

President Lee Teng-hui stated on 1 October 1999, the 50th anniversary of the PRC, that Mainland China would declare that “Taiwan was a local government of China.” Subsequently, at the end of October, Wang Dao-han, the Chairman of ARATS, would visit Taiwan and discuss the concept of “one country, two systems” with Taiwan. Lee Teng-hui therefore decided to use the opportunity of an interview with the German media to announce that the Cross-Straits relationship was a state-to-state relationship (Lee & Chiu 2000:57), in order to avoid the political Cross-Straits relationship going in the direction of unification.

On 9 July 1999, President Lee Teng-hui was interviewed by the Director of the Asian department of the German Voice radio station, Deutsche Welle (Lee, T.H. 1999h:1). He stated that “the 1991 constitutional amendments have placed cross-strait relations as a state-to-state relationship or at least a special state-to-state relationship, rather than an internal relationship between a legitimate government and a renegade group, or between a central government and a local government” (Lee, T.H. 1999e:1-2). The state-to-state relationship clearly meant that Taiwan and Mainland China were two countries and, hence, was simplified and termed the so-called “two-state theory”. On 12 July 1999, at a press conference, MAC Chairman Su Chi stated that because Mainland China had used the one-China principle as a yoke around Taiwan’s neck, it was not necessary for Taiwan to accept its previous position of one-China. Taiwan would, therefore, adopt the term “special state-to-state relations” internationally (Su 1999:11-18). This was carried by the mass media as a major news item, and people thought that Taiwan would give up its policy of

one-China. It touched the most sensitive nerves in China and the US.

8.2 The reaction to the special state-to-state relationship

The two-state theory clearly indicated that the Cross-Straits relationship was a state-to-state relationship, namely, that Taiwan wanted to secede from Mainland China. This view of Lee Teng-hui's announcement was carried as a major item in the mass media the following day, and generated significant political debate and argument on unification versus secession (Tsou, C.W. 2001:230). Simultaneously, the two-state theory also triggered strong concern by Mainland China and the US. For the US, its relationship with Taiwan was friendly at the time when MAC Chairman Su Chi was visiting the US. As he was not informed of the "two-state theory" in advance of his visit, Su exchanged views on Cross-Strait affairs with US officials, but did not touch upon sensitive topics. For the Clinton administration, Taiwan was seen to have cheated the US intentionally, and the US did not forgive Taiwan for this (Shieh, C.L. 1997:24-25).

8.2.1. The reaction of the Taiwanese residents

The secessionists supported the two-state theory strongly, and the pro-independence chairman of DPP, Lin I-siung, stated that Lee Teng-hui had welcomed and accepted the DPP's independent line (RR 1999:292). Another prominent politician, the DPP's presidential candidate Chen Shui-bian (who would become the tenth President of the ROC in 2000), not only supported the two-state theory, but also hoped that the KMT-led government would amend the Constitution and revise the *Guidelines for National Unification* as soon as possible, and repeal the status of Taiwan and Mainland China being two countries (Tong & Wang 1999:40), in other words, he did not want unification.

While the two-state theory received strong support from secessionists and the DPP, the public reaction led to the stock exchange plunging 7.3 per cent over three consecutive days (Chu & Yang 1999:4). Taiwanese residents, who were in favour of Cross-Straits unification, objected strongly to the two-state theory. For example, famous scholars such as Lu Ya-li and Chang Ling-chen claimed that the two-state theory violated the ROC's Constitution. Over 100 scholars and professors signed a

statement opposing the two-state theory (Tong & Wang 1999:40). This statement pronounced that the two-state theory could not stand as the opinion of all twenty-one million people in the Taiwan area, and suggested to stop expanding the interpretation of the special state-to-state relationship immediately; to not make any amendment or revision of the Constitution, laws and the *Guidelines for National Unification*, and to maintain the position of one China (Anonymous 1999c:20).

Public opinion in Taiwan could not influence Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy. The reaction of Mainland China and the attitude of the US did, however, force Lee Teng-hui to revise his theory of the special state-to-state relationship. The reaction of Mainland China will be discussed in the next chapter.

8.2.2. The reaction of the US

Lee Teng-hui's two-state theory increased tensions between Taiwan and Mainland China sharply, and the Clinton administration was shocked and astonished (Tsou 2001:242). The US reacted immediately. The Clinton administration reiterated that the US adherence to the one-China policy had not changed. On 13 July 1999, State Department spokesman Jamie Rubin reiterated the "three no's" of the US policy: no support for Taiwan's independence; no support for Taiwan's participation in any international organization of sovereign states; and no support for "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan" (Anonymous 1999a:1). Subsequently, on 14 July, Darryl Johnson, the Director of the AIT in Taipei, bade farewell to President Lee Teng-hui and departed from Taiwan the same day (Ho 1999:2). The reason for Johnson's farewell was to reiterate US adherence to the one-China policy, and to ask Lee for clarification of his recent special state-to-state theory (USA/USIS 1999b:1).

On 18 July 1999, US President Bill Clinton had a telephone conversation with Mainland China's President Jiang Zemin. Clinton reiterated the US one-China policy and its support for a peaceful solution to increased tension between China and Taiwan (USA/USIS 1999a:1). Furthermore, he stated that "I want to assure you that policy will not change, you should have full confidence in the statements I have made to you in our previous meetings". Jiang Zemin indicated that they had talked about the Taiwan issue many times, and that the Taiwan issue was concerned with China's

sovereignty and territorial integrity. It was also related to the peaceful reunification and the national sentiment of all Chinese people, and that the basic policy for solving the Taiwan problem was still “peaceful reunification and one country, two systems”. However, Jiang pointed out that Mainland China had not promised to give up the use of force towards Taiwan, and that if Taiwan were to engage “Taiwan’s independence”, or foreign powers intervened, Mainland China would have to react (Anonymous 1999b:1).

Subsequently, on 21 July 1999, at a White House press conference, Clinton answered questions on the crisis of the Cross-Strait relationship. Clinton said that the US government had dispatched people to Taiwan and Mainland China to express the position of the US. Clinton said that “I think that the pillars of the policy are still the right ones. The one China policy is right; the cross-strait dialogue is right; the peaceful approach is right”. On Lee Teng-hui’s two-state theory, Clinton said that “I’m still not entirely sure, because I have read things which seem to resonate both ways on this, exactly what the Lee statements were entitled – trying to convey” (Clinton 1999:7). Clinton also did not use the American “China policy”, that is, did not distinguish between the American “China policy” and the Chinese “China policy”. Therefore, there was a lack of understanding of Lee’s statement, and it was obvious that the US officials were still suspicious of many of the explanations of Taiwan authorities regarding the two-state theory (Chang, C.C. 1999:3).

To settle the Cross-Strait crisis, the Clinton administration dispatched representatives to Mainland China and Taiwan. US Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth and US National Security Council senior adviser Kenneth Lieberthal, visited Beijing to reiterate the US adherence to the one-China policy, and to ask Mainland China for self-restraint (Chang, C.T. 1999:3). Simultaneously, the Clinton administration also dispatched an emissary, Richard Bush, the Chairman and Managing Director of the AIT, to Taiwan. On 22 July 1999, Bush arrived in Taipei. The following day, he met with Foreign Minister Hu Chich-chang, MAC Chairman Su Chi, National Defence Minister Tang Fei, Premier Siew Vincent C, and then senior officials (Shieh, H.Y. 1999:2). On the same day, President Lee Teng-hui, accompanied by Senior Presidential Advisor Ding Mou-shih, Secretary General of the National Security

Council Yin Tsung-wen, Su Chi, and Hu Chich-chang met Bush. During the meeting, Lee Teng-hui explained his statement on the special state-to-state relationship and solemnly reiterated that “I am firmly opposed to Taiwan’s independence”. Bush reiterated Clinton’s three pillars (one-China policy, Cross-Strait dialogue and peaceful approach) (Chang, N.Y. 1999a:1). After Bush had clearly and intensively conveyed the position of the US one-China policy, the Taiwanese authorities agreed to explain the special state-to-state relationship as the further interpretation of “one-China, with respective interpretations”. Bush responded that he could accept this explanation (Tsou, C.W. 2001:244). According to other high level sources, Taiwan’s authorities gave a guarantee to Bush that Taiwan would not amend the ROC Constitution, and would not revise the related laws (such as the *Guidelines for National Unification, Statute Governing the Relations between the People of the Taiwan Area and the Mainland Area*). This proved that Taiwan would not change the current Mainland China policy (Chang, C. 1999:1).

On 25 July 1999, Bush left Taiwan, and issued a departure statement at Taiwan CKS International Airport. “I came here not to mediate or exert pressure but to understand”. He explained that “steps that result in increased tensions, a freezing of dialogue, and regional instability and conflict are not good”. Furthermore, he clearly explained that “the ‘one-China’ principle is the cornerstone of U.S. policy. Six administrations – four Republican and two Democratic – have adhered to it over the past twenty-plus years”. Finally, he indicated that “how specifically to define the ‘one-China’ principle and how concretely to realize it are best left to the two sides of the Strait on a mutually acceptable basis” (USA/USIS 1999c:2).

8.2.3. The failure of the special state-to-state relationship

On 9 July 1999, President Lee Teng-hui announced his special state-to-state relationship theory. Subsequently, on 12 July 1999, Darryl Johnson, the Director of the AIT in Taipei, met Lee Teng-hui and conveyed the US position. He also asked Lee for clarification of his special state-to-state relationship theory. Lee Teng-hui attempted to play down his theory and responded that Taiwan had not changed its policy toward Mainland China, and the standpoint and attitude of the Cross-Strait exchange and dialogue remained unchanged (Meng *et al.* 1999:1).

On 25 July 1999, Richard Bush left Taiwan. The following day, Lee Teng-hui met the “Cross-Strait Peace and Security International Forum”, a Japanese group, and stated that when he had agreed to the interview with the German radio station, he did not mention a “two-state theory”. Rather it was people that had simplified his statement, and peaceful unification was a long-term goal of Taiwan’s struggle (Chang, H.Y. 1999b:1). Obviously, Lee Teng-hui manipulated the facts in order to distance himself from the special state-to-state relationship.

On 1 August 1999, the MAC Executive Yuan, in charge of policy towards Mainland China, announced “Parity, Peace, and Win-Win: The Republic of China’s Position on the Special State-to-State Relationship” and stated that Taiwan and Mainland China should return to the agreement on “one-China respectively interpreted by each side”. The MAC clearly explained that Taiwan’s policy toward Mainland China remained unchanged: “Since there was no policy change, there is certainly no need to revise the Constitution, the laws, or the *Guidelines for National Unification*” (MAC 1999:49). The KMT-led government therefore formally declared that the political Cross-Straits policy remained unchanged, and that government would not amend the current Constitution and *Guidelines for National Unification* which were in line with the one-China concept. In early September 1999, Taiwan’s authorities dispatched Senior Presidential Advisor Ding Mou-shih to the US to convey this to the Clinton administration, that is, that Taiwan would not change its policy toward Mainland China, and would, therefore, not amend the Constitution or revise the laws and *Guidelines for National Unification* (Tsou, C.W. 2001:250).

Accordingly, owing to strong pressure from the US, the Lee Teng-hui administration nullified the two-state theory. As the two-state theory would not be contained in the Constitution and related laws, and as Lee Teng-hui had reiterated that the government would remain in pursuit of unification in the future, the “two-state theory” remained an announcement that would not be implemented.

9. CONCLUSION

As discussed in the previous chapter, due to various factors, Lee Teng-hui had to

conceal his hatred toward Mainlanders for 40 years, in order to keep pace with the Mainlander élite's political ideology. In that way, Lee Teng-hui became the handpicked successor of Mainlander President Chiang Ching-kuo. After Lee consolidated his immense political power, he was then able to openly proclaim "sorrow at being born Taiwanese" without being afraid of the Mainlander's negative reaction. In Lee Teng-hui's career, he worked hard and respected his superiors, especially Chang Ching-kuo and Mainland ministers. The famous politician Lee Kuan-yew, assumed that Chiang had trusted Lee absolutely and that he would continue his route of political unification, and not be a secessionist. He therefore designated Lee Teng-hui as Vice-President in February 1984 (Lee 2000:564). The assumption of Lee Kuan-yew was correct. On 23 January 2003, at an oral history forum memorial for former President Chiang Ching-kuo, Chiang Fang, Chih-I (daughter in-law of Chiang Ching-kuo who possessed Chiang Ching-kuo's diary) recited a true story: In 1983, Chiang Ching-kuo read an article in which Lee Teng-hui criticized the Taiwanese secessionists and indicated that "China has never abandoned Taiwan, and Taiwan had also absolutely never forgotten China". Chiang Ching-kuo then designated Lee Teng-hui as the candidate for Vice-President in February 1984 (Liu, S.R. 2003:1). Lee Teng-hui had therefore camouflaged his true belief of national identity in order to keep favour with Chiang Ching-kuo, and become his legal successor. However, Lee Teng-hui was a real secessionist. On 9 November 2001, he admitted that he was "a man of secessionist action" for Taiwan's independence (Su 2001:4). On the other hand, this case also meant that Mainland and Taiwan élites lived together for 40 years, but that the Mainland élite still did not comprehend some of the Taiwan élite's ideology, nor could Lee Teng-hui hide his true political intention from the Mainland élite.

In Lee Teng-hui's early years, he firmly believed in Taiwan's secessionism. However, his true colours were not yet clear, or his political power strengthened, and as both Vice-President and subsequently President, he had expressed his future secessionist intention in metaphors. For example, at the end of 1987, Chiang Ching-kuo's health went from bad to worse, and Lee Teng-hui, as Vice-President, summoned the pro-secessionism Fu Wen-chang (a Taiwanese member of the Taiwan Provincial Assembly). During the discussion, Fu asked that, in case of

Chiang Ching-kuo's death, what would the national direction of Lee Teng-hui's rule be. Fu Wen-chang also asked metaphorically that if one day Lee Teng-hui became a general manager of a store, would he change the advertising board and would he improve the store's interior decoration? Lee Teng-hui also answered metaphorically that he would not change the advertising board, but would revamp the store's interior decoration step by step. In a metaphorical interpretation, Lee Teng-hui would not change the name of the Republic of China, but would amend the ROC Constitution (Fu 1992:93). In January 1988, Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency. In April 1990, he met the Taiwanese Association of America (TAA) where he stated that before the sun rose, there was always dawn, and the sun's circle of light would gradually radiate the light and heat that they had felt (Sun 1990:8). Most members of the TAA are professional Taiwanese Americans (TAA 2002:1) and, as a general rule, are pro-secessionists. When reviewing Lee's political Cross-Straits policy in the 12-year period (1988-2000), it was proved that the above-mentioned metaphorical meaning was absolutely correct: Lee Teng-hui adopted a secessionist political Cross-Straits policy under the ROC, and it was apparent that those who could feel the light and heat of the sun (namely benefitted from the political interests) might have been the Taiwanese separatists.

From the ADB event (1989), *Guidelines for National Unification* (1991), Koo-Wang Talk (1993), Chingdao Lake Incident (1994), unofficial dialogue with the Japanese author Shiba Ryotaro (1994), six-point proposals (1995), to Lee Teng-hui's speech at Cornell University (1995), the basis of the political Cross-Straits policy was always in favour of Taiwan seceding from Mainland China. Furthermore, Lee Teng-hui, as President, not only provided the concept of Taiwan's secessionism from the historical and legal view, where there was completely no relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China (Tang 2000:2), but also distorted the meaning of unification by simple political language, such as after unification, you would be a slave (Sun 1994:4). This was done in order to incite Taiwanese misunderstanding of, and disdain for, unification. As for the politicians who favoured unification, Lee Teng-hui stated that they wanted to sell out Taiwan. Finally, before the end of his presidency in 1999, Lee Teng-hui formally proposed the special state-to-state relationship theory. However, owing to pressure from the US and Mainland China, the special

state-to-state relationship theory failed.

Following Lee Teng-hui's presidency, the current ROC Constitution and related laws still remain in line with the one China concept, Taiwan authorities still claim that Taiwan's jurisdiction includes Taiwan, Penghu, Quemoy (Kinmen) and Matsu, given that Quemoy and Matsu belonged to the Fujian province of the ROC. Theoretically, therefore, in terms of the current ROC Constitution and self-claimed jurisdiction, Lee Teng-hui could still not sever the Cross-Strait relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China. However, the immediate and strong negative reaction of the US toward the two-state theory was fomented by extreme pressure from Mainland China. The next chapter will therefore study the reaction of Mainland China towards Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy.

CHAPTER SIX

THE REACTION OF MAINLAND CHINA

On 13 January 1988, Mainlander President Chiang Ching-kuo passed away, and Taiwanese Vice-President Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency immediately. Owing to his participation in the CCP, Lee Teng-hui had been under surveillance by the Mainlander-led secret police for around 20 years. He was, however, always able

to weather these political crises safely, and his political career eventually flourished. Obviously, Lee Teng-hui was politically astute, and was able to camouflage his true identity, especially with regard to the Cross-Straits aspect. At that time, all his Mainlander colleagues, friends and the President, Chiang Ching-kuo, did not suspect his real views. Therefore, Mainland Chinese authorities, on the other side of the Taiwan Strait, were unable to understand Lee Teng-hui's real political Cross-Straits policy. Not until May 1994, after the publication of the private dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and the Japanese anti-China novelist Shiba Ryotaro, did Mainland Chinese authorities begin to understand Lee's real political Cross-Straits policy. This chapter will focus on the reactions of Mainland China towards Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy.

1. THE REACTION OF MAINLAND CHINA TO THE CROSS-STRAITS ISSUE FROM THE 1950s TO THE 1970s

In May 1950, Mainland China had prepared to attack and occupy Taiwan (Anonymous 1994f:176). However, on 25 June 1950, the Korean War broke out, and the US sent the Seventh Fleet to patrol the Taiwan Strait, and the Thirteenth Air Fleet to Taiwan to prevent an attack from Mainland China (Shen *et al.* 1990:70), and to deter Mainland China from uniting Taiwan by force. This started the era of the long-term confrontation between both sides of the Straits. From the standpoint of Mainland China, in the period from 1950-1978, the Cross-Strait relationship could be categorized into three phases: the US forces' occupation of Taiwan, the battle for the Kinmen Islands, and the US forces' withdrawal from Taiwan.

1.1. US forces' occupation of Taiwan

In 1950, Mainland China attempted to cross the Taiwan Strait to wipe out the KMT-led Taiwanese authorities, therefore, it massed a great number of troops in the southeast directed toward Taiwan. On 25 October 1950, at North Korea's request, Mainland China sent troops to participate in the Korean War. Its military strategic direction changed from the southeastern coast of Mainland China to the Korea Peninsula. In July 1953, the Korean War ended and Mainland China returned its focus to its southeastern coast (Yang 1995:26).

From 27 June to 21 July 1954, Taiwan mobilized navy vessels on numerous occasions to attack Mainland China's commercial ships and fishing boats. Simultaneously, Taiwan and the US announced their intention to conclude a mutual defence treaty, and in response, Mainland China decided to launch a massive bombing campaign on Quemoy (Yeh 1988:634-645). In spite of Mainland China's objection and warning, on 2 December 1954, the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* was signed between Taiwan and the US. From the standpoint of Mainland China, this treaty further strengthened the separation of Taiwan and Mainland China. Subsequently, on 8 December 1954, Zhou Enlai, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mainland China, issued a strong statement, which alleged that the US publicly invaded Mainland China's territory – Taiwan and the Penghu Islands (the Pescadores), under the guise of protection, and that the US intended to use this treaty to legitimize its invasion of Taiwan (Chou 1954:98-99).

The I-Chiang San Islands, at the centre of the Tachen Islands, are only about 30 kilometers from the central coast of Mainland China (Deng, L.F. 1992:206). To counter the US treaty with Taiwan, on 18 January 1955, Mainland China attacked and occupied the I-Chiang San Islands. Taiwan was forced to give up the Tachen Islands and KMT soldiers and civilians were evacuated to Taiwan with the assistance of the US Seventh Fleet (Shen *et al.* 1990:129-134).

1.2. Quemoy artillery battle

In the 1950s, Mainland China's air force and navy were backward and had no ability to confront the US forces, including over the US navy's intervention in the Taiwan Strait. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) of Mainland China was unable to cross the Taiwan Strait. Conversely, with the aid and support of the US military, Taiwan sent groups of armed soldiers to raid the southeastern coast of Mainland China every year (Peng 1958a:117). Due to instability in the Middle East in mid-1958, US troops landed in Lebanon (Yeh 1988:651). At this opportunity, in order to retaliate for the armed raids from the Taiwanese authorities, on 23 August 1958, Mainland China launched a massive bomb attack against the Quemoy Islands (Peng 1958a:117-118). By 25 October 1958, Mainland China had launched approximately 620,000 bombs (Chu, P.I. 1994b:80-81).

During a battle on 23 August 1958, Mainland China shelled the Quemoy Islands with over 57,000 bombs in two hours, and caused considerable damage (Chu 1994b:74-85). After one month of bombardment and blockade, Quemoy was slowly suffocated. For Taiwan, the most important challenge was to supply food, medicine and munitions to soldiers and residents of the Quemoy Islands (Lee, Y.P. 1993:237-244). Many of Quemoy's military facilities and castles were destroyed. At that time, if the PLA launched a military landing action, it would easily be able to occupy the Quemoy Islands. The PLA soldiers believed that the next step was to land at Quemoy (Yeh 1998:666), however, on 6 October 1958, Mainland China's Minister of National Defense, Peng Dehuai, issued a *Statement to Taiwanese Compatriots*. This statement was drafted by Mao Zedong (Deng, L.F. 1992:236) and proclaimed that the PLA would stop bombarding Quemoy for seven days only so that Taiwan was able to convey the supplies sufficiently and freely, but it had to be on the condition that there was no US escort (Peng 1958a:117-118). On 26 October, Mainland China also announced that the PLA would shell Quemoy every 'odd' day, and stop firing at Quemoy every 'even' day to allow the KMT-led government to supply food and munitions to Quemoy (Peng 1958b:119).

