

Academic Apologists for the KMT's Authoritarian Rule:

Ramon H. Myers and Thomas A. Metzger

By Linda Gail Arrigo, Ph.D. Sociology

Post-Doctoral Scholar, Academia Sinica, Institute of Sociology

Contacts: arrigo@seed.net.tw, Taipei (02) 2234-9680, 0928-899-931

Prepared for the North American Taiwan Studies Association Conference

June 17-20, 2004, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu

First Draft, June 15, 2004

Introduction

This analysis of the writings of Ramon H. Myers, and secondarily Thomas A. Metzger, concerning Taiwan from 1980 to the present places them in the context of the political developments of this period. Basically Myers closely follows the themes of Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang, KMT) propaganda in various periods, from the suppression of the 1978-79 democratic movement in the name of KMT-defined social stability and anti-communism, through downplaying human rights issues in China for the sake of rapprochement, to decrying the rise of Taiwan nationalism accompanying the democratic election of Chen Shui-bian in 2000.

The putative values of democracy and human rights that have been put forth in these writings are attenuated by the priority given to regime stability, economic growth and U.S. interests. The underlying assumptions of these writings are that elections and manifestations of intellectual expression in civil society are due to the benevolence of rulers, and martial law controls on speech and publication can be justified under the regime's subjective need for legitimization. That is, human and civil rights are not an inalienable property of the people; in this respect, this author profoundly subverts commonly accepted standards of democracy. This is justified with a form of cultural relativism claiming that the moral economy of other cultures, and in particular the Confucian pretensions of KMT authoritarianism, should not be subjected to the standards of Western democracy. Thus these arguments sidestep direct investigation into government abuses, while grudgingly admitting certain abuses that have already

been widely exposed. But Myers all the same has been allowed to appropriate the verbiage of democratization and human rights, and has met little published disagreement in doing so.

Other individual writers, such as John Copper, have played similar if lesser roles, but Myers has wielded the formidable resources of Hoover Institution at Stanford University and for a quarter-century has served as a prolific propagandist. It remains to be confirmed how much the Institute of International Relations, attached to National Chengchi University on the outskirts of Taipei and historically funded from the national security budget for the Republic of China, has provided in sizeable grants to the Hoover Institution and Myers himself from the 1960s until this year. Such funding might further explain why and how scholarly objectivity was compromised in these institutionally supported publications on Taiwan, and should lead to concerns about the distortion of U.S. foreign policy influenced by such think tanks.

[NOTE: In 2003 I was finally able to bring back to Taiwan from the United States several boxes of materials from the human rights campaign of 1980/81, due to support from the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, July 2002 – June 2004. These archives are the source of much unpublished material used in the preparation of this article. Now I am in the process of organizing this material; several hundred pages have been scanned electronically by the Archives Department of the Institute of Modern Chinese History at Academia Sinica, to be made available on-line in the future through their website.]

Two Sides of History

The historical account and the perspective of that account is central to any political analysis of the present. Especially in the case of Taiwan, a.k.a. Republic of China, that historical account and its presumptions have been hotly contested in the last decade. The historical perspective that sees the regime of the Kuomintang as an alien, parasitic regime imposed by coercion on the people and culture of Taiwan in 1945-49 is gradually being substantiated. After the end of martial law in 1988, it was increasingly possible to research the oppression of the past without fear of official reprisal, formal or indirect. After the change of ruling party in 2000, such critical study in Taiwan has been academically recognized and even funded. A subaltern history has emerged, and been the subject of increasingly detailed investigation.

Works in English, however, have long been heavily influenced by the perspective held by the ruling Kuomintang regime on Taiwan, and this influence continues due to the preponderance of the past literature showcasing “Free China” and its economic miracle, a literature much shaped by ROC officially-sponsored research grants and conferences, as well as the “one China” pretense of U.S. foreign policy. The works of Ramon Myers, Thomas Metzger, Cal Clarke (notably his *Women in Taiwan Politics*), and others, make light of the oppressive and exploitative nature of the Kuomintang regime, and/or justify this in the name of later economic development – sidestepping the questions of why basic human rights had to be violated, as well as which social groups benefited disproportionately from that economic boom. Till present, there is a dearth of alternative sources in English.

One step in rectifying this situation is illustrating how the writings of Ramon Myers and Thomas Metzger in particular catered to the propaganda imperatives of the Kuomintang. Ramon Myers, even while conscientiously compiling a catalogue of political events, has produced conclusions in apparent contradiction of those events, for example, the conclusion that Chiang Ching-kuo on his own initiated the democratic transition in Taiwan – assisting the Kuomintang in appropriating the current political credit for democratization. This is a crucial contention that affects all subsequent judgments. Later contradictions involve his depiction of Lee Teng-hui, evolving from 1992 to 2002 – the wise leader of the renewed Kuomintang, or the traitor to Chinese identity.

Why would the Kuomintang government and its academic and diplomatic establishments place such efforts and resources in cultivating friendly U.S. academic circles? The obvious answer is that Republic of China on Taiwan from the beginning was abjectly dependant on the United States. The China Lobby in Washington D.C. was the mechanism during the early Cold War period. After December 1978 when Washington announced the impending switch of diplomatic recognition to the Peoples Republic of China, and the legitimacy of the Republic of China was further challenged internally and internationally by the Taiwan Democratic Movement of 1978/79 and its suppression, the KMT recognized new needs for English language propagandists. That is when Professors Thomas Metzger and Ramon Myers began to take on this role.

The Historical Perspective of the Taiwan Democratic Movement of 1978/79

Let us recreate that moment in history, from the perspective of the Taiwan Democratic Movement.

The democratic movement of 1978/79 greatly increased the international exposure of the opposition politicians and dissidents in Taiwan. For example, the Non-Kuomintang Candidates Coalition, organized in November 1978 to prepare for the December 18 election of supplementary seats to the National Legislature and the National Assembly, attracted visits from international scholars such as Victor H. Li of Stanford University Law School, and provided regular reports to overseas Taiwanese through the Voice of Taiwan telephone news service based in Jamaica, New York. This was a breakthrough in formal public exposure and in overcoming the fear of guilt by association with the overseas Taiwan independence movement groups, labeled seditious or terrorist organizations by the Taiwan Garrison Command.

The Coalition campaign platform far surpassed any previous campaign statements, including those that had led to immediate arrest in recent years: it demanded freedom of speech and publication; the rescinding of martial law; the full re-election of the central government bodies frozen since 1949; removal of KMT party and security operatives from military, schools, and bureaucracy; and a host of social welfare measures. The first eight exciting days of the ten-day campaign (the permitted campaigning period) promised a considerable advance of the opposition coalition, despite the KMT's structural monopoly in the representative bodies.

Jimmy Carter's announcement of impending U.S. de-recognition of the Republic of China on December 16, 1978 provided the occasion for President Chiang Ching-kuo to cancel the elections and postpone them indefinitely. But it also brought to the forefront the logical fear that the Republic of China's "one China" fiction would lead to precipitous takeover of Taiwan by the Peoples Republic of China: Taiwanese would again be taken over by hostile Chinese if they did not make their demands for democratic determination of their own future known to the world.

With this sense of urgency and already under threat from the security agencies, the Coalition re-grouped, re-issued its demands, and rallied in protest rather than retreating following the arrest of Coalition sponsor Yu Deng-fa on January 21, 1979. One of the secret leadership core of five, Hsu Hsin-liang, stated the situation clearly at that point: the Coalition members would hang separately if they did not hang together.

Jimmy Carter's international human rights policy and the KMT's uncertainty over its future relations with the United States probably deterred the Taiwan government from a more immediate and decisive crackdown in the early months of 1979. The support of Taiwanese-Americans for the Democratic Movement and their lobbying of Congress and Senate members may have provided some crucial space for the survival of the movement. With the founding of Formosa: The Magazine of Taiwan's Democratic Movement in June 1979 as a new organizational form for the Campaign Coalition, overseas Taiwanese were listed as members of the editorial staff; two U.S. contact addresses were printed on the back cover beginning with the first issue, July 26, 1979.

Within a few weeks time the magazine had become a de facto political party with a dozen offices throughout the island. It called large assemblies with each office opening, and sold censored publications to the crowds. It reacted strongly to government attacks, generally achieving rescue of its members from prison. During this period reporting on human rights violations in Taiwan became increasingly open and linked with organizations abroad such as Amnesty International and the International League for Human Rights. A crucial intermediary in this was the International Committee for the Defense of Human Rights in Taiwan, run from Osaka, Japan, by an American, Lynn Miles.

Clearly the ruling Kuomintang was at a crossroads of repression or the devolution of

martial law. Public activity emboldened widening numbers of citizens to defy the Taiwan Garrison Command. But the opposition was by no means a radical alternative: its middle-class leadership of former KMT protégés, lawyers and teachers plus a few former political prisoners most basically demanded resumption of the elections and freedom of speech. The details of events in the days preceding the Kaohsiung Incident on Human Rights Day, December 10, 1979, suggest that the security agencies were closing in for the kill, but it cannot be known at present how high that decision went. After clashes between crowds and military police on that evening, the leadership of Formosa Magazine and most of the Campaign Coalition candidates were snatched from December 13 on, along with editors and activists; the initial arrests and attempted arrests likely numbered several hundred.

Following an international outcry, eight defendants, including most of the central leadership of Formosa Magazine, were tried in military court in late March 1980, and sentenced to 12 years to life imprisonment for sedition. The charge of sedition was cemented through spurious links to a business deal involving importing eel fry from China. That is, the prosecutors sought to portray the democratic movement as a scheme for violent overthrow of the government for the sake of the Taiwan Independence Movement, supposedly manipulated from afar by the Chinese communists. Several dozen other members and supporters of Formosa Magazine were sentenced to shorter terms in civilian criminal courts.

The Kaohsiung Incident suppression also gave the Taiwan government an opportunity to take out another thorn in its side: the leadership of the Presbyterian Church of Taiwan. In 1977 the Presbyterian Church had issued a statement on the right of the people of Taiwan to determine their own future, and had accumulated activist ties with the World Council of Churches and its related Asian and American organizations, despite threats of confiscation of church property. Former political prisoner Shih Ming-deh, general manager of Formosa Magazine, escaped encirclement on December 13 and was successfully hidden by Church members for nearly a month despite an intense manhunt. This provided the rationale for sentencing Presbyterian Church General Secretary Rev. Kao Chun-ming to seven years in April 1980.

The international outcry over all these events was the fruit of intense efforts of overseas Taiwanese in Japan, the United States, and Europe. Deported on December 15, 1979, I immediately brought my eye-witness account of the events of 1978/79, and in particular of the Kaohsiung Incident, to Hong Kong, and these were published

in Chinese in the January 1980 issue of The Seventies, quickly countering the KMT's version of the Incident. Sponsored by the Formosan Association for Human Rights, which was coordinated by Taiwanese-Americans near San Diego, and accompanied by my mother, Nellie G. Amondson, who was an indefatigable publicist, I made a sweep of a dozen major U.S. cities and the U.S. Congress by the first week of January, speaking several times a day in press conferences, campus programs, and community dinners.

These activities, daily protest marches abroad, and the ransacking of several Taiwan consulates were carefully followed by the authorities in Taiwan; the reports from their offices in the U.S. can now be read, if approval is granted, at the newly-established National Archives (Guo-jia Dang-an Ju) in Taipei. (The long document National Archives No. 8486, National Security Bureau barcode number 069300/Z00109, compiled by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from the reports of their overseas offices and submitted to the National Security Bureau (Guo-jia An-quan Ju) on January 16, 1980, provides a succinct account of this overseas protest.)

A wide range of Chinese intellectuals overseas reacted as well, including those associated with Chinese nationalism. In early January 1980, Chen Ruo-shi, a Taiwan-born writer who had gone to China in the early 1970's but then exposed the cruelties of the Cultural Revolution with her novel The Mayor of Shanghai, personally delivered to President Chiang Ching-kuo a short letter dated December 16, 1979, with thirteen signatories (later 27 endorsements), artists and writers, professing that the riot was induced by police moves, and requesting clemency for the Formosa Magazine defendants. She met with Chiang Ching-kuo twice. (An interview with Chen Ruo-shi by Zhang Wen-yen was published in an addendum to the founding issue of Centre Magazine (Zhong Bao Yue-kan Chuang-kan-hao Fu-ye), February 1980. A copy of the letter is held in my own archives. She has also been interviewed in recent years by several oral history projects.)

On December 28, 1979, an urgent directive citing the instructions of the President and of Premier Sun was issued by the Executive Yuan Government Information Office, headed by James Soong (Song Tsu-yu), to all Ministry of Foreign Affairs offices in the United States (National Archives No. 8335, National Security Bureau barcode number 068300/Z00095). It stated that on that day an English explanation of the Kaohsiung violence had been sent by express courier to the New York Information Office, to be distributed for the use of all U.S. offices and information sections.

On January 19, 1980, the public relations firm of Hugh C. Newton, officially registered as an agent of a foreign government, addressed a letter on the Kaohsiung Incident to newspaper and magazine editors throughout the U.S., and attached under James Soong's name the Taiwan Garrison Command's six-page report of the events and rationale for the arrests, presuming the seditious intent and guilt of the Formosa Magazine defendants. (Xerox copy in my archives.)

Hugh C. Newton and Associates
Public Relations
618 South Lee Street (Old Towne)
Telephones: (202) 638-1038 (703) 549-5825
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

January 19, 1980

Dear Editor:

Last December on Taiwan, under the guise of a "World Human Rights Rally" the editors of Formosa Magazine led a violent demonstration in the city of Kaohsiung.

The leader of that demonstration, Shih Ming-the has been arrested and his wife, Linda Arrigo Shih, an American citizen, deported. She is now touring the United States on behalf of a group called "The Formosan Association for Human Rights."

