

The logic of Taiwanese nationalism and the recent development of the
Taiwan independence movement abroad, 1980-85

Linda Gail Arrigo

Department of Sociology

State University of New York

At Binghamton, 13901

October 1985

For Prof. Martin Murray

“Colonization and Decolonization”

Fall 1984

Prologue

In 1982 it was suggested to me by the spokesman of a Taiwan independence movement Marxist-Leninist group, one usually known by the name of its publication, Taiwan Era (台灣時代), that I write an article explaining to the American left the development and line of the Taiwan independence movement (TIM) progressive position, particularly in regard to the issue of nationalism.

I took that as a formidable task, since the body of American left scholars concerned with Asia grew into their roles through the struggles of the Vietnam War period, affirming the rights of China and Vietnam, and calling for normalization of relations with China. The Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars is an example of an organization of such Asia scholars. A central issue in China's terms for rapprochement was United States recognition of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan. The Asia scholars' predominant view on Taiwan has followed the official position of China, that Taiwan is one of the few remaining territories of China that remains to be restored to it from colonial or neo-colonial domination.

At that time I did not feel up to the task, for one because of the uncertainty of progress for the radical line among Taiwanese overseas; although I was fairly confident of continuing development within Taiwan. In the past most progressive Americans who came into contact with public advocates of Taiwan independence in the U.S. and Japan, for example for the purpose of working on issues of human rights in Taiwan, quickly became disgusted with their bourgeois and pro-American mentality, as well as lack of international perspective. Such experience often served to personify some aspersions cast by China representatives, that the TIM was a pawn of the CIA, a superficial movement created as a reserve ploy in U.S. efforts to continue the division of China and maintain U.S. military bases on Taiwan. In 1982 the rightist TIM groups still held full sway among Taiwanese in the U.S.

For a second matter, the policy of China in regard to Taiwan had not yet been fully elaborated. There was as yet too little contact for Taiwanese with the Peoples' Republic of China officials to allow knowledge of the full texture of their opinions. When such contact was made, the officials often said privately that China was internally reevaluating its Taiwan policy. The policies of China would of course affect how palatable the TIM analysis would be to the American left. The policies of China would also affect, thought to a lesser extent, the self-analysis and position of some Taiwanese.

Since 1982, however, there has been a transformation of the structures of overseas Taiwanese organizations, and a general shift towards the left in ideological perspective. This was a belated response to the development which took place within Taiwan in 1979. Continuing and growing activism around social issues in Taiwan indicates a continuing evolution of the popular line, to present. There is now a broad social base for the argument of a progressive Taiwan independence movement, as well as a logic for such a trend, which I will explain in this paper.

Secondly, the position and the mentality of the PRC has by now been amply demonstrated in their official pronouncements and in the personal communications of their emissaries to the U.S. and to Taiwanese-American gatherings in this country. In particular, incidents earlier this year have allowed an

unequivocal judgment on the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) terms for rapprochement with their “Free China” nemesis, the Nationalist Party (Kuomintang, or KMT) 國民黨

As a consequence of these two strands of history, the time is ripe for an exposition of the position of Taiwan nationalism within the circuit of Marxist-Leninist discourse. This paper is the first step in preparing such an exposition.

I make no claim to the hypothetical role of “impartial” observer, though I do claim considerable sociological insight into political sentiments within Taiwan and among Taiwanese overseas. I was a human rights worker and participant in the 1977-79 Democratic Movement in Taiwan (lastly with the title of “foreign public relations secretary” in the coalition of opposition organization). In 1978 I married a former political prisoner who became a central organizer of mass protest, Shih Ming-Deh (施明德), and who since his trial in 1980 has been among the best-known living symbols of Taiwan nationalism. I was deported in December 1979. Parallel to the experience of some native Taiwanese, I came to a position of advocating Taiwan nationalism only through an internationalist and anti-imperialist perspective, in 1981.

In 1980-81, following the December 1979 crackdown within Taiwan, I served as the English mouthpiece for Taiwanese groups in the U.S., presenting lectures on human rights conditions in Taiwan to church and university gatherings. However, the conservative Taiwanese-Americans were soon displeased by the picture of U.S. neo-colonialism that I injected into these presentations, and by my critique of the Taiwan Democratic Movement. So also since 1980 I have been an inveterate and aggressive political infighter in the Taiwanese political organizations in the U.S., early on violating the standards of propriety and politeness held by the respectable and middle-class mass of Taiwanese supporters of TIM in this country, in order to challenge the conservative organizations.