Geographically, the Quemoy Islands are situated 2.3 kilometers from the southeastern coast of Mainland China at its narrowest, but 277 kilometers from Kaohsiung port in the southwest of Taiwan. The Matsu Islands are only 0.9 kilometers from the southeastern coast of Mainland China at its shortest distance, but 211 kilometers from Keelung Port at the tip of Taiwan (GIO 2001:17-18). Because the two islands were occupied by Taiwanese soldiers, Taiwan not only had to send troops to Quemoy and Matsu Islands in turn, but also had to ship food and munitions to the soldiers and residents periodically. The supply lines between Taiwan and Quemoy and, between Taiwan and Matsu, resembled two ropes linking Quemoy and Matsu to Taiwan.

At that time, Mainland China had the ability to occupy the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, and the PLA soldiers also believed that their next action was to attack and occupy Quemoy. However, Mao Zedong believed that the Quemoy and Matsu

Islands were two nooses around the necks both of the Taiwanese authorities, Chiang Kai-shek, and the US (Yeh 1988:678-680) (because the US had an alliance with Taiwan). From the perspective of Mainland China, Quemoy and Matsu were seen as two reins with which to grab and hold Taiwan. If Mainland China occupied the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, Taiwan would secede completely from Mainland China under the protection of the US. This would be equivalent to Taiwanese independence, and therefore, Mao Zedong did not occupy the Quemoy and Matsu Islands (up to the present, Taiwan's de facto administrative jurisdiction comprises Taiwan, Penghu, Quemoy and Matsu). In fact, Mainland China's military action only consisted of shelling Quemoy's seashore and not its military facilities and residential districts, while KMT-led Taiwanese troops counter-attacked the seashore of Mainland China. Both sides across the Strait thereby established an unwritten agreement that the bombardment by Mainland China and Taiwan of Quemoy was symbolic rather than a military action (Yeh 1988:674-675). Such bombardment, therefore, established a long-term civil war, but also prevented the possibility that Taiwan would separate from Mainland China.

1.3. US forces withdraw from Taiwan

On 16 July 1960, the Soviet Union terminated its agreements and contracts with Mainland China, and abruptly withdrew all its experts from Mainland China (So & Si 1992:570). The relationship between Mainland China and the Soviet Union was completely severed. In March 1969, Mainland China also had military skirmishes with the Soviet Union on the Zhenbao Island (known as Damansky Island in English) on the Chinese side of the Ussuri River and the northeastern border with the Soviet Union. This shocked the world (Tyler 1999:47-48).

In 1969, Richard Nixon was elected US President. Nixon believed that the Sino-Soviet relationship had split and that Mainland China was changing its diplomatic policy. The US could, therefore, end the Vietnam War (1954-1975) with Mainland China's help and counter-balance the Soviet Union. Therefore, Nixon promoted *rapprochement* between the US and Mainland China (Nixon 1992:164-166). From 21-28 February 1972, Nixon visited Mainland China and, on 27 February 1972, the US and Mainland China issued the *Joint US-China Communiqué*

in Shanghai (known as the *Shanghai Communiqué*). The US declared that “the United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China”. Furthermore, the US reaffirmed its intention to settle the Taiwan question peacefully and, “with this prospect in mind, it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan” (US/PRC 1972:4-5). To further improve relations between the US and Mainland China, the US also withdrew its nuclear weapons, F-4 Phantom fighters, and U2 planes which were deployed in Taiwan. According to the original schedule, the US would establish normal diplomatic relations in the spring of 1975, and Nixon would re-visit Mainland China to announce the formal establishment of diplomatic relations between the US and Mainland China. However, due to the Watergate scandal, Nixon resigned as President in 1974 (Fu, C.C. 2002:11).

On 20 May 1978, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Assistant for National Security Affairs of the US, visited Mainland China. He stated that the US would oppose the Soviet Union’s intention to achieve global or regional hegemony. He reiterated that the US resolution was the normalisation of diplomatic relations with Mainland China, and accepted the Chinese proposal of three principles to normalise relations. They were the severing of relations with Taiwan; the withdrawal of US forces from Taiwan; and the abolition of the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* with Taiwan (Lee, H.S. 1993:178-179).

On 15 December 1978, the US and Mainland China released a *Joint Communiqué* establishing diplomatic relations as of 1 January 1979. The US recognized Mainland China as “the sole legal Government of China” (US/PRC 1978:1) and ended diplomatic relations with Taiwan. The US terminated the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* with Taiwan, and withdrew remaining military personnel within four months (RR 1978:394).

From the perspective of Mainland China, from the 1950s to 1970s, the presence of US forces in Taiwan and the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* between Taiwan and the US amounted to Taiwan being under substantial military protection of the US.

In fact, the US had ‘invaded’, or at least partially ‘invaded’, Taiwan, in this view. However, Mainland China adopted drastic changes in policy, such as the severance of diplomatic ties between Mainland China and the Soviet Union, and seized the opportunity of cooperating with the US to counter-balance the Soviet Union. Through long-term negotiation, China caused the US to terminate the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* with Taiwan, and to withdraw its forces, including nuclear weapons, from Taiwan voluntarily. This outcome was a great success for Mainland China, because it is difficult for the US to withdraw its forces voluntarily from any foreign strategic post. Even until now (2003), the US still retains its forces in many foreign countries with various military cooperation treaties, some of which have operated since World War II, such as in South Korea and Japan in Far East Asia. However, since the gap of national power between Mainland China and the US is so large, Mainland China has not been able to attain another objective, namely the end of US arms sales to Taiwan. On the other hand, the termination of the treaty and the withdrawal of the US forces from Taiwan symbolised the end of the ‘invasion’ era of the US, thus Mainland China also changed its Cross-Straits policy from non-peaceful unification to peaceful unification.

2. DENG XIAOPING AND “ONE COUNTRY, TWO SYSTEMS”

On 1 January 1979, Mainland China issued the *Letter to Taiwanese Compatriots* in the name of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress (SCNPC). This stated that Mainland China had stopped firing on the Quemoy Islands and had implemented a peaceful unification policy towards Taiwan (SCNPC 1979:3). On 30 September 1981, the Chairman of the SCNPC, Ye Jianying, issued the *Nine-Point Proposal*, the main points of which were as follows: to suggest holding parity negotiations between the CCP and the KMT; implement the third cooperation between the CCP and KMT (see Chapter two); and complete the great achievement of motherland unification together. After the unification of the two sides, Taiwan could be a Special Administrative Region (SAR) and possess a high degree of autonomy. It could keep military forces, and the central government would not intervene in local Taiwanese affairs. Furthermore, the existing Taiwanese social and economic system would not be changed, the lifestyle would not be changed, the economic and cultural relations between Taiwan and foreign countries would not be changed. In addition,

Taiwanese authorities and representatives of each field could hold leadership positions in the whole national political institution, and participate in national management. On the other hand, if Taiwanese local finance were in a predicament, the central government would consider assisting (Ye 1981:490). On 4 December 1982, Mainland China provided for the creation of the SAR in its Constitution (RR 1982:506-507).

On 26 June 1983, Deng Xiaoping met Yang Li-yu, an American Chinese professor, and stated that China opposed the statement of Taiwanese ‘full autonomy’. Autonomy could not be unlimited, if there was a limit it could not be ‘full’, ‘full autonomy’ was two Chinas, and not one China. After unification between Taiwan and Mainland China, Taiwan can be a SAR; can possess the special privileges that other provinces and autonomous regions do not have; can implement a capitalist system which differs from Mainland China’s socialist system; and can remain judicially independent, namely, it can have the right of final adjudication. Taiwan can retain its troops, but cannot threaten Mainland China. Mainland China will not send central officers to govern Taiwanese residents, and Deng emphasised that not only would soldiers not go, but administrative personnel would also not go (Deng 1983:251-252). On 22 February 1984, Deng further clearly proposed the idea of one country with two systems, stating that after unification, Taiwan could still implement capitalism, but remained part of a unified China (Deng 1984a:588).

On 31 July 1984, Deng mentioned the problem of a transition period for Hong Kong’s jurisdiction. He indicated that the idea of “one China, two systems” was designed for Mainland China to solve the Taiwan and Hong Kong problems. In Hong Kong, Mainland China guaranteed that Hong Kong’s existing capitalist system and lifestyle would remain unchanged for 50 years from 1997 - when Hong Kong was returned to China (Deng 1984b:269). On 19 December 1984, Deng met British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher. He explained that the reason for the 50 years of unchanged lifestyle was owing to the real situation in Mainland China. At the time (1980), Mainland China had set the goal of increasing economic growth fourfold within 20 years. Even if Mainland China could have reached this goal by the end of the twentieth century, it would only translate into a moderate standard of living. If

Mainland China wished to close the gap with the developed nations' standard of living, it required 30 to 50 years. Therefore, Mainland China guaranteed 50 years of unchanged lifestyle for Hong Kong (Deng 1984d:302-303). On 16 April 1987, Deng further indicated that, should Mainland China's open policy (namely, free or semi-free economic policy that it referred to as "Chinese-style socialism") remain unchanged, by the end of the twentieth century, the per capita income of Mainland China would reach US\$800 to US\$1000. After 50 years (by 2050), the per capita income would reach US\$4,000. If Mainland China could fulfill this goal after 50 years, there would be no reason to change the open policy towards Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan. Deng indicated that he believed the future leader of Mainland China would also understand this approach (Deng 1987a:367-369).

With regard to Cross-Strait unification, Deng Xiaoping stated that this was a national problem and involved national sentiment. All Chinese desired unification, and secession was against the nation's will (Deng 1986:348). He further stated that the unification of China had been an all-Chinese aspiration and yearning for more than one hundred and fifty years. Since the Opium War, the unification of China had been a common desire of all Chinese, including Taiwanese. It was a whole nation's desire. Thus, if Taiwan did not unite with Mainland China, Taiwan's territorial integrity as part of China could not be guaranteed, and one day Taiwan might be occupied by foreign nations (Deng 1987a:372).

In the early 1980s, Mainland China faced a situation of semi-secession with Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan. Deng Xiaoping also understood that the solution to Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan lay in only two approaches: peaceful negotiation or forced settlement. He therefore proposed the method "one country, two systems". In 1984, Mainland China was negotiating with the British on Hong Kong. With regard to Taiwan, Mainland China insisted on using peaceful methods to solve the problem, but Deng Xiaoping also clearly indicated that China could not exclude using force. China and its next generation had to remember this point. This was a strategic consideration (Deng 1984c:288-291). On the other hand, as previously mentioned, the US sent its Seventh Fleet to patrol the Taiwan Strait, protecting Taiwan during the Korean War in 1950; mobilised its vessels and flights to evacuate 32,000 KMT

soldiers and civilians from the Tachen Islands to Taiwan in 1955; and still provided and sold the arms to Taiwan to prevent an attack from Mainland China, and to stop Mainland China from bringing about unification by force. Deng Xiaoping also understood that the US had always intervened in the Taiwan issue, and thus in the Chinese unification problem (Deng 1986:347). Furthermore, Deng explained that if the US implemented a stern policy in support of Taiwanese independence, Mainland China will react affirmatively, even if it meant confronting the US and the introduction of hostility into Sino-US relations. He clearly indicated that in the Taiwan problem, if it was necessary to retrograde the Sino-US relationship, China would face the reality (Deng 1981:223).

Deng Xiaoping was one of the greatest politicians in modern Chinese history. In the 1980s, due to his sagacious leadership, China embarked on an open and prosperous journey, and due to his strategically handpicked successor, China achieved enormous economic development over 20 consecutive years. In the early 1990s, according to the propaganda of the Western media, a free Hong Kong should not be returned to a demonized Mainland China. However, due to Deng's astute political judgment and measures, Hong Kong eventually was returned to Mainland China. The successful return of Hong Kong and Macao erased the Chinese humiliation of the Opium War, and also proved the feasibility of a "one county, two system" approach. Therefore, Deng obtained immense respect from the Chinese, and simultaneously, his unification ideology not only reflected the Chinese desire, but also serves as the guide for the present and next generation of Chinese leaders.

3. MAINLAND CHINA'S REACTION TO LEE'S INITIAL SECESSIONIST POLICY

Due to 40 years of separation between Mainland China and Taiwan, Mainland Chinese leaders did not understand Taiwanese society and the new Taiwanese leader Lee Teng-hui. President Lee implemented his initial secessionist political Cross-Straits policy under the banner of pursuing Chinese unification. For example, Lee's administration passed the *Guidelines for National Unification*, terminated the "Period of National Mobilisation for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion", and held the Wang-Koo Talks. Mainland China reacted to Lee's initial secessionist policy in a low key manner and exhibited peaceful tolerance.

3.1. Mainland China's reaction to Taiwan's *Guidelines for National Unification*

On 23 February 1991, the Taiwanese authorities passed the *Guidelines for National Unification*. In Mainland China, the mass media criticized the guidelines on the grounds that the Taiwanese authorities: (1) divided the unification process into short-term, medium-term, and long-term stages, using the chronological process to conceal the possibility of secession, because long-standing separation would trigger the ideology of independence in Taiwan; (2) identified the direct "Three Links" (trade links, postal links, air and shipping links) with Mainland China as medium-term goals, and intentionally set up pre-conditions which would never be allowed by Mainland China in the short-term. For example, both sides should respect each other in the international community (see Chapter five). This meant that Mainland China had to allow the international recognition of Taiwan, and it sought to create the co-existence in international organizations of both the PRC and ROC (It was tantamount to admitting Taiwan's independence); (3) it used the reasoning that "both sides of the Straits should work together and assist each other in taking part in international organizations and activities" to enforce the "one country, two governments" and "double recognition" (namely recognition by foreign nations and establishment of formal diplomatic relations with Mainland China and Taiwan respectively); and (4) it carried out "two Chinas" "one China one Taiwan" and "equal political entity" policies under the banner of "national unification" (ROC/Shih 1991:23-24).

On 18 March 1991, Mainland China's official newspaper, *Remin Ribao* (People's Daily News), also released an article, in the name of a "commentator", supporting the official standpoint of Mainland China. The article stated that, pursuant to international law, it is impossible for two equal governments which represent the same country to exist. Therefore, in Taiwan's *Guidelines for National Unification*, the purpose was to request that Mainland China recognize Taiwan as an independent political entity (Commentator 1991a:208-209).

In retrospect, when viewed against Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy, and Lee Teng-hui's recollection of his true political intention with the policy, the analysis of Mainland China's mass media and "commentator" in 1991 reflected the true purpose

of Taiwan's *Guidelines for National Unification*.

3.2. Mainland China's reaction to Taiwan's termination of the "Period of National Mobilisation for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion"

On 30 April 1991, Lee Teng-hui's administration proclaimed the termination of the "Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion", and simultaneously abolished the *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion*. Subsequently, on 11 May, under the name of "commentator", *Remin Ribao* published an article stating that the efforts of this termination by the Taiwanese authorities were to end the "civil war" between the CCP and KMT; to lessen the hostility between the two sides; and to promote the development of relations between the two sides. Mainland China expected that the Taiwanese authorities could implement the measures to develop Chinese unification. On the other hand, however, the "commentator" deemed it unrealistic that Taiwanese authorities still emphasized "not giving up the basic national policy of anti-Communism", and still regarded Mainland China as a "hostile political entity" (Commentator 1991b:210-211).

With regard to the termination of the "Period of National Mobilisation for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion", in 1991, Lee Teng-hui stated that it "demonstrates our sincere desire to improve relations with Mainland authorities" (Lee, T.H. 1991:218). Later, in June 1995, when Lee Teng-hui addressed the pro-Taiwanese community in Los Angeles in the US, he stated that after 40 years of the Cross-Strait relationship being characterised by military confrontation, Chinese could not kill Chinese. Therefore, he terminated the "Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion". His purpose was to express Taiwan's sincere desire to end the hostility of the Cross-Strait with real measures (Lee, T.H. 1997:146). Even up to 1998, Lee Teng-hui always reiterated his public and official view toward Mainland Chinese and Taiwanese. For example, on 22 July 1998, Lee Teng-hui made closing remarks to the 13th Plenary of the National Unification Council (NUC), where he still stated that "over the past ten years, the ROC government has followed a positive and pragmatic mainland policy in an effort to promote salutary cross-strait interaction and moved toward democratic reunification".

He ended the “Period of National Mobilization for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion” as early as May 1991, “thereby formally renouncing the use of force as a means of resolving the issue of reunification” (Lee, T.H. 1999g:116).

However, subsequently, on 19 August 1998, Lee Teng-hui granted an interview to a Japanese-Taiwanese Professor, Ito Kiyoshi, of Kyoling University, Japan (Lee, T.H. 1999f:152). Lee Teng-hui stated frankly that “(t)he Republic of China on Taiwan is a political entity that has been established for a very long time. There’s no doubt about that. It would be wrong for people to deem the current cross-strait situation as a prolonged civil war between the Nationalist Party (KMT) and the Communist Party (CCP). Basically, the Republic of China on Taiwan is a sovereign, independent country” (Lee, T.H. 1999d:163). In May 1999, Lee Teng-hui further indicated that “as far as Taiwan is concerned, civil war is a thing of the past. Taiwan faces mainland China in a relationship that transcends the ‘internal affairs of China’ thesis, placing two political entities on a de facto equal footing” (Lee, T.H. 1999b:183). In 2001, as an ordinary civilian, ex-president Lee Teng-hui stated that the purpose of the abolition of the *Temporary Provisions* was to end the civil war between Taiwan and Mainland China automatically and to allow the existence of two countries, namely, Mainland China as a new nation, and Taiwan as an existing nation (from Taiwan’s standpoint) (Lee & Kobayashi 2001:92-93).

The *Temporary Provisions* were instituted during civil war and were set up to pursue national unification through force during the civil war. As a matter of fact, Lee Teng-hui understood that the *Temporary Provisions* were created as a result of the civil war between the KMT and CCP (Lee, T.H. 1994:407). Because civil war by definition exists within one country, therefore, Lee Teng-hui also understood that the termination of the *Temporary Provisions* meant that civil war no longer existed, and also that Taiwan and Mainland China were two countries. However, in order to deceive Mainland China and the Taiwanese, Lee Teng-hui re-iterated that termination reflected Taiwan’s sincere intention to end the hostile confrontation between the two sides, and to depict Lee Teng-hui himself as a lover of peace. Owing to this positive depiction of Lee Teng-hui, it was difficult for Mainland China to react.

On the other hand, the positive depiction and image of the termination also caused the Taiwanese pro-secessionists to misunderstand the real meaning of the termination. Thus, when Lee Teng-hui's presidential term ended and he became a civilian, it was no longer necessary for him to disguise his secessionist beliefs behind the banner of Chinese unification. Lee Teng-hui frankly disclosed the real meaning of the abolition of the *Temporary Provisions* and the termination of the "Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion" to his supporters. Lee Teng-hui, in other words, terminated the civil war in order to end the perception that Taiwan and Mainland China formed one country, and to consolidate the notion that Taiwan and Mainland China were two different countries.

3.3. Mainland China's reaction to the Wang-Koo Talks

On 9 March 1991, the Taiwanese authorities' SEF was organised in Taipei. At that time, in order to prevent the image being created that the two sides negotiated with equal standing as two countries, Mainland China did not intend to set up a similar institute. However, on 16 December 1991, Mainland China established a counterpart organization – ARATS. In doing so, it took into consideration: (1) the need to establish an opportunity to negotiate with Taiwanese authorities; (2) the need to solve travel, fishing and smuggling disputes caused by the Cross-Straits exchanges and; (3) the need to prevent the inconsistency of the SEF, a non-governmental organization, having contact with Mainland China's government (Ou-yang 1997:209-212).

After the establishment of ARATS, Mainland China and Taiwan held talks through ARATS and the SEF. During discussions, Mainland China requested that the premise of the talks between the two sides be the one-China principle. However, Taiwan was unwilling to accept this. After discussions, in October 1992, the SEF recommended that a one-China principle could only be expressed orally. Subsequently, in November 1992, ARATS agreed to Taiwan's recommendation. According to unidentified sources, this agreement by Mainland China was decided by Deng Xiaoping (Meng 2001:19-20), and the barrier to negotiations between the two sides was removed. From 27-29 April 1993, ARATS and the SEF held the Wang-Koo Talks (Mainland China called it the Wang-Koo Talks, while Taiwan called it the Koo-Wang

Talks, pursuant to the surnames of the chairmen of ARATS and SEF respectively). In the Wang-Koo Talks, the SEF limited the discussions to non-political issues such as fishing disputes. The ARATS Chairman, Wang Daohan, suggested that both sides also discuss political issues, for example the “Three Links” concept (trade links, postal links, air and shipping links), but Taiwan’s SEF rejected this suggestion (SEF 2001:36).

Thus, in order to negotiate with Taiwan’s SEF, Mainland China established ARATS and made major concessions to Taiwan on the one-China principle by accepting the expression of one-China orally, and by agreeing to discuss only non-political issues. Mainland China did not know that Lee Teng-hui had limited the issues for discussion to technical and functional areas, and that he had not given the SEF the mandate to discuss political issues with ARATS. At the time, Mainland China still did not fully understand Lee Teng-hui’s secessionist intentions.

4. MAINLAND CHINA’S REACTION TO LEE’S GUIDELINES FOR A SECESSIONIST POLICY

While there was no progress on political issues in the Wang-Koo Talks (from 27-29 April 1993), ARATS and the SEF signed four agreements on functional issues. Through the mass media, the Cross-Strait relationship seemed to be friendly. However, on 31 March 1994, the Chingdao-Lake incident took place in Mainland China and President Lee Teng-hui slammed and humiliated Mainland China (see Chapter five). Mainland China tolerated this. Almost at the same time, on 30 March 1994, Lee Teng-hui met the famous anti-China Japanese novelist Shiba Ryotaro for a candid dialogue and, on 13 May 1994, the full text of the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro was released. In this dialogue, Lee Teng-hui expressed his strong secessionist ideology. He did not only say that the word ‘China’ was also vague in order to negate the basis of Cross-Straits unification indirectly, but also said that it was a strange dream for Mainland China to want to unite with Taiwan, and exodus was a means to an end. This encapsulated Lee Teng-hui’s secessionist goal to lead the Taiwanese to establish a new nation separate from Mainland China (see Chapter five). These secessionist statements infuriated Mainland China.