But whose rights were harmed? As Dr. James Soong, Director General, Government Information Office for the Republic of China says in the attached report on the demonstration, on the evening of December 10, "the lawless elements began to ignite their torches. They then attacked the police, who had shields but no weapons, with clubs, torches, axes, broken bottles, brickbats and rocks.... For six hours, the police obeyed their order not to 'shout or strike back.' They endured the assault and finally contained the violence. The price in broken heads was high. More than 180 policemen were injured."

In other words, the demonstrators initiated the violence and put more than 180 policemen and innocent bystanders into hospitals ... and not one single protestor was harmed in any way.

I believe this report will help you put this event into perspective, particularly as Mrs. Shih and her supporters step up their efforts to gain an audience in this country for their point of view.

Hugh C. Newton

This letter probably backfired and cast doubt on GIO credibility. In later months, the GIO stepped back from presumption of guilt to use more circumspect language in English publications, though not in Chinese publications.

Subsequently, the trial itself, forced open to newspaper reporting by a combination of international pressure and nationalistic pride – Yu Guo-ji, China Times editor, insisted

that local reporters could not be denied what was allowed to foreign reporters, and published a daily transcript of the trial – almost certainly spread political consciousness much more broadly among the population of Taiwan than had the previous year and a half of opposition activities. The basic issues and stance of the opposition were aired. Shih Ming-deh's statement at the trial, "Taiwan has already been independent for thirty years!" rang forth as an electrifying pronouncement, while providing also an argument in international law for the programme of the opposition.

The controversy was not limited to Chinese-speaking circles. It raged across campuses in the United States, as "professional students" with government funding attempted to stop students who were in sympathy with Formosa Magazine from holding discussions and demonstrations. The reports in student newspapers and campus town newspapers were compiled in a booklet, "Taiwan KMT Spy Activities on U.S. University Campuses", September 1981, Organization for the Support of the Democratic Movement of Taiwan, P.O. Box 53447, Chicago, IL 60653 (OSDMT head was Lin Shiao-Shin). Foreign student advisors were faced with difficult choices, to believe the native Taiwanese students who came to them with secret reports of spies on campus, or to deny use of school facilities to all meetings that might potentially incur dangerous conflicts, despite the appeal to freedom of speech. The controversy eventually involved as well many white faces in news reporting and academia in the United States, mostly those who found the new information about "Free China" a real eye-opener.

This is the general background of the period, and it is well known to most Taiwanese abroad at that time. But this paper chooses to focus on the role of two well-known American professors who have gone on to achieve status as experts on Taiwan democratization: Professor Thomas A. Metzger and Professor Ramon H. Myers.

Thomas Metzger's 1980 Commentary on the Kaohsiung Incident Arrests

On Sunday, February 3, 1980, the following opinion article appeared on page C-5 of the San Diego Union, with type columns set around a large map of the island of Taiwan.

Double Standard Rules Taiwan-China Attitudes
By Thomas A. Metzger
For The San Diego Union

Metzger is professor of Chinese history at UCSD [University of California at San Diego]. He is writing a book on Taiwan political life commissioned by the Hoover Institution of Stanford University.

A riot last month in the Taiwan city of Kaohsiung has revived the debate between those who support and those who oppose the Kuomintang-controlled government in Taiwan. Trying on Dec. 10 [1979] to hold a Human Rights Day celebration, several hundred dissidents paraded without a permit and attacked police ordered to block their path. As a result, more than 100 police were injured but not one of the dissidents. The government had astutely ordered the police not to strike back as the dissidents attacked them with clubs and torches.

Although two of the dissidents' workers had been arrested and injured the day before, public opinion in Taiwan has mostly sided with the government. The dissidents themselves have admitted this. The dissidents, however, are active in the United States, where they claim that the Kuomintang government has no right to restrict dissent.

American liberals are likely to agree with them and to conclude that the Kuomintang runs as repressive a dictatorship as do the Chinese Communists. In fact, however, political life in Taiwan is a paradoxical mixture of freedom and authoritarianism.

A good example of this paradox is one of the dissidents' publications, "Tang-wai-te sheng-yin" (Voices Outside the Kuomintang). On Sept. 26, 1978, ten days after it was published, it was banned. Yet some of the articles in it had been published previously in a magazine and so had already circulated freely throughout the island. Moreover, banned writings often can be obtained easily in Taiwan, and indeed the very policy of censorship is openly debated.

Unconscious of any contradiction, dissidents often travel freely in and out of Taiwan denouncing the government for restricting their freedom, as did Chang Fu-chung in 1979, until he was arrested in connection with the Kaohsiung riot. The dissidents also complain that the Kuomintang manipulates the judiciary. Yet they simultaneously admit that the government respects the law. Yao Chia-wen, a lawyer arrested after the riot, became famous helping dissidents understand the law and use it for their own benefit. Interviewed in 1978, he said that dissidents were not harassed by the government so long as they were careful to avoid the slightest legal offense. His own lucrative law practice, he said, had not been hurt a bit by his open work for dissidents.

He also stated that the 1977 elections were fairly administered. Indeed, a good number of dissidents competing against Kuomintang candidates were elected, such as Su Nan-ch'eng, mayor of T'ai-nan. Contemplating Taiwan's paradoxical political system in 1978, Mayor Su said it was unique, neither a democracy nor a dictatorship.

The dissidents claim that they speak for the people more than the Kuomintang does. Unfortunately, they see no contradiction between this claim and their frequent complaints about the trouble they have winning popular support, especially in urban, educated circles. The fact is that in the 1977 elections, which lawyer Yao acknowledged were fair, the Kuomintang won the vast majority of the 97 races for mayor, district magistrate and provincial assemblyman.

Moreover, the Kuomintang contains perhaps 6 percent of the population and is a porous organization whose members often have close relations with various dissidents. One dissident, Hsu Hsin-liang, was a former Kuomintang member in 1977 when he won the election for magistrate of T'ao-yuan County. Originally wanting to run as the Kuomintang candidate, he claimed that a majority of the Kuomintang membership shared his views.

Certainly the Kuomintang is authoritarian. Authoritarianism, however, is not just a Kuomintang characteristic; it is a widespread cultural tendency throughout China, as recognized even by such famous dissidents as Hsu Hsin-liang and Yin Hai-kuang. Therefore, it cannot be replaced by American-style democracy overnight.

Operating in this paradoxical context of authoritarianism and freedom, the Kuomintang also has to worry about the solidarity of Taiwan's people as they respond, alone in the world, to the war of nerves and subversion being waged against them by their mammoth communist neighbor. As a result, the Kuomintang opposes not dissent, but what it regards as irresponsible dissent.

Responsible dissent, it argues, begins with honest recognition of its successes, of what the people would stand to lose in case of a communist takeover. It can point with pride especially to its economic record, which is almost unmatched in the Third World, as was recently pointed out by Nobel laureate Simon Kuznets, an expert on economic growth.

For the dissidents, however, the glass is only half empty, never half full.

Such ignorant views are inflammatory in a society that still lacks sophisticated public opinion. The peasant or Taipei cab driver struggling to support his family and send his daughter or son to college does not realize that he is part of an economic miracle admired by Professor Kuznets. He is more conscious of what the dissidents harp on: minor scandals, lack of insurance in case of serious illness, and other painful facts inevitable in an economy still developing, however quickly.

Explicitly trying to fire up such feelings of discontent and create a "mass movement" against the Kuomintang, the more extreme dissidents insist that "human rights" are incompatible with any limits on dissent. Therefore, they challenged the limits put on them last Dec. 10 in Kaohsiung. Told they could have their rally, they fought the police because they were not allowed to have it where they wanted it.

Justifying its restrictions on them, the government has pointed not only to similar restrictions in Western democracies but also to the traditional emphasis on settling differences through a reasonable, harmonious dialogue (ho-hsieh hu-liang). At this point, for many Chinese, it is the dissidents who have violated the norms of this precious dialogue and so have endangered Taiwan's difficult struggle for democracy.

It is high time, therefore, that American liberals drop the double standard they have applied to the two Chinese governments. If they can sympathize with the Chinese Communists, who recently snuffed out almost all political liberty, why do they denounce the Kuomintang, which puts limits on dissent only after already allowing a broad range of free political activity?

Professor Metzger, an expert on the Qing Dynasty salt tax system and professor at the University of California, San Diego, did not explain precisely how he came about his information on the Kaohsiung Incident, or how he knew that one of the defendants, the lawyer Yao Chia-wen, had "admitted that the 1977 elections were fair".

At any rate, it was a most insidious allegation, which Metzger seemed to use to justify Yao's own arrest. To the contrary Yao Chia-wen, after observing KMT election fraud in 1975 at the end of Kuo Yu-shin's campaign in Ilan, wrote a book Hu Luo Ping-Yuan

which may be roughly translated as “Tiger Lost on the Plains”, meaning a powerful person brought low in a difficult environment. Furthermore, in defending Yu Deng-fa in martial law court against charges that he had failed to report a “communist spy”, Yao Chia-wen in March 1979 challenged the whole basis of martial law and the right of the military to put civilians on trial, to no avail. The charge allowed imprisonment of seven years, even though the “communist spy” Wu Tai-an was apparently a government plant, based on Lynn Miles’ investigation of his previous activities in Japan. (See full report and other documents in Documentary Collection on Democratization Movement of Postwar Taiwan, Vol. 3, p. 354. Eds. Chen Shih-hong, Chang Chien-lung, Academia Historica 2001, ISBN 957-02-9717-4, Tel: (02) 2217-5500 x 605.) By no stretch of the imagination can Yao be depicted as endorsing the KMT’s system of control. This case was perhaps the first time that a defendant in a martial law trial had been allowed a lawyer of his own choosing, outside of pre-selected lists. But Yu and his handicapped son were found guilty all the same.

Yao was, however, as he recalls laughingly in his April 2000 account of his own arrest and trial (self-published, 124 pp., Office of Yao Chia-wen, Tel: (04) 724-4909, Fax: 725-9013), exceedingly legalistic and naïve at that time; he believed that the Formosa Magazine leadership could be found guilty of nothing more than unauthorized and disorderly assembly. This despite their joint statement signed in mid-1979, “We are Willing to Go to Jail for Taiwan’s Future”.

But my main query here is why a respected American academician would step so far out of his expertise to make such specious arguments on behalf of a martial law regime. Perhaps now, at a distance of over twenty years, I can ask Professor Metzger to explain his perspective and thinking at that time.

Professor Metzger did go on to expand his inquiry into Taiwan’s political conditions, evidently, but with the same bent.

As a visiting scholar at University of California, Berkeley, Professor Chen Gu-ying commented on Metzger’s unpublished paper “Political Modernization in Taiwan” at a UC Berkeley Center for Chinese Studies seminar. I recently found a copy of Professor Chen’s undated commentary in my archives together with 1981 conference manuscripts from the Center.

Professor Chen Gu-ying, a mainlander born in Fujian Province who grew up in Taiwan,

was purged in 1973 from his position at National Taiwan University as professor of philosophy. His expertise was in the early Chinese philosophers. He was also an early human rights advocate, and was recruited by the opposition in 1978 to run as a Campaign Coalition candidate. Paired on a Taipei slate with Chen Wan-chen, a young woman reporter at the Provincial Assembly, and both holding Kuomintang membership, they produced a scathing attack on the KMT for violating all three of Sun Yat-Sen's Principles, in a succinct 500-word document employing classical Chinese. Chen Gu-ying was abroad at the time of the 1979 arrests, or he would almost certainly have been included in the dragnet.

Professor Chen Gu-ying presented the following commentary on Metzger's paper:

I am going to present my observations on the present Taiwan situation very briefly. This is somewhat different from Professor Metzger's presentation. I would like to make two points.

The first point concerns the problems of national security and political stability in Taiwan.

The two major characteristics of the ruling system in Taiwan are: 1) the Kuomintang (KMT) party's prerogative over the government; 2) rule under martial law.

For over 30 years, the KMT has used the pretext of national security to put Taiwan under martial law. Although there is a constitution, it has been suspended indefinitely and therefore exists only in name. Among the numerous provisions of the martial law, the "Statute for Punishment of Rebellion" and the "Publication Control Measures" are the most repressive.

(Here Chen Gu-ying describes three articles of the Statute, one of which prescribes the death penalty, and he cites several cases in which authors were sentenced to ten years.)

The rule by martial law in Taiwan is unique in history for its duration and severity. There is no reason for its continuing imposition since the present political and social situations are reasonably stable, and there are no imminent external threats. Furthermore, without reinstating the Constitution, it will be difficult to attain political modernization in Taiwan. Professor Metzger has hardly discussed this important issue in his paper.

My second point concerns the relationship between traditional cultural values and political modernization.

Since 1949, the KMT government in Taiwan has tried to revive the feudalistic-conservative Confucian values such as filial piety and loyalty in order to justify their conservative and authoritarian rule. Therefore, the KMT government constantly censors those who criticize the conservative side of Confucian culture, and advocate its liberal or "progressive" side. For example, when Wang Hsiao-po, a lecturer in the Department of Philosophy at Taiwan National University, published his M.A. thesis criticizing the conservative political ideology of Confucius, the thesis was banned. Tseng Hsiang-To (a history professor at Chung Hsing University) was arrested for discussing with his students Chin Shih Huang Ti's [the founding emperor of the Chin, beginning 255 B.C.] contribution to Chinese history in terms of his achievements such as the construction of the Great Wall and the unification of the Chinese language. When I gave lectures on the "liberal" elements of Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu's thought in the Department of Philosophy at Taiwan University, the Minister of Education examined the contents of the lectures.

Professor Metzger argued that even in a democratic state and society like Taiwan, traditional Confucian values and democratic ideals go together well. However, I could argue that the traditional Confucian values such as San-kang and Wu-lun are not congenial with the democratic ideals such as liberty, equality and human rights.