The present paper will straightforwardly present my account of and opinions on the recent development of the Taiwanese independence movement overseas. There have been no published accounts in English of this development. This paper follows on my manuscript, “The Social Origins of the Taiwan Democratic Movement”, printed in Formosa Weekly (Chinese language, Los Angeles) in ten parts, beginning July 1981, which will be summarized here also.

The present paper is meant for only limited circulation in this version, for one because the time is not yet ripe for setting off some of the internal critiques I anticipate, and second because it needs more careful consideration, expansion and scholarly substantiation. This paper is meant to serve as an initial preparation for later articles.

INTRODUCTION

It has been the weight of opinion among progressive Asia scholars in the United States that Taiwan is one of the territories of China that still remains under virtually colonial control by imperialist powers. But it is one of the ironies of history that at this point such a line upholds neither democratic, anti-imperialist, or socialist principles.

To understand this, the current internal polity and political sentiment in Taiwan and the current People's Republic of China policy towards Taiwan must be seen in historical perspective. The historical perspective elucidates the objective and subjective condition of the people of Taiwan, as well as the current issue of political control and nationalism for which a resolution cannot be delayed much longer.

Taiwan nationalism, as a mass political phenomena and as seen most recently in the opposition's explicit election campaign demand for "self-determination" in 1983, is a logical product of the subjective experience of the people of Taiwan over the last five decades. Taiwan nationalism is also the common expression of the aspirations of several social strata in Taiwan, aspirations whose main resentments are directed against the Chinese Nationalist regime, but with class interests which in fact are in real of potential conflict with each other.

I subscribe to Breuilly's definition: nationalism is a form of politics, in particular that of a mass movement aspiring to state control. I also concur in Breuilly's description that nationalism in its express content is not a rational construct, but determinatively a vague amalgamation, one which facilitates inter-class "unity" and manipulation. Therefore, there is not one nationalism, but a continuous struggle within the ranks of those who profess it, as they attempt to coopt popular support and gain ideological and political ascendancy. In the case of Taiwan, Taiwan nationalism was a political issue first in the 1930's. After nearly total repression, the issue has reemerged in the 1970's. The current struggle over the content of a Taiwan nationalist position is only in its early stages, but it has been evolving rapidly since 1977.

As a practical caveat, it must be noted that discussions on Taiwan nationalism frequently devolve into arguments about whether the Taiwan independence movement can possibly succeed in overthrowing the KMT and remaining out of control of the PRC. That is not the issue here. The subjective experience of a mass of people and the social dynamics among them do not evaporate even if their aspirations are not met. Their historical experience continues to shape a reaction to future outcomes, even if, as is often the case, whole nations are pawns in the global politics of the superpowers. I do not choose here to speculate on any particular scenario for the future.

First this paper will briefly outline the logic of Taiwan nationalism as a social and political phenomenon – one which is likely to be reinforced, not dissipated in the future. Then this paper will describe the development of Taiwanese community and revolutionary organizations outside of Taiwan since 1973.

Before this analysis can proceed, however, we must review the political, social and economic history of Taiwan.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Though prehistorically populated by tribes of Malayan and other origin, Taiwan was settled by migrants and refugees from South China beginning as early as the twelfth century; the main migration from South China occurred in the mid-1600's when the Ming Dynasty fell to the invading Manchus, who established the Ch'ing. The Ch'ing only established administration over Taiwan about 1870, but soon lost it again after the 1895 defeat in the Sino-Japanese war. Taiwan was ceded to Japan, but Japan had to secure its

conquest by subduing a “Republic of Taiwan” briefly declared by local officials, and then by repeated pacification campaigns and bloody massacres particularly directed against the aborigines.

Under Japanese imperialism Taiwan was forcibly modernized by the mid-1920's, with public health and malaria control; modern communication systems such as railroads, post offices, and telegraph; a green revolution and peasant-based agriculture utilizing capitalist inputs and oriented towards the market. Taiwan yielded 50% of its rice and 80% of its sugar to Japan. In the 1930's Japan further established an industrial base in Taiwan to support its military drive into Southeast Asia and China. Like Korea and the Liaoning Peninsula, also under Japanese occupation during this period, Taiwan was an intensely-managed colonial economy. Major industries were chartered as colonial government monopolies. Education and economy were in this period already much more modern than in the vast expanse of China.