4.1. Mainland China's reaction to the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro

One month later, on 13 June 1994, Mainland China's *Remin Ribao* published an article "Is China also vague?" which argued that "China was one of the oldest civilisations in the world that had existed for many thousands of years." Hence, the concept of "China" was not unclear. The article further made the point that the purpose of Lee Teng-hui's statements was to justify Taiwanese secessionists, and to provide an excuse for foreign countries to divide China (Han & Yao 1994:30). The following day, on 14 June, Mainland China's *Xinhua News Agency* (China News Agency) published an article "to comment on Lee Teng-hui's statements that had disintegrated the motherland". It criticized Lee's secessionist notions, especially his statements that "one China is the future goal, now it does not exist", and the Two Chinas Theory implied by the use of the phrase "the Republic of China on Taiwan" (XNA 1994:28). On 16 June, Taiwanese expert Lee Chia-chuan wrote an article "Where is Chinese sentiment?" which stated that it was difficult to discern Lee Teng-hui's sentiments regarding China from his dialogue with Shiba (Lee, C.C. 1994:32). On 18 June of that year, Deputy General Editor of *Xinhua News Agency*, Chu Cheng-hsiu, published an article "to comment on Lee Teng-hui's speech in some fields" alleging that Lee Teng-hui often instigated ethnic friction between Taiwanese and Mainlanders in Taiwan, and that he intended to create two Chinas by using the term "Republic of China on Taiwan" (Chu, C.H. 1994:31-32). The term "ROC on Taiwan" defined the ROC's geographical jurisdiction which covered Taiwan, the Penghu (Pescadores), Quemoy and Matsu Islands, but not Mainland China. Thus, the "ROC on Taiwan" seceded from Mainland China (see Chapter five). On 9 June 1995, in Lee Teng-hui's speech at Cornell University in the US, he repeated the term "ROC on Taiwan" many times. However, according to the reaction of Chu Cheng-hsiu and the *Xinhua News Agency* article, Mainland China had already noted the use of the term "ROC on Taiwan" as a sign of Taiwan's secessionist goals one year earlier.

The official mass media of Mainland China always used the title of "Mister" for the Taiwanese leader in respect. However, following the release of the dialogue, Mainland China not only criticised Lee Teng-hui by name, but also no longer used

the title of “Mister” (Wang, S.P. 1994b:1) rather using the term “Taiwan’s number one ruler” (XNA 1994:28), or “Taiwanese authorities’ number one figure” (Chu, C.H. 1994:31).

4.2. Jiang Zemin’s eight-point proposal

Despite Lee Teng-hui humiliation of Mainland China over the Chingdao-Lake Incident, and his expressed secessionist views during the dialogue with Shiba Ryotaro, the leaders of Mainland China still reacted in good faith towards Taiwan. On 30 January 1995, Mainland China President Jiang Zemin, took the opportunity to congratulate the Taiwanese compatriots on Spring Festival (Chinese traditional new year), and re-iterated that Taiwan could retain a military force after unification. In addition, an eight-point proposal for concrete principles and approaches to Cross-Straits unification was prepared by Jiang Zemin. The eight points are:

1. Persist in the principle of one China as the basis and premise of peaceful reunification.
2. Taiwan can develop non-governmental economic and cultural relations with other nations as long as it does not engage in “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan.”
3. Peking intends to hold negotiations between the two sides of the Cross-Straits for peaceful unification.
4. Endeavour to implement peaceful unification and that the Chinese should not fight with each other.
5. Develop economic exchanges and cooperation between the two sides of the Cross-Strait for the common prosperity of both sides.
6. The two sides of the Cross-Strait have to inherit and develop the glorious Chinese culture.
7. Beijing respects the lifestyle of the Taiwanese and their desire to be masters of Taiwan and to protect their legitimate rights and interests.
8. Welcome the leader of Taiwan on a visit to Mainland China at the appropriate level (Jiang 1995:234-236).

From the standpoint of Mainland China, Jiang’s eight-point proposal admitted Taiwan’s historical legacies indirectly, and consented that Taiwan should possess a high level of autonomy, and retain a military force after unification. Therefore, objectively, if Taiwan were to accept unification with Mainland China, Jiang’s

eight-point proposal was feasible.

The dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro amounted to an unofficial explanation of secessionist policy with Lee Teng-hui skillfully conveying his secessionist policy to his pro-secessionists supporters. Furthermore, a view of Lee's candidly secessionist statements since 1998, showed that Mainland China's criticism in 1994 was well-founded. Therefore, on 8 April of 1995, in reaction to Jiang's proposal, Lee Teng-hui offered a six-point proposal which had no intention of unifying the two sides (see Chapter five). Subsequently, on 9 June 1995, when Lee Teng-hui delivered his speech at Cornell University in the US, he emphasized the "ROC on Taiwan" as a sovereign independent country.

5. MAINLAND CHINA'S REACTION TO LEE'S VISIT TO CORNELL UNIVERSITY

In early 1995, Lee Teng-hui made every endeavour to visit the US. However, every US president since Nixon had declined such visits, because they understood that if they gave Taiwan's leader an opportunity to make political speeches in the US, it would destroy the one-China pledge which the US had given to Mainland China (Tyler 1999:24).

On approximately 20 May 1995, Lee Teng-hui was informed that he could visit (Lee, T.H. 1996b:56), and on 23 May, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mainland China issued a strong official statement opposing the visit (MOFA/PRC 1995:389-392). During this time (27-28 May), the preparatory discussions for the second Wang-Koo Talks were held in Taipei, and the ARATS Standing Vice-Chairman, Tang Shubei, visited Taiwan (Ou-yang 1997:133). Tang was asked about Lee's visit to the US, and he answered that he knew of the visit, but said no more. According to the opinion of the former president of the Taiwanese government's Control Yuan, Wang Tso-yung, apart from its initial statement, Mainland China said nothing more against the visit in public. Rather, Mainland China had reluctantly agreed (or accepted), as Wang Tso-yung reasonably judged, because it had reached agreement with the US government on many restrictions for the visit. The US notified Lee Teng-hui of these in advance. He accepted the conditions, and the US allowed the visit and emphasized its "private" and "unofficial" nature. However, on 9 June 1995, the main

theme of Lee's address at Cornell University was that the Republic of China on Taiwan was a sovereign independent country (Wang, T.Y. 2001:99).

At that time, the senior leaders of Mainland China watched the whole video recording of Lee's address at Cornell University, and noted that he did not mention one China as such, and only emphasized the words "the Republic of China on Taiwan" (Lee, K.Y. 2000:568) to stress the ROC as an independent country. From the viewpoint of Mainland China, the main topic of the address was equivalent to declaring Taiwan's independence to the international community (Wang, T.Y. 2001:100). Mainland China reacted strongly, and retaliated diplomatically against the US. For example, Mainland China suspended Defence Minister Chi Haotian's visit to the US; postponed the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Head John Holum's visit to Beijing; and delayed scheduled talks concerning the Sino-US nuclear energy and the control of missile technology. Furthermore, on 17 June 1995, Mainland China recalled its ambassador from the US, and intentionally prolonged the process of agreeing to President Clinton's appointment of Ambassador James Sasser as the US ambassador to Mainland China. As a result, there were no ambassadors from each country stationed in the other for the first time since the establishment of formal diplomatic relations in 1979 (Mann 1998:328), and Sino-US relations deteriorated sharply.

5.1. Criticism of Lee Teng-hui's address at Cornell University

Immediately following Lee's address at Cornell University, Mainland China reacted. On 16 June 1995, the spokesman of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council of Mainland China announced that the planned second Wang-Koo Talks between the two sides could not be held (TAO/PRC 1995:393). Effectively, Mainland China suspended negotiations between the two sides temporarily. Subsequently, every day from 23-26 July 1995, Mainland China released articles in *Remin Ribao* and *Xinhua News Agency* criticising Lee Teng-hui's address at Cornell University (as previously stated in Chapter five) under the name of "commentator". The titles of the four critical articles were: "a frank statement which encourages secessionism"; "there is no space for Taiwan's independence to exist in the international community"; "the political drug for promoting Taiwan's independence", and "Lee Teng-hui is a criminal

who has undermined relations between the two sides” (Anonymous 1995a:15).

The first article stated that Lee’s address at Cornell University was a frank encouragement of secession. In recent years, Lee Teng-hui had indicated secessionist tendencies, but his true views regarding secession had been expressed clearly in public for the first time. Also, in Lee Teng-hui’s address, there was no mention of one China, but he mentioned the “ROC on Taiwan” many times. That is to say, it created the impression of “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan.” In private, Lee Teng-hui told secessionists that the unification concept was only talk, but in reality what he believed from the bottom of his heart was the same as them. The article indicated that Lee Teng-hui had participated in the CCP during his early years, but betrayed them and then followed Chiang Ching-kuo, who did not support secession, for many years. Now he had betrayed him. Finally, the article stated that the Chinese people absolutely did not concede that any form of secession could be accepted (Commentator 1995a:307-310).

The second article stated that Lee’s address at Cornell University emphasized the development of Taiwan’s “international space to exist”. Because Taiwan did not gain diplomatic recognition from the international community, it had to break the “normal operation of traditional international law and the international community.” However, Lee Teng-hui stated that Taiwan maintained close economic, trade and cultural relations with many countries, and that this proved that Taiwan had “international space to exist”. He pointed out that Mainland China had not opposed Taiwan’s unofficial economic and cultural relations with foreign countries. However, the “international space to exist” that Lee Teng-hui requested was to “stress the existence of the Republic of China on Taiwan”, in order to obtain international recognition of Taiwan’s independence. This article indicated that it was impossible to achieve Lee Teng-hui’s international space to exist because it involved secession from Mainland China and Taiwan’s independence (Commentator 1995b:311-313).

The third article claimed that Lee’s address at Cornell University was a political drug for promoting Taiwan’s independence. Lee Teng-hui sold democracy in the US. In fact, however, he had gradually established a dictatorial system. For example, he

mobilised the secret police, used secessionists and instigated ethnic conflict to force some KMT members into self-imposed exile. He then established his dictatorship system. Lee Teng-hui even compelled the KMT's members not to vote secretly and had them rise to their feet in front of him at a meeting to vote for him as the presidential candidate of the KMT. On the other hand, in the name of democracy, Lee Teng-hui not only legalised the secessionist movement, but also assisted in strengthening the secessionists and implemented various policies to this end. The original goal of the KMT was to unite with Mainland China. However, under the direction of Lee Teng-hui, the goal of the KMT became the same as that of the DPP, which claimed Taiwanese independence. The difference between the KMT and DPP was the name of an independent Taiwan. The DPP called it "Republic of Taiwan" and the KMT called it the "ROC on Taiwan" (Commentator 1995c:315-317).

The fourth article stated that Lee Teng-hui was a criminal who undermined relations between the two sides. In recent years, Lee Teng-hui's behaviour has been contrary to the one-China principle. Lee Teng-hui had proposed "one country, two governments"; "one country, two districts"; "two equal political entities". He said that Taiwan was a sovereign independent country, and that the word 'China' was also vague; and that Taiwan's being one of the provinces of China was a strange dream. He added that for example one side of the Strait was water, one was oil, water and oil could not be mixed, and the Taiwanese had to make every effort to forget the word of one China, two Chinas (namely, to forget the debates around one China, or two Chinas). Lee Teng-hui proposed various strategies to bring about secession from Mainland China. For example, he requested the central government (Mainland China) to admit that the different sides of the Strait were separate and subject to separate rule; Taiwan and Mainland China are two equal political entities; to request Mainland China to renounce the use of force to achieve unification; and allowing Taiwan to have international relations (Commentator 1995d:319-320).

The full text of the four articles reflected the standpoint of Mainland China concerning Lee Teng-hui's address at Cornell University and his secessionist political Cross-Straits policy. Reviewing Lee Teng-hui's frank recollection around 2000 concerning his real intention in a secessionist political Cross-Straits policy and the

real meaning of his use of the term “ROC on Taiwan”, in general, the criticisms expressed in the four articles were correct.

According to custom, the Mainland China government made public important national policy directions for all Chinese, usually in the name of “commentator”, in *Remin Ribao* and *Xinhua News Agency*. For example, when Mainland China participated in the Korean War (1950-1953); launched the Sino-India War (1962); and the Sino-Vietnam War (1979), it issued advance warning in this way (Wang, S.P. 1995:1). Therefore, the four articles gave notice to the people that Mainland China could face war. When Mainland China released the four critical articles, relations between Mainland China and Taiwan deteriorated seriously.

5.2. Mainland China’s missile exercise in 1995

On 18 July 1995, *Xinhua News Agency* announced that surface-to-surface guided missile launching exercises would take place from 21-28 July between 26°22’ N latitude and 122°10’ E longitude, within a 10-nautical mile radius. This area is about 155 kilometers north and slightly east of Taipei city (MNIC/TR 1995:1).

The military exercise that Mainland China held was the closest to Taiwan’s territory in 40 years (Anonymous 1995d:22), and Taiwan and the US reacted immediately. That night (on 18 July 1995), after an urgent study, the MAC of Taiwan issued a serious protest to Mainland China and stated that this exercise would damage Taiwanese sentiment, and would not serve the common interests of the two sides (Ho 1995:1). Also on the same day (18 July), Nicholas Burns, Spokesman of the US Department of State, stated that “certainly we’ll want to talk to the Chinese Government about these actions” (USA 1995a:8). On 19 July, Burns further stated that “we’ve certainly noted the recent announcement by the Chinese People’s Liberation Army, the PLA, of surface-to-surface missile exercises approximately 150 kilometers north of Taiwan in the east China Sea. And we intend to discuss with the Chinese Government the purpose of these tests and length and duration of these tests and are seeking more information about the Chinese Government on them” (USA 1995b:12). On 20 July, President Lee Teng-hui said Taiwanese people could not become soft because of Mainland China’s one or two exercises. He emphasized that all Taiwanese should

stand firm, because Mainland China had always been a bully (Liu, T.T. 1995:2). However, in reality, the news of Mainland China's military exercises on 18 July led to the Taiwanese Stock Index plunging from 5276.72 to 5047.72 (Huang, K.H. 1995:3). It was a 4.3 per cent drop in one day.

On 26 July 1995, *Xinhua News Agency* announced that the PLA fired six guided missiles into the area accurately, and that the guided missile launching exercises had ended two days earlier than scheduled (XNA/Beijing 1995a:1). However, Mainland China also announced that from 15-25 August in the trapezoidal area within 27°16' N latitude and 121°26' E longitude, 27°16' N latitude and 122°30' E longitude, 26°30' N latitude and 122°05' E longitude, and 16°30' N latitude and 122°00' E longitude, guided missile and artillery firing exercises would be held (XNA/Beijing 1995b:1).

The significance of the surface-to-surface guided missile launching exercises by Mainland China was more political than military in nature. The main purpose of these exercises was to show that Mainland China would not tolerate either Taiwan's moves towards independence, or the US policy of progressive support for Taiwan's independence. For the first time, Mainland China publicly revealed its position – it was prepared to use force to unite China immediately (Wang, H.C. 1995:21). At that time (August 1995), Lee Kuan-yew, Singapore's former prime minister, visited Beijing, and senior Chinese officials told him that Taiwan would not be permitted to use the US as a tool to seek secessionism. If Taiwan persisted, they would not "rule out the use of force" (AFP 1995:6). The other purpose was to strike at Lee Teng-hui, so that he would not win the next presidential election easily (Anonymous 1995d:23-24). With regard to military consequences, the most important outcome for Mainland China to understand was the reaction of the US. If Mainland China united with Taiwan through force, would the US intervene militarily? (Kuan & Wang 1999:36-37) On the other hand, these missile tests highlighted Taiwan's vulnerability in that it lacked an anti-missile and missile strike ability to use against Mainland China (Fisher 1997:175).

5.3. Mainland China's missile exercise in 1996

On 23 March 1996, the ROC's first direct presidential election was to be held, and on

5 March, the *Xinhua News Agency* announced that the PLA would conduct surface-to-surface guided missile launch exercises from 8-15 March in two square water areas. One was located between 25°13' and 24°57' N latitude and between 122°20' and 122°40' E longitude. The other was located between 22°37' and 22°22' N latitude and between 119°25' and 119°45' E longitude. The former area is only 35.2 kilometers from the northeast coast of Taiwan; and the latter 51.9 kilometers from the Kaoshiung port in the southwest of Taiwan (Anonymous 1996a:1). The target areas of these tests were closer than the previous tests of July 1995. From 12-20 March, Mainland China would also conduct a second round of “live-fire naval and air exercises” along the Fujian province coast at the southern end of the Taiwan Straits at 23°57' N latitude, 118°06' E longitude, 23°25' N latitude, 118°50' E longitude, 22°30' N latitude, 117°30' E longitude, 23°01' N latitude, and 116°46' E longitude (Anonymous 1996b:1). Subsequently, from 18 to 25 March, Mainland China then held a third round of military exercises – “joint ground, naval and air exercises” also along the Fujian province coast, but at the northern end of the Taiwan Straits at 25°50' N latitude, 119°50' E longitude, 25°32' N latitude, 120°24' E longitude, 24°50' N latitude, 119°56' E longitude, 25°12' N latitude, and 119°26' E longitude. This area was close to the Taiwan-controlled offshore Matsu Islands (only 18.5 kilometers away) - it was the closest distance to Taiwanese troops (Wu 1996:1).

5.3.1 Mainland China's missile launches

The series of military exercises by Mainland China were more sensitive than the previous year, especially, in that the target areas of the missile tests were so close to Taiwan. On the same day that Mainland China announced the missile launching exercises, Lien Chan, premier of Taiwan, issued a statement protesting to Mainland China, but also declaring that presidential and vice-presidential elections would be held as scheduled (Chen, S.C. 1996:1).

On the morning of 8 March 1996, Mainland China fired three M-9 ballistic test missiles. Two missiles went into the waters near the west of the Kaoshiung Port, and one missile went into the water near the east of the Keelung Port (Lu 1996:1). On the same morning (8 March 1996), Mainland China's President, Jiang Zemin, stated that Taiwan was an undivided part of China, the future task was still to continue insisting

on the guidelines of peaceful unification, one country two systems; insisting on the principle one-China; and absolutely not to allow Lee Teng-hui and any other groups to engage in changing the position that Taiwan was a part of China through any measures. This was the first time that Jiang Zemin criticised Lee Teng-hui publicly (Wang & Shen 1996:1), and it was aimed, together with the missile tests, at Lee Teng-hui's secessionist behaviour.

5.3.2. US sends aircraft carrier battle groups to Taiwanese waters

At 11a.m. (Washington Time), on 7 March 1996, (Beijing 00a.m. on 8 March 1996), Mainland China fired ballistic test missiles into the waters close to Taiwan (Tyler 1999:26). On that day, Liu Hauqui, Director of the Foreign Affairs Office of the State Council of Mainland China, arrived in Washington. That night, he attended a dinner at the State Department's Madison Room. At the dinner, Secretary of Defence, William J. Perry; Secretary of State, Warren Christopher; and National Security Adviser, Anthony Lake, informed Liu that Mainland China had to halt the missiles exercises at once (Tyler 1999:30-32). Perry warned that if the missiles hit Taiwan, there would be "grave consequences" (The term 'grave consequences' in international understanding means a 'military response') (Gellman 1998a:A01). Perry informed Liu that if Mainland China insisted on launching missiles, the US had to respond to protect its interests, and Liu was told to deliver this message to Beijing immediately on the same night. Liu still criticised the US policy towards Mainland China, and the following morning, US intelligence confirmed that Liu had sent a message to Beijing. According to US satellite data, however, Mainland China continued preparation for additional missile launches, and Perry was angry that Mainland China had ignored his warning (Tyler 1999:32-33).

On 9 March 1996, at the Pentagon, in response to Mainland China's missile tests, Christopher, Perry, Assistant Secretary of State, Winston Lord, and General John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, discussed a proposed military response (Tyler 1999:35). Subsequently, President Clinton approved an operation to send two aircraft carrier battle groups close to Taiwan (Mufson 1996b:13).

On 10 March 1996, Christopher stated that a battle group, including the aircraft

carrier, the *USS Independence*, would move closer to Taiwan and was scheduled to stay there until 20 March (23 March was Taiwan's presidential election day). Christopher stated on NBC-TV that "we are concerned to make sure that those forces, that carrier battle group, are in a position to be helpful if they need to be". He further indicated that "we've made it clear to the Chinese that if they try to resolve this policy through force rather than through peace, that will be a grave matter with us" (Anonymous 1996c:1). On the other hand, National Security Advisor, Anthony Lake, also gave another warning. He stated on ABC-TV that "if they get out of hand", and "if there are accidents", Mainland China "will be held accountable" (Knowlton 1996:1). Separately, US Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright said on CNN's "Late Edition" that the US had "warned very specifically" Chinese officials that Mainland China should avoid military action against the US (Anonymous 1996c:1). US officials, therefore, repeatedly and publicly delivered their warning to Mainland China through the mass media.

On 11 March 1996, Clinton ordered the carrier *Nimitz* to go to the Taiwan Strait from the Persian Gulf. US officials stated that the Pentagon would announce that the *Nimitz* would move to the waters near Taiwan before 23 March, the day of Taiwan's presidential election (Fu, C.C. 1996:1). On 12 March 1996, the *Yomiuri Shinbun* (Yomiuri Newspaper, a Japanese newspaper) said that the US had formally informed Taiwanese authorities that, after the *Nimitz* battle group's arrival in the waters of the Kaoshiung Port, it would pass through the Taiwan Strait, that it would arrive at the area near Taiwan on 19 March, would station in the Taiwan Strait before 23 March and leave on 24 March as scheduled (Chen & Liu 1996:1). In response to the increased military deployment of the US in the waters near Taiwan, on the morning of 13 March, Mainland China fired a fourth test missile (Anonymous 2002b:1). Subsequently, on 15 March, Mainland China announced that the missile exercise had ended (Wu 1996:1). At that time, Mike Doubleday, the US Defence Department spokesman, told reporters that "in public and private conversations, the United States has been assured that the Chinese do not intend to take any military action against Taiwan" (Anonymous 1996d:1).