Because of time constraints, I just present the above two points although I have many more issues to discuss. In short, Professor Metzger argued that political modernization is very successful. I think that his view just represents the KMT's position. I still think political modernization in Taiwan has many problems. How could political modernization be achieved under the rule of martial law?

Can Thomas Metzger really claim an objective stance based in political science or classical studies?

Ramon Myer's 1981 Commentary on the Kaohsiung Incident Trials

Professor John Kaplan of the Stanford University Law School went to Taiwan in March 1980 to cover the Kaohsiung Incident trials. He originally planned to go to accompany Victor H. Li, who had visited the Campaign Coalition offices in November 1978 and spoken with General Manager Shih Ming-teh (a photo of that meeting is extant). However, the Taiwan government postponed the trials several times, possibly to dodge such high-profile visitors as Ramsey Clark, and Victor Li could not attend. This left the task of reporting on the trials for several human rights organizations to Professor John Kaplan. Professor Kaplan did not have a command of the language, but he was one of several foreign observers admitted, and the newspapers carried daily transcripts of the trial.

On May 23, 1981 the Center for Chinese Studies of the University of California at Berkeley held a three-session seminar. The first session, in the morning, was a discussion of Kaplan's book, of which he had completed and distributed for comment the first three chapters, the major portion. Four discussants were scheduled to follow Professor Kaplan's brief cap on his book, in order as follows: Chen Gu-ying, Ramon Myers, Linda Arrigo Shih, and Su Ming-teh (pen name Tang Chu-guo).

I have on hand the English transcripts (apparently transcribed by staff of the Center for Chinese Studies partly from notes and partly from tape recorder) for Kaplan, Myers, and myself. A slightly abridged transcription for all participants was published in Chinese translation in Center News (Chung Bao) magazine, September 1981. The English reads as follows, with only a few grammatical corrections to the transcript of

the spoken source.

John Kaplan, presenter:

It was a very strange experience, finding myself, in the space of 24 hours, transported to Taiwan and to a courtroom in, of all places, a military garrison. The experience was eerie, even frightening. I have never had an experience like that before that time, and have only had the same eerie feeling once since – in watching the movie “Breaker Morand”, about an Irish court determined to convict a political offender. It was clear that the judges had already made up their mind, and what was going on was an outward form, a charade of a trial.

Perhaps the defendants were guilty of creating a disturbance. This is a reasonable charge in the light of their holding a rally without permission from the police, and their preparation of torches. The Kaohsiung Incident can also be seen as the result of a crowd angered over the mistreatment of their partisans the previous evening, surrounded by police, and some mis-moves by the police forces. But however, the government charged the defendants with sedition.

The probity of the confessions cannot be supported. Only the most naïve person would think that over sixty days isolated from the outside world could lead to a probative confession. The example of what happens in some police states is too well known.

The case of the indictment against Huang Hsin-Chieh, based on the eel-fry connection with Hung Chih-Liang, is a flimsy frameup in any book. The evidence is more in accord with a business transaction than a political conspiracy. For example, the defense sought to present a check given to Huang by Hung as prepayment of interest on the loan. This was not admitted to the court.

Nor was the court able to show evidence of intent to commit sedition. That does not mean that in some cases there is not reasonable suspicion of intent to commit sedition. But the materials submitted did not substantiate it.

On the other hand, the defendants had clearly stepped beyond the limits of dissent permitted in Taiwan. For Taiwan, these limits might be seen broad in the context of an “embattled state”, but the defendants further pushed the limits back.

As far as the riot is concerned, it may very well be that there was some element of agents provocateur in the crowd, which contributed some to the violence. For the most part it seemed to me a large, unruly, quite angry crowd because of the beating of their partisans the night before, packed into an area where the police made a number of tactical errors, and somebody probably prematurely released a little tear gas, which frightened the crowd and made them surge against the police lines. It is also quite clear that in addition to surging against the police lines, a number of people went out of their way to beat the police, some severely, and that this caused a major scandal in Taiwan. Whether it forced the government to act is another question entirely. I certainly don’t think it did “force” the government to act, but it provided those in the government who wanted to act with the occasion, and removed the opposition in the government against whatever harsh measures they may have wanted to use. The result: we had the trial of the Kaohsiung defendants.

There is no right, to my mind, in any one particular side. If we judge Taiwan against the United States, why then of course the defendants were very shabbily treated for exercising rights to democracy. If we judge the case against the mainland, then my guess is that if any of the defendants even talked about what they intended doing, over most of the history

of the mainland, they would have been very severely dealt with, and no one would have even found out about it. So again, all I can say, I have been unable to give you the full richness of it here, so I have saved that for my monograph of a hundred-some pages, where I can tone down statements that seem too strong, and can give you a much more precise picture, rather than just the flavor as I am giving you here. There are others here to speak who were much more intimately involved, so I'll stop here.

As can be seen in the account in Chinese in Center News magazine, Chen Gu-ying made several salient points as the first discussant, based on his own participation in the activities of 1978/79 and from detailed reports of the Kaohsiung Incident:

The prosecution alleged the leadership "cell of five" of Formosa Magazine had formulated short-term and long-term "plans to seize power", as seen in their confessions. But these confessions seem to have been a product patched together by the interrogators while the defendants were held incommunicado for over two months. The confessions often used identical language, and the short-term and long-term "plans" were in obvious contradiction. It would seem that the interrogators wove their story with customary carelessness and impunity, and never expected the product to be subjected to scrutiny.

Similarly, the charges, though pinned on the events of the incident in Kaohsiung, were often at odds with the facts. For example, lawyer Lin Yi-hsiung and Ms. Chen Chu were charged with taking the podium to exhort the crowds to violence, but actually neither of them made an address that evening.

As for the organization's insistence on public assembly, the dissident politicians did intend to increase their power and appeal to the public, as in any electoral process, and they sought forums for discussion with the public beyond martial law restrictions. But they did not seek violent confrontation with the government forces, and in fact the recordings of the evening show the leadership tried to quell the struggles with the riot police. How could bamboo sticks overthrow the government? They could only protect the marchers from the riot police and from hooligans like those who had attacked the offices in recent days.

Finally, a point that Chen Gu-ying particularly emphasized: Formosa Magazine was not a conspiracy of Taiwan separatists, but an umbrella organization encompassing many views, with a common ground in the demand for democratic process, and in fact the editorial content was controlled by youth such as Chen Chung-hsin who sought to make Taiwan the shining example of democracy for the whole Chinese nation.

Ramon Myers spoke at length as the second discussant:

This is the kind of topic that whatever you say is bound to outrage people in this audience or elsewhere, so with that caveat let me make these remarks. Of course the events of this Kaohsiung riot itself are very much like the Rashomon problem. The different actors of the particular event that occurred all had very different views of the event. ...

But saying all of that I do believe that Professor Kaplan has made a commendable attempt here to put out a story about what happened and try to judge it with the Anglo-Saxon legal standards, and I believe he has done that very effectively. As for the three chapters that we are supposed to comment on, I think that I would have liked to have seen a little more in the first chapter about the content of Meilitao. He does talk about organizational activities, but again he might have also talked about how these were viewed by the government, the different conservative and liberal factions; this discussion is notably missing. Finally there are some statements sprinkled throughout the chapters that I would have edited out, and about these I can talk to him later.

But where I thought my perspective could be of some purpose here was to raise some points with respect to the entire methodology. In a way, Professor Kaplan's verbal comments here hit right on what I'm about to say, because he himself said that if we judge the events in Taiwan according to U.S. Anglo-Saxon standards, we find the trial truly wanting. If we judge it by other standards, such as that on the mainland of China, of course we see that the matter of political dissent there is a much different issue. So we have here again the very important issue in discussions in the United States today of human rights in Third World developing countries, and how we should try to judge them. As these three chapters are supposed to be part of a report that he was charged with making by human rights organizations, then needless to say the methodology he has used here is justifiable. That is, that he has applied the standards of Western, Anglo-Saxon law to evaluate the matters of a non-Western society with a one-party system, and of course he has found that the system works differently, and that the individuals tried under that system certainly do not have at their disposal the same means to protect themselves and their human rights that would be available in Western systems like our own. And then of course because of that great gap we can then make a moral judgment about the society, and we can hope that by making that judgment, it will spur the society leaders on to do better next time and the time after that, so that a trend is generated in the direction of a convergence with Western societies.

But I wonder if we shouldn't try to do better in this intermediate time in trying to come to grips with something like the Kaohsiung Incident and the trial thereafter. Should we not try to judge the judicial proceedings in non-Western societies by different criteria which take into account not only the concerns about safeguarding the human rights or liberties of political dissidents, but also society's rights at that particular time and situation? I raise this question, and I think it's very important, because many single-party, strongman states today are very fragile, and they rest upon underpinnings which can be pulled down very easily, and this can then create a situation of anarchy. And in that period of anarchy the society is bound to experience very high human costs, and there is the further risk that once law and order is restored, you don't know whether you are going to get a political system that is like the one you had before, or possibly worse. There is always the possibility it might be better, I don't rule that out, but the historical examples of that sort are not to cheerful.

So if this assertion has any validity, then, and it is certainly valid for Taiwan's political system today, should we not therefore be groping for these different criteria? I've tried to think hard about these criteria, and it seems to me we might have something like this. We have to take into account the context, or a whole variety of circumstances. Some of this context has to do with whether we can really empirically demonstrate whether there has

been a gradualistic, real progress towards liberalism where representation is gradually being expanded and liberties are very gradually being widened, and criticism and dissent is more and more being tolerated. That's one element.

Another element of course has to do with the particular national political security predicament of a nation-state. Now, if we may have a situation similar to that of Taiwan where the risk of subversion is very high, and where it is necessary to have martial law, which that state has had since 1949, we might find this very unusual, but a state like Israel, surrounded by hostile states, also has had martial law for decades, and that, it seems to me, has to be considered as a secondary element in this criteria – the degree of security, concern for the society's stability. Finally of course we have to have some element in our criteria which takes into account the unique philosophical-political underpinnings, or rationale, by which a particular leadership or single-party government practices its rule. That is to say, it may be very fragile, as the situation on Taiwan has been and still is, in terms of the philosophical underpinnings of what that government represents. However, since it is so easy to attack those, and thence so easy to de-legitimize that government and thereby de-stabilize it, it seems to me that this could be conceivably a third element by which to judge the situation that Professor Kaplan's paper addresses.

Now, Taiwan certainly had not observed any night quite like the Kaohsiung Incident, since the famous February 28 incident of 1947. Sure, there had been the crowds that stormed the U.S. Embassy (in 1957), and the tremendous mob that met Warren Christopher's car in (December) 1978. But the disturbance in the city of Kaohsiung, involving a fairly large crowd – the numbers, differ, to be sure – and involving the injury of a fairly large number of police – again the numbers given differ, and the severity of injury is interpreted in different ways – still was a major shock, I think, to everyone, not just the people in government. So again this is part of the context by which we have to weigh whether or not the charges brought against this group of defendants had any particular veracity.

Going over these criteria, we can certainly say that Taiwan has been having economic progress and development, it certainly has had an improvement in income distribution, it certainly has had an improvement in the recent elections. I cite in particular the elections of last December (1980), about which there will be an article to appear in Asian Survey by an observer who was there last December, who points out conclusions such as these.

At stake in that election were 97 seats in the Legislative Yuan, and 76 seats that had been expanded in the National Assembly. We further know that in that election the "dang-wai" or "without-party" candidates, one of them the wife of Yao Chia-Wen, one of the defendants, and another also a relative of a defendant, acquired the majority votes that came out of that election. During that election these candidates were still able to criticize the government.

It was reported that there was a display of large cartoon posters depicting the government, and the KMT, as being corrupt, oppressive, undemocratic. But these candidates now stayed within the boundaries of the new rules of the game, which the Meilitao group clearly I think did not. They did not criticize the government's mission of returning to the mainland, nor did they advocate a two-party system, nor did they say anything about the government negotiating with Peking or advocating becoming part of the PRC, a claim made by one of the defendants, Yao Chia-wen, at the trial – or at least a claim made in the sense that they were fearful of that outcome. Nor did the two relatives of the defendants sentenced for sedition in the trial claim to represent the dissidents.

So the results of this election were that a backlash sympathy vote for the dissidents didn't seem to appear. Both sides could claim victory, the "dang" (KMT party) and "dang-wai" (non-party) as well. Nor did we find cases of the right-wing groups, the Chi-Feng groups, disrupting the campaigning or threatening violence against the non-party candidates. The overall signs of this mid-December election strongly suggest polarization perhaps has not occurred after the trial, and that the steady march toward democratization in Taiwan

continues, and will continue as long as intellectuals and politicians alike play the proper rules of the game, that is, do not express certain utopian contentions, which put the parties on an escalation path, and thereby lead to the unfortunate events at Kaohsiung, the trial, and thereafter.

Now, this sort of criteria that I have spelled out in very general terms here is not of course the kind of criteria that Professor Kaplan has used. His basic contention is that we have a situation very much like that in the "Breaker Morand" movie, and I think he's right, in the sense that the government prosecutors had clearly made up their minds and were not going to be persuaded otherwise in the trial, and they found the defendants guilty and sentenced them to long terms. I think the issue perhaps put more pointedly is whether they were correct in their assessment of the intent of sedition. That is, if we define this broadly to include a kind of step by step operation which tries in varying ways, intellectual ways on one hand, to de-legitimize the government, and then perhaps in more confrontational ways to create situations in which the government must react, and in reacting then you produce a popular disturbance in a large city which then creates turmoil, and perhaps out of that you'll have the desired political change.