Japanese nationals occupied the administration, from the monopolies down to police stations and high schools, and numbered nearly one million, compared to a native population of about five million. The native population was closely monitored with population registers at local police stations, the system which remains today. However, many Taiwanese studied medicine in Japan, and a few from mostly landlord backgrounds were educated in Peking. Influenced somewhat by the intellectual ferment in China, Taiwan developed a home-rule movement, and worker and peasant movements. After initial policies of ethnic segregation, Japan allowed some enfranchisement and assimilation (e.g. Japanese-Taiwanese marriages) in the 1930's, to bind Taiwanese loyalties to the Empire during the war effort. Also during this period an underground Taiwan Communist Party was formed; it communicated with the Chinese Communist Party, but clashed on the issue of subsuming the Taiwanese struggle under the CCP (Hsiao, Chien).

After Japan's surrender in 1945, the U.S., by previous agreement with Chiang Kai-Shek at Yalta, allowed the Nationalist Chinese to receive the administration of Taiwan. The Japanese population was repatriated in 1946. The native population was not consulted, and at first did not object. But Chiang Kai-Shek's warlord confederates and carpetbaggers soon made havoc of the economy, dismantling factories and selling off the island's reserves to Shanghai speculators. The marauding Nationalists treated Taiwanese as collaborators of Japanese imperialism. The illiterate and undisciplined Nationalist soldiers elicited the contempt of the Taiwanese, who were accustomed to efficient, if harsh, Japanese rule.

An incident in a market place on February 28, 1947 sparked rioting and an island-wide insurrection. Feigning a willingness to negotiate, the Chinese stalled until new troops could be landed on the island. Then a massacre was unleashed, utilizing U.S.-made weapons. 10,000 or more Taiwanese died in a few weeks in random machine-gunnings and in pitched battles. About another 10,000 died, mostly educated professionals and community leaders, in mop-ups that continued through to 1952. The 2-2-8 Incident, as this sequence of events is called, is the main event commemorated by the Taiwan independence movement (TIM). Although even mention of 2-2-8 has been censored in the last decades, it is the deep reservoir for simple ethnic anger against the Chinese, and aversion to their rule. My husband, Shih Ming-Teh, was among the children who watched mass executions at the plaza in front of the Kaohsiung Railroad Station in 1947.

Also in the years 1947-49 about 30,000 Taiwanese went to mainland China, among them businessmen, conscripts of the Nationalists, and Taiwan Communist Party members fleeing the KMT purges. Other thousands, including expropriated landlords, made permanent residence in Japan.

After their defeat at the hands of the CCP, the Nationalist government headed by Chiang Kai-Shek retreated to Taiwan with some half a million bureaucrats, capitalists and former landlords, and also about half a million troops. Most of these troops were doomed to living out the rest of their prime years in military camps as “bare sticks”, unmarried or separated from their families on the mainland. Some petty officers did bring wives or married Taiwanese women, but have also lived on meager salaries in “military villages”. The Shanghai capitalists reestablished their textile and paper mills in Taiwan; and the Japanese monopolies for wood, cement, wine and tobacco, etc., were taken over by Chinese government appointees.

In 1949 the Nationalist government carried out a land-to-Tiller program, which, as recently noted by George C. Hsiung, it did not have the political will to carry through on the mainland where its power base included the landlords to be expropriated. In Taiwan the land reform program allowed the ruling party (the Kuomintang, KMT) to dispossess the Taiwanese gentry, its rival for local control. The program (under the Joint Commission for Rural Reconstruction, designed with American assistance) in effect transformed rents in kind into ten years of installment payments to the government, allowing it to ration rice to the military and the bloated bureaucracy. This did engender some support from Taiwanese peasants. But in the 1960's the government continued to extract a large portion of the agricultural surplus through a monopoly program exchanging rice and cane for overvalued fertilizer.

With U.S. military protection after 1950, and intensive U.S. AID assistance and PL480 program handouts of grain and soybeans (Jacoby), the Chiang regime was able to stave off economic collapse in the early years and reconsolidate tight political control. By the late 1950's pre-war production levels had been recovered. As direct U.S. AID was phased out by 1965, the Taiwan economy was bolstered by U.S. military procurement for the Vietnam War, and by U.S. direct investment in labor-intensive electronics and other manufacturing (Zenger, Arrigo). The expansion of the export economy, particularly rapid in the years 1968-73, created near full employment for the youth pouring out of the countryside, and allowed the rise of native Taiwanese capitalist and professional classes.