5.3.3. Mainland China mobilises nuclear submarines

On 14 March 1996, the spokesman of the US Pacific Fleet declared that the US had sent three attack-type nuclear submarines to the aircraft carriers near Taiwanese waters. From an analysis of military satellite pictures, the US discovered that all Chinese nuclear submarines that had been harboured in the Chingdao Port, a famous port not far from Beijing, had disappeared on 13 March. The US studied and estimated that the Chinese nuclear submarines were moving near to Taiwanese waters, and were prepared to attack the US carrier battle groups. On 20 March 1996, the US naval liaison officer in Hong Kong stated that the tension around Taiwanese waters had eased, and that the *USS Independence* battle group had, therefore, received the instruction to decrease its sail speed. The *USS Independence* battle group was thus strolling at a distance of 200 miles (320 kilometers) east of Taiwan. The *USS Nimitz* battle group was strolling at a distance of 200 miles south of Taiwan. On 25 March 1996, the spokesman of the US Defence Department stated that the two aircraft carrier battle groups would leave the area (Anonymous 2002b:1).

From July 1995, Mainland China undertook military exercises, and published articles criticizing Lee Teng-hui's secessionist political Cross-Straits policy, which caused tension between the two sides. However, this did not make Lee Teng-hui change his secessionist policy. Eventually, in March 1996, Mainland China reacted more strongly through military exercises before Taiwan's presidential election. Its meaning was obvious (I 1996:33), namely, that Mainland China intended to dissuade the Taiwanese from voting for President Lee Teng-hui (Mufson 1996a:1). However, Lee Teng-hui distorted the criticism by Mainland China of his secessionist policy into a threat, namely that Mainland China was trying to intimidate the Taiwanese people (I 1996:33). He used Mainland China's intention to influence Taiwan's presidential election to instill the belief that Mainland China was afraid of Taiwan's democracy. Lee Teng-hui stated that Mainland China saw freedom and democracy and were scared to death. He further stated that Mainland China wanted to scare the Taiwanese and threaten them, but they should know where their strength lies (Anonymous 1996e:4). As a result of the distortion, instigation and propaganda by Lee Teng-hui, the Taiwanese strongly believed that they were threatened by Mainland China forces, and this ignited an anti-China consciousness (I 1996:33). Lee Teng-hui also mobilised ethnic consciousness (namely Taiwanese

consciousness). Thus, Lee Teng-hui won the presidential election, gaining 54 per cent of the vote (GIO 2001:497). This outcome reflected that Mainland China did not fully understand the enormous influence of Lee Teng-hui's distortion and propaganda, and it was unable to deliver its own political message to the Taiwanese effectively as it did not have any mass media, such as TV or radio stations, in Taiwan.

Mainland China is a nation with nuclear weapons. Although its national power is far less than that of the US, it is not the same as the China of old. In retrospect, when the Korean War broke out in June 1950, the US sent the Seventh Fleet to patrol the Taiwan Strait, and Mainland China did not react. This time, the US declared clearly that they would send aircraft carriers to the waters near Taiwan, and pass through the Taiwan Strait. No matter what the reasons, the *USS Independence* and *Nimitz* remained a distance of 200 miles from Taiwan. However, the US Fleet was patrolling the Taiwan Strait in 1950. On the other hand, Chinese leaders also understood that Mainland China lacked sufficient power to confront the US directly, and that premature force to achieve unification would cause US military intervention, ignite a military conflict with the US, and result in humiliation (Brzezinski 1997:171). Mainland China, therefore, deferred to the US threat. For China, the US deployment of aircraft carrier battle groups as opposed to their nineteenth century ships implied that, if China wanted to command respect and dignity in the international community, and to complete unification without being humiliated by the US, the only way is to improve its military power (Wang 1999:523-524). Therefore, from the 1998 Taiwan Strait Crisis, Mainland China speeded up the pace of its military modernisation, especially in the high-tech field.

6. MAINLAND CHINA'S REACTION TO THE TWO-STATE THEORY

The crisis of March 1996 in the Taiwan Strait almost triggered military conflict between Mainland China and the US. Subsequently, two months later, on the eve of the presidential inauguration in Taiwan, Lee Teng-hui secretly conducted an interview with Chen Peng-chi, an old Taiwanese CCP communist friend (see Chapter three), who came from Mainland China. Lee Teng-hui told Chen Peng-chi to deliver a message to Beijing that he would not promote Taiwan's independence in his future presidential terms (Hsu, T.M. 2003:46-48).

However, as a matter of fact, from 1998, Lee Teng-hui planned a further secessionist project, on 9 July 1999. He proposed the special state-to-state theory, namely, the two-state theory (see Chapter five). Mainland China reacted at once. On 11 July, the spokesman of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council of Mainland China warned that Taiwan's secessionist groups had to give up their secessionist actions (Tsou, C.W. 2001:232). The following day, the ARATS Standing Vice-Chairman, Tang Shubei, stated that the two-state theory destroyed the basis of the Cross-Strait relationship (Tang 1999:351). On 14 July 1999, General Chi Haotian, Mainland China's Defence Minister, stated that Taiwan was a province of China, Chinese sovereignty and full territory could not be divided, those who wanted to disintegrate China and make 'one China one Taiwan' could not be successful. The PLA would wait and prepare to protect the full territory of the motherland, and destroy any attempts to disintegrate the motherland (Anonymous 1999d:10). On the other hand, in the name of "commentator", *Remin Ribao*, *Xinhua News Agency* and *PLA News* (PLA Newspaper) also criticised Lee Teng-hui for two months starting from 13 July. They said the two-state theory was equivalent to declaring formally that Taiwan had seceded from Mainland China and become independent. The criticisms were, therefore, stronger than when Lee Teng-hui had addressed Cornell University in 1995 (Commentator 1999:215-216).

Lee Teng-hui hid his secessionist intention from the US, made a secessionist address at Cornell University in June 1995, and provoked conflict that went to the brink of war between the US and Mainland China in March 1996. The grave implications of the two-state theory went beyond Lee's Cornell address. On 18 July, US President Clinton had a telephone conversation with Mainland China's President Jiang Zemin, during which he explained the view of the US. Clinton dispatched the Chairman and Managing Director of the AIT, Richard Bush, to Taiwan from 22–25 July to attempt to understand the matter further (see Chapter five). In the US, in early August, Mainland China Embassy officials warned that Mainland China had the capability to take military action which would cause massive damage to Taiwan, but would not involve the US. The US warned, however, that if Mainland China used force against Taiwan, it would retaliate (Tsou, C.W. 2001:252). At that time, Mainland China was holding an important political meeting – the Pei Dayho meeting.

According to information that Taiwan's authorities had obtained, Mainland China decided at the Pei Dayho meeting that its Taiwan policy was "first-wait, second-watch, third-prepare (unification with force)", and secondly to determine whether Taiwan would revise its Constitution and law to include the two-state theory or not. This was the bottom line (Tsou, C.W. 2001:249-250). On 13 August, Chan Yunlin, Director of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council of Mainland China, warned that if Taiwan revised its Constitution and law pursuant to the two-state theory, peaceful unification would be impossible (Tsou, C.W. 2001:249). That is to say, the bottom line for Mainland China was if Taiwan revised its Constitution pursuant to the two-state theory, it would be equivalent to starting war (Tsao, C.C. 1999:15). On 14 August, in Shanghai, when ARATS Chairman, Wang Daohan, met members of the US Heritage Foundation, he said if the dialogue between the two sides of the Cross-Strait on the one China principle (namely Taiwanese authorities accept the one China principle) would be held, war was avoidable. If Lee Teng-hui chose independence and seceded from Mainland China, war was unavoidable (Chiao 1999:41).

At that time, an Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting was held in New Zealand, and Jiang was due to meet Clinton. However, before their meeting, US officials secretly met Taiwanese officials in Boston in the US. The US explained the possible results of such a meeting between Clinton and Jiang, and guaranteed that the US would brief Taiwan after this meeting. Thus, in advance, the US told Taiwan that Clinton would not sacrifice Taiwan's interests and re-iterated its original policy (Tsou, C.W. 2001:253). On 11 September, Jiang Zemin met Clinton at the APEC meeting. Jiang told Clinton that, if Lee Teng-hui retracted the two-state theory, and if he would invite Chairman Wang Daohan in the name of Chairman of the KMT, then Wang could visit Taiwan. Jiang also indicated that Mainland China opposed Taiwan's inclusion in the Theatre Missile Defence (TMD) and requested Clinton to prevent the US Congress from passing an Act that allowed the US to sell advanced weapons to Taiwan. However, just as the US promised Taiwan in advance, Clinton only reiterated the one-China policy (Tsou, C.W. 2001:254). Obviously, the US adopted an abstract policy approach, reiterating the one-China policy to deal with Mainland China, but adopted a substantial approach to supporting Taiwan. In reality, the real intention of the US was to prolong the situation of separation between Taiwan and Mainland

China to ensure its own continued hegemony.

As discussed, the two-state theory was far more serious than Lee's address at Cornell University. It is, therefore, reasonable to believe that it was possible that Mainland China would take military action. However, on 21 September, the centre of Taiwan was hit by a major earthquake. Over 2,000 people died and 100,000 people were left homeless (Bee 1999a:5). Taiwanese authorities had to make every effort to rescue the victims. As this was the most devastating of catastrophes in Taiwan, both Mainland China's authorities and Taiwan's authorities were able to step down from the stalemate over the two-state theory (Bee 1999b:6). The crisis in the Taiwan Strait, therefore, dissipated as a result of the natural disaster.

7. CONCLUSION

In 1949, Taiwan was established through civil war. Since that time, Taiwan was under the protection of the US (Anonymous 1999e:159-160), and Mainland China had no ability to cross the Taiwan Strait to unite Taiwan through force. In 1958, Mainland China launched a massive bombing campaign against the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. However, it did not occupy the two islands as Mao Zedong believed that Mainland China had to let the KMT-led Taiwan government keep the islands which were seen as a means of reining Taiwan in.

For Mainland China, the decision of Mao Zedong was significant and proved correct. For example, to protect and keep the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, the Taiwanese Government had to ship and supply food and ammunition to the Taiwanese soldiers and residents. Simultaneously, the Taiwanese Government also had to send a number of troops to the Quemoy and Matsu Islands every year. Many Taiwanese soldiers were dispatched to stay and protect the two islands. They, as well as all Taiwanese residents, were therefore, psychologically still attached to Mainland China and realized the closeness of the interests of Taiwan and Mainland China. They further recognized that Taiwan and Mainland China were one country. At that time (1958), if Mainland China had occupied the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, it would have meant Taiwan's separation from Mainland China administratively. On the other hand, even in the 1990s, Lee Teng-hui implemented a secessionist political

Cross-Straits policy, and even proposed the political term of the “ROC on Taiwan”. It meant that the ROC’s jurisdiction covered Taiwan, the Penghu, Quemoy and Matsu, and hinted that the ROC’s jurisdiction did not include Mainland China (Lee, T.H. 1999a:63). However, the Quemoy and Matsu Islands are extremely close to Mainland China, and still had Taiwanese military troops based there. Thus, Lee Teng-hui, even as a secessionist President, was also unable to sever relations between Taiwan and Mainland China administratively and jurisdictionally.

On 12 January 1988, President Chiang Ching-kuo passed away, and Vice-President Lee Teng-hui succeeded as President and introduced a 12-year era of secessionist political Cross-Straits policy in Taiwan. However, even Chiang Ching-kuo did not understand Lee Teng-hui’s secessionist ideology, and, hence, it was also impossible for Mainland China’s leader to realize Lee Teng-hui’s secessionist political intention. Therefore, in the initial stage of Lee Teng-hui’s political Cross-Straits policy, Mainland China tolerated Lee’s actions. For example, Lee’s administration rejected direct governmental contact with Mainland China; Lee’s administration established an unofficial institute, the SEF, and Mainland China reluctantly matched it and established its counterpart, ARATS; Mainland China also accepted Taiwan’s conditions which limited discussions in the Wang-Koo Talks to technical and functional issues and excluded political issues. Then, despite Lee Teng-hui’s humiliation of Mainland China over the Chinqdao-Lake Incident, Mainland China also did not react. However, when the anti-China dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro on 30 March 1994 was released, Mainland China reacted negatively. Furthermore, on 9 June 1995, Lee Teng-hui delivered an address at Cornell University, and Mainland China reacted very strongly, because, from the perspective of Mainland China, Lee’s address was equivalent to a declaration of independence. However, Lee Teng-hui denied his secessionist intention and still flew the banner of unification. Around 2000, Lee Teng-hui gradually and frankly admitted his secessionist intentions. On 15 March 2003, Lee Teng-hui publicly and clearly stated that (we) have to re-write the Constitution, “the most important thing is to change the name of the ROC” to the “Republic of Taiwan” (Lin 2003a:1).

Mainland China’s realisation in 1995 that Lee Teng-hui was a secessionist was

correct. Therefore, faced with Lee Teng-hui's secessionist political Cross-Straits policy, Mainland China held missile exercises in July 1995 and March 1996. However, in March 1996, the US sent two aircraft carrier battle groups to intervene in the Taiwan Strait Crisis. Mainland China had then launched four test missiles. Subsequently, in April 1996, US President Clinton, on the deck of the *USS Independence*, told the officers and crew that "we showed our power to the world without firing a bullet" (Gellman 1998b:A1). On the contrary, the outcome of the confrontation between the US and Mainland China humiliated the Chinese leaders and the PLA deeply. This humiliation would remain through the decades, and led China's leaders to believe that in order to achieve national unification, and to become an Asian power with the ability to confront the US in its coastal waters, it had to accelerate its military modernisation programme. Many experts on China believed that Mainland China's authorities made a decision never again to be humiliated by the US (Tyler 1996:36). According to US intelligence, since the March 1996 crisis in the Taiwan Strait, Mainland China has procured many advanced weapons such as Kilo-class submarines; Su-27 strike fighters; and Sovrenenny-class destroyers, with SS-N-22 Sunburn missiles, which were designed by the Soviet Union to attack US aircraft carrier battle groups (Gellman 1998c:A16).

The impact of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy, therefore, forced Mainland China to establish a programme for military expansion. Theoretically, the political policy not only involves military aspects, but also covers and interacts with cultural and economic elements. The next chapter will examine Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy in the cultural, economic and military fields.

CHAPTER SEVEN

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL CROSS-STRAITS POLICY

Lee Teng-hui's Cross-Straits policy could lead the two sides across the Cross-Strait to either peace or war. The political Cross-Straits policy was the core of Lee's Cross-Straits policy. However, political policy comprises various areas, for example, with regard to fishing labour policy, Lee Teng-hui's administration regulated that fishing labour from Mainland China hired by Taiwanese fishing boat owners, had to live on the fishing boats and prohibited them from coming on land. When the weather

was adverse, however, after obtaining approval from the police, they could land (Ting 2002:13). With regard to Cross-Strait immigration policy, applicants from Mainland China waited more than twice as long as foreigners to obtain Taiwanese identity documents. Thus, Lee's administration used administrative and legal means to discriminate against the people from Mainland China (Chen, C.V. 2003:A15). These were at odds with Lee Teng-hui's alleged support for human rights. However, the impact of these policies was not as strong and comprehensive as the cultural, economic and defence aspects of his secessionist policy, because culture involved the identity of the Taiwanese, economy involved their interests, and defence involved the power needed to pursue independence. Therefore, this chapter will analyse Lee's political Cross-Straits policy from the cultural, economic and defence perspectives.

1. POLITICAL-CULTURAL CROSS-STRAITS POLICY

When Lee Teng-hui decided to implement his secessionist policy, he also realised that a pre-condition for achieving the goal of secessionism was to establish a Taiwanese identity. Lee Teng-hui emphasized that people should pay attention to the Taiwanese identity problem and stated that Taiwanese identity was a sophisticated problem, it would not be solved by establishing a Taiwanese Republic or declaring independence (Lee & Nakashima 2000:38). He further indicated that the ethnic problem that people identified either with China or Taiwan also had to be resolved (Lee & Nakashima 2000:35). However, due to the long influence of Chinese culture, Chinese political identity intermingled with cultural identity and it was difficult to distinguish one from the other. In Chinese society, cultural identity was even the basis of political identity (Huang, C.C. 2000:51-65).

The scope of culture is very comprehensive, because it includes history, language, writing, customs, religious beliefs etc. Culture is the core of ethnic consciousness, and the basis of ethnic identity and nationalism. It creates the nation's identity which makes citizens sacrifice their lives to protect the survival of their culture. For secessionists, culture is the original catalyst to create a new nation. However, a modern educational system is necessary to promote culture comprehensively. Therefore, cultural education policy was one of the most important pillars of Lee

Teng-hui's secessionist political Cross-Straits policy, the substance of which included the revision of historical textbooks, the promotion of mother language classes and the non-recognition of qualifications from Mainland Chinese universities.

1.1. The revision of historical textbooks

History is the collective memory of people, and it is also one of the most important motivating elements of ethnic identity. Simultaneously, one of the best ways to instill strong ethnic ideology is through school education. Therefore, education becomes an ideological apparatus of the state and history education creates ethnic identity. As discussed in Chapter one, ethnic identity can lead to a secessionist movement.

Lee Teng-hui also realized that historical education involves the identity of people (Lee & Kobayashi 2001:130). He said that during his term as vice-president (1984-1987), he had read all primary and junior high school textbooks on history and other subjects (Lee, T.H. 1999b:107), and deemed that the history textbooks should not only contain the history of the rise and fall of Chinese dynasties, but also include Taiwanese history (Lee, T.H. 1999a:138) (In reality, in the context of Chinese history, the inclusion of Taiwanese history in Chinese history textbooks would be the same as including Californian history in American history textbooks). In March 1994, in the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro, Lee said he requested that it (government) should increase focus on Taiwan's history, Taiwan's geography, and their roots through initiatives such as courses in primary school. Before that time, schools had not taught Taiwanese studies and had only taught Mainland Chinese studies, and it had been a ridiculous education (Lee & Shiba 1994:4). In 2000, in the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Kobayashi Yoshinori, Lee Teng-hui stated that in Taiwan, many people who learned history, only learned the affairs of Mainland China, but did not understand Taiwanese history. He further indicated that if this situation continued, it could not create Taiwanese 'identity'. He believed that such lack of recognition had to be corrected, therefore, he mobilised scholars to write a new textbook, entitled *Getting to Know Taiwan* (Lee & Kobayashi 2001:130). This revised history for junior high school was published by the educational authorities in 1997.

However, the contents of the textbook was distorted and downplayed the real

historical relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China to a large extent, viewing Mainland China or the Ching dynasty as a foreign nation. Conversely, the textbook celebrated the Japanese achievements during the colonial period, but minimised the Japanese slaughter, racial discrimination and deprivation of the Taiwanese. Therefore, the primary purpose of the revised history textbook was to promote Taiwanese identity and to build a new nation (Yang 1999:176-178).

1.2. The promotion of the mother language course

Language is one of the main components of culture, and is the main basis of ethnic identity. As previously discussed in chapter one, language is also one of the most important tools that can be used to establish a new national identity. Lee Teng-hui re-iterated the importance of identity, and also realized the importance of language in the secessionist process. Therefore, in the dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro in 1994, he stated that at that time, he encouraged people to speak Taiwanese. It was necessary to do that during the election period, and he only spoke Taiwanese in election speeches (Lee & Shiba 1994:4).

In Taiwan, the KMT-led government never prohibited people from speaking Taiwanese as part of their daily life. However, it regulated that people had to speak the national language, Mandarin, in school and for official business (see Chapter four). It also included a few hours of English tuition in junior high school. However, Lee Teng-hui believed that children had better to learn their mother language, Mandarin and English courses from primary school years (Lee, T.H. 1999b:105). On 7 January 2000, five months before Lee Teng-hui's presidency expired, the Minister of Education, Yang Chaur-shin, announced that from 2001 students from grade one to six in primary school had to study a local language course for one or two classes a week. These local language courses included the Southern Fujian language (Taiwanese), Hakka and the indigenous language. Every student could choose one of the three local languages. With regard to students from grade one to three in junior high school, a local language course was not compulsory (Chiang 2000:1). The government increased mother language (local language) courses at primary school, thereby upgrading the mother language to the level of Mandarin and English. Relatively, it lowered the importance of Mandarin.

In Taiwanese society, Taiwan's aborigines who used the indigenous language made up only 1.7 per cent of the total Taiwanese population (Huang, S.F. 1993:21). However, as government implemented the local language course, the aborigines acted as genuine Taiwanese. Because of the political need of promoting Taiwanese identity, the indigenous language logically became one of the three local Taiwanese languages. However, Taiwan's aborigines could be divided into nine aboriginal tribes, the Atayal, Saisiyat, Bunun, Tsou, Paiwan, Rukai, Puyuma, Ami and Yami, and have nine different tribal languages (GIO 2001:26). That is to say, Lee's administration had to start nine different indigenous language courses at primary school for 1.7 per cent of the population. However, the nine indigenous languages were not used in common Taiwanese society. With regard to the Hakka language, except in the area of the Hakka people, it was also not commonly used in Taiwanese society. In order to promote secessionism and to expand the language gap between Taiwan and Mainland China, Lee's administration was prepared to expend a huge amount of government resources to create courses teaching the nine indigenous languages seldom used in society. From the perspective of cost alone, it was incredible, but for Lee's secessionist policy, it was necessary. On the other hand, although the Mainlanders' mother tongue may be Shanghainese, Cantonese or Schuanese, they were forced to learn a Taiwanese local language. Why did Lee's administration not create Mainlanders' mother language courses at primary school level? This shows that the majority ethnic group controlled language usage politically.