And finally, third, of course circumstantial as all the evidence is which the three chapters bring forth, I think clearly if one reads in the Meilitao literature itself, or believes the verbal statements that were attributed to the various defendants, there seems to have been a shared sense here among the defendants for a kind of Taiwan separatism in the long run. That is, of course, again in the political zone of "not to be discussed", under the situation on Taiwan today.

Linda Arrigo Shih, third discussant:

I am the only discussant here who has been a witness and, indeed, a participant in the Kaohsiung Incident and the events that preceded it. I have a great deal to say about it, and am preparing a manuscript on the sociological analysis of the Democratic Movement, but will limit my present discussion to the immediate issue and to the ten minutes allotted me [after Professor Metzger's extended presentation]....

The immediate lesson to be learned from our session today is that academics can only present to be above the influence of political issues. We see here that political issues penetrate far into academics. I'd say that this lesson is a healthy one.

I heard that some people were concerned about my presence here today as a discussant, since my credentials as a political activist overshadow my background in academia. However, I see no need to be concerned about that. I have been far outdone today by Professor Myers.

In doing academic research, we are concerned with making sense of an event, explaining it sociologically and attempting to understand its source. We are not called upon to make a value judgment upon it, either good or bad. Moreover, we do not do research from the point of view of interests of the State Department or the Republic of China, nor need we be concerned with their response or pleasure. The test of Professor Kaplan's article is not in whether or not it may work to de-legitimize, and therefore as Professor Myers says, de-stabilize, the Taiwan government. The test is in its explanation and elucidation of the Kaohsiung Incident trials. Professor Myers, rather, seems to be saying that Professor Kaplan should not publish his paper because it will de-stabilize the Taiwan government. But from an academic point of view we have no reason to be solicitous of the legitimacy and stability of the Republic of China government. Its legitimacy is its own business.

There are many small corrections to be made in Professor Kaplan's paper. In some aspects he has not probed far enough. His first section on the background of the democratic movement is weak. But as an account of the issues and proceedings of the trials, in which he was an observer, his paper does grasp the issues and reflects a great

deal of work in interviewing and investigating. In this respect it is a considerable contribution.

To understand the government's treatment of the trials, it is necessary to look into its concurrent political and propaganda needs. The trial cannot be understood solely from a legalistic stance. This is the explanation for what Professor Kaplan noted, that the government side of the case refused to review the evidence, the tape recordings, or even to make a public record of the exact injuries of the 183 policemen it claims were injured, or the Taiwan Garrison Command account on which it claimed to base its case.

Professor Kaplan's implication that the defendants and the court agreed on the happenings at the incident is incorrect. While the court did not take issue with the accounts of the defendants, the propaganda put out in voluminous quantities by the government-controlled press, such as in booklets by the Government Information Office's U.S. public relations agent Hugh Newton, and others, described the incident as an unprovoked attack on the military police that began about 8:30 p.m. and continued for several hours until the riot trucks finally began to shoot tear gas.

But actually, after an initial period of struggle, about fifteen minutes, right after the crowd broke out of police encirclement, the Formosa Magazine leaders and the crowd settled down again for another hour of speeches, before they were again attacked by an armada of 23 riot trucks. This puts a very different complexion on the case, and conflicts with the propaganda put out by the government, that the riot was an act of heartless violence perpetrated by the Formosa Magazine leaders. ...

In response to questions, I added:

Professor Myers has mentioned the recent elections as a sign of popular approval of the Kuomintang. But the elections have little to do with the underlying political issues on Taiwan, for the most part. Notably the recent elections only were carried out after the new "election laws" made it an offense punishable by seven years' imprisonment for a candidate to "incite the listeners", i.e. criticize the government or discuss the issue of the future of Taiwan. Two of my friends, Chang Chun-nan and Liu Feng-sung, have recently been arrested under the election laws.

What was the significance of the Kaohsiung Incident in regard to elections? In preparation for the December 1978 elections the island-wide coalition demanding the end of martial law was formed. This was a basic challenge to the government. It called off the elections, and refused to re-schedule them, all the way through 1979. One can only make sense of the sentences after the Kaohsiung Incident, including both the martial law court and the civil law court, in terms of the government's desire to put down this challenge.... Then, only after all the candidates had been sentenced, did the government reschedule the elections (for December 1980). That is the strongest statement I can make, and it is self-evident in its implications.

Tang Chu-guo, the final discussant, aptly noted that the sentencing in this case, twelve years for most of the defendants in military court, showed a relative tolerance for "Taiwan independence" dissidents, and that pro-communist dissidents would have been dealt with much more severely. While supporting the cause of Chinese nationalism, he apparently did not find the government's charges of communist connections plausible.

As can be seen in their writings and presentations, Professors Metzger and Myers in

1980 and 1981 largely justified the “authoritarian” rule of the Kuomintang by presenting that the alternative was “totalitarian” communist China, a bogeyman of human rights abuse. This was the dichotomy set by the “one China” device of the U.S., a device created to isolate the newly-established Peoples Republic of China from 1950 on, and deny it a place in international society. It was not a logical dichotomy – rather, it represented the interests of the Chiang Kai-shek regime in commandeering the people of Taiwan and their resources. In fact the security agencies manufactured communist conspiracies in order to justify funding for their vast apparatus (this is the conclusion of Roger Hsieh, Hsieh Tsung-min, who was arrested in 1964 with Peng Ming-min, and again in 1971), which effectively suppressed Taiwanese aspirations for democracy. At the same time, the Kuomintang’s rule was fictionalized as “Free China” to serve the Cold War device of containment of communism.

Metzger and Myers willingly served U.S. and KMT interests through their rhetoric. This is particularly evident in the “rules of the game” argument – i.e. the people of Taiwan in their view had no inherent right to discuss, much less decide, their own future, because this transgressed the “rules of the game” set by the ruling Kuomintang. Allowing legitimacy to the “rules of the game” likewise implicitly “blames the victim” for the repression he suffers as a result of his resistance. Metzger has mythologized the KMT’s “rules of the game” in abstruse forms, presenting them as the cultural givens of a Confucian morality, shared by the whole society – an obvious distortion of the mainlander/native-Taiwanese power relations under martial law, even if both sides could be said to share a general Confucian cultural heritage. In this rhetoric Metzger and Myers displayed a wanton lack of adherence to the basic concepts of human rights, in particular when violated by government terror in the form of arrest, confiscation, torture, and arbitrary execution.

The Submerged History of Human Rights Abuse under the Kuomintang Regime

These academics could perhaps plead ignorance of the extent of regime abuses, but that by the mid-1970’s, Taiwanese activists in the United States were producing limited materials in English that bore witness to the oppressive behavior of the Kuomintang. The closing of Taiwan Political Review and the arrest of editor Huang Hua in 1975 was an obvious recent case of suppressing demands for democracy. By late 1979 and early 1980, the Formosan Association for Human Rights, Voice of Taiwan, and Taiwan Communiqué had widely disseminated information on current human rights violations, with some materials in English, such as the booklet

“Repression in Taiwan: A Look at the Kaohsiung Rally and Trials”, November 1980, a publication by Formosan Assn. for Human Rights and the Asian Center, 36 pp.

Perhaps these orthodox academics allowed more credibility to the Republic of China’s Government Information Office. But we might expect anyone with a political science background would be sensitive to the submerged side in power relationships.

It is virtually a tautology that in circumstances where democratic processes and basic human rights are violated, the oppressed have very limited access to public media, and spreading information on violation of democratic process and human rights may itself be construed and punished as sedition. Conversely, the oppressors are free to lavish resources on their particular version of events, dominating public media and academic institutions, and utilizing their own subsidized political personnel. They rarely meet public refutation.

A vivid example of this is found in my recent interview of a former political prisoner, Tsai Tsai-yuan, who in early 1971 compiled and smuggled out of prison a list of over 400 political prisoners, for which he was severely punished. I interviewed him in Kaohsiung on May 27, 2004, at his office. The abbreviated account follows.

Tsai Tsai-yuan (personal name means “wealth source”) is currently the elected Director of the Board of San Fong Gong (Three Phoenix Temple), Kaohsiung City, San Min District, one of the oldest and largest temples in Kaohsiung, an important community position he recently achieved due to his father’s legacy with the temple.

Tsai was born on April 6, 1940, in Kaohsiung City. He is a man of medium stature, but husky in build and physically vigorous. His face is somewhat square, with large features and light skin, and hair still black and thick.

He went to San Min Primary School and Kaohsiung Middle School together with Shih Ming-teh (Japanese nickname Nori). Then he went to the Army Officers School in Feng Shan, while Nori went to Artillery School. They felt the legacy of massacres by the KMT military in Kaohsiung in March 1947, and figured that you had to learn military skills in order to resist; and the military was also a career.

There were about 1000 students in the whole school, but only 41 Taiwanese (Minnan speakers). Taiwanese parents discouraged their sons from joining. The Taiwanese students were forbidden to speak Minnan and would be fined NT\$5, a lot of money for them, but the mainlander and the Hakka students would speak their own dialects in their own groups, e.g. Hunan, Szechuan, Hakka, etc. The students were pressured to join the KMT, but Tsai declined to do so.

In March 1962 the military cadets’ political discussion groups in which Nori, Tsai and others had participated was exposed. Over a hundred were arrested, and 22 were sentenced. Nori was returned from the outer islands first, and then Tsai was arrested not long after.

In talking later about the location of the Bao An Ju, Tsai remembered where he was sent the first time he had been arrested, in 1962. He said the screening location for political

cases was at Xi-Ning South Road. Originally in the Japanese period it was an intelligence agency (name in Chinese: Dong Ben Yuan Shih), and then taken over by the Taiwan Garrison Command, and later changed into the Bao An Ju (Security Bureau).

When they were taken there in 1962, the old guards laughed and said it was lucky for them that it was no longer like in the 1950's, when they were paid NT\$5 to strangle a prisoner in a burlap bag to death, without seeing the face, and without bothering with a trial. They also heard that in the basement, below where the prisoners slept, there had been a machine that crushed a person alive to meat mush, so it could be flushed out through the sewers into the Tamsui River, which was not far away.

Tsai was sentenced to 12 years and jailed at several locations. In 1970, when he was back at the Taiwan Garrison Command prison in Jinmei on the south side of Taipei, Tsai saw headlines and a newspaper report in the Central Daily News. Tsai was able to read this newspaper because the political prisoners working in the laundries often found newspapers and magazines in pockets, or got clothes wrapped in newspapers. The report said 198 members of the Asian News Association had come to Taiwan, and in visiting President Chiang Kai-shek made an inquiry concerning the number of political prisoners. Chiang said the ROC had no political prisoners; there was only a small group of people advocating Taiwan independence, in the United States.

In August and September 1970 Tsai tried to send out a list of political prisoners, two hundred or so names, but his courier got cold feet and this first attempt failed.

He began the second attempt in early 1971, just about Chinese New Years time. It was before Taiwan lost the China seat in the UN. This time he was able to expand the list to over 400 names. He carefully listed name, date of birth, address, sentence or indictment item, and a commentary on the political nature of the case, e.g. alleged communist, Taiwan independence, simple democratic, or result of internal struggles in the KMT.

He collected the information with the help of 8-9 other prisoners, some of whom were working in the offices, and also the prisoner/doctor Chen Chung-tung, who has recently published his own book. Tsai collected a great deal though questioning that he tried to make appear casual. He would make the inquiry while playing the board game "go" with another prisoner. There were 12 people in his cell, and of these one or two helped him. Other than that, he compiled the names at night, and hid the information on small pieces of paper stuffed in various corners of his drawer. When he compiled the whole list, in his own writing, it was a small pile of sheets.

He was able to get the list carried out and transmitted to Hsieh Tsung-min, who had recently been released from prison due to international attention to Professor Peng Min-ming's case. Hsieh gave the list to Miyake Kyoko, and she got it out of the country.

Two or three weeks later Tsai saw a report, in Hong Kong's weekly "News Universe" (Hsin Wen Tian Di) that a list of political prisoners in Taiwan had been revealed. The report was something along the line that the U.S. had obtained a detailed list of Taiwan political prisoners, and that only the C.I.A. could have the capacity to get this material. Tsai felt great relief that the list had been shown to the world; his efforts and risk had not been in vain.

On April 5 afternoon, he and some friends had bought some food for a feast for the Ching Ming Festival. But at 5 pm he was called to the warden's office, and immediately shackled, hand and foot. He was taken to an isolation room, and questioned with three tape recorders going. He readily admitted that he had compiled the list and smuggled it out, but he refused to implicate others. At 11 pm he was abruptly taken to the second floor, and savagely beaten by a single guard, in the shower there, apparently as retribution.

The next day he was taken to the Bao An Ju (National Security Bureau) on Bo Ai

(Universal Love) Street in back of the Presidential Office, and a long period of interrogation began. He was sent there twice over a period of months for extended interrogation, in the basement. The building is still there, and it is the big building to the right of the Entrance/Exit Management Bureau.

Tsai finds it hard to explain his feelings at that time, and how he could withstand the torture. He says that since he had been successful in exposing the list, he was willing to suffer anything. He went through several hours of interrogation a day, continually beaten. His kidneys were damaged, and he still needs treatment for the long-term damage to them. Having his fingers squeezed in a vise, knees forced the wrong way, legs beaten, all were “small cases” to him. This went on for a month, and he still did not crack.

It was clear that the National Security Bureau had been severely embarrassed by the leak of the political prisoner list, and was determined to break him and punish all those involved in the leak.

Then they sat him in an electric chair, with wires attached to his fingers, toes, and penis. Three people were watching. He was not aware of when they turned on the current. He felt nothing, but they were surprised at his lack of reaction. Tsai thought there must be something special about his constitution, that the current didn't stun him. Then they crossed the wires, which would send the current through his heart. He had seen the man in the cell next to him, who wore a heavy jacket even in hot weather. The man said his heart had been damaged by electric shock.