The new demographic and economic balance had further political repercussions by the mid-1970's. Taiwanese political demands became more sophisticated, and had a more solid economic backing. The new balance also brought forth an effort at cooptation by the regime. Particularly since 1975, since Chiang Ching-jiou's accession to his father's presidential throne, the new guard of the KMT has overtly emphasized economic development and technocratic administration, to the detriment of the old guards' “counterattack the Communists, return to the mainland” rhetoric. The KMT has sought to penetrate Taiwanese society to the grass roots level, and to bind the Taiwanese bourgeoisie, especially the big bourgeoisie collaborators whose industries have been nurtured through government connections. Such connections are sealed, for example, with free stock shares to “political bodyguards” in the KMT security agencies. The KMT has now entered into local elections even down to the neighborhood chief level, and

often nominates the educated sons of Taiwanese magnates (jokingly called the “Beautiful, Taiwanese, Young” policy, 吹台青, a parody on a movie star’s name) for important posts in the electoral façade.

THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION

At present the population of Taiwan is approximately 87% native Taiwanese, 13% mainlander. Native Taiwanese are internally divided into two ethnic groups, Hokkien (福洛, originating in the coastal counties of Fukien province across the Taiwan straits) and Hakka (客家, “guest people”, who were dispersed over Kuangtung province and Fukien in migrations a millennia ago), in a ratio of about 4:1. Their dialects are mutually unintelligible, as also is the official language, Mandarin Chinese. In the 1800’s neighborhoods with origins in different Fukien counties still warred with each other; in the present generation some Hakka assimilate to Hokkien language, and some to Mandarin. Although anti-government protest has been no less vocal in Hakka than in Hokkien areas of Taiwan, the Hakka/Hokkien division still has some relevance, since the KMT regime has created ethnic-identity ploys, such as an emphasis on the ancient history North China origins of the Hakka. “Taiwanese” language (台語) refers to Hokkien dialect; the Hakka stand to be a minority in a Taiwanese-run state. Reportedly about half of the security agencies’ personnel are Hakka, who often speak both Mandarin and Hokkien fluently.

Those who are presently called “mainlanders” or “outside-province people” (外省人) in Taiwan are of very diverse geographical origin within China, and are bimodally distributed between the rich and powerful, including those who have expanded into lucrative “private” business with the aid of cronies in government posts, and the aging and marginally-employed retired soldiers, who are all the same dependent on the government for pensions and patronage posts as, for example, guards at factories.

The offspring of the mainlanders are also listed in the population registers by their fathers’ place of origin; they are predominantly middle and upper class, and are already inheriting positions of economic, administrative, and police control as they are vacated by their previous generation.

The vestiges of the aboriginal population (“original inhabitants” is the term that has now been introduced by an advocacy group associated with the opposition) number about 150,000 persons of 13 tribes. They occupy the lowest status and most oppressed roles of the society, e.g. as miners, fishermen, and prostitutes, and suffer an advanced stage of cultural extermination. This group might experience some renaissance if it could make contact with culturally similar native peoples in the Philippines and Melanesia, but there seems no likelihood of that in present circumstances. The opposition is attempting to capitalize on recent mining accidents that claimed about 300 lives, mostly aborigines.

Still, all of these linguistic and ethnic divisions—which are in fact rather minor by comparison with those of Malaysia or India—are less significant for the younger generation. Nearly all native Taiwanese under age 40 speak Mandarin passably, as well as their own dialect. The written language is held in common, one of the curious advantages of an ideographic medium. In much of industry and even in some small sections of government bureaucracy, Hokkien dialect predominates in daily use. This is so despite the early vigorous efforts of the government to eradicate the native dialects and folk customs. Mandarin is

the language associated with education, classical culture, and elite status. The second generation of urban, middle-upper class Taiwanese may even be losing their fluency in native Taiwan dialects. At the same time, the children of impoverished mainlander military men often merge with the Taiwanese working class.

In sum, what older Taiwanese see as an inexorable ethnic conflict is collapsing, in my opinion, to a class conflict as seen in Korea or the Philippines. However, the heritage of past oppression and the issue of nationhood remains a central organizing principle. The working class speaks native Taiwan dialects, and the ruling clique and collaborators speak Mandarin and propagate a sterile version of classical Chinese high culture. Finally, the ruling clique commands in the name of Chinese nationalism, while it “skims the oil” off the export economy, and deposits it in U.S. and Swiss bank accounts.