1.3. Non-recognition of Mainland Chinese qualifications

For unification and secession, cultural identity is a double-edged sword. It is one of the elements of nationalism, as discussed in Chapter one. Nationalism is one of the motivations for secessionism. On the other hand, nationalism is also one of the motivations for unification. In modern Chinese history, because of the strong Chinese cultural identity and nationalism, many of the Chinese élite dedicated themselves to uniting and rejuvenating China. Therefore, from the standpoint of Mainland China, they also understood the importance of cultural identity, namely, if the Taiwanese had a strong Chinese cultural identity, it would benefit Chinese unification. However, Mainland China, which had no real jurisdiction, had no influence over the revision of

historical textbooks and the promotion of other language courses by Lee Teng-hui. In order to help Taiwanese students understand Chinese culture, one of the best options for Mainland China was to promote cultural exchange by attracting Taiwanese students to study in Mainland Chinese universities. Therefore, the Mainland Chinese Ministry of Education regulated that universities which accepted students from Taiwan (including Hong Kong and Macao) should set up related courses and activities to make them learn about their motherland (PRC 1999:2).

In 1986, Mainland China allowed seven famous and excellent universities, such as Beijing University and Tsinghua University, to accept Taiwanese students. In the 1990s, Mainland China further adopted an asymmetrical policy, which gave a preferential standard in university entrance (easier examinations and no limits on quotas) to Taiwanese (as well as Hong Kong and Macao) students (Chou 2002:134-140). This was in order to increase the awareness of the next generation of Taiwanese about Mainland China. Mainland China provided special opportunities to allow Taiwanese students to succeed in studying at the above-mentioned famous universities. In the 1990s, the number of Taiwanese students who went to Mainland China to study increased gradually. By 2001, Mainland China allowed over 140 universities to accept Taiwanese students, and approximately 4,000 Taiwanese students were studying in Mainland China (Wang 2001:13). However, Taiwanese authorities did not accept the applications for recognition of Mainland China's academic qualifications, and still does not recognise degrees from Mainland China (Wei 2003:14).

Lee Teng-hui's cultural Cross-Strait policy may have had a secessionist orientation, however, the actual outcome had its limits. For example, as previously discussed, with regard to Lee Teng-hui's revision of historical textbooks, the contents downplayed the real historical relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China. However, of the 400 years of written Taiwanese, the Ming, Cheng Cheng-kun and Ching dynasties had ruled Taiwan for over 230 years (1661-1895). Taiwan was a part of China - a historical fact which existed objectively, therefore, although the historical textbooks downplayed the Cross-Strait historical relationship or even provided a distorted historical view that Mainland China was a foreign nation. However, it could

not omit the historical fact that Taiwan was a part of China during the Qing dynasty, or that, in order to protect Mainland China, many Taiwanese ancestors had sacrificed their lives resisting the aggression of the British, French and Japanese (see Chapter four). Conversely, the perspective that eulogized the achievements of the Japanese colonial period and minimized the Japanese slaughter and racial discrimination against Taiwanese prompted many to suspect the motives of the textbooks. On the other hand, Mainland China not only educated the next generation that Taiwan was a part of China, but also presented real Chinese history to Taiwanese tourists through tourist guides. For example, by 2002, around 3.4 million Taiwanese had travelled to Mainland China (TIER 2003:35), however, Taiwan's total population was only 22 million (GIO 2001:22). Furthermore, in order to represent real Cross-Strait history, Mainland Chinese authorities also invited students and teachers from Taiwan to travel to Mainland China during the summer and winter holidays. Therefore, generally speaking, the influence of Lee Teng-hui's textbook revision was not as great as expected.

With regard to the promotion of mother language courses, in the twenty-first century, it is common knowledge that if a country wants to thrive and avoid disintegration, it should have a common language as a communication tool and common denominator, such as the US, France, Germany and Japan. For Chinese, Mandarin, which is popularly spoken in Mainland China and promoted in Taiwan, is used by the people on both sides of the Straits. In the beginning of the twenty-first century, Mainland China's economy was booming. Many people from Taiwan invested, traded with, studied in and even emigrated to Mainland China. The language with which they communicated with Mainland Chinese people was Mandarin. Because Taiwanese could speak Mandarin, they had no language barrier and could move to any province or city in Mainland China to trade, study or emigrate easily. Taiwanese were the beneficiaries of the previous KMT-led Mandarin policy. As the economy of Mainland China boomed, in order to trade with Mainland China more easily, it was better to use Mandarin in Mainland China and the practical value of Mandarin increased (Chou & Chang 2003:25). Therefore, it was popular to learn Mandarin, something that was not predicted by Lee Teng-hui.

With regard to increasing the cultural identification of Taiwanese students with Mainland China and preventing them from going to Mainland China to study, Lee Teng-hui's administration did not recognise academic qualifications from Mainland China. However, in April 2002, according to an opinion poll in Taiwan, 53 per cent of the interviewees believed that Taiwan should recognise them and 81 per cent of the interviewees who had Bachelors, Masters and Ph.D. degrees favoured the acceptance of the academic qualifications of the main universities in Mainland China (OPC/UDN 2002:1). Taiwanese authorities were always proud of their democratic achievements, and of respecting public opinion, however, even the US, Japan, South Africa etc recognise academic qualifications from Mainland Chinese universities, such as Peijing University. Even though most of Taiwanese public opinion favours their acceptance, Taiwanese authorities still do not accept academic qualifications from Mainland China. Obviously, the non-recognition of academic qualifications is ridiculous, and it is difficult to stop Taiwanese students from going to Mainland China. As previously mentioned, by 2001, the number of Taiwanese students who graduated from senior high school and studied further in Mainland China numbered over 4,000. Therefore, the policy of not recognising qualifications from Mainland China has not been successful.

2. POLITICAL TRADE CROSS-STRAITS POLICY

Taiwan is close to southeast Mainland China, separated by the Taiwan Strait, which is only 130 kilometers wide at its narrowest (GIO 2001:10). Therefore, the geographical position of Taiwan determines its close relationship with Mainland China. Naturally this includes economic relations. However, in a general sense, economic affairs are influenced by political decisions. Politics eventually decides the economic integration with or separation from Mainland China.

In 1683, as previously discussed in Chapter four, due to the end of the civil war between the two sides of the Strait, the Ching dynasty achieved its unification goal and had jurisdiction over Taiwan. The political barriers of the civil war disappeared, trade between the two sides mushroomed, and Taiwan became part of the coastal trade circle of Mainland China (Tsao, Y.H. 1991:40-41). In 1895, due to the Sino-Japanese War, Taiwan and the Penghu Islands were ceded to Japan. During

the early Japanese colonial period, the Japanese slaughtered Taiwanese guerrilla fighters, and brought about the merging of various fields such as culture, education, finance etc. At that time, the Japanese colonial government intensified trade relations between Taiwan and Japan, for example through the implementation of uniform tariffs since 1910. This measure regarded Mainland China and other nations as foreign countries, and deterred trade between Taiwan and Mainland China through high tariff barriers. Therefore, Taiwan's trade shifted to Japan (Yauchi 1929:114-115). In 1945, Japan was defeated in World War II, and Taiwan was returned to China. Trade became an internal economic matter - the political barriers across the Cross-Strait disappeared, and trade between the two sides increased sharply (CCTHSP 1947:Z9). In 1950, due to its loss of the civil war against the CCP, the KMT-led government moved to Taiwan. The two sides fell into extended civil war and trade was completely disrupted. Therefore, looking back at history, the trade relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China was always determined by politics.

2.1. Trade development across the Taiwan Strait

On 1 January 1979, Mainland China announced that it would stop bombing the Kinmen islands, implemented its peaceful unification policy, and encouraged Cross-Strait trade and economic exchange (SCNPC 1979:1-4). Subsequently, on 8 May 1979, Mainland China promulgated the *Temporary Regulations for Trade with Taiwan District*, and described the trade between Taiwan and Mainland China as a special trade transition period preceding Taiwan's return to the motherland (Wang *et al.* 1993:284). It opened the door to Cross-Strait trade. At that time, Taiwan still prohibited trade with Mainland China, and Taiwanese businessmen traded indirectly with Mainland China through Hong Kong. According to Taiwan's MAC, the total transit trade between Taiwan and Mainland China through Hong Kong was US\$77.8 million in 1979, but increased to US\$955.6 million in 1986 (TIER 2001:17).

On 2 November 1987, as previously discussed in Chapter five, the KMT-led government permitted its civilians to visit their relatives in Mainland China. This lifted the strict prohibition that Taiwanese residents (Mainlanders and Taiwanese) could not visit Mainland China. Because the people of both sides belonged to one country, originally the Han people, the national language, Mandarin, used in Taiwan, was the

common language used in Mainland China. Because they shared the same language and race, Taiwanese businessmen could communicate with Mainland China's people directly, and it decreased the cost of economic activities greatly (Wei 2002:61-66). Other factors also played a role. For example, the market of Mainland China was virgin territory and held many business opportunities. Taiwanese investors could earn money in Mainland China, therefore, the transit trade between the two sides of the Strait increased sharply (Taiwanese authorities still prohibited direct trade). According to the estimation of the MAC, the indirect trade total was 37.4 billion in 2002 (TIER 2003:21).

2.2 Go South and No Haste, Be Patient policies

In the early 1990s, trade between the two sides across the Strait increased rapidly. To contextualise this phase, it was the period when Lee Teng-hui had just succeeded to the presidency, his real political power was not yet consolidated, and he was unable to deter the fast increasing trend in Cross-Strait trade. According to the estimation of the MAC, total indirect trade between Taiwan and Mainland China was US\$3.9 billion in 1989, and increased to US\$11.7 billion in 1992 (TIER 2001:21). At that time, Lee Teng-hui was busy purging his political opponents, and consolidating his political power. It was, therefore, necessary for him to conceal his real political Cross-Strait policy. At the same time, the countries in Southeast Asia were attracting foreign capital to develop their economies. In 1993, in order to avoid investment converging on Mainland China, Lee's administration proposed the Go South policy, which actively encouraged Taiwanese businessmen to invest in countries such as the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and Thailand to the south of Taiwan.

As a matter of fact, the Go South policy was indirectly aimed at deterring the rapid expansion of Cross-Strait trade. However, in 1997, Southeast Asia experienced a financial crisis. Taiwanese investors who followed the Go South policy to invest in Southeast Asia suffered great losses. Therefore, investment from Taiwan in Southeast Asia declined. Subsequently, in 1999, anti-Chinese riots broke out in Indonesia, causing Taiwanese investment to decrease again (Chang 2001:10-11).

On the other hand, on 3 July 1988, Mainland China declared the implementation of a

preferential policy towards Taiwanese compatriots (including Mainlanders and Taiwanese) to encourage them to invest in, or trade with Mainland China (Shi & Lin 1994:156-157). On 5 March 1994, Mainland China further passed the *Investment Protection Law for Taiwanese Compatriots in the People's Republic of China* (SCNPC 1994:1-2). Mainland China upgraded preferential measures for 'Taiwanese compatriots' from the administrative level to the legal level and provided greater benefits to them. At that time, indirect Cross-Straits trade and investment by Taiwanese businessmen increased quickly. According to the MAC, the amount of total indirect trade between Taiwan and Mainland China was US\$15.1 billion in 1993, and increased to US\$23.8 billion in 1996 (TIER 2003:21), an increase of 57.6 per cent within four years. From 1993–1996, average annual indirect investment from Taiwan in Mainland China reached US\$3.3 billion (TIER 2003:26). Obviously, the Lee administration's Go South policy could not deter the rapid increase in trade between Taiwan and Mainland China.

On 4 September 1996, when Lee Teng-hui had consolidated power successfully, he further proposed the No Haste, Be Patient policy towards Mainland China (Lee, T.H. 1997b:231) to deter Cross-Strait trade. His administration promulgated more strict regulations to limit Taiwanese investment in Mainland China. Lee Teng-hui's policy stipulated that investments of more than US\$50 million to Mainland China should obtain the approval of government. It also limited types of investment, for example, they could not invest in high-tech fields or in public infrastructure, such as public roads and railways (Lee, T.H. 1999d:165). Thus, Lee Teng-hui adopted administrative measures to impede the rapid expansion of Cross-Strait trade.

As a result of the No Haste, Be Patient policy and the Asian financial crisis, total indirect trade between Taiwan and the Mainland was US\$26.4 billion in 1997 and US\$24.0 billion in 1998, a decrease of 9.2 per cent. It slightly recovered to US\$25.8 billion in 1999 (TIER 2003:21). On 18 March 2000, DPP candidate Chen Shui-bian won the presidential election and was sworn in on 20 May 2000 (GIO 2002:509). After considering investment policy towards Mainland China, on 7 November 2001, Chen's administration announced that Taiwan would relax the No Haste, Be Patient policy and implement the Active Open, Effective Management policy (MAC

2002:230). They did away with the regulation that investments of more than US\$50 million required approval (Tung 2003:43). Thus the Taiwanese authorities terminated Lee's No Haste, Be Patient policy indirectly.

2.3. Mainland China's economic rise and Taiwan's economic marginalisation

From 1979, Mainland China began to implement its economic reform and achieved great economic success. In the 1990s, Mainland China absorbed direct foreign investment of over US\$300 billion (Studwell 2002:xi). Particularly, from the mid-1990s, foreign investment, mainly non-Japanese investment, flowed into Mainland China, naturally accompanied by advanced technologies, which not only led Mainland China to emerge as an economic power, but also redrew the economic map of the region – with Mainland China, not Japan as its centre. It seems inevitable that Mainland China will grow further unless there is great social upheaval (Wehrfritz & Meyer 2002:12-14).

The Gross National Product (GNP) of Mainland China was 4.5 billion Yuan in 1980, however, the GNP reached 88.2 billion Yuan in 2000 (NBSC 2002:51), increasing 19.5 times. With regard to foreign economic relations, total imports and exports in 1980 were US\$38.1 billion; reached US\$474.3 billion in 2000 (NBSC 2002:612), increasing 12.4 times; and was US\$620.8 billion in 2002 (NBS 2003:7-8). It far outstripped Deng Xiaoping's prediction in 1985 that the total of imports and exports would reach US\$200 billion at the end of the twentieth century (Deng 1985a:307).

Lee Teng-hui became President in 1988 and his term expired in 2000. During this period, he faced Mainland China's rapid economic growth and many Taiwanese businessmen invested there. He did not use the geographical advantage of Taiwan being so close to Mainland China and the cultural advantage that Taiwan and Mainland China shared the same language and race to develop trade between Taiwan and Mainland China. In contrast, in order to achieve his goal of secession, politics determined the economy. He implemented the Go South policy, the No Haste, Be Patient policy and insisted on rejecting links with the Mainland. Because there were no direct links between Taiwan and Mainland China, commodities had to transit through other ports, increasing transportation costs (such as freight fees and

additional time). This meant that Taiwanese businessmen who invested in Mainland China had to purchase materials or parts in the Mainland directly to save costs (Lin, Y.H. 2001:65). On the other hand, if large factories wanted to import components from Taiwan, they had to pay increased transportation costs. Therefore, in order to ensure the supply of components to the main factories cheaply and quickly, the upstream factories which manufactured components also accompanied the move of the main factories to Mainland China. It created the phenomenon that entire industries moved to Mainland China from Taiwan. According to official data from Mainland China, by 2002, Taiwanese businessmen had invested in 55,691 projects, totalling US\$33.1 billion (TIER 2003:26). The huge investment from Taiwan in Mainland China meant that the amount of investment in Taiwan decreased. Furthermore, because Taiwan interacted with the West earlier than Mainland China, its economic development also started earlier. Since Taiwan and Mainland China had the same language and race, Taiwan could play an intermediate role between Western businessmen (even including overseas Chinese) and Mainland China. However, there were no direct links between the two sides, and the political relationship deteriorated year after year. It increased the cost and risk of Cross-Strait trade and caused foreign and overseas Chinese investors to invest in Mainland China directly. Simultaneously, foreign and overseas Chinese decreased their investments in Taiwan.

Eventually, these factors caused Taiwan to fall into a vicious circle. Relative to Mainland China's rapid economic expansion, Taiwan's economy was gradually marginalised (Sung 2002:10-11). For example, in 2001, Taiwan's economic growth rate was -2.2 per cent (CEPD 2003:7); the unemployment rate was 4.6 per cent (CEPD 2003:30-31); the annual growth rate of overseas Chinese and foreign investments was -32.6 per cent (CEPD 2003:266); and per capita national income (in US\$) was -9.9 per cent (CEPD 2003:50). These economic legacies were what Lee Teng-hui left for the next administration. However, the economic prosperity of 1989, the first year of Lee Teng-hui's presidency was the legacy of Chiang Ching-kuo. Taiwan's economic growth rate in 1989 was 8.2 per cent (CEPD 2003:43); the unemployment rate was 1.6 per cent (CEPD 2003:31); the annual growth rate of overseas Chinese and foreign investments was 104.5 per cent (CEPD 2003:266);

and per capita income (in US\$) increased by 19.7 per cent (CEPD 2003:50). Compared to 1989, the 1990s was the lost decade for Taiwan. In contrast, Mainland China's economy increased rapidly which caused Taiwan and Mainland China to merge economically. For example, in 2002, Taiwanese business investment in Mainland China was US\$3.97 billion, an increase of 72.9 per cent compared to 2000 (TIER 2003:26). Direct Cross-Strait trade was US\$37.4 billion, an increase of 19.8 per cent over 2000 (TIER 2003:21). These figures show that direct Cross-Strait trade rapidly integrated the economies, and that Lee Teng-hui's economic Cross-Strait policy had been a failure.

3. ACCEPTABILITY OF “ONE COUNTRY, TWO SYSTEMS”

As a general rule, politics determine the economy. However, the economy also influences politics. The relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China is one case in point. In the 1990s, the Taiwanese economy suffered while Mainland China's grew. This had a profound influence on the movement of people. As previously discussed in Chapter two, due to various historical legacies and factors, from 1950-1980, Taiwan was about 30 years more advanced in terms of economic development. During the Cold War era, under authoritarian rule, the KMT-led government used this economic gap to portray Mainland China negatively, and to eulogize Taiwan's economic achievement and propagandise it as a Taiwan Experience. In the 1990s, Lee Teng-hui succeeded in this propaganda strategy. Furthermore, he not only ignored Mainland China's rapid economic growth intentionally, but demonized Mainland China. Lee Teng-hui even expressed the distorted view that unification meant the Taiwanese would be enslaved by Mainland China (Sun 1994:4). He wanted to frighten the Taiwanese and make them despise and fear Mainland China. During the Cold War era, Taiwan and Mainland China implemented different political systems, capitalism and socialism. If Taiwan lost sovereignty (for example political state sovereignty), it would also lose its capitalist lifestyle (Jan 2001:1). However, because Mainland China reformed its economic system and implemented what was basically a Western economic system, its economy is rapidly expanding. At present, Mainland China is different from the old Mainland China. For example, in 2001, the annual per capita income in Mainland China was over US\$800 (Jan 2002:1). In Shanghai, it reached US\$ 4,500 (Peng 2002:1). By now, the living standards in

Shanghai made the Taiwanese feel that there was no difference between Taiwan and Shanghai (Jan 2001:1). The scale of development and modernization of cities such as Peking and Shanghai have overtaken that of Taiwan's Taipei. Therefore, Taiwanese changed their image of Mainland China as a backward place.

The people in Taiwan and Mainland China are of the same race. They used the same language, and belonged to one nation. Mainland China has not only attained great economic growth, but has also been able to provide preferential measures for 'Taiwanese compatriots' in the political, educational, and economic fields. As a result, many Taiwanese visit Mainland China for tourism, study, investment and business. Through real contact with Mainland China, Taiwanese are able to understand Mainland China objectively. In June 2001, the two biggest newspapers in Taiwan, the *United Daily News* and *China Times*, and the popular TV channel, TVBS, conducted an opinion poll that showed that the ratio of interviewees who favoured the "one country, two systems" policy were 33, 29 and 31 per cent respectively (ESC/NCU 2000:1). However, the official MAC also conducted an opinion poll in March 2001 where the above-mentioned ratio was only 16 per cent. The reason why the gap in the opinion poll between the private and official investigations was so big was mainly because questions were asked in different ways. For example, the question by the *United Daily News* was "the PRC has suggested using 'one country, two systems' to resolve the issue of the separation of Taiwan and the Mainland peacefully. Can you accept this suggestion?" The TVBS question was very similar to that raised by the *United Daily News*. However, the question of the MAC was "regarding the development of cross-strait relations, the PRC has suggested 'one country, two systems' making Taiwan a local government under the rule of the Mainland, with the ROC government no longer existing. Are you in favor of, or opposed to, such a 'one country, two systems' formula as suggested by the PRC?" (MAC 2002:121)

Obviously, the *United Daily News* asked its question objectively. The question raised by the MAC was purposely designed to elicit a negative response to the definition of 'one country, two systems'. This could create misunderstanding among the interviewees in the opinion poll. For example, it stated that Mainland China would regard Taiwan as a local government under its rule, and that the ROC (Taiwan)

government would disappear. However, the truth was that early in January 1995, Mainland China's President Jiang Zemin offered an eight-point proposal for developing Cross-Strait relations. Jiang stated that after unification, Taiwan as a Special Administrative Region would possess a high degree of autonomy: the government would not only still exist (the ROC government would change its name to Special Administrative Region government); but it would possess legislative and judicial power (including final adjudication); it would possess an army; and the central government would not send military and administrative personnel to Taiwan (Jiang 1995:233). Taiwanese would rule Taiwan in reality.

As a matter of fact, Mainland China still implements the one country, two systems policy in Hong Kong successfully. As a result, the Taiwanese, and even some international communities, have realized the feasibility of the one country, two systems approach. For example, on 9 July 1999, Lee Teng-hui opposed the two-state theory. Subsequently, on 21 July 1999, President Clinton reacted by saying; "the Chinese tend to take a long view of these things and have made clear a sensitivity to the different system that exists in Taiwan, and a willingness to find ways to accommodate it, as they did in working with Hong Kong, and, perhaps, even going beyond that" (Clinton 1999:7). It was the first time that the US President mentioned the Hong Kong case in relation to the Taiwan problem. Simultaneously, the Taiwanese people had a deep and comprehensive understanding of Mainland China. Therefore, the opinion poll of March 2001, in which 33 per cent of Taiwanese people were in favour of one country, two systems, showed astonishing results which were inconceivable in the 1990s.