When Tsai began to feel the current being turned up, he jolted his body in a pretended shock, threw back his head and rolled his eyeballs up, and virtually ceased breathing. They checked his eyes, and believed he had passed out. The interrogators had a worried discussion, and they took him out of the chair and threw water on him.

On May 31, the prosecutor of his case visited him at the Bao An Ju, and he was called from his cell to the reception room to meet with him. The prosecutor asked Tsai to sit down, but Tsai, wearing only shorts, turned to show the severe bruises up and down his legs and back (he could only lie on the floor of his cell).

The National Security Bureau had wanted to convict Tsai of Article 2, Item 1, which is a charge of sedition requiring punishment by life imprisonment or death, i.e. considering the leak of the list of political prisoners a continuation of his previous sedition. But the prosecutor looked at his discolored flesh and only asked him his motivation.

Tsai said, “Before in my first case I was young, and I had no family of my own, and we classmates would mouth off when we got together. But others had families, and I couldn't bear to see how their families became destitute after they were arrested, and no one would even give them employment because they were political cases. So I thought that if I made an international appeal there might be some humanitarian relief.”

This statement seemed to have some effect, because Tsai found that on August 15, 1971 (lunar calendar, the Mid-Autumn Festival, so mid-September by the solar calendar), the KMT made some self-examination of their treatment of political prisoners, and for the first time some small holiday relief was sent to the families of political prisoners. At the same time, Tsai was unshackled (shackling means that the prisoner is slated for execution), and he was sentenced to only three additional years of “reform”, which he served on Green Island.

This is an account from the year 1971, at a location half a block behind the Presidential Office, dealing with a leak of information that occasioned international embarrassment for the ROC. Tsai heard later that his punishment had been

determined at the highest levels. And by late 1971, the American ambassador knew of Tsai Tsai-yuan's plight, and made an unsuccessful effort to visit him at the Jinmei prison. Should we conclude, as Myers might, that Chiang Ching-kuo, the ultimate head of the security agencies, was democratizing, because Tsai was not executed?

Ramon Myers and February 28, 1947:

A Tragic Beginning to Research on Taiwan's Post-World War II History

Perhaps to his credit, Ramon Myers did soon after take on a difficult topic: the Taiwanese uprising of February 28, 1947, against the venal government of Governor Chen Yi and the marauding Chinese soldiers that occupied Taiwan after the withdrawal of Japan. With his background in the Japanese colonial empire, Ramon Myers would be an academic qualified to study the transition from Japanese to Nationalist rule. The research involved about sixty interviews, some conducted in late 1986 and early 1987, according to the Acknowledgments in his book, A Tragic Beginning: The Taiwan Uprising of February 28, 1947, 1991, authored together with Lai Tse-han and Wei Wou, and with some participation by Thomas Metzger as well. It is not clear, however, who conducted those interviews, and with what plans, especially at that early time when such research might rile official overseers.

Chapter 1 begins with a description of the 1988 commemoration of 2-28, sponsored by the recently-established opposition Democratic Progressive Party. However, a common criticism of this book has been that it is based largely on official Kuomintang accounts of the events, which tend to exonerate the government. Be that as it may, an apt summary of the book is encapsulated on the book jacket:

For more than a week, the government [of the Republic of China] and its police forces lost control over Taiwan, or at least its cities. The nine largest cities were taken over by rebel committees and militia units, and rampaging mobs destroyed buildings and other property and savagely beat hundreds of Mainlander officials and civilians. Determined to crush the rebellion and to set a stern example to prevent a recurrence, the KMT brought in troop reinforcements from the Mainland, who, together with the provincial police, ruthlessly suppressed the uprising, arresting alleged leaders and participants and killing perhaps as many as 8,000 of them.

The rebellion and its suppression, like the Paris Commune of 1970, were instantly mythologized by both left and right. They spawned the Taiwanese independence movement and permanently damaged relations between the native Taiwanese and the Mainland Chinese. *Ironically, the tragedy also inspired reforms that ultimately permitted the economic and political modernization of Taiwan over the next four decades* [emphasis added].

Some additional quotes from the book help to flesh out the picture:

[Governor of Taiwan] Ch'en I felt sorrow but considered himself blameless in the brutal suppression of the Uprising. In fact, Chiang Kai-shek and Ch'en I could not have been expected to control those division and regimental commanders and officers who rounded up and shot citizens, secretly disposed of their bodies, and strafed residences and shops. (p. 161)

Moral Aspects of the Uprising: ... We cannot but endorse the anger with which the dissidents reacted to KMT and provincial misrule. Yet were they wise to react so violently, to brush aside Ch'en I's conciliatory offers, and to radicalize their demands? Was the hope for "self-rule" that some of them entertained a practical possibility in that day and age? (p. 178)

The elements of this account (and the book in general) that are shared by the line minimally acceptable to the current-day Kuomintang are that 1) it depicts the participants as violent and recalcitrant, in contrast to the native Taiwanese view that the settlement committees restored order and made reasonable requests, 2) it depicts a short period of disturbance and repression, rather than continuing government brutality and White Terror, 3) it absolves the central government of guilt in the massacres carried out by government troops and police, and 4) it places some of the blame on the victims, who "unrealistically" believed themselves entitled to the rights enshrined in the ROC constitution or in their experience with Japanese colonialism.

Other objections stated strongly by Stephen O. Murray in an on-line review are Myers' presumption of the legitimacy of Kuomintang control, in the first place. REF

Tragic Beginning does however provide some useful information from official sources, for example Table 10 on p. 160, which gives an estimate of the number of dead and wounded, by category, at the time of the February 28th Incident. The source is the feared National Security Headquarters, the Bao-an Si-ling-bu, 1956. Of a total calculated at 6,317 cases and divided into fourteen rather arbitrary descriptive categories, there are 33 cases of "police officials and policemen", 3,230 cases (51%) of "district and city protesters", and 2,252 cases (36%) of "arrested, convicted, or executed". Nearly all of the remaining 15% or so are identified as various groups labeled as resisting the central government. These numbers seem to reflect the largely arbitrary nature of the repression, mowing down people in the streets with no pretense of legal process.

But what I wish to take issue here with Myers in particular is the optimistic twist he puts on the end of this tragedy that "ironically, inspired reforms". The sudden transition in the account from "tragedy" to "reform" and hopeful economic development seems

to be a Myers trademark to be seen in many of his arguments; in this the book cover closely follows the book.

In his description of post-1947 reforms, on p. 164, there are reports of organizational and economic recommendations, but no democratic or human rights measures. Pro-KMT writers make much of the supposed reforms of the KMT in 1950-52, and no doubt Chiang Kai-shek hoped to impress the American sponsors; but these “reforms” only seem to have been calculated to strengthen lines of command and internal control. After a relative lull till the start of the Korean War, White Terror was again unleashed upon the countryside, and local personages who had surrendered to and even been given ceremonial positions in the administration, such as XXXX, were summarily taken into custody and executed. Some of those who survived both 2-28 and later political imprisonment have been interviewed, e.g. Lee Rong-zhong of Shen Kun, Taipei County, or they are known to relatives; I will present their stories elsewhere. Clearly, political functioning could not but be chilled for that generation. Myers continues,

KMT Policy in the Wake of the Uprising: Can we say, then, that the KMT policy for dealing with the repercussions of the Uprising was a failure? This policy alternated between silence and attempts to blame the Uprising on Communists and “ambitious” Taiwanese. By refusing to discuss the Uprising candidly and to accept responsibility for misrule and violent excesses during the spring of 1947, the government made itself vulnerable to criticism. Yet the government may not have survived an uninhibited public discussion of the tragedy before it had built up the overall record of progress which by now has won so much Taiwanese support. (p. 192)

Again, why does Myers find the survival of the Kuomintang government a sacred cause? Why does he exonerate any level of abuses?

Linda Chao, Ramon Myers, and the First Chinese Democracy

Taiwan was subjected to perhaps the longest period of martial law in world history, 1949 through 1987. In these nearly four decades, major figures of the Kuomintang reiterated their insistence on the continuance of martial law “during the period of communist insurgency” and tacitly approved the arrest of dissenters, even while President Chiang Ching-kuo annually uttered platitudes about the Republic of China’s shining goals of democracy. After the enactment of national security laws to replace martial law mechanisms of control, the Kuomintang sought to portray itself as the harbinger of democracy and freedom, thus to salvage its shredded legitimacy and international image, and to snatch the cachet of innovation from the competing

Democratic Progressive Party. Surprisingly, it discovered that Chiang Ching-kuo himself, since 1949 the ultimate authority over the very security agencies that were charged with enforcement of martial law and suppression of dissent, was the source of democratization. It fell to Ramon Myers, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, and Linda Chao (Tsai Ling), Research Fellow, to substantiate this scenario in the English literature.

In "The First Chinese Democracy: Political Development of the Republic of China on Taiwan, 1986-1994", Asian Survey, Vol. 34, No. 3, March 1994, pp. 213-230, Linda Chao and Ramon Myers sketched their vision of this development, starting from a candid description of the crux of contradictions in the foundations of the Republic of China.

... The party and government used other legalistic procedures to adapt the 1947 Constitution to the political realities of Taiwan. Three types of repressive actions were used by the Garrison Command, security bureau, the police, and military courts to enforce compliance ...: first, the regime arrested, imprisoned, or executed any individuals considered to threaten national security and public order; second, it arrested and imprisoned any individuals trying to organize an opposition party; and third, the regime closed journals and newspapers that printed information threatening public order and its legitimacy. In the early decades the regime launched a "white terror" to arrest and imprison many thousands, often without a military trial. In September 1960 the authorities arrested the chief editor of *Tzu-yu Chung-kuo* (Free China), Lei Chen, and several others for attempting to establish an opposition party; the Kaohsiung Incident in December 1979 led to the arrest of 152 persons and the imprisonment of opposition leaders also believed to be trying to organize an opposition party. ... (p. 216)

They were not, however, above flights of fancy:

Meanwhile, government leaders and personnel belonged to only one party, the KMT, which was Leninist in structure but differed from its communist counterpart on the mainland in that it neither adopted a party line nor tried to mobilize Taiwan society to follow such a line. It did not closely monitor and control its members or punish them if they criticized party policy. The first chairman, Chiang Kai-shek (1949-75), and his son and successor, Chiang Ching-kuo (1975-88), did not drive their opponents out of the party or hound them in personal life. ... (p. 216-217)

Some of these were corrected not long after in their full-length book, The First Chinese Democracy: Political Life of the Republic of China on Taiwan, 1998, Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 372.

... The former Taipei city mayor and Taiwan provincial governor in 1952, Wu Kuo-chen, recalls his confrontations with Chiang Ching-kuo, whom Wu charged with abusing his power and causing great harm to the Nationalist government [through secret police intimidation and arbitrary arrests]. Wu even complained to President Chiang Kai-shek, but to no avail. ...

The Wu-Chiang Ching-kuo confrontation did not last long. In 1953, when Wu and his wife were being driven to Sun Moon Lake in central Taiwan, they discovered that vital bolts

connecting the car's wheels were missing, thus averting an accident ... Now convinced that their lives were in danger, Wu and his wife left Taiwan for the United States, never to return. (p. 107)

To add to this, according to many of the former political prisoners I have interviewed over the years, the Taiwan Garrison Command and the Ministry of Justice Bureau of Investigation engaged in vendettas in which they accused each others' agents, and even military judges, of serving as communist moles. Between 1965 and 1967 there were at least three cases of political arrest of high-ranking MJIB officials, and at least nine were executed. (See fold-out chronological chart of 325 political cases in The Road to Freedom: Retrospective on Taiwan Democracy and Human Rights, editor Lee Chen-hsiang, 2002. Taipei: Yu Shan Publishing. Commissioned and distributed by the Chen Wen-cheng Foundation.) But the cannibalistic habits of the Taiwan security agencies are not the main concern of this review of The First Chinese Democracy.

The preface of the book explained some of the background of the research.

...[W]e began studying Chinese political life on Taiwan in the fall of 1989 during the December 2 local and national elections. We continued to monitor later political changes, and in 1991 the Hoover Institution supported our research. Soon after, we were assisted by funding from the Luce Foundation and the ROC's Government Information Office, which enabled us to interview more than fifty leading politicians who had been involved in the important political events of recent decades. ...

The First Chinese Democracy, 1998, correctly identifies several of the critical issues undermining the legitimacy of the Republic of China on Taiwan, central issues that were harped on yearly by those critics who dared to state the obvious.

The power vested in the ROC president, who also served as chairman of the ruling party, was enormous, especially after the constitution was frozen in 1948. The president was the supreme commander of the nation's armed forces; he appointed the most important government and military officers, including the cabinet, the governor of Taiwan, and the mayors of Kaohsiung and Taipei cities, and he influenced the agenda for legislation. From Chiang Kai-shek, between 1949 and 1975, to Chiang Ching-kuo, between 1978 and 1988, and now to Lee Teng-hui, the constitution's normal checks on the president's power had never existed. (p. 178)

Theoretically, the National Assembly was the representative of the people in its power to write and amend the national constitution, and to elect the president, who was constitutionally limited to two terms. In practice it was a rubber-stamp body, with members frozen in place in 1948, that suspended the constitutional protections, passed the measures legislating martial law, and extended Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's tenure as president to life. As decades passed and the foreign press ran photos of doddering National Assembly members, supported by nurses, or carried into the Sun Yat-Sen Hall on stretchers and dangling urine bags, the National

Assembly was increasingly an embarrassment to the regime.

... Those actions preserving the National Assembly's power did not go unnoticed. Critics of the KMT complained that the government granted special privileges to National Assembly members that were unfair and very costly. ... Other critics charged that the government annually spent ... about US\$27 million of taxpayers' money to cover expenses for National Assembly members.