Then we must look further into the mechanics of political and police control.

Under the surface of this thoroughly modern military-technocratic dictatorship, the fourth decade of martial law continues. The multiple security organs, designed on the Russian model in the early days of the KMT, reach into every government office, school, military unit, and factory over 30 persons. In the early 1960's U.S. advisors assisted in modernizing domestic intelligence and counter-insurgency techniques. Shih Ming-Teh was among the military cadets and high school students arrested for various real or imagined conspiracies during the early 60's, and he resided for seven of fifteen years in a prison reportedly built with U.S. funds. To present, books and magazines are banned and confiscated monthly; repeat-offender writers and editors frequently are sentenced to three to ten year terms. Torture has been systematically applied, though in a more sophisticated fashion since the mid-1970's. However, the political murders of the last few years indicate that continuing amelioration cannot be assumed.

In response to this oppression there have been various waves of resistance, the major ones summarized as follows:

1. 1959-60, the Free China (自由中國) magazine attempt to form an opposition party. This was led by Lei Chen (雷震), a member of the legislature and prominently known as a representative of the “Third Force” in China before 1949. This effort was a coalition of mainlander and Taiwanese political elites; but in the same period KMT control was spontaneously contested and its corruption exposed in county-level election races throughout Taiwan. The core was quickly suppressed and Lei Chen served ten years, 1960-70. Local challengers such as Su Tung-Chi (蘇東啟) were put away for fifteen years on various frame-ups.
2. 1971-72, the Diaoyutai student movement. This was initiated within pro-KMT circles in Taiwan to press governmental territorial claims against Japan over a group of small islands north of Taiwan (called the Sangkaku Islands in Japanese), but it culminated, particularly among Chinese students in the U.S., with exposure of the Chiang regime's crimes in the Republican period, and its failure to protect Chinese nationalist interests. Since in this period Nixon was making the first U.S. overtures to China, there was a sudden influx of information about the new China, and a new nationalist pride for those disaffected with the KMT. This is the origin of most of the modern pro-PRC sentiment in Taiwan, as represented by the China Tide (夏潮) group of

intellectuals, both mainlanders and Taiwanese. This movement was also strongly flavored with the style of Vietnam war protest in the U.S., and the U.S. Asia scholars' laudatory reflections on the Great Cultural Revolution.

3. 1975, the Taiwan Political Review (台灣政論) magazine grouping of Taiwanese intellectuals and politicians (many themselves the bright young men absorbed by the KMT for window-dressing in its Central Offices) demanding constitutional protections and legal procedures. Kang Ning-Hsiang, the magazine's sponsor, Huang Hua (黃華), a former political prisoner, was arrested after the fourth issue and sentenced to ten years.
4. 1978-79, the Formosa magazine (美麗島) movement, which called itself synonymously The Taiwan Democratic Movement. This movement, for the first time since 1947, involved mass participation and island-wide organization in an explicit demand for the end of martial law. The implicit issue for the population was their anxiety for the future of Taiwan, as signs of impending U.S. recognition of the People's Republic of China appeared. The power of this movement, which will be described further later in this paper, was that it coalesced in one organization the powers of many facets of dissent: the local "big-men" politicians with their peasant followings and strident Taiwanese ethnicism, the socialist-idealist and pro-China intellectuals of the China Tide group, and the representatives of the new Taiwanese professional middle class, imbued with ideals of American liberal democracy.

The last set the agenda, and by late 1978 formed around a core leadership of five persons, all native Taiwanese, and four of whom were elected officials or candidates – two modern politicians with Western political science training who had been expelled from the KMT in previous years; two lawyers from the most prominent institution; and a recently-released political prisoner, Shih Ming-Teh, who executed the agreed-upon plans for mass mobilization (commonly crowds of 20,000) and confrontation with the security forces. The aged Lei Chen passed on the aura of the 1959 democratic effort to the new generation when he made his first and last post-imprisonment public appearance to preside over my wedding to Shih in October 1978. Along with other Taiwanese-American scholars and concerned foreigners, I provided part of the link to Taiwanese overseas, who were increasingly vocal and increasingly threatening to the shredded image of the KMT's "Free China" in the U.S.