4. POLITICAL-MILITARY CROSS-STRAITS POLICY

Whether by unification or by independence, the way to solve secessionism or separation is either through peace or conflict, and at their core lies comparative military power. Unification requires strong military power, as does the avoidance of unification. In this case, the Taiwan Strait between Taiwan and Mainland China presents a natural barrier to unification. In 1950, the US sent the Seventh Fleet to cruise the Taiwan Strait. At that time, Mainland China's military capacity was inferior and unable to react effectively. Then, after long negotiations, on 1 January 1979, the

US established formal diplomatic relations with China, and withdrew its forces. However, the US still provided many advanced weapons to Taiwan, thus enabling Taiwan to have the ability to resist a unification war with Mainland China. In the 1990s, in order to implement his secessionist policy, Lee Teng-hui rapidly expanded Taiwan's forces. On the other hand, particularly since 1996, in order to have the ability to deal with US intervention in the Taiwan problem and to achieve national unification, Mainland China also rapidly expanded its military power.

4.1 Taiwan's procurement of advanced weapons

Mainland China still did not give up the use of force as a means to solve the Taiwan problem. Therefore, Taiwanese authorities regarded Mainland China as a "major threat" (MHTO/ROC 2002:51), and actively prepared for war with Mainland China. However, the scale of Taiwan's economy was too small. For example, the total population of Taiwan was only 22 million. It had no ability to produce modern weapons, such as advanced fighters and warships. Therefore, Taiwan had to procure modern weapons from foreign suppliers. Also, the process of designing, and manufacturing modern weapons is very long, therefore, by implementing a huge purchasing programme from foreign suppliers, Taiwan could obtain advanced weapons for its armed forces very quickly (Bitzinger 1997:95).

The main source for Taiwan's military procurement was the US. Since the 1950, the US had always supplied or sold sufficient weapons of good quality to counter Mainland China and to maintain the separation. On 1 January 1979, the US complied with the three conditions for establishing official relations with Mainland China, namely the severing of relations, the withdrawal of its military, and the abrogation of the treaty with Taiwan, and established formal diplomatic relations with Mainland China. However, the US still insisted on selling weapons to Taiwan. The relationship between the US and Mainland China, therefore, still did not solve the problem of arms sales to Taiwan. Then, through negotiations, on 17 August 1982, the US and Mainland China issued the *US-PRC Joint Communiqué* (known as the *817 communiqué* or the *1982 communiqué*), in which the US stated that it did not seek to implement a long-term programme of arms sales to Taiwan; that such sales would not exceed, either qualitatively or quantitatively, the level of those sold since the

establishment of diplomatic relations with China; and that it intended to reduce these sales gradually. This statement acknowledged China's consistent position regarding the settlement of this arms sale (US/PRC 1982:1). For ten years, Taiwan had submitted requests to procure advanced F-16 warplanes, and had always been refused (Mann 1998:269). In general, the US kept to the commitments of the 1982 *US-PRC Joint Communiqué*.

On 4 June 1989, the Tiananmen Square event (see Chapter five) occurred in Mainland China. In order to sanction Mainland China, the US suspended military sales (Hoffman and Dewar 1989:A1). As a result, military sales between the US and Mainland China were not only suspended, but also discontinued and remain so until the present. Subsequently, in 1991, the Soviet Union disintegrated. Russia was an independent nation, however, its economy deteriorated and it was eager to sell arms to boost its penniless defence industries. This was a good opportunity for Mainland China to procure advanced arms. In March 1992, Russia approved the sale of 24 advanced Sukhoi-27 all-weather jet fighters to Mainland China. At that time, the jet fighters of the Taiwanese armed forces were outdated F-5E and F-104 models. In order to curb Mainland China's military modernization, the US reacted strongly, selling 150 of the advanced F-16 warplanes to Taiwan. Of course, at that time, it was during the presidential campaign and President Bush's re-election was under threat. Considering aviation labour's votes, in September 1992, Bush agreed to the F-16 deal totaling about US\$6 billion. This was good news for Lee Teng-hui's administration. However, several US officials believed that the necessity of the F-16 sale was clear, and that it was not only the presidential race that affected the timing of the sale. Mainland China's procurement of Russian Sukhoi-27 fighters meant that any US administration would have taken the same decision on the F-16 sale (Mann 1998:257-269).

In the F-16 deal, the US violated the 1982 *US-PRC Joint Communiqué*, which limited the types of arms to be sold by the US to Taiwan to not exceeding the level set up in 1982. However, Mainland China did not want to cause trouble for President Bush in his presidential election campaign, and did not react strongly (Lee, K.Y. 2000:639). Another important consideration was that Mainland China was not strong, hence,

even if the US broke its word, the only thing Mainland China could do was protest.

In Taiwan, during the early period of Lee Teng-hui's presidency, namely the early 1990s, expenditure on weapon acquisitions remained stable. For example, US\$510 million in 1990, US\$470 million in 1991, and US\$470 million in 1992, but it abruptly increased to US\$6.43 billion in 1993 (because Taiwan bought 150 of the F-16 fighter planes and 60 of the Mirage 2000 fighters), and US\$ 3.23 billion in 1996 (TI 1998:229-230). However, the total area of Taiwan Island is only about 36,000 square kilometers, there are high mountains and terraces in the central parts, plains below 100 meters constitute only 31 per cent of Taiwan's land and are mostly in the west (GIO 2001:11). Most of the 22 million Taiwanese live in the western plain, especially in Taipei and Kaohsiung cities. Thus, Taiwan is a densely populated island, especially in its western area. It lacks territory to wage war and it is difficult for Taiwan to engage in an independent war. On the contrary, Mainland China's territory is 9,596,960 square kilometers (NBSC 2002:4). Its population is over 1.25 billion (NBSC 2002:23). It also has the capacity to absorb the destruction of war and to engage in a war of unification.

Another lethal disadvantage was the diversity of the Taiwanese. The *2002 National Defense Report, ROC*, published by the Taiwanese Ministry of National Defence, indicated that "aside from military threat from the PRC, menaces to our national security include domestic destabilising factors. Some of our people, for example, are confusing foes with friends, or are divided on the issue of national identity, undermining the unity of people against external threats" (MHTO/ROC 2002:52). For example, the previously mentioned opinion poll in 2001, showed that the ratio of interviewees who favoured accepting the one country, two systems policy was 33 per cent. How could this one third of the 22 million Taiwanese population be expected to sacrifice their lives for Taiwan's secessionist war ?

Even if Taiwan possessed advanced weapons, it was still difficult to engage in a secessionist war with Mainland China. Why did President Lee Teng-hui still spend a huge amount of money to purchase arms from Western countries, especially from the US? Reasonable inference may be that he wanted to establish substantial

indirect military relations with the Western powers. According to a report on the ROC's arms purchase by the Rand Corporation, a famous US think tank, Taiwan's arms procurements were often decided by President Lee Teng-hui. Many decisions regarding arms purchases from the US were significantly based on political rather than military considerations, and he also supported Taiwan's entry into a planned Theatre Missile Defense (TMD) system. Lee Teng-hui regarded arms sales by the US to Taiwan as a symbol of security in that the US supported Taiwan militarily (Rand 2000:1).

From the secessionist policy perspective, this method of large arms procurement from the US was the most correct and effective way of ensuring an ongoing military relationship with the US. Taiwan did not have formal diplomatic relations with the US. However, due to the large scale arms procurement from the US, the US and Taiwan held the US-Taiwan Defence Summit 2002, in Florida (Chen and Wu 2002:1), and the US-Taiwan Defence Industry Conference 2003, in Texas (Wolf 2003:1). Thus, Taiwan successfully established substantive indirect military relations with the US. Therefore, in June 2003, when the Taiwanese legislature discussed expensive arms procurements from the US, including items such as the old Kidd-class destroyer, which was not the most advanced weapon, the legislature criticized the fact that it seemed to be paying a protection fee to the US (Lin 2003b:A4). The term protection fee reflected the substance of the indirect military relationship between Taiwan and the US and also reflected the essence of Taiwan's procurement of arms from the US.

4.2. Mainland China's military modernisation

For Mainland China, the main purpose of military modernisation was to be a world power and to achieve unification with Taiwan. With regard to the former, in 1988, Deng Xiaoping stated that if China did not have the atomic bomb, or the hydrogen bomb, or did not launch satellites since the 1960s, it could not be called an influential big country and would not have its present international status (Deng 1988:413). He also noted that although China possessed nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles and satellites, generally speaking, it was still a poor nation (Deng 1987b:375). On 13 January 1975, Mainland China's former premier, Zhou Enlai, said that Mainland China should achieve modernization in four areas: agriculture, industry, national

defence, and science and technology (Han 1995:451). However, military modernization required huge spending and, it was apparent that at that time, Mainland China should concentrate national resources on developing the economy as a priority. On 4 June 1985, Deng Xiaoping instructed the PLA that the four modernisations had to be prioritised and that the modernisation of military equipment was only feasible once the economy was on a stronger footing. He asked the PLA to be patient, and believed that Mainland China could increase GNP growth fourfold by the end of the twentieth century. At that time, the economy would be strong and more money could be allocated to renewing military equipment (Deng 1985b:324).

With regard to the goal of uniting with Taiwan, as the previous chapter discussed, in the mid-1990s, the military power of Mainland China was still far behind that of the US. Therefore, when Mainland China conducted military exercises near Taiwan in 1996, the US sent two aircraft carriers to intervene. Mainland China then ended the exercises quickly. To overcome this humiliation from the US, the only option for Mainland China was to accelerate the modernization of the PLA and hope that someday the PLA could be strong enough to confront the US forces (Wang, T.Y. 1999:523). At present, after many years of rapid economic progress, economic and scientific strength have increased rapidly, and it has made it possible to realise Deng Xiaoping's vision - Mainland China has the capability to modernise the PLA.

4.2.1 Mainland China's air force and navy

Both the air force and the navy have modern high-tech equipment. It is the extent of this modernisation that reflects the nation's general strength. China's main naval power was destroyed in the first Sino-Japanese War in 1895. As a result of the long-term invasion by the powers, China had no opportunity to build naval and aircraft industries, therefore, until the establishment of the PRC in 1949, Mainland China had no capacity to produce cars, tanks, fighter aircraft, warships and submarines by itself.

On 25 June 1950, the Korean War broke out. Subsequently, on 25 October, Mainland China sent troops to participate in the Korean War to fight against the US troops. The Korean War made Chinese leaders realise the importance of military

modernisation and they actively engaged in establishing Chinese defence industries. With the assistance of the Soviet Union, in September 1955, Mainland China established the first Chinese defence high-tech school, the Harbin Military Engineering College, which trained many excellent defence engineers (Lo 1995:28-35). On the other hand, also with the assistance of the Soviet Union in the 1950s, general defence industries were established, and the first generations of armoured personnel carriers, tanks, fighter aircraft, naval vessels and submarines had been produced (Shambaugh 2002:227). For example, Mainland China produced copies of the Soviet MiG-17 fighter in 1956 and produced a 1,000 ton ordinary torpedo submarine by itself in 1957 (Nie 1994:529-530). In 1960, when Mainland China's modern defence industries started, the Sino-Soviet relationship had split. The Soviet Union tore related aid agreements into pieces and abruptly withdrew all its high-tech experts. When these experts left, they took away their technological data from Mainland China (Nie 1994:583-586). Undoubtedly, for the Chinese aircraft industry, the abrupt withdrawal of Soviet experts meant that Mainland China could not import new military technology. Then, unfortunately, a mass movement, the Cultural Revolution (1966-1969), was launched by Chairman Mao Zedong. In order to establish a utopian communist society, Mao 'purified' the CCP. Some intellectuals and scientists were humiliated and sent to work on collective farms, and the universities were also closed (Elliott 1992:299). Between knowledge and politics, Mao gave priority to politics. The whole of Mainland China was politicised. Politics was more important than science and technology, and society was in chaos with intensive mass movements. Simultaneously, these mass movements also impeded economic growth.

Until it ended in 1976, the Cultural Revolution caused the atrophy of the PLA air force. Then Mainland China attempted to rejuvenate the backward PLA air force (Allen 1997:219), navy and national defence industry. In the 1980s, Mainland China launched the movement of the Four Modernisations. The movement aimed to modernise agriculture, industry, defence, science and technology. Since defence modernisation required advanced weapons and equipment, it also required enormous public expenditure. However, Deng Xiaoping allocated Mainland China's limited national resources to developing its economy as a priority. Therefore, at that

time, the PLA air force progressed slowly. In the 1980s, it even imported foreign technology, but its equipment was almost entirely renewed by Mainland China's aircraft industry (Allen 1997:220).

In May 1989, the President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, visited Mainland China and the hostile confrontation between Mainland China and the Soviet Union ended, establishing normal relations (So & Si 1992:733). As previously discussed, subsequently, the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991, and Russia became independent. Soon Russia fell into economic chaos. However, its gigantic high-tech military industrial capability still existed. Experiencing economic hardship, Russia attempted to sell arms to generate revenue. At that time, Mainland China was under US arms sanctions as a result of the Tianamen Square event (1989). Therefore, Mainland China was a big buyer of Russian advanced arms and it had the capability to pay large sums of money. Under this supply and demand situation, Mainland China had the opportunity to procure many advanced weapons from Russia. In March 1992, as mentioned, Mainland China imported 24 Sukhoi-27 (Su-27) jet fighters. In 1996, Mainland China obtained co-production permission from Russia to produce the Su-27. Mainland China not only imported US\$900 million in parts but also had to pay a US\$650 million technological aid fee (Yuan 2002:11). Subsequently, Mainland China procured and had already received 40 Su-30MKK fighter bombers by 2002 (Pomfret 2002:1), and further procured 28 Su-30MKK fighters in early 2003 (Yuan 2003a:1). The Su-30MKK is the improved model of the Su-27 and has more advanced digital avionics and radar, air-to-air and air-to-ground missiles, precision-guided smart bombs and has an all-weather ground attack capability (Shambaugh 2002:263-264). In 2002, Mainland China started to produce 50 J-10 fighters - the fourth-generation of fighters produced by Mainland China which are equipped with Russian AL-31 FN jet engines, air-to-air, air-to-ground and air-to-ship missiles, and flies at Mach 2. It has a combat radius of 1,100 kilometers and a range of 2,500 kilometers. The production of J-10 fighters symbolised that Mainland China had boosted its self-production capability in the military aviation industry (Wang 2002:11).

In the 1990s, Mainland China procured and received two Sovremenny-class

destroyers and four Kilo-class submarines (two of the export models and two of the more advanced Project 636 models) from Russia (Pomfret 2002:1-3). By 2002, according to Western and Russian sources, Mainland China ordered two more Sovremenny-class destroyers and eight more Kilo-class submarines (the diesel-powered Project 636 model) (Pomfret 2002:1-2). They will be equipped with Klub anti-ship missiles with a range of 300 kilometers, will have a submerged speed of 20 knots, a diving depth of 300 meters and are silent when submerged, making it difficult to detect (Du 2003:43). With regard to the added procurement of two Sovremenny-class destroyers, they are the 956EM Type, equipped with “Sunburn” SS-N-22 anti-ship missiles with a range over 200 kilometers (Yuan 2003b:A11). In November 2002, Mainland China tested an YJ-83 anti-ship cruise missile from a fighter-bomber. The YJ-83 has a range of about 250 kilometers. US Pentagon officials believed that the purpose of developing a long-range strike capability was to be able to confront US aircraft carriers and other ships (Gerts 2002b:1).

The imported Klub missiles with a range of 300 kilometers in the Kilo-class submarines; the “Sunburn” sea-skimming missiles with a range over 200 kilometers in Sovremenny-class destroyers; and the Mainland Chinese-produced YJ-83 cruise missile with a 250 kilometer range when fired from fighter-bombers, are all long-range anti-ship missiles. However, the Taiwan Strait is 130 kilometers at its narrowest. If Mainland China wanted to blockade the Taiwan Strait or attack Taiwan Island, the Chinese-produced WS 1B model ground-launched artillery, with a range of 180 kilometers (Yang 2003:45) was enough. It was not necessary for Mainland China to spend a huge amount of money to buy advanced weapons from Russia, for example, spending US\$ 1.4 billion to procure two 956EM Type Sovremenny-class destroyers (Yuan 2003b:A11). On the other hand, Mainland China also spent more billions of US dollars to procure and co-produce the Su-27 and Su-30MKK fighter bombers, to develop its fourth generation fighter J-10, YJ-83 cruise missile by itself, and to buy Kilo-class submarines etc. It is reasonable to suppose that the major purpose of upgrading the long-range strike capability of Mainland China was not related to Korea, the Philippines or Thailand. The only goal was the US aircraft carriers and ships, namely, be able to confront US intervention in Taiwan with force.

4.2.2. Mainland China's nuclear capability and ballistic missiles

Currently, nuclear weapons are the ultimate form of national power. They are also the weapon of last resort because their use would assure mutual destruction. For Mainland China, nuclear weapons were the last resort to avoid US attempts to divide China, either in the case of Taiwan or Tibet. For the US, to retain its hegemony, it can not tolerate 'unfriendly' nations possessing nuclear weapons. For example, in the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Cold War no longer existed, but the US still attacked and occupied Iraq. One of the major reasons was allegedly to avoid the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In the Cold War era of the twentieth century, the Sino-US relationship was hostile, and the US also made an attempt to deter Mainland China from becoming a nuclear power. In the early 1960s, the Kennedy administration (1961-63) made efforts to initiate a preventive strike against Mainland China's nuclear facilities. However, on 22 November 1963, US President John F Kennedy was assassinated. Subsequently, the Johnson administration wanted to avoid direct confrontation with Mainland China, and abstained from carrying out the plan (Burr and Richelson 2000:54-99).

On 16 October 1964, Mainland China exploded its first atomic bomb (So & Si 1992:587); on 17 June 1967, it exploded its first hydrogen-bomb in the air (So & Si 1992:598); on 27 April 1970, it launched its first satellite (So & Si 1992:608); on 24 December 1970, it produced its first nuclear-powered submarine (Peng, T.C. 1995:237); on 30 April 1981, it produced its first ballistic missile – carrying, nuclear-powered submarine; and on 12 October 1982, Mainland China launched its first submarine-launched ballistic missile successfully (Chen, Y.M. 1994:135). Mainland China's nuclear forces, and its instruments of delivery – ballistic missiles – had been in development for over 30 years. However, compared to the nuclear power of the US, Mainland China's nuclear power was small-scale. Now that the US is establishing its National Missile Defence (NMD) system, it places a great deal of pressure on Mainland China. Therefore, the utmost priority for Mainland China is how to penetrate the NMD system of the US.

On 15 December 2000, Mainland China launched the JL-2 version (JL is short for Julang, meaning "Great Wave") multiple warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles

from two nuclear submarines in the Yellow Sea and the East China Sea respectively, hitting five military targets which were 4,000 to 5,000 kilometers away in the desert of Xinjiang province (HKI 2000:13), the biggest northwestern province. In early 2001, Mainland China produced the Type 094 submarine, the first nuclear-powered strategic ballistic missile submarine (SSBN), and started testing at sea. According to reports, Mainland China will produce at least six of these submarines. The Type 094 is equipped with the JL-2 submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), which carries three to six nuclear warheads, and is silent and extremely mobile when submerged (ICMC/HK 2001:11). Obviously, the Type 094 strategic nuclear submarine will significantly boost Mainland China's second strike ability against the US.

Subsequently, in August 2002, Mainland China successfully tested land-based and sea-based ICBM. Two of the land-based ICBMs hit a target, 6,000 kilometers away in the centre of Xinjiang province. According to reports from Mainland China, in close-war circumstances, the PLA's Second Artillery Corps (ballistic missile troops) could move 1,000 kilometers to conduct manoeuvres within 48 hours. At sea, Mainland China successfully launched a sea-based ICBM from a nuclear-powered strategic ballistic missile submarine and hit a target which was also 6,000 kilometers away in the desert of Xinjiang province. According to US analysis, the range of this SSBN version is 14,500 kilometers. It was believed to be an improved JL-2 version. (The US Department of Defence previously estimated that Mainland China would not have the capability to launch this SSBN until 2008) (HKI 2002:13). In July 2002, Mainland China tested the DF-21 (DF is short for Dong Feng, meaning "East Winds") medium range missile, containing multiple dummy warheads designed to defeat interceptor missiles (Gertz 2002a:1-3). In December 2002, Mainland China successfully tested the launching of multiple warheads on the DF-21 at a range of 1,800 kilometers. It is believed that this missile used multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle (MIRV) technology. This showed that Mainland China had made great progress and had the nuclear missile capability to confront the US missile defence network and to deter the intervention of the US in the Taiwan Strait in the future (Sugiyama 2003:13).

4.2.3. Mainland China's outer space capability

The development of outer space technology has changed the defence arena and it is a priority for major powers to establish outer space capacity. Mainland China's leaders also understood the importance of this capability, therefore, in March 2003, President Jiang Zemin approved the "126 Programme" which includes a space and aeronautical technological system; an electronic information technological system; a strategic defence technological system; a layer counterattack system; an optical laser technological system; and an informal and formal material technological system. When Jiang Zemin approved this programme, he indicated that Mainland China had to establish an advanced defence strategic system with the capability to counterstrike in the event of an invasion (CAN/HKI 2000:10).

Which nation has the military capability to invade Mainland China? Currently, Western countries, such as the Britain, Japan, France and Germany, do not have this capability. Russia was in an economic predicament and established friendly co-operative relations with Mainland China. The only nation that has the military capability to strike Mainland China and has the potential intention to strike it is the US. And the only real reason for the US to strike Mainland China, objectively, would be to deter Mainland China from achieving unification with Taiwan, in other words, to deter the rejuvenation of China in order to maintain its own hegemony. Therefore, an important reason for Mainland China to establish an outer space capability is to counter military intervention in the Taiwan issue.