By 1981, nearly 16 percent of the representatives were over eighty, with another 50 percent in their seventies. A critic complained that these "eternal representatives" (*wannien yiyuan*) had already served thirty-eight years, were too old, and lived overseas, which put them out of touch with political conditions in Taiwan. In 1948, 2,841 National Assembly members had convened, but in November 1984 only 1,046 members (797 original members and another 249 chosen in supplementary elections) did so. ... The KMT and the government either tolerated these criticisms or closed down the journals and newspapers that printed them. Their attacks on the National Assembly intensified in the 1970s and early 1980s, but they never dared stage public demonstrations to denounce the assembly for fear of arrest and imprisonment. (p. 50-51)

Myers and Chao have repeatedly in their summary writings glossed over the early elections in Taiwan as a training exercise managed by the Kuomintang for the sake of developing democratic procedures. See, for example, their article "How Elections Promoted Democracy in Taiwan under Martial Law" in Diamond and Myers, 19XX, [Elections and Democracy in Greater China](#). But it seems that Myers has occasionally (perhaps in a moment of pique over the unseating of the Kuomintang) let another reality slip through, as in his presentation "The Evolution of Democracy in Divided China" at the conference Democracy: The Bridge Between China and Taiwan, held at The Claremont Institution, Pasadena, California, June 6, 2000.

Political change in Taiwan evolved by the GMD ruling party and state using their power to cultivate democracy at the local government level and establish a social contract with the people to allow them a high degree of freedom of movement, occupation, and expression as long as they did not interfere in the political governance of the Republic of China (ROC). ... The new local election system in Taiwan did not give people the right to establish an opposition party. The regime punished dissidents who tried to push political change faster than it preferred, so that arrests, detentions, trials, imprisonment, and censorship were common in the years of martial law between 1949 and 1987. Taiwan's limited democracy merely allowed the GMD to claim it was promoting a democratic revolution without declaring any timetable for opposition parties to compete in open, fair, and democratic elections.

For roughly forty years, the ruling party and state governed by a political constitution drafted in 1947 and approved by an elected National Assembly in Mainland China. That National Assembly ... then moved to Taiwan and put the ROC Constitution on hold while transferring power to the ROC president. The National Assembly elected the president and vice-president nominated by the GMD every six years. At the local government level, the GMD still controlled local elections by having enough of its nominees elected to control local governance. Such unfair practices allowed the GMD to claim that Taiwan Province was the democratic model by which China could be governed when reunification became a reality. ... GMD candidates had a field day of winning the majority of races because few non-GMD candidates had the courage to enter these contests. (p. 2-3)

Actually the Taiwan Democratic Movement of 1978/79 arose precisely over these denials of the right of the people of Taiwan to determine their own future, and it did dare to stage public demonstrations. In May 1978 former political prisoner Shih Ming-teh, later Formosa Magazine general manager, produced a small booklet with a dark green cover, A Proposal for a Fourth National Body. A newspaper clipping reprinted in the foreword was probably more likely to provoke the authorities than was the booklet's legalistic content: the newspaper told that a senile national assemblyman had wandered away from his home and was unable to find his way back.

Although the Formosa Magazine leadership was arrested and sentenced to long terms in Spring 1980, the experience of mass movement in defiance of martial law and the public airing of these challenges to the regime's legitimacy had a lasting effect. The organizational and human contacts remained, though latent. The hypocrisy of Kuomintang ideology and the bald impunity of the security agencies had been exposed before and during the trials. The daily transcript of the main trial, printed in all the major newspapers for ten days, spread the ideals of the democratic movement leadership, including Shih Ming-teh's strident argument, "Taiwan has already been independent for thirty years!" All this set off widening repercussions throughout the society; a theme of resistance to authority and conformity broke out in novels and movies in the early 1980s. The personnel of the bureaucracy itself, especially those in law enforcement and in foreign affairs, came under increased psychological pressure, and there are hints that many of the security agents chose to emigrate.

In Myers' and Chao's account,

Between 1980 and spring of 1986, the KMT-dominated political center came under increasing pressures from outside and from within. United States pressure on Taipei to improve human rights intensified. On May 31, 1984, Congressman Stephen Solarz, a Democrat introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives that the ROC lift martial law and improve human rights by freeing political prisoners. On June 23, Senator Claiborn Pell, a Republican, echoed these sentiments. Pressures from Washington never eased.

...

The greatest pressure on the KMT, however, came from the relentless challenge of the *dangwai* to organize a political party. (p. 120-121)

But Myers generally only understands the outcome of elections as they are rationalized by the KMT, not the dynamic process, and tries to discount the effects of the challenge to KMT authority. If the candidates were successfully elected, he sees them as moderate and "staying within the rules of the game". If they were defeated and/or arrested, he labels them dangerous radicals. (See his categories and cases on

p. 99.) In particular, the revision of the election laws before the December 1980 elections prescribed that candidates would be sentenced to seven years imprisonment for advocating campaign planks “in violation of national policy”. Chang Chun-nan, formerly elected National Assemblyman, and Liu Feng-song, teacher and historian, each served 3-1/2 years. Concerning these laws, Myers said, almost farcically,

In 1980 the government passed a new election law which made the former election law more open, free, fair, and democratic. (Ramon H. Myers, “The Evolution of Democracy in Divided China” at the conference Democracy: The Bridge Between China and Taiwan, held at The Claremont Institution, Pasadena, California, June 6, 2000, p. 3)

Again based partly on the account of Myers and Chao, 1998, p. 119-120, the younger cadre of the opposition made application in January 1984 to establish an organization called the Public Policy Study Association. Many served as assistants to the wives of the imprisoned Formosa leaders; the wives had been elected in December 1980 as protest vote. Although the application was refused by the Ministry of Interior, they proceeded to announce formation of the organization on March 11. The authorities finally granted approval in September after some face-saving compromises. This stretching of the “rules of the game” progressively forced open the space for organized dissent.

Despite the sequence of this historical account as outlined above -- first challenge to the authorities by the opposition, and then cooptation and accommodation --, Myers and Chao still contend

Chiang Ching-kuo alone had initiated the democratic process [in late March 1986, see p. 126-7] and kept it moving forward. ... When the DPP formed illegally [on September 28, 1986], a government intelligence unit had urged Chiang to act and abolish the party, but Chiang had refused. ... (p. 153)

After martial law was lifted on July 15, 1987, the stringent rules governing where and how newspapers printed their daily editions were finally removed on January 1, 1988. ... In October 1986 the KMT finally produced a draft law allowing sociopolitical groups to organize and sent it to the Ministry of Interior for review. (p. 154)

Or had Chiang Ching-kuo really planned democratization early on, but been delayed by the Henry Liu murder of October 1984, and the financial scandals of 1985? This is the inside story that Myers and Chao claim to have unearthed.

On March 21, 1984, the day after Vice President Lee’s inauguration, President Chiang visited Lee’s office and talked with him for some forty minutes. At that meeting the president revealed his intentions of carrying out major political reform ... (p. 119; note 54 at end of paragraph)

Chiang Ching-kuo had confided in his vice president but in no other top party leaders. (note 55 here)... For Chiang Ching-kuo, the issue now was when to enact political reform, which depended only on how quickly his vice president learned the art of governance. (p. 120)

Given the paucity of evidence for President Chiang Ching-kuo's concrete moves towards democratization, the source of this statement deserves scrutiny. The reference note for this statement, number 54 on page 324, says "Based on interviews with Vice President Lee Teng-hui in 1986".

Since the year 2000 and the expulsion of Lee Teng-hui from the Kuomintang, there has been strident contention over who embodies the legacy of Chiang Ching-kuo's intentions, the Chinese-nationalists Lien Chan and James Soong, or the (later revealed) Taiwan-nationalist Lee Teng-hui. Lee claims that he represents the real intention of Chiang Ching-kuo's reforms, and he has just recently documented his interaction with Chiang Ching-kuo, in a book of facsimiles of Lee's notes over the period May 20, 1984 through January 13, 1988, the day of Chiang Ching-kuo's death and Lee Teng-hui's accession to the presidency (*Witness to Taiwan: President Chiang Ching-kuo and Me* (*Jian Zheng Taiwan: Jiang Jing-guo Dzung-tong yu Wo*). Narrated by Lee Teng-hui, edited by the Historica Sinica. May 2004. Taipei: Yun Chen Cultural Enterprise.) However, Lee has concurrently explained that Chiang Ching-kuo's setting up of committees to study liberalization came to nothing, apparently stonewalled by his subordinates.

This coincides with Myers and Chao's consecutive note, number 55 on p. 324.

To our knowledge, no KMT top leaders ever privately proposed or publicly advocated immediate political reform. There seems to have been general agreement in their ranks that the status quo was satisfactory. Our interviews with party leaders like Mah Soo-lay and others also lead us to believe that not one top KMT official was even aware that Chiang planned political reform at the party's March 1986 Third Plenum.

In sum, while the basic political models and values on which Ramon Myers bases his conclusions are profoundly undemocratic, ingenuous, and insidious, we can still appreciate his assiduous attention to detail and annotation. It seems well established that even if President Chiang Ching-kuo did have some intentions for accommodation to Taiwanese demands late in his reign, the Kuomintang as a whole experienced no such inclination and no moves towards internal party democracy.

Democracy's New Leaders in 1997 Taiwan: Lien Chan is the Man

This dearth of internal KMT democratic process is relevant to another booklet by Linda Chao and Ramon H. Myers produced at about the same time, "Democracy's New Leaders in the Republic of China on Taiwan", Hoover Essays No. 17, ISBN

0-8179-3802-8, 23 pages, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, 1997. This booklet exclusively showcases Lien Chan, at that time in line for succession to President Lee Teng-hui as the KMT nominee in the year 2000. Selected passages are below.

A Historical Puzzle

In a 1991 book entitled *The Third Wave*, the author, Samuel P. Huntington, analyzed how thirty-odd nations between 1974 and 1990 had undergone a political transition from authoritarianism to democracy. He went on to argue that whenever authoritarian rulers and their ruling parties had initiated a democratic breakthrough and carried out a successful democratic transition, the voters eventually ejected them from power. ... (p. 1-2)

Huntington did not include the ROC in his sample because that nation had not lifted its martial law (imposed in 1949) until 1987 and had just begun its democratic transition. Nine years later, on March 23, 1996, Taiwan held the first democratic election in Chinese history. Of the four teams competing in that election for the offices of president and vice president, KMT politicians Lee Teng-hui and Lien Chan won 54 percent of the votes. Both had been nominated by the KMT, which had governed Taiwan since October 25, 1945. Although this party had initiated a democratic breakthrough and guided the democratic transition, it had also upheld martial law for thirty-six years and severely repressed political dissent and any efforts to establish an opposition party. ... How was it possible that this party, ... long regarded by Western critics as a dictatorial, Leninist-type party, still remained in power? The answer is that its leaders had developed a creative leadership style of a special kind. (p. 2)

The Formative Years and Early Political Career of Lien Chan

...
Lien Ya-t'ang and his wife had only one son, Lien Chen-tung, who wanted to study in Japan, the country his father despised. Lien Chen-tung, however, graduated from Keio University in Tokyo with a major in economics, and he and his wife moved to the city of Sian in Shensi Province, where their only son, Lien Chan, was born on August 27, 1936. Lien Chan attended primary school and soon spoke Mandarin with a pure northern accent. (p. 7)

The family returned to Taiwan in late 1945 when Lien Chen-tang accepted a position in the new ROC provincial government. Active in promoting land reform, organizing local government elections, and enacting compulsory military service for all young males, he was elected as Taipei county's first magistrate, ... and later the secretary-general for the Provincial Assembly. ... Having learned the art of politics – avoiding making enemies, cultivating friends everywhere, and bringing people of different opinions to agree – he frequently instructed his son on how to succeed: “You do not have to say very much to be successful in politics. To be active in politics is like riding a bicycle: your head is always nodding up and down so as to never oppose your superiors, and you vigorously pump at the same time as if working very hard at your job.” Lien Chan says he never forgot that advice.

While his father became widely respected in political life, his mother managed the family's fortunes. She sold their rice field and, with those proceeds as well as family savings, purchased more land and real estate and later invested in the construction industry and various financial institutions. On the basis of these successful transactions, she parlayed the family fortune into a vast holding estimated in the mid-1990s to be worth around US\$1 billion, making the Lien family one of the wealthiest in Taiwan. (p.8)

...
By 1959 [Lien Chan] had graduated from the Political Science Department [of National

Taiwan University] and completed his compulsory military service by teaching at the Political War College. (p. 8)

The source of this information, according to the notes, is various biographies of Lien Chan, including an official one released by the Government Information Office in 1995. Lien went on to study politics and international relations at University of Chicago; his doctoral thesis was on the Chinese communist 1952 propaganda campaign against Hu Shih, a famous liberal philosopher who sided with Chiang Kai-shek.

In 1975 Lien served as ambassador to El Salvador in Central America, and later as director of the World Anticommunist Youth League. His roles advanced from KMT Standing Committee member, to minister of foreign affairs, and governor of Taiwan province. In 1993 spring, he was appointed premier after the resignation of the military strongman, Hau Pei-tsun, under pressure from native-born legislators both in the ruling party and the opposition.