The Formosa group was suppressed with massive and sudden arrests in December 1979. Thousands were picked up and questioned, but the number sentenced was reduced from over 200 to about 60 under the force of foreign pressure. I was deported. The March 1980 trial of eight core Formosa figures became an exposition of their political ideals. Shih said, most powerfully, "Taiwan has already been independent for thirty years; the only issue that remains is internal democracy".

The exposure that Taiwan nationalism was at the heart of the Democratic Movement dissolved the fragile coalition between Taiwan-nationalist dissidents and Chinese-nationalist dissidents, and the latter, small in numbers but ideologically important, have largely withdrawn from mass action. About the same time perfunctory PRC statements of support for "democratic" forces in Taiwan (e.g. in the People's Daily) were thereafter superseded by support for "patriotic democratic" forces.

This listing does not fully explain the continuity and evolution of these developments, but it sets the social and historical landscape that is the scene of present ideological debates among residents of Taiwan. These debates are spurred, both within the ruling party and within the opposition, by the ominous ticking of a time-bomb, figuratively speaking.

An insuperable crisis of the KMT seems to be steadily drawing nearer. After the U.S. recognition of the PRC as the rightful government of China, in December 1978, the regime has been able to maintain only the most trivial diplomatic relations, with South Africa, Saudi Arabia, and a few small Latin American dictatorships. The Taiwan regime is classed among the pariah nations of the world; although on the economic side it has weathered this trial and largely maintained its markets.

The KMT's whole rationale for its suspension of the Constitution and its dictatorship over Taiwan is that Taiwan is a province of China; and during the period of Communist insurgency the National Government of China has temporarily retreated to this province, where national functions must overlay provincial ones, and where the purpose of national recovery overrides all else, including civil rights. This rationale – for which hundreds of those who challenged it in past decades were executed – is by now in an advanced state of decay.

After 1975, the theme of military conquest was incrementally replaced in government propaganda with a slogan of “three part military, seven parts politics”, i.e. the example of a successful and prosperous Taiwan would cause the mainland regime to collapse from within, and then the Nationalists would return triumphant. The KMT no longer cares to insist in international forums on the oneness of China, which would play into the absorption plans of the PRC – in the past it would not even tolerate an East/West Germany type formulation -, but rather places advertorials in U.S. business publications about the “eighteen million people of the Republic of China charting their own future”. At the same time, Taiwanese independence “bandits” (匪) have replaced Communist “bandits” (共匪) as the main subjects of plots uncovered by the security agencies, though the two are usually depicted as somehow in conspiracy with each other.

This decay of legitimacy is personified by the octogenarian and senile members of the National Legislature and National Assembly, elected in 1947 and still claiming they represent China. The supplemental elections carried out for Taiwan province national representatives have brought in a sizeable contingent of opposition members, in particular the wives of imprisoned Formosa leaders. Under public pressure, and no longer fully protected by KMT manipulation of the ballot boxes, many KMT nominees no longer submit to Party discipline, even when elected. Although defeated on one level, the Democratic Movement has in fact become diffused throughout the society in various social movements, ecological protests, and cultural currents, and government controls on publication and speech have been unable to stem the tide. Former political prisoners are public heroes who write books and even make movies.

As China intensified its pressures for unification, by export competition, by confrontation in international forums, and by increasingly elaborated offers to the KMT, the KMT is caught between reassuring and coopting the Taiwanese middle class and bourgeoisie, and forcibly maintaining its claim

to be the legitimate government of China. There is now no solution for the short-sightedness of previous years, and succession to the ailing CCK is uncertain. The son of the President is both half-Russian and has unsavory associations with the most vicious security agency murders (specifically the Henry Liu murder of October 1984 in California); neither the supporters of the KMT nor the U.S. would be pleased by his accession.

Parallel to my deportation from Taiwan at the end of 1979, I will shift the discussion now to the overseas Taiwanese organizations and the impact of these events in Taiwan on their consciousness and behavior.

THE TAIWANESE INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT ABROAD

The dominant social base for the Taiwanese independence movement overseas is now in the United States. There are an estimated 70,000 households of native Taiwanese origin in the United States. There are smaller numbers in Japan, Brazil, and Europe.