One of Mainland China's greatest achievements in the space field was to launch a manned spaceship, Shenzhou (Sacred Vessel), which included a manned capsule, an orbit capsule and had aft propulsion (Johnson-Freese 2003:6-7). On 15 October 2003, Mainland China launched its first manned spaceship (Beech 2003:32). After the US and Russia, Mainland China is the third nation that has the capability to launch a manned spaceship. The manned spaceship is a mammoth engineering system, which involves the integration of spaceman, space application, spaceship, carrier rocket, monitor and communication, launching site and landing site system. Therefore, the successful launch of the manned spaceship meant Mainland China had overcome many obstacles in space technology and it symbolised

comprehensive progress in high-tech technology and the defence field (Tien, Y. 2003:34-36).

On 24 April 1970, Mainland China launched its first satellite (So & Si 1992:608). Since then, it has launched various satellites, such as meteorological satellites, scientific experimental satellites, communication satellites, reconnaissance satellites and navigation satellites. One of the most important types of satellite is the navigation satellite. Navigation satellites can provide receivers with continuous (24 hours/day), real-time and three-dimensional (latitudinal, longitudinal and altitudinal) positioning data. At present, there are two navigation satellite systems operating in space. One is the Global Positioning System (GPS) of the US, the other is the Russian Global Navigation Satellite System (GLONASS). The GLONASS uses one code, however, the GPS uses two kinds of codes, the C/A (Coarse Acquisition) code and the P (Precise) code. The C/A code provides less accuracy than the P code, and is available to civilian users. The P code is more accurate and is available to military receivers only (Cooksey 2003:1-3). Mainland China used the C/A Code of the GPS system in its many advanced weapons such as medium and long range guided missiles and the Su 30 MKK fighters etc. However, the C/A code may be interfered with or intercepted by the US in wartime. In order to avoid the control of the US, Mainland China developed its own navigation satellite positioning system (Tien, H. 2003:40). In 2000, Mainland China launched two regional positioning satellites into orbit, the Beidou satellites system. Subsequently, in May 2003, Mainland China launched its third Beidou navigation satellite to join the first two (Tien, H. 2003:38-40). The Beidou navigation system accurately locates the longitude, latitude and altitude of the subscriber at any time and place. Therefore, it helps the development of advanced weapons, such as cruise missile systems (Ang 2003:1). However, the reaction, speed and precision is not on a par with the GPS (In 2003:65-66). Mainland China was the third nation with the capability to deploy a satellite positioning system and this was a significant step for its space technology (Ang 2003:1).

On the other hand, Mainland China has also deployed and is developing electromagnetic weapons and laser weapons. The electromagnetic weapon includes an electromagnetic gun, electromagnetic pulse (EMP) bombs and a microwave

weapon. The explosion of EMP bombs will paralyse or destroy electronic equipment or radar systems within dozens of miles around an aircraft carrier and other vessels. The non-nuclear electromagnetic pulse released by the microwave weapon can also paralyse computers and electrical appliances over a wide area. The laser weapon includes a short-range battlefield laser gun, anti-satellite laser weapon and anti-missile laser weapon. The energy output of the anti-satellite and anti-missile laser weapon, that the PLA developed and tested, has the capability to damage satellites in low orbit and low-flying cruise missiles (Nemets 2002:1-5).

In retrospect, Lee Teng-hui's military Cross-Straits policy had two elements. One was that politics controls the military, the other was the military connection with the US. Taiwan is a small densely-populated island, and its residents are split between favouring unification with, or secession from Mainland China. Therefore, it would be difficult for Taiwan to resist a unification war launched by Mainland China. This is common knowledge in Taiwan. However, Lee Teng-hui's administration still spent huge amounts of money to purchase advanced weapons from the US aimed at resisting and deterring a unification war with Mainland China. Another main purpose was to establish substantial Taiwan-US military relations by purchasing huge amounts of arms. The US whilst priding itself on its values, such as honesty, violated the *1982 US-PRC Joint Communiqué* by breaking its word and allowing the sale of advanced F-16 fighter planes to Taiwan. Obviously, the purpose of the US betrayal was to impede the unification of Taiwan with Mainland China, to thwart the rejuvenation of Mainland China, and to maintain its hegemony. The sale of the 150 F-16 fighter planes enabled Taiwan to confront the pressure of a unification war launched by Mainland China, so Taiwanese authorities were pleased. For Mainland China, facing the pressure of US attempts to impede the unification between China and Taiwan, even at the expense of breaking its international commitment, and the military intervention of a US aircraft carrier battle group in 1996, the only option was to rise to the US's challenge and accelerate the development of its own military power. After ten years of effort, in 2003, the PLA's power increased far more quickly than the US could have expected in 1992 when it broke its international commitment.

5. CONCLUSION

Due to the intervention of the US, or at least the semi-protection it provided, Mainland China was unable to unite with Taiwan through force. Therefore, Taiwanese authorities kept complete autonomous administrative power. Mainland China was unable to alter Lee's secessionist policy. Lee Teng-hui fully used his autonomous administrative power to implement his secessionist policy. As previously mentioned, at the core of Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy were his cultural, economic and military policies. In order to create the next generation's secessionist identity, he adopted a series of cultural secessionist Cross-Strait policies, such as the revision of historical textbooks, the increase of mother tongue education and non-recognition of qualifications from Mainland Chinese universities. Similarly, in order to deter the increasingly close relationship arising from Cross-Straits trade which could lead to Taiwan uniting with Mainland China economically, Lee adopted the Go South and No Haste, Be Patient policies.

In the face of Lee Teng-hui's strong cultural and economic secessionist policies, Mainland China could only implement various measures against Taiwanese residents within its administrative area. In the past, during the Qing dynasty's rule of over two hundred years, Mainland China was the central government. At present, Mainland China has 9.6 million square kilometers and 1.25 billion people - by contrast, Taiwan has only 0.03 million square kilometers and 0.022 billion people. Therefore, in the future, if Taiwan unites with Mainland China, logically and realistically, Mainland China would be the central government. As a matter of fact, Mainland China implemented its political Cross-Straits policy from the perspective of being the central government, and it behaved as such. At the end of the 1980s, Mainland China was neither rich nor advanced, however, it gave preferential economic treatment to Taiwanese businessmen, and preferential educational treatment to Taiwanese students. Since the 1980s, Mainland China had opened its door to Taiwanese residents, welcomed them to visit Mainland China and allowed them freedom to go or stay. However, until now, Taiwanese authorities have resisted even indirect Cross-Straits trade and have implemented many sophisticated regulations to limit Mainland Chinese residents from visiting Taiwan. In the 1990s, Mainland China extended more preferential policies to Taiwanese, and these preferential measures caused many Taiwanese businessmen, students, tourists, reporters, and political

figures to visit Mainland China, and helped them to gain insights into the real Mainland China. As a result, many more Taiwanese interacted with Mainland Chinese residents than before, and there were even about 4,000 Taiwanese students studying at Mainland China's universities. These phenomena were inconceivable before, and were not to the advantage of secessionism. From the view of Lee Teng-hui, this was a blow to Taiwanese identity. In early 2002, Lee Teng-hui stated that the 1996 missile exercise by Mainland China had heightened the Taiwanese sense of national identity. However, this had dwindled recently. He even further indicated that Taiwan would be in danger if these phenomena continued (Chen, S.C. 2002:4). In other words, if these phenomena continued, it would be impossible to achieve full secession.

Before the 1990s, Taiwan implemented the one-China policy, and purchased weapons from the US, but did not have the intention to secede from Mainland China. Therefore, there was no urgent need for Mainland China to complete unification. However, Lee Teng-hui's administration's reason for purchasing arms was secession, and in 1995, his speech at Cornell University (see Chapter five) was a key turning point. From the view of the Mainland China, Lee's speech was equivalent to a declaration of Taiwanese independence. Therefore, Mainland China launched military exercises at sea near Taiwan in July 1995, and March 1996 respectively, to give warning that if Taiwan declared independence, Mainland China would launch its unification war no matter what the sacrifice. However, it caused the US to send their aircraft carrier battle groups to interfere in the Mainland's military exercise. Facing the military intervention of the US, Mainland China tried to speed up its military modernization. Coincidentally, after 15 years of economic reform, Mainland China's economic power increased rapidly, and it had a friendly relationship with Russia, and therefore, it had the capability and the opportunity to acquire advanced weapons technology. Simultaneously, due to its rapid economic growth, Mainland China's science and technology capacity also progressed rapidly. For example, in August 2002, Mainland China produced its first super computer which operated 1.027 trillion calculations per second (XNA 2002:1). Along with the growth of science and technology capability, Mainland China produced the new generation J-10 fighters, Type 094 nuclear-powered SSBN, YJ-83 anti-ship cruise missiles, the MIRV missiles,

sea-based ICBMs, regional navigation satellites and even a manned spaceship. Mainland China also procured the Kilo-class submarine, Sovremenny-class destroyers and Su-30MKK fighters etc. It was unexpected that in only seven years (1996-2003), Mainland China's military strength would quickly increase and its military capability would improve to the extent that it was able to prevent future US intervention in the Taiwan Strait Crisis.

CHAPTER EIGHT

EVALUATION

This study has shown that Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy was a secessionist policy, namely, to have Taiwan secede from Mainland China. Lee Teng-hui used the cover of Cross-Strait unification to implement what was really a secessionist Cross-Strait policy under the flag of the ROC.

1. SUMMARY

Lee Teng-hui's secessionist policy had two significant characteristics. Firstly, as is the case with other secessionist movements, such as the Basque secessionist movement in Spain, the Kashmir separatist movement in Pakistan, the Tamil separatists in Sri Lanka, and Kurdish separatists in Turkey, the people and territory of the secessionist groups are adjacent to the central government. However, Taiwan island is geographically divided from its central government – Mainland China - by the Taiwan Strait. Its people and jurisdictional territory are not adjacent to Mainland China. Secondly, Taiwanese secessionists can claim an independent government. The separation between Taiwan and Mainland China was caused by the Chinese civil war between the KMT-led and CCP-led governments. The KMT-led government was defeated and moved to Taiwan. Also, due to the military intervention and protection of the US, it resulted in long-term de facto separation across the Strait. This meant that the ROC in Taiwan had a completely independent administrative jurisdiction and the history and jurisdiction of the ROC was divided into the ROC on Mainland China and the ROC on Taiwan. Due to the geographical and administrative separation between Taiwan and Mainland China and the strict dictatorial rule of the Mainlander KMT-led government, some Taiwanese élite questioned their national bond with the Chinese motherland and this gave rise to secessionist ideology. Lee Teng-hui grew up during that era, and his youthful experience was like that of other Taiwanese élite of that era. Needless to say, he was kept under political surveillance by the Mainlander-led government for over 20 years. Therefore, he was a secessionist, but he concealed his secessionist ideology under authoritarian rule. When he was President, he implemented his real secessionist Cross-Strait policy, which impacted on all areas, including culture, trade and the military. This study has looked at the policies he implemented with relation to important political Cross-Straits issues. On the surface, he supported unification with statements or slogans, but secession was really his goal. This study also comprehensively analysed the perspective and reaction of Mainland China to Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy. Thirdly, in the context of international relations, this study shows that Lee's secessionist Cross-Strait movement was far more significant than other secessionist movements because it related to the strategic interests of Mainland China and the US, especially, their national security and the question of the integration or disintegration of Mainland China. Finally, the study analysed the possible future

development of the Cross-Strait issue.

However, as with all academic research, this thesis also could not cover certain areas. For example, Lee Teng-hui's Cross-Strait policy also involved the mass media, smuggling, crime, labour and diplomacy, to name a few. This study focuses on the political Cross-Straits policy and his actions in the fields of culture (education), trade and the military. It was believed that the exclusions listed would not influence the results of the study. As a Taiwanese descendant of the brutal Japanese colonial rule, Lee Teng-hui inconceivably had a positive attitude towards Japan. In Taiwan, there was a rumour that Lee Teng-hui's real father was Japanese, however, Lee Teng-hui never admitted or denied this. This study could not draw the inference that one of the real purposes of his secessionist policy was to avoid Mainland China's re-unification and rejuvenation which would threaten his real mother nation – Japan, and that the purpose of his secessionist Cross-Strait policy was to help Japan's national interest by creating a buffer state between southern Japan and Mainland China.

2. TESTING OF PROPOSITIONS

It has been shown that Lee Teng-hui's political Cross-Straits policy was essentially a secessionist policy. However, what caused Lee Teng-hui to betray Chiang Ching-kuo's political unification route and implement a secessionist political Cross-Straits policy? What caused Lee Teng-hui to implement his secessionist policy in the name of unification? In other words, why did he deceive Taiwanese residents whilst implementing this policy? And why did Lee Teng-hui instigate ethnic resentment between Taiwanese and Mainlanders, and try to use Taiwanese resentment to foster a Taiwanese identity and further to promote Taiwanese secessionist ideology?

2.1. Proposition 1: The main cause of Taiwanese secessionism was ethnic conflict

This study showed that the main cause of Taiwanese secessionism was ethnic conflict between Taiwanese and the Mainlanders. In 1895, China was defeated in the Sino-Japanese war and was coerced into ceding Taiwan and the Penghu Islands to Japan. In 1945, Japan surrendered to the Allies. At that time, the Taiwanese

welcomed the return of Taiwan to China, and the joyous mood of the Taiwanese reflected their national identification with China completely. However, the 228 Incident took place in Taiwan, where Mainlander-led troops slaughtered many Taiwanese, and soon after, the Mainlander or KMT-led government fled to Taiwan from Mainland China, and many Taiwanese (including Mainlanders) were killed during the State of Emergency in the 1950s and 1960s. Simultaneously, because the KMT-led government fled to Taiwan in its original central government form, the Mainlander élite occupied the key positions in the KMT-led government. This meant that the Taiwanese élite were at a disadvantage in the political power sharing system. The suppression by the Mainlander-led government as well as the unfair power-sharing system led the Taiwanese élite to believe that the Mainlanders were the main reason that they did not possess their own government (nation), and this hostility towards Mainlanders was gradually transformed into secessionist ideology. That is to say, in only fifty years, Taiwanese secessionism rose from nothing. It was produced artificially by political factors, and it differs from many other secessionist movements, which are caused by religious and/or racial differences. However, before 1985, due to the strict authoritarian rule of the Mainlander-led government and rapid economic growth, the Mainlander-led government usually won elections in Taiwan and Taiwanese separatists did not have the opportunity to develop their secessionist movement. They had a covert secessionist movement in the name of pursuing democracy and freedom until 1986. The Taiwanese élite established the Taiwanese-led DDP, of which almost all members were Taiwanese, and it openly sought an independent Taiwan. The ethnic resentment and conflict between Taiwanese and Mainlanders had existed a long time, therefore, Lee Teng-hui could instigate and manipulate it to promote Taiwanese secessionist ideology. The evidence thus supports this proposition.

2.2. Proposition 2: Lee Teng-hui's secessionist ideology reflected a hatred toward Mainlanders

The architect of modern change, Lee Teng-hui, as a Taiwanese intellectual, weathered political difficulties. This study showed that Lee Teng-hui's background was unusual and contradictory. He had participated in the CCP and was under political surveillance by the Mainlander-led government for over twenty years, and he

weathered political crises many times. With the exception of his 1969 interrogation by the TGGH (Taiwan Garrison General Headquarters), Lee Teng-hui did not mention his interrogations or detention. However, in the State of Emergency from the 1950s to 1960s, Lee Teng-hui had been arrested and detained by the Mainlander-led secret police before being released. During this difficult political period, Lee Teng-hui did not only remain safe, but was also allowed to go to the US to study for his Master's and Ph.D. degrees. However, about 4,000 political prisoners (Mainlanders and Taiwanese) were executed in the 1950s. Under such circumstances, as a member of the CCP during the 1950s and 1960s, he could have expected to be tortured and humiliated in the process of interrogation, and forced to cooperate with the secret police authorities. Unless a political prisoner to some extent made political confessions or betrayed his comrades, he could not remain safe. That is why the famous historian, Lee Ao, suspected that Lee Teng-hui had been a traitor to his Chinese Communist comrades. These experiences must have been unforgettable for Lee Teng-hui, and he revealed his negative sentiments toward the Mainlanders. Maybe that is why, even as the chairman of the KMT, he criticised the KMT-led government, as an outside regime (namely a Mainlander-led or non-Taiwanese led government). In 2000, due to the ending of his presidential term, he was a civilian. The friends and supporters around him were all Taiwanese, and there were no Mainlanders. This also indicated that there was an insurpassable barrier between Lee Teng-hui and Mainlanders.

By reasonable inference, there was a close relationship between the political oppression by the Mainlander-led government and the secessionist political Cross-Straits policy of Lee Teng-hui. Lee Teng-hui transformed his hatred towards Mainlanders into hating Mainland China, and pursued Taiwan's independence. Therefore, the Taiwanese secessionist movement was Lee Teng-hui's way of making his feelings public. However, in reality, most average Taiwanese did not have the terrible life experience of Lee Teng-hui. Conversely, most Taiwanese were the economic beneficiaries of Taiwan's rapid economic growth during 1950-1980, which took place under the rule of the Mainlander-led government. Thus, average Taiwanese did not hate Mainlanders or Mainland China as Lee Teng-hui did. That is why, even during the demonisation of Mainland China by Lee's administration, there

were many Taiwanese who went to Mainland China to invest, to study, to marry Mainland Chinese, and to emigrate. The evidence, therefore, also supports this proposition.

2.3. Proposition 3: Lee Teng-hui disguised his secessionist aims as unification

On the other hand, the main difference between Lee's secessionist movement and other secessionist movements was that Lee Teng-hui implemented his secessionist Cross-Strait policy in the name of Cross-Strait unification. However, he was a president who had strong political power, then why did he use deception to implement his secessionist policy? This study showed that Lee Teng-hui differed from the Taiwanese élite who participated in the elections. He worked for the Mainlander-led government, concealed his secessionist political identity and pretended to support the one-China policy of President Chiang Ching-kuo. As a result, Chiang Ching-kuo handpicked him as vice-president. In 1988, President Chiang Ching-kuo passed away suddenly and Lee Teng-hui immediately succeeded him as the President of the ROC. Because Lee Teng-hui was the leader of the ROC, he dominated the government and could change governmental policy to implement his real secessionist policy. This is different from other international secessionist movements which do not have political power. This is why Lee's secessionist measures could influence the US government to change the policy and allow him to visit the US.

When Lee Teng-hui succeeded to the presidency, the non-secessionist Mainlander and Taiwanese élite controlled political power, and Taiwanese residents were indoctrinated by Chiang Ching-kuo and his father, Chiang Kai-shek's administration for about 40 years (1950-1988). Chinese ideology influenced the Taiwanese residents comprehensively. For example, from 2 November 1987, Chiang Ching-kuo's administration allowed civilians to visit their relatives in Mainland China. Although, the KMT-led government demonized Mainland China for about 40 years, and they were also demonized by the US because of the 1989 Tiananmen Square event, Taiwanese residents were not afraid to visit Mainland China en masse. The number of Taiwanese visitors to Mainland China was 948,000 in 1990 (and reached 1,526,969 in 1993) (TIER 2001:35). At that time, Taiwan's total population was only

about 22 million) (GIO 2001:22). In such a pro-Mainland China atmosphere, Lee Teng-hui used deception, namely the slogan of Cross-Strait unification, to implement his secessionist policy. Therefore, Lee Teng-hui not only supported Cross-Strait unification superficially, but also promulgated the *Guidelines for National Unification* in 1991. The political Cross-Straits policy Lee Teng-hui implemented was substantively secessionist. This study showed that even early in Lee Teng-hui's period in office, when his power was not yet consolidated, his administration indirectly viewed Mainland China as another nation. Subsequently, in April 1990, Lee Teng-hui hinted to a pro-secessionist group that he would implement a secessionist Cross-Strait policy metaphorically. The Chingdao-Lake Incident (1994), the private dialogue between Lee Teng-hui and Shiba Ryotaro (1994), and the address in Cornell University (1995) are all secessionist in nature. Thus, from the beginning to the end of his presidential term, the political Cross-Straits policy Lee Teng-hui implemented was secessionist. The evidence therefore again supports this proposition.

3. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE TRENDS

By betraying Chiang Ching-kuo's unification route and using deception Lee Teng-hui implemented his secessionist policy for 12 years. However, what was the result? This study showed how in order to maintain the single nation status of the relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China, early in the Quemoy Artillery Battle of 1958, Chairman Mao Zedong voluntarily abandoned occupation of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. The purpose of Mao Zedong's giving the Quemoy and Matsu Islands to Taiwanese authorities was to let them keep the islands which were seen as two reins with which to control Taiwan. It did not indirectly make Taiwan separate from Mainland China's administrative jurisdiction. Subsequently, Mainland China shelled Quemoy every 'odd day' and stopped firing at Quemoy every 'even day', in order to let Taiwanese authorities supply food and munitions to Quemoy, and to allow them to maintain their possession of these islands. However, another important result was to place Taiwan and Mainland China in a civil war situation, thereby showing that Taiwan and Mainland China belonged to one nation.

President Lee Teng-hui understood the meaning of being the leader of Taiwan. In

order to end the civil war situation between Taiwan and Mainland China automatically, on 30 April 1991, Lee Teng-hui's administration declared the termination of the "Period of National Mobilisation for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion" and simultaneously abolished the *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion*. This ended the conflict between the KMT and the CCP, and the relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China was indirectly that of two nations. However, this was only Lee Teng-hui's personal desire. On the other hand, a key consideration was that Lee Teng-hui was still unable to change the existing constitutional and legal framework based on the one-China policy during his presidential term. And even until today, Taiwanese authorities allege their real jurisdiction covers Taiwan, and the Penghu, Quemoy and Matsu Islands. However, the Quemoy and Matsu Islands are extremely close to Mainland China. Thus, it has not changed the framework set up by Mao Zedong in 1958. On the other hand, on Taiwan Island, Lee Teng-hui using the advantage of independent administrative power, did not only legalise the secessionist movement, but also deliberately increase its power and hurt the political groups that supported Cross-Strait unification. Although Lee Teng-hui did not reach his secessionist goal, he increased the strength of the secessionists successfully by preventing the unification of Taiwan and Mainland China. Mao Zedong would never have expected this.