Each (Lee Teng-hui and Lien Chan) held great respect for Chiang Ching-kuo and owed his early promotions to Chiang's watchful eye and approval. After becoming the first Taiwanese ROC president, Lee Teng-hui in turn kept a close watch on Lien Chan and made him the first Taiwanese premier. (p. 9)

From Myers' account, Lien Chan was an obedient, colorless functionary – hardly the “creative leader” that Myers dubs him. We might almost suspect that Myers is speaking tongue-in-cheek. As for his family wealth, this was a main topic of DPP television ads leading up to the March 20, 2004 election: Lien Chen-tung, the father, was a bureaucrat in charge of receiving Japanese property at the time of retrocession. In the 1970s, with the Agriculture Commission, he dealt with city planning and zoning. Both gave him the opportunity for insider trading in real estate. The ROC's laws previously stipulated that only persons with the occupation of “farmer” could buy and sell agricultural land. As a graduate student in the U.S., Lien Chan was still nominally a “farmer”, although neither he nor his father had ever farmed in Taiwan. His daughter at the age of two was likewise listed as a “farmer” holding property. In current Taiwanese scuttlebutt, Lien Chan is often referred to as “Ah Shia”, a pampered son of the rich who does not know what the world looks like outside the family estate.

Was Lien a “leader of democracy”? According to my August 2, 2002 interview with Chen Shao-ting, now a presidential advisor to Chen Shui-bian, Chiang Ching-kuo held two secret group meetings with party youth in summer and fall 1970, called “intellectual youth seminars” (zhi-shi qing-nian dzuo-tan hui), to solicit the frank opinions of youth, at a time when the legitimacy of the Republic of China was increasing being called into question in international forums. The 30-40 participants

were mostly Chung Shan scholarship recipients but also included a few native Taiwanese. Chen Gu-ying (the philosophy professor quoted earlier in this paper) requested the convener, Chang Bao-Shi, to guarantee that no one who spoke out would be arrested. According to Chen Shao-ting, who was the most vocal participant, Lien Chan was present but said nothing.

Myers quotes a 1995 article by political journalist Chou Tien-ray, an important editor of the newspaper China Times (published in Hsin-hsin-wen (The Journalist), no. 426 (May 7-13, 1995): p. 31):

It is so nice to be Lien Chan. He has all kinds of titles, and he is now called premier. The future might bring even a greater title. The big problems can be managed by his "big boss" [President Lee], and the minor problems can be referred to subordinates. ... Therefore, his functions seem to be purely formal ones. He does not have to show any determination, ability, or wisdom, and he never displays any anger. ...(p. 11)

All the same, Myers gives Lien Chan credit for the policies advanced by President Lee Teng-hui:

...Thus in 1993, President Lee Teng-hui, working closely with Premier Lien, initiated the foreign policy of pragmatism (wu-shih wai-chiao), which called for vigorously expanding economic, social and cultural ties with other nations to develop diplomatic ties with them while obtaining their support for the ROC to reenter the leading international organizations. But, even more significantly, in July 1994 Lee and Lien also initiated the ROC's White Paper on China policy that redefined the ROC's one-China principle ...

... The PRC leaders bitterly opposed Taipei's new one-China principle and accused Taipei's leaders of violating that principle and trying to establish an independent Taiwan. ... The PRC continued to threaten the use of force ...(p. 13)

In the midst of the 1995-96 crisis, Premier Lien tried to revive stalled negotiations between Taipei and Beijing... By proposing that both sides set aside their differences and agree on a new strategic framework for conducting cross-strait relations, Premier Lien offered PRC leaders new ideas on how to resume the difficult road toward China's unification. By late 1996, Beijing still had not responded to them. (p. 16)

Metzger and Myers on U.S. Policy Towards China:

Freedom Fighters Meet Free Market

At the same time that Myers was so protective of the Kuomintang heirs in Taipei, he and Metzger responded to the siren call of oil for the lamps of China, the lure of that huge market of labor and consumers. Metzger in particular provided the ideological baggage for a turn away from the Cold War containment of China. Their book Greater China and U.S. Foreign Policy: The Choice Between Confrontation and Mutual Respect (Edited by Thomas A. Metzger and Ramon H. Myers. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1996, 124 pp.) was summarized by Donald Zagoria in Foreign Affairs, May/ June 1997

(online at www.foreignaffairs.org, website of the Council on Foreign Relations):

A prominent group of American China specialists warns against a "containment" policy toward China. The American public is unwilling to bear the burden of a strong foreign policy. China has the capacity to inflict considerable harm on a variety of U.S. national interests. And "given some hopeful tendencies today alive in China," engagement could encourage China's leaders to "follow the international norms" of "the United States and its allies." Metzger, a widely respected China historian, argues that "perestroika" (economic and social reform) should be given priority over "glasnost" (political freedom). An impressive social science literature shows that there are "social requisites of democracy" such as levels of per capita income, urbanization, and literacy, and that, "pressing for immediate democratization is not . . . the most effective way to democratize in all cases." Moreover, in some cases nondemocratic, authoritarian rule may be morally justified to maintain stability. And the "Chinese democracy movement" does not criticize the PRC government in a balanced way, has not developed a practical alternative to the present regime, and is highly utopian -- as is evident from its failure to appreciate the importance of the Taiwan experience.

What is especially notable to me here is the message that "Moreover, in some cases nondemocratic, authoritarian rule may be morally justified to maintain stability". This is the same justification that Metzger, Myers, and others used previously to support the authoritarianism of the Kuomintang over native Taiwanese aspirations, but in the name of the higher goal of defeating communist dictatorship in China.

At the same time, these two senior fellows of Hoover Institution (by this time Metzger had been recruited to the staff) presented an opinion no doubt novel to those China watchers who continually warned of China attacking its "renegade province": that China's bark was worse than its bite. This opinion was concocted as a cultural analysis of Chinese history back to the 8th Century. It could be seen as defending the Lee Teng-hui/Lien Chan defiance of China, as well as rationalizing America's increasing business ties with communist China. Originally published under the title "Chinese Nationalism and American Policy" in Orbis, Winter 1998, it was excerpted in the online Hoover Digest, 1998, No. 2, as "The Problem of Chinese Nationalism":

Its economy thriving, its military growing, will China embark on an expansionist foreign policy? Thomas A. Metzger and Ramon H. Myers argue that the Chinese are far too realistic for that -- and have been for more than a thousand years. ... In fact, however, the pessimists misunderstand Beijing's historical baggage.

It is true that, even before the days of Confucius (551–479 b.c.), the Chinese saw themselves as the one and only civilized or "flowery" (hua) part of the world....Hence, even today, Chinese cannot quite imagine a normative international order with more than one center or fully accept as normal an international system the center of which is not China, not to mention a system in which China is not even the equal of any other nation. This persisting feeling of global centrality, however, ... has invariably been combined with the premise that this centrality could be fully realized only if the leadership in the center were morally ideal--in Confucian eyes, a morally perfect sage... [T]hey have long accepted as normal a global situation in which the balance of power was tilted against

China.... Beijing knows that efforts to intensify ethnic feeling would collide with its main goal, which is stability and modernization achieved by joining the world system.

...
 Contrary to the claims of some American sinologists, it does not suggest that the foreign policy of late imperial China was "aggressive" and "expansionist." In fact, this policy was weak and fundamentally defensive all through the Ming period (1368–1644) and only spasmodically aggressive when the Manchus conquered China and established their dynasty (1644–1912). After all, the Chinese did not even bother to start settling Taiwan until late Ming times, which they did as private citizens acting illegally and without state support. ...

By the beginning of the twentieth century, this sense of ethnic identity was frequently translated into popular expressions of outrage directed against foreigners who had insulted Chinese or seized their territory. ... Such nationalistic feelings were especially aroused when the Japanese seized large parts of China during 1931–1945. ... Moreover, intense nationalistic feelings largely took the form of spasmodic outbursts, not movements mobilizing the population in a sustained way.... The idea of being the descendants of the Yellow Emperor (Huang-ti-te hou-i) never aroused Chinese passions the way the idea of Mother Russia inspired the Russians during the Second World War. ...

... Some scholars argue that because the Maoist or Marxist ideal of socialism is no longer taken seriously in China, Beijing will have to depend on nationalism to hold the country together. ... But Beijing's leaders, masters of realpolitik, know that efforts to intensify this ethnic feeling would collide not only with particularism, consumerism, ethnic diversity, the revival of Confucian values, and cynicism about their leadership, but also with the pursuit of their main goal, which is political stability and modernization achieved by joining the world system.

Despite his overall move towards accommodation with China, Ramon Myers still stood up for his friends in Taiwan with an article attacking the Clinton administration's three no's, entitled "Aggravating the One-China Problem", published in the Washington Times, September 23, 1998.

When President Clinton declared his administration's guidelines toward Taiwan -- no "one China and Taiwan" or "two Chinas"; no entry into international organizations for Taiwan; and no Taiwan independence -- he was intervening in the divided China issue in a way that no previous president and administration had done before. Mr. Clinton's three no's suggest that the U.S. government might cooperate with the People's Republic of China (PRC) to deny the Republic of China on Taiwan (ROC), a former ally and sovereign state, its right to join international organizations, establish diplomatic ties with other states, and purchase weapons to protect its national security. ...

But Mr. Clinton's three no's invalidate the Taiwan Relations Act and ignore the new realities on Taiwan. The authoritarian government that once ruled by martial law no longer exists. The Taiwanese now elect their president and vice president and enjoy full human rights. ...

In December 1998, the ROC will elect a new parliament and mayors and councils for Taipei and Kaohsiung cities. *In spring 2000 there will be a second presidential election. That election could influence how the issue of a divided China will be resolved. Taiwan's people might elect a new ruling party and president who will subject the one-China principle to public polling and even a national referendum.* (emphasis added)

Such a development could not come at a more dangerous time. In the last few years the Taiwanese people have become more distrustful of the PRC because of its inability to protect Taiwan citizens traveling in China. The Taiwanese are not hopeful that Beijing's leaders can reduce corruption, promote democracy or carry out successful socioeconomic

reforms. And they resent the Communist Party's bullying other nations to isolate Taiwan and prevent it from expanding its foreign relations. Growing Taiwan nationalism and Beijing's failure to win the friendship and confidence of Taiwan's leaders and people could converge in a dramatic Taiwanese declaration soundly rejecting the one-China principle.

That action would anger the PRC and force America's leaders to decide whether they can abandon a democracy of 22 million people to avoid enraging Beijing or risk being dragged into a conflict to uphold the U.S. goal of promoting democracy and free markets around the world. The divided China issue is a time bomb waiting to explode. Mr. Clinton's ill-advised three no's only strengthen those forces in Taiwan society that could reject the one-China principle, in effect telling both Beijing and Washington that Taiwan's people can also say no -- thus creating a profound dilemma for America's leaders.

In 1998 there seemed only a faint possibility that the Democratic Progressive Party could unseat the ruling Kuomintang at any time in the next ten years, though Myers contemplated it in the above opinion piece. In fact when James Soong (Song Tsu-yu, a mainlander, head of the Government Information Office at the time of the Formosa Magazine suppression) split from the KMT he no doubt dismissed that possibility, and assumed that the contest was between him and the "Taiwanized" KMT, represented by Lee Teng-hui's pawn, Lien Chan. The error was typical KMT hubris.

Victory for Democracy, Defeat for the Kuomintang:

The Post-2000 Pessimism of Ramon Myers

Following the victory of the DPP's presidential candidate, Chen Shui-bian, in March 2000, with just 39.3% of the popular vote, Ramon Myers changed his tune both in regard to Taiwan's internal politics and its confrontation with China. At the Roundtable Discussion on Taiwan's Historic 2000 Elections, Asia/Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, May 24, 2000 (following an address by Richard Bush entitled "Political Change in Taiwan: Implications for American Policy"), Myers spoke bluntly (conference transcript online; Myers' presentation, pp. 46-49).

MYERS: Soong and Lien could have been a team that would clearly have projected the KMT party into victory. But there was bad blood between President Lee Teng-hui and James Soong and that bad blood goes back as early, I believe, as the last week in December 1997 [the National Development Conference]. ... At that conference, Lee Teng-hui essentially engineered his own agenda: ... number one, that there would be constitutional revision to strengthen the hand of the presidency, and number two, that there would be downsizing and abolition of elections for the provincial governor and the provincial assembly.

[I]t's interesting to note that James Soong had never been informed about it. He never even knew that his own job was in jeopardy because the president already feared him. When he was elected a provincial governor in 1997, I believe, he had won the most votes ever in any election in the country. And President Lee regarded him as a danger, a threat to his long-standing efforts to redefine Taiwan's relationship with China. ... James Soong

certainly didn't want to redefine Taiwan's relationship with China. Therefore, he and the president gradually had a falling-out, ... meaning that Lee Teng-hui would never have allowed Mr. Soong to be on that election ticket in February and March 2000. ...

Something else also happened to Lee Teng-hui in the four years after he had been elected in March 1996. He became very arrogant. He had already been in power about eight years. Hubris clearly clouded his political judgment, because I believe he honestly thought that his stalking horse, Vice President Lien, could win the election. ...If Lee's first objective was to put Lien into office, his second objective was to make damn sure that Mr. Soong didn't win, in case Lien didn't look like a good outcome.

Even after the election, it was extremely hard for the defeated Party chairman to think about taking accountability and stepping down. In fact, there had to be demonstrations in front of Party headquarters, and advertisements by unhappy KMT cadres and scholars demanding that this man step down, and take responsibility. There was a huge struggle just to get Lee to finally relinquish his Party chairmanship. But from information that I've been getting from Taiwan recently, it seems that Lee can't stay out of politics. Lien Chan, the vice president, has the path now of trying to rebuild the KMT party for the second time in the last fifty years. He has set up a committee to restructure the KMT, and it seems that Lee is even trying to meddle even in that effort...

...Keep this in mind. In 1979, Beijing made an offer to Taiwan, a federation formula for how the Taiwan–China sovereignty problem could be resolved. To this day, the leadership in Taiwan has never replied with a formula for federation of its own.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Might one of you elaborate on a new scenario or framework for cooperation across the Strait, and also on the role of arms sales between the United States and Taiwan?