Before the 70's, however, Japan had greater political weight. Right after 2-2-8 (1947), Taiwanese gentry who had fled to Japan set up a Provisional Government and petitioned the United Nations to call for a plebiscite on Taiwan, to no avail. The one-time head of the Provisional Government (臨時政府), Liao Wen-Yi (廖文毅), in 1965 capitulated to KMT threats to execute his relatives and confiscate his property, and returned to Taiwan. The TIM in Japan, with publicly-known members such as Huang Yo-Jen (黃有仁) and Ms. Chin Mei-Ling (金美玲), reformed as group called Taiwan Youth, with a publication by the same name, and in 1970 was amalgamated into the World United Formosans for Independence. But another prominent son of the old gentry, Ku Kuan-Ming (辜寬敏) (a cosmopolitan aristocrat with an American wife and a feudal retinue), betrayed the organization in 1974. The old supporters of the TIM in Japan are as virulently anti-communist as the Taiwan government, and to this day oppose dialogue with mainland China. They do not dare to demonstrate publicly for Taiwan independence in Japan, because of the xenophobic immigration policies of that country – e.g. twenty years residence is the prerequisite for permanent residence rights.

There are some remnants of Taiwan Communist Party influence among Taiwanese in Japan, and these have also gathered some youthful followers there. The main group seems to be related to a silver-haired revolutionary who is perpetually clad in jeans and denim jacket, Shih Ming (nom de guerre, meaning “bright history” 史明). Also loosely associated with the Taiwanese left in Japan are internationalist Americans and Japanese who have founded various human rights organizations, namely The International Committee for the Defense of Human Rights in Taiwan (then based in Osaka, founded by Mr. Lynn Miles in 1975) and the Committee in Support of Political Prisoners in Taiwan (based in Tokyo, founded about 1974 by Ms. Kiyoko Misake, a.k.a. “Miss Li”, Okada-san”, who secretly collected human rights violations information in Taipei in the 1960's.) These organizations were of central importance for communication of the opposition in Taiwan with the outside world, until late 1978.

Back to Shih Ming. A younger member of the Taiwan Communist Party in 1945 – such as it was after the 1930's purges by the Japanese – Shih Ming went to China and joined the CCP, where he was trained and served as an intelligence agent during the civil war. (He also helped indoctrinate and train about 300

Taiwan aborigines who had been conscripted by the KMT, but captured by the CCP; he says they fought to their deaths with incredible courage against the KMT. These are among the pieces of the past that are almost entirely unknown today.) His experience there led him to feel that the CCP did not understand Taiwan, and that there was a real ethnic difference. Like other older Taiwanese, he says “The Chinese are a very cruel people”, and he includes the CCP in this description.

After hearing of the 2-2-8 massacre, Shih Ming determined to return to Taiwan, and made a perilous exit through the KMT-CCP battlefield in South China. Back at his family home in Grass Mountain (草山, Yangmingshan 陽明山), he conspired in 1949 to assassinate Chiang Kai-Shek, but was lucky to merely escape with his life, to Japan, after the weapons cache was uncovered. Since the remainder of the Taiwan Communist Party cell structure was uprooted by KMT intelligence in 1952, Shih Ming is one of the slender links to the political experience of the 1930's.

Shih Ming was expelled from Taiwan Youth in 1968, and set up his own revolutionary organization, the Taiwan Independence Army, which claims and seems to actually have an intelligence and terrorist network extending into Taiwan; its publication is Independent Taiwan. His current political role will be discussed more later.

Famous Taiwanese Communist Party leaders, such as the woman peasant Hsieh Hsueh-Hong (謝雪紅), who fled to China through Hong Kong after 2-2-8 seem to have played no further part in Taiwan's history. Within the CCP they were accused of regional factionalism, and it seems from scattered reports that a great number were purged during the 1957 anti-right campaigns, and during the Great Cultural Revolution. However, such Taiwanese now play a role in Beijing's public relations missions to the U.S., and we may gradually understand more about them.

There are an estimated 70,000 households of native Taiwanese origin in the U.S. The largest communities are in Los Angeles and New York, with secondary concentrations in San Francisco, Chicago, and Houston. Although otherwise sparsely distributed through the U.S., mainly in college towns and high-tech areas, the U.S. Taiwanese still have something of a national community, due to dense classmate and kinship relationships, and to their high degree of community organization. Their social networks tend to be confined to fellow Taiwanese, hardly expanding into American society except for cordial and formal acquaintances with American colleagues. Their voluntary contact with Chinese from either Taiwan or the PRC tends to be shortened by differences in the language they are most comfortable with, and political antipathy.