With regard to the future, this study shows the following main consequences of Lee Teng-hui's secessionist Cross-Straits policy. Firstly, a future Taiwanese president will not be able to establish a secessionist ideology unilaterally. Lee Teng-hui was the first Taiwanese president, and his Taiwanisation allowed the Taiwanese élite to grab core political power. Therefore, he obtained support from Taiwanese. Simultaneously, Lee Teng-hui was handpicked by a Mainlander, Chiang Ching-kuo. Therefore, he also obtained the support from Mainlanders in the early period of his presidential term. Later on, Lee Teng-hui implemented his real secessionist Cross-Strait policy, but he used the cover of Cross-Strait unification, thereby limiting possible criticism by anti-secessionist groups. On the other hand, when Lee Teng-hui took office after the period of authoritarian rule, he was able to mobilise the secret police to oppress the pro-unification groups (Wang, T.Y. 1999:501-502). In April 1998, Lee Teng-hui ordered increased political surveillance. Subsequently, on 1 June 1998, Yin

Tsung-wen, the Director-General of the National Security Bureau, publicly admitted that the people who supported Cross-Strait unification were under their surveillance (Wang, S.P. 1998:1-2). Lee Teng-hui threatened the freedom and security of the pro-unification figures through the secret police, and it proved that he was lying when he spoke about freedom and democracy. On the other hand, Lee's administration introduced political slogans, such as "Taiwan first" and "Taiwan is the priority" and alleged that the pro-unification figures would betray Taiwan. As a result, people dared not question or criticise his secessionist Cross-Strait policy. Against such a background and in this political atmosphere, Lee Teng-hui possessed unprecedented political power and prestige. It would be difficult for a future Taiwanese president to possess such historical timing and power. If Lee Teng-hui, who had such unprecedented political power, was still unable to oppress the unification voice in Taiwan, it will be even more difficult for future Taiwanese presidents to obtain unanimous support for secession.

Secondly, Lee's secessionist Cross-Strait policy made Mainlanders support Mainland China and the outcome of Taiwanisation may have been to decrease opposition to Cross-Straits unification. In order to create Taiwanese consciousness, Lee Teng-hui implemented Taiwanisation strongly and it caused unexpected results. For example, under the banner of Taiwanisation, Lee Teng-hui actively discriminated against Mainlanders. He excluded the Mainlander élite from the core of political decision-making and even declared publicly that (we) could not let Mainlanders be vice-president (Wang, T.Y. 2003:68-69). Lee Teng-hui always claimed that Taiwan was so democratic and free, however, Lee also said that Mainlanders not only could not be president but also vice-president. He discriminated against Mainlanders with this attitude that completely violated the democratic system. Obviously, this discrimination forced Mainlanders to support Mainland China politically (Wang, T.Y. 2001:97). Therefore, it increased the number of people in Taiwan who favoured unification.

Thirdly, on the other hand, the outcome of Lee's Taiwanisation might be a lessening of Taiwanese opposition towards Cross-Strait unification. As a result of Lee Teng-hui's 12 years of Taiwanisation, Taiwanese, who were the majority ethnic group

in Taiwan, obtained political power in Taiwan and ruled Taiwan. From a long-term perspective, Taiwan's political power should be controlled by the majority ethnic Taiwanese. Because Taiwan is ruled by the majority, in the future, if the time is right, Taiwan and Mainland China could hold unification negotiations. If the Taiwanese rulers agree to accept Cross-Strait unification, because they are not Mainlanders, it would be difficult for extreme Taiwanese secessionists to criticise or say that the Mainlanders have betrayed Taiwan. Therefore, Lee Teng-hui's Taiwanisation, to some extent, has decreased the grounds for opposition to Cross-Strait unification in the future.

Fourthly, the second Cross-Straits interaction might also be to the advantage of unification. Ideologically, Lee Teng-hui's secessionist Cross-Strait policy was to use the tragedy of the first interaction after World II, between the Taiwanese and Mainland China upon the return of Taiwan to China in 1945, the 228 Incident, and ethnic conflict (see Chapter four), which aggravated ethnic resentment and caused hostility towards the Mainlanders. However, with the passing of time (the 228 Incident occurred 56 years ago) and the Taiwanisation of the regime (the Taiwanese obtained political power), the importance of these motivations for the Taiwanese secessionists dwindled. On the other hand, the CCP-led government in Mainland China did not slaughter or oppress the Taiwanese as the KMT-led government had in Taiwan. Conversely, as the central government of a big country, Mainland China gave various preferential treatment of a political, cultural, trade and educational nature to Taiwanese residents (both Taiwanese and Mainlanders). For the Taiwanese, this was their second interaction with Mainland China. Since the 1990s, the Taiwanese benefitted from various preferential measures provided by Mainland China. It was different from their first tragic experience. That is why, despite the demonising propaganda against Mainland China during Lee's presidential term, many Taiwanese went to Mainland China to invest, tour, study, marry Mainland Chinese and even to emigrate. Obviously, it was impossible for the Taiwanese to engage in a civil war like the American Civil War (1861-65), where 258,000 Southern soldiers died. It could not afford to sacrifice 258,000 Taiwanese to engage in a secessionist war. Furthermore, after the US Civil War experience, the Southern States chose a unified US and identified with the US eventually. The Taiwanese

secessionist ideology was created artificially, because the people across the Straits had a common historical memory and common national identity. One day, if Taiwan were to unify with Mainland China, the unified government would recover real historical memory through education, and it would be the same outcome as the Southerners identifying with the unified US.

Fifthly, Lee Teng-hui's secessionist Cross-Strait policy accelerated Mainland China's military modernisation. From a tactical political perspective, Lee Teng-hui's visit to the US and his speech at Cornell University were successful in deceiving the US. At that time, Lee Teng-hui used the banner of Cross-Strait unification, and spoke in American democratic language to conceal his real secessionist intentions; to mobilise governmental financial sources; and to engage in intensive lobbying and propaganda. Eventually, he persuaded the US to change its decision and to allow him to visit the US and deliver an address at Cornell University. However, from a strategic political perspective, Lee Teng-hui underestimated the nationalism of Mainland China. His speech at Cornell University was regarded by Mainland China as a semi-declaration of independence and it provoked the 1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis, in which Mainland China carried out missile exercises in waters near Taiwan Island, causing the US to mobilise two aircraft carrier battle groups near Taiwanese waters. The military intervention of the US made Mainland China clearly understand that the pre-condition for its national unification would be the ability to confront the US force. Therefore, in order to prevent US military intervention as far as it could, Mainland China made efforts to speed up its military modernisation. In only seven years (1996-2003), Mainland China's military strength progressed quickly. In the future, when it may be difficult to achieve Cross-Strait unification peacefully, Mainland China will be forced to launch a unification war. Currently, Mainland China has a greater capacity to prevent US military intervention than during the 1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis. This development was not expected when Lee Teng-hui implemented his secessionist Cross-Straits policy.

However, no matter how Lee's secessionist Cross-Strait policy is analysed, this study shows that the difference between the secessionist Cross-Straits movement and general international secessionist movements is the importance of Taiwan Island

geographically. For the US, Taiwan lies to the centre of the first island chain, namely, in the center between Japan's Ryukyu Islands and the Philippine Islands. Taiwan was the pivotally strategic island that caused the US to threaten southeastern Mainland China and which deterred the emerging Mainland China from entering the Pacific. The US always interfered in the Cross-Strait issue. The separation between Taiwan and Mainland China in the 1949 Chinese civil war was the outcome of US military intervention. From 1949-1979, with the support of the US in the United Nations, the KMT-led government in Taiwan with 0.03 million square kilometers represented the whole of China, with 9.6 million square kilometers, for 30 years. Similarly, when Lee Teng-hui implemented the secessionist Cross-Strait policy, there was also US support.

As mentioned in the Introduction, the purpose of the support by the US for the separation between Taiwan and Mainland China was to deter the rejuvenation and emergence of China. However, the US seemed not to understand that Mainland China had no ability to dominate the world or control Asia. From the perspective of race and culture, the Chinese are a yellow race and Chinese characters are ideographic and pictographic. They differ from the characters used by languages such as English, Spanish and French. These racial and cultural characteristics make Chinese society completely different from American or European society, and limit Chinese influence on the American and European continents. Geographically, Mainland China is far from America and Europe, and is not like Russia which lies on the European and Asian continents, or like the US which is bordered by both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. In general economic and scientific terms, Mainland China is still behind the US and Europe. Therefore, Mainland China does not have the ability to interfere in American and European affairs, namely, it is impossible for Mainland China to dominate the world.

Because of the half century (1895-1945) of brutal aggression by Japan, Mainland China still feels antagonism. It would, therefore, be impossible for Mainland China to enter into an alliance with Japan in the foreseeable future. In Southeastern Asia, Australia and New Zealand are English-speaking countries. The Philippines was an American colony and used English as a national language. Singapore also used

English as an official language. The relationship between the US and these English-speaking countries is far closer than their relationship with Mainland China. In Indonesia and Malaysia, due to the presence of a large number of Chinese immigrants in their countries, ethnic conflict between the indigenous people and Chinese immigrants caused anti-Chinese movements to arise many times in the late twentieth century. Also, the two countries are Muslim nations, and, therefore, their relationship with the Middle East is far closer than with Mainland China. Therefore, it is also impossible for Mainland China to dominate Asia. On the other hand, in the middle of the twentieth century during World War II, it was the US that defeated Japan and rescued the southeastern countries (Vietnam, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and Myanmar) from the brutal Japanese rule. Therefore, even in Asia, the relationship between the US and the Asian countries is far closer than with Mainland China. Therefore, the US élite who designed the US policy towards Mainland China to maintain hegemony, do not understand the cultural, historical and political situation or the national feelings between Mainland China and Asia. Perhaps they only looked at the world map, or at population statistics, economic indicators, and the number of nuclear weapons from a tactical military perspective and imagined that Mainland China would be a potential enemy, so they used Taiwan as a pawn to impede the century-long desire for Chinese unification. They pushed Mainland China into opposition, and were even prepared to ignite a Sino-US war. If it does happen, the tragedy will be that it is caused by US ignorance of Chinese culture and history.

Furthermore, due to the language barrier, it is difficult for the US élite to understand modern China deeply and comprehensively. Chinese civilisation is the only civilisation that has continued and still exists in a large united nation, and the Chinese are proud of their long history and civilisation. However, due to the aggression from the West since the Opium War, in the early half of the twentieth century (1911-1950), Mainland China partially disintegrated. From 1937 to 1945, Mainland China was invaded by Japan. About 22.5 million Chinese soldiers and civilians were injured and killed (Liu, T.H. 1995:316); and countless Chinese women were raped and killed by Japanese soldiers or forced to be the sexual slaves of the Japanese military. If they refused, they would be put to death. About 3,000 Chinese

were arrested and subjected to medical tests by Japanese military doctors without anaesthetics until they died (Fujii 1997:189-222). All these Chinese sufferings were unimaginable to the US élite, who claim to support human rights and democracy. Therefore, the unification of Mainland China, with the exception of Hong Kong and Macao in 1949, fulfilled the century-long desire of all Chinese. That is why many Chinese scientists went back to Mainland China to help build their motherland at that time.

From the standpoint of Mainland China, in the early twenty-first century, after weathering one hundred years of suffering (1840-1945), the only purpose of Chinese nationalism is to rejuvenate the once-great nation. One of the core elements of the rejuvenation is to achieve national unification, namely, Cross-Strait unification. China is a five-thousand-year-old civilisation and it is the responsibility of this generation to recover the pride of China. From 1840 to 1945, China was subject to invasion by the West and Japan. If there had not been the struggle and sacrifice of the Chinese élite and people for generation after generation, Mainland China might today be disintegrated like the Arabic world or the Soviet Union. However, at the end of the twentieth century, the jurisdiction over Hong Kong and Macao was returned to Mainland China and this reflected to some extent the general national strength of Mainland China. In the view of Deng Xiaoping, it was not dependent on the talent of the Chinese diplomats who negotiated with the British government, but it was the outcome of the revitalisation of China (Deng 1984c:289). The return of Hong Kong and Macao helped Mainland China rid itself of national humiliation over being invaded by the West. The last remaining national humiliation was that Mainland China had been coerced to cede Taiwan to Japan. Therefore, it would be impossible for all Chinese and for any Chinese leader to accept Taiwanese secession.

Apart from the memory of this national humiliation, there are national security considerations for Mainland China. Early in 1684, the Chinese General, Shih Liang, indicated that Taiwan protected the security of the southeastern region of Mainland China geographically, and if Taiwan were occupied by a foreign nation, it would have a disastrous impact on Mainland China (Shih 1684:62). Firstly, the security of the southeastern region would be threatened. In reality, today's situation is similar to the

prophecy of General Shih, since a reasonable assumption is that in order to maintain its hegemony, the US will enter into an alliance with Taiwan and threaten Mainland China's security through Taiwan Island. Secondly, Taiwanese ancestors immigrated from Mainland China. They were of the same race and spoke the same Chinese language (the Fujian dialect) and used the same Chinese characters as the Mainland Han people. If Taiwan were to secede from Mainland China, it would have the disastrous effect that many language or race minorities within Mainland China, such as the Tibetans of the Tibetan Autonomous Region, the Kazakhs and the Uighur of Xinjiang province, may also attempt to secede from Mainland China (Lin, Y.K. 1991:2), triggering a domino effect, and causing Mainland China to disintegrate like the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Therefore, the Taiwan question is connected with Mainland China whether it is its integration or its disintegration, namely, its survival or extinction.

Therefore, no matter whether from the perspective of Chinese nationalism or national security, if Taiwan were to declare independence or to try to legitimise secession, the only option for Mainland China would be to launch a unification war. At present, Mainland China is only accelerating the upgrading of its military force. If Taiwan were close to legal independence or if it were to declare independence, Mainland China would be forced to cause a showdown or launch a unification war. Mainland China has a second-strike nuclear capacity. Although it will not be able to defeat the US in the foreseeable future - the US may likely still be the superpower in the twenty-second century - one day, Mainland China will, to some extent, have the capability to deter US intervention in the Cross-Strait issue. That will be when Mainland China will have a showdown with the Taiwanese authorities to force Taiwan to state clearly whether it wants unification or not, and to achieve national unification.

From the perspective of the US, Taiwan is only a pawn that it uses to deter Chinese rejuvenation. However, in retrospect, the US did not occupy the territory of Mainland China as did Japan, Britain and France. There is no national animosity between the two sides, also, Mainland China lies on the Asian continent, the US lies on the American continent. There is a great distance between the two nations, and there is no conflict geographically. However, in the foreseeable future, the only factor that

may cause a Sino-US war is the Taiwan issue. The kind of role that the US will play will be decided by the wisdom of the US governing élite.

However, the excuse for interfering in Cross-Straits unification is attractive. For example, the US Government has stated that the reason the US supports Taiwan is because Taiwan and the US have the same values (such as freedom or democracy). But in the 1950s, the Taiwanese authorities implemented a terrible dictatorship. About 50,000 people were arrested for political reasons and about 4,000 people were executed. During that period, the US not only supported the non-democratic Taiwanese Government, but also signed the *Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty* with the Taiwanese authorities. Thus, the US supported Taiwan in the form of a legal agreement. Another example is that at the end of the twentieth century, there were many non-elected authoritarian nations in the Muslim world, however, the US supported the friendly but non-democratic Muslim nations (Nixon 1992:230). Therefore, whether the US supports a nation or not, depends on the interests of the US, not on the persuasive language of shared values. With regard to the Cross-Straits issue, the US Government supported human rights, and that the Taiwanese people's free choice should be respected, limiting the options for a peaceful solution. However, during the American Civil War (1861-1865), the American Central Government (the Northern States) did not respect the human rights of the Southern secessionists. It did not allow the Southern secessionists to hold a referendum or to make free choices and the options for settling the North and South issue peacefully were limited. So, in order to unite the US, the American Central Government launched a unification war, in which about 617,000 soldiers died (from the North and the South).

Although the American Civil War occurred more than one century ago, it remains the classic example of national unification in modern Western history. In the Civil War, the US sacrificed 617,000 lives for unification. It showed that, from the perspective of the US, the goal of unification is paramount even at any cost. This unification resulted in the powerful country that is today the United States, and its historical correctness has been proved. Therefore, the US should fully understand the advantage of unification, and also that the last resort to settle the question of

unification might be to use force. However, in order to deter Chinese unification, the US insisted that the process of Cross-Strait unification should be peaceful. This showed the real intention of US hegemony – the US could unify its own nation through a unification war but other nations should not. On the other hand, the US Government also understands that some Taiwanese residents support secession, but that some Taiwanese residents also support Cross-Strait unification. However, in reality, the US government's so-called respect for Taiwanese free choice is to respect the Taiwanese secessionists' opinions and choice. Why does the US ignore public opinion and right to free choice of the pro-unification Taiwanese residents? Lastly, the Cross-Strait issue concerns two sides – Taiwan and Mainland China. This means that Mainland Chinese also have human rights, including the right to free choice. Since the free choice of Mainland Chinese was to support Cross-Strait unification, for example, Mainland Chinese overwhelmingly supported Cross-Strait unification on the Internet, where users can express their opinion freely. The US did not mention their right to free choice. Obviously, the US government, the US élite and the US mass media's statements about democracy, human rights, and respecting people's free choice, are not always consistent.

On the other hand, the extent of democracy and recognition of human rights in Mainland China are comparatively less than in the US, and it is the lethal drawback for Mainland China. However, for a poor person, they are the same. He has to sell his freedom and human rights to the rich men, to get a job to survive, and to sell his vote to electoral candidates to earn a little money to stay alive (in many poverty-stricken regions, rich candidates can use money to buy votes in elections). In reality, even in the democratic US society, there is a big difference between the freedom, democracy and human rights of poor and rich people. Similarly, for a poverty-stricken Mainland China, CCP leaders led Chinese to sacrifice the freedom and human rights of a generation to pursue the establishment of a nation. They sacrificed individual freedom and earned low wages, leaders and average people wore simple gray blue uniforms to accumulate primary capital for the priority of developing the defence industry. However, the Communist system discouraged people's motivation to work hard and caused economic recession. From about 1980, the economy shifted to a free market system to absorb foreign investment and

technology from the West. Today, along with economic development, Mainland China has more freedom and human rights than before. For example, Chinese people are not only allowed to move around Mainland China, but also to tour other countries freely. In many areas, basic elections have been implemented. In central government, the president was publicly elected by the National People's Congress in a televised electronic secret vote. All of this progress towards freedom, democracy and human rights was inconceivable twenty years ago. In reality, if there were no basic improvement in this regard, Mainland China could not absorb foreign investment. In 2002, the amount of foreign investment flowing into Mainland China surpassed the US for the first time. Apparently, it reflected the big improvement in freedom and human rights in Mainland China.

However, due to various factors, particularly the historical burden of ethnic and race conflicts, Mainland China is still backwards economically and in terms of education. If Mainland China implemented Western-style democracy (direct election system) completely, in order to win elections, the minority élites will instigate hatred between different race and ethnic groups. This hatred is potentially like 'Pandora's box', once opened, no one can predict what will happen. In order to prevent the disaster of disintegration as with the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, currently, Mainland China implements its own democratic system (mainly indirect elections) and might implement direct elections step-by-step. However, Mainland China also understands the importance of US-style democracy. This is why Mainland China proposed one country and two systems, namely, allowing Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan to implement Western-style democracy (see Chapter six). Before 1997 (the British had to return Hong Kong to Mainland China in 1997), following the demonisation of Mainland China by the Western mass media, many Hong citizens emigrated to other countries, including South Africa and Canada. However, after 1997, Mainland China recovered Hong Kong, and kept their commitment. Hong Kong retained its free, democratic system and human rights, so many Hong Kong people, who had emigrated to Canada and South Africa, returned. The US government also understood this and, therefore on 21 July 1999, President Clinton stated that Mainland China could take a long view of unification, to find solutions as it did in Hong Kong (Clinton 1999:7).

By deterring the rejuvenation of Mainland China or causing the disintegration of the Mainland intentionally, in spite of its strategic importance on the Asian continent; the huge commercial interests of the US in the Mainland; and the nationalism of 1.25 billion Chinese; the US would be placing itself in opposition to Mainland China. Thus it could cause the US so-called future potential rival to become a present enemy. For the US, it is problematical that its well-being is dependent upon developments on the opposite side of the world. Clearly this is not in the US national interest. This is common sense and not a sophisticated theory. Furthermore, Mainland China is different from the Muslim world in that it not only a big country, but it also possesses nuclear weapons. One day, if a Sino-US war were ignited, it would not compare to the Korean War of the 1950s or the Vietnam War of the 1960s, because in both wars, the military conflict between China and the US took place in third countries. However, a Sino-US war would result in direct conflict.

Looking back on the late twentieth century (1950-2000), Mainland China always maintained its territorial safety and sovereignty at any cost. For example, Mainland China fought the superpower, the US, in the Korean War from 1950-1953 to guard the borders of the Chinese northeastern territory and it fought against the US to protect its southern frontier during the Vietnam War from 1964-1973. The policy of Mainland China has been clear and consistent: to seek national unification, even by using force. Cross-Strait unification not only involves Chinese territorial jurisdiction over Taiwan and removing the last national humiliation of having ceded Taiwan, but also the national security of Mainland China's southern territory and the domino-effect of secession on its survival. Therefore, if Taiwan were to declare independence or reject unification, namely, if its de facto independence continues indefinitely, the only option for Mainland China would be to launch a unification war. Because of the sacred unification mission, it would be impossible to tolerate the humiliation of the 1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis again and fighting US forces would be the only option for any leaders of Mainland China. And since both Mainland China and the US possess nuclear weapons, a Sino-US war has the potential to explode into the first nuclear war. The outcome of a Sino-US war would be a human disaster, because in a nuclear war, there is no winner, there are only big or small losers.