MYERS: Well, I would simply say that we concluded a policy study, which we will shortly publish at Hoover, that outlines the only way I see of getting Taiwan to sit down and negotiate the issue of sovereignty and the resolution of the civil war—by forcing them to do so. To have Beijing force Taiwan would not be good for peace across the Strait. I think the pressure would have to come from the United States, and basically I don't see any reason to sell any weapons at all to Taiwan until they sit down and talk. They must put on the table their own kind of federation formula to preserve Taiwan's democracy and prosperity, within a cooperative framework that would still satisfy the nationalistic impulse of the People's Republic of China. ...

Myers suggestion here that the United States force negotiation (or capitulation) on Taiwan by refusing weapon sales is in stark contrast to his 1998 criticism of Clinton's three no's, at which time he also presented the reasons why the populace on Taiwan resented China's claims and efforts to ostracize Taiwan from international association.

It is not clear what his rationale is for concluding that former president Lee Teng-hui, and not the unsuccessful candidate himself, Lien Chan, with only 24% of the vote, should take the blame for the KMT's loss of the presidency. Perhaps Lee Teng-hui's transgression was in putting forward such a wooden candidate, uncomfortable with pressing the flesh. But it was subsequently clear that excessive rigidity of hierarchy and lack of flexibility within the KMT precluded substitution with a more appealing candidate, even after the departure of Lee.

Like the current Kuomintang, Myers' bitter attack on Lee Teng-hui has continued long past the year 2000. In "Consolidating Democracy in the Republic of China on Taiwan, 1996-2000", by Ramon H. Myers, Linda Chao, and Tai-chun Kuo (pp. 73-90 in Assessing the Lee Teng-hui Legacy in Taiwan's Politics, Bruce J. Dickson and Chien-min Chao, editors, 2002. M. E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY), the authors in hindsight paint a sharp picture of behind-the-scenes struggles in 1997, very different from their previous depictions in Democracy's New Leaders, 1997.

What began as broad consensus-style politics now became a bitter political struggle. Governor Soong learned through the press that the provincial government was to be downsized Soong suspected that the president wanted to marginalize him; his comments to the media revealed that a power struggle was under way. Some in the KMT were also unhappy that their party had agreed with the DPP to abolish the provincial government. Many criticized the president for his authoritarian behavior.

On July 16, 1997, an intense struggle took place in the National Assembly over the proposal to eliminate the Taiwan provincial government. The president and members of his government organized a strong lobbying effort to support the measure Rumors circulated that opponents of the measure had been threatened with government tax audits. ... In response to this public charges of coercion and "dirty tricks", James Soong denounced the government's "white terror", a term that described government repression in the early years of martial law.

... Many politicians and elites resented the president's coercive methods. According to one public opinion survey, most issues agreed on at the National Development Conference were not supported by scholars of political science, public administration, economics, and law. (p. 76-77)

Yet Myers et al. make no presentation that "Democracy's New Leader" Lien Chan had any objection to President Lee's "authoritarian" behavior during that period.

In "Some Implications of the Turnover of Political Power in Taiwan", by Linda Chao, Ramon H. Myers, and Jialin Zhang (Hoover Institution Essays in Public Policy, No. 108, 2002, 15 pp.) the authors echoed many of the contentions of the now-opposition Kuomintang as they jockeyed for leverage in the impending presidential election of 2004.

Executive Summary: On March 18, 2000, Taiwan's citizens voted the Nationalist Party (KMT) out of office and the Democratic Progressive Party's candidate Chen Shui-bian in as president. ... [I]nstead of negotiating with mainland China's authorities to achieve a political settlement of the divided China problem, President Chen has opted for negotiations to take place under a special state-to-state relationship. ... In response, mainland China's authorities offered a new interpretation of the "one-China" principle, but the Chen administration rejected that concession. Political fragmentation continues. ... (front page)

The Old View: Between 1990 and 1993, a majority of Taiwan's citizens felt that the KMT administration should begin negotiating with the mainland on how to unify China. ... (p. 2)

For example, President Chen agreed to talks with Beijing but without any preconditions, such as the one-China principle, forcing Beijing's leaders to rebuff his negotiation offer. ... (p. 5)

Taiwan's economy has also deteriorated, mainly because of the economic slowdown in the West. In the first quarter of 2001, Taiwan's economic growth rate fell by 0.09 percent; by August it had declined by 4.2 percent, with unemployment at an all-time high of 5.2 percent. ... Not since the late 1940s have Taiwan's people felt so poor. (p. 9)

We must perhaps respect Ramon Myers as a true believer. He has not foresworn his loyalty to the Kuomintang, whatever its leadership, nor his support for Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan (whatever that Chinese nationalism may mean at this point), despite a narrow but crucial loss for the combined Lien/Soong ticket in 2004, a loss from which the machine of the Kuomintang is not likely to recover.

On the other hand, it should be abundantly clear from this analysis of writings and presentations that Ramon Myers and Thomas Metzger can lay little claim to any principles of democracy or human rights or social justice, whether "Western" or "Eastern".

Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, and its Alliance with
Institute of International Relations, National Chengchi (Political) University

They are not alone in this; none of the American presenters at the last session of the 33rd Sino-American Conference on Contemporary China, May 27-28, 2004, hosted by the Institute of International Relations, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan, championed any values of American democracy or Wilsonian self-determination. Rather, nearly all saw dire consequences – abandonment of U.S. protection -- if President Chen Shui-bian allowed populist pressures to push his hand in the direction of Taiwan nationalism.

Round Table Discussion: Taiwan's 2004 Presidential Election
and Its Implications for Regional Cooperation

May 28, 2004, 13:30-15:30, Institute for International Relations, NCCU

Chair: Chwei-Liang Chiou, Tamkang University

Participants:

Brantly Womack, U of Virginia

Gang Lin, Wilson Center

Ramon Myers, Stanford University

David Brown, Johns Hopkins U.

Robert Sutter, Georgetown University

Der-Ker Lee, National Chengchi University

Tzong-Ho Bau, Nat Taiwan University
Edward I-Hsin Chen, Tamkang University
David W.F. Huang, Academia Sinica

Ramon Myers spoke next-to-last in the Round Table. The following notes are from my own transcription of his comments on the spot, somewhat paraphrased and shortened.

The election of 2004 has left a great dark cloud. Millions were mobilized. The results left a sore wound on society. A great number felt cheated, and the losers want an explanation of the weird events of March 19, when the president was lightly wounded. I see that the future of Taiwan is terribly uncertain. It seems that this uncertainty will continue.

It seems that the incentive systems in Taiwan and China will direct behavior to more confrontation across the Taiwan Strait. The historical background explains how dangerous this situation is.

There has been an incredible change in core beliefs on Taiwan.

Previously, the values of the Three Principles of the People and of Chinese culture, represented by the one-party state of the Kuomintang, under its own challenges of pain and tragedy, produced great economic growth -- until the last four years. The KMT brought Taiwan from a guided democracy of a limited kind to full democracy.

The new belief system has some of the elements described here: Taiwan must be a sovereign state ruled by Taiwanese. Taiwan's history has been that it has been ruled by outsiders, the Japanese from 1895, and the Chinese from 1945.

These new elements are being propagated through the Ministry of Education: the supremacy of Taiwan culture and history is being disseminated, and Chinese civilization marginalized. This is being promoted by the ruling party.

I will not judge whether this is good or bad, but I will judge it in terms of potential conflict with mainland China. There was a conflict with the PRC's socialist state, and there has been no finality in the civil war, and there can only be a settlement that satisfies Beijing. Taiwanese people must be farsighted. Taiwanese cannot appeal to utopian hopes of peace. There must be accommodation in order to begin negotiation.

If the Kuomintang/Peoples First Party ticket had won, or if they still have a chance of Lien Chan being declared the winner, negotiation could have been done with dignity.

But now there are new belief systems related to the rise of new institutions, and conflict with the PRC looms. There are incentives for people to believe these systems; you must create rules and customs compatible with institutions. All indicators are for both sides to increasingly dislike each other, and distrust each other; there will be increasing occasions for misunderstanding.

How can we change the incentive system to lend itself to dialogue?

The United States has been buffeted by both sides, by PRC demands and by Taiwan pleas. The ugly scenario is that at the end of 2004 or in 2005 the PRC will create a new law, and set the rules of the game for reunification. With the PRC concerned about de-sinification in Taiwan, and nervous, it will bring out the troops and practice on the coast, to put enormous pressure on Taiwan.

I have watched Taiwan since I came to Taiwan for the first time, before 1959....I have been alarmed by the decline in the economic conditions in the last few years. There was some

hope for an accommodation across the Strait, if we could have taken a cue from Lien Chan's statement – two states on both sides of the Strait, but this side represents China. That would accommodate the PRC. Now, however, I feel the situation is extremely ominous.

Most of this content was previously articulated by Myers et al. in "Some Implications of the Turnover of Political Power in Taiwan", 2002. However, it is somewhat a different experience to hear Ramon Myers forcefully enunciate this in person, and still allude to the remote possibility of an overthrow of the 2004 election results. As of May 20, the narrow margin of a 20,000-plus vote advantage for Chen Shui-bian seemed to have held in the recount, according to lawyers involved in the process, though the official process is not completed. Does he endorse the KMT's current stasis, hanging to a shred of reversibility, refusing reexamination of its goals or strategies as a political party?

As far as "incentive systems" go, I wondered what Professor Myers considered to be their role in a democratic society, who would administer them and to what goals, and how there could be incentives on such a vast scale as to bridge the gap between Chinese chauvinism and Taiwanese aspirations – with democratic participation, not the power-broking of elites.

It was curious to me that Myers embraced the definition of Taiwanization as de-sinification. No doubt this definition has been shared by the current Beijing government and the old Kuomintang government in Taipei. Up until recent years it suppressed native Taiwanese languages and wrecked Taiwanese cultural sites, even though Ho-lo language, brought from Fujian Province, is arguably the closest to ancient Chinese, and sites such as the old port of Lukang illustrate Qing Dynasty links between China and Taiwan. Such a mentality reflects the imperial pretensions of Beijing, and its rejection of cultural variation and pluralism, not to speak of political pluralism – good reason not to embrace its control. It would seem American scholars could transcend such monolithic definitions.

At the round table discussion, one final impromptu outburst demonstrated the bombastic nature of contemporary Chinese nationalism, even when masquerading as academic discourse. Dr. Jian (first name) Chen (last name) from Shanghai, now at the University of Virginia History Department, delivered a passionate oratory to the effect that the nation-building of Taiwan must bow to the nation-building of modern China, and if it does not, it will be destroyed. This was a vivid debunking, as well, of the

presumption that academic discourse by definition seeks some level of objectivity above and beyond the rationalization of current political purposes. As in my first face off with Ramon Myers in May 1981, I thought this was a healthy lesson, and one that should be more generally disseminated.

Incentive Systems in Academic Production

The May 28, 2004 Round Table at Institute for International Relations also provided opportunity to make inquiries concerning the historically long and close relationship between the Institute of International Relations at National Chengchi University, and Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University.

National Chengchi (Political) University, in Mucha on the southeast edge of Taipei City, was originally a school for Kuomintang cadres; Chiang Kai-shek was the honorary president of the university, and he still sits in rousing pose on a bronze horse on the upper campus. The university has long trained the diplomatic corps of the Republic of China, and helped expand its foreign relations. The Institute of International Relations is located a few blocks from the NCCU campus, contiguous to a military camp which misleadingly bears the name of a mountain villa. Early on, it specialized in studies of communist China. In the 1970s and earlier, a few left-leaning dissident intellectuals were commanded to work there, to lend their expert knowledge and to isolate them from students. Otherwise, it provided sinecures for KMT propagandists, and its budget was reportedly dispensed through the national security appropriations. In the last few years it has prided itself on de-politicization and professionalism, and its former deputy director, Joseph Jaushieh Wu, has been recruited into high visibility positions in the Chen Shui-bian administration. All the same, following the second failure of the KMT in the presidential elections, the IIR is on notice to decrease its staff by about two-thirds, to 30, and merge with the School of International Relations.

Relations between IIR and Hoover Institution are said to have developed in the late 1960s, as part of anti-insurgency studies. According to a dissident intellectual previously employed at IIR, funding from IIR to Hoover may have reached as high as US\$30 million per annum. A second source places this figure at US\$10 million per annum, and a third, "huge". At any rate, funding in recent years has dropped off to a very low rate, allocated for particular projects. One of the long-term administrators at

IIR told me the level of funding a decade ago was perhaps US\$150,000 per annum, and this was disbursed to particular scholars and for cooperative projects, three times a year, so it might be difficult to calculate a sum. However, Dr. Bih-Jaw Lin, Vice President of National Chengchi University, on the occasion of May 28, assigned a member of the staff to respond to the issue of the historical level of funding from IIR to Hoover Institution. In April 2003, a Stanford student-run organization, Community for Peace and Justice, made an issue of the conservative agenda of Hoover Institution, and called for Hoover to reform or sever ties with Stanford University (see http://www.bulldognews.net/stanford_anti-war_activities_clash_with_Hoover_Institution).

Have the kinds of incentives of which Professor Myers speaks been at work in shaping an ideological structure of core beliefs, a process of shaping in which he and his institution have been key players? There seems to have been a self-reinforcing loop in operation: the Republic of China encouraging a particular agenda of anti-communism and Chinese nationalism at Hoover and other institutions, and Hoover in turn advising and serving as a creature of conservative American governmental policy, which sets the constraints and options for the unfolding of Taiwan's future under the "one-China" policy, a policy originally designed for the purpose of isolating communist China during the Cold War era.

It may not be possible to answer this question definitively, but the probability that this loop has been deliberately constructed provides inspiration that it can also be deliberately deconstructed.