Taiwanese began to come to the United States in the early 1960's, when U.S. universities accepted bright students from around the world in great numbers, and provided them funding, especially in the natural sciences. Before that time, Taiwanese students went to Japan in greater numbers; those born in the pre-war period often spoke some Japanese, from elite childhood environments. By contrast, Taiwanese students accepted for studies in the U.S. after 1965 were often of middle or even lower class and peasant origin, e.g. the brightest son of the village who worked his way up to the Electrical Engineering Department of National Taiwan University, the highest institution of learning.

The availability of U.S. scholarships meant that the aspiring scholar only had to put together about \$2,500 for visa guarantee purposes. This could be done through loans from relatives and friends, and the sum returned as soon as the student arrived at the U.S. university and picked up his fellowship. In this period reportedly 90% of the graduates of National Taiwan University went to the U.S. for further studies, and about 90% took up employment there and did not return to Taiwan. These graduates were probably composed of about equal numbers of Taiwanese and mainlander youths.

In the early years there was little friction among mainlander, Taiwanese, and Hong Kong students on campus. They played soccer and held "China Night" feasts for the Americans together. The PRC was a distant rumor, a renegade not mentioned in the U.S. environment. However, after a few months in the States Taiwanese students would begin to dredge up from their repressed childhood memories images of machine-gunnings in the streets, and stories of uncles who were dragged away in the middle of the night and never seen again; then they would share anti-government sentiments secretly among a few trusted friends. Their most forbidden reading was Formosa Betrayed, an account of 2-2-8 written by George Kerr, a U.S. diplomatic officer assigned to Taipei in the 1930's and again 1945-49; the book was just published in 1965.

The means for such affirmation was friendly and mutual-help associations among Taiwanese overseas, i.e. provincial associations as is common among ethnic Chinese throughout Southeast Asia and throughout the world. Those leaders who dared to set up Taiwanese Associations, speaking their own Hokkien dialect, were targeted for retaliation by the KMT. This standardly involved cancelling ROC passports – leaving them stateless – or revoking Taiwan visas on U.S. passports, as applicable, such that they could not return to Taiwan. Other revenge could also be taken on their relatives, including denial of government-related jobs or promotions, and refusal of exit permit applications for leaving the country.

Despite these dangers, Taiwanese students took up the initiative in establishing Taiwanese Associations, and thus the forerunners were often in college towns, notably Manhattan, Kansas, Wisconsin. Taiwanese associations were formed here and in Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and New York by 1968. An important milestone in the formation of a U.S.-wide "community" of overseas Taiwanese and the stimulation of political discussion was the compilation and publication of a directory of names and addresses, carried out by Manhattan, Kansas students in 1969. Any political organization could pick this up and do a direct mail-out.

As more and more Taiwanese students finished their graduate studies through the early 70's, they took up well-paid professional and research jobs, in universities, medicine and industry (usually related to the space program or military contracts). This gave them "green card" (permanent residence) eligibility, and many filled as well the affirmative action quotas of the research industries, although the Taiwanese knew little and cared less about oppressed U.S. minorities. Their economic and migrant status security allowed them to turn their spare time to nostalgia for their homeland, and many began to affirm a Taiwanese identity and cultural heritage.

In 1958 a small number of students had established an organization which became the United Formosans in America for Independence, putting out a handwritten newsletter Formosagram. This

organization was not significant, however, until 1970. In January 1970 this organization joined with Taiwan Youth in Japan, and with smaller political and human rights organizations in Canada (representative Albert Lin 林哲夫), Brazil, and Europe (representative Chang Wei-Chia 張維嘉, in France) to announce the formation of World United Formosans for Independence (台灣獨立聯盟), hereafter referred to as WUFI. At the same time they announced the escape of Peng Ming-Min (彭明敏) from house arrest in Taipei to asylum in Switzerland. Professor Peng, an expert on international law, was the author of a Taiwan Declaration of Independence in 1965, for which he served four years imprisonment.

In only a few months TIM was again invigorated by another major event, the attempted assassination of Chiang Ching-Ku (蔣經國) (CCK), the President's son and heir apparent, in New York on April 24, 1970, the "4-2-4 Incident".

The 4-2-4 Incident was at first a stimulant to Taiwanese feelings. Taiwanese community leaders were sought and became "secret" members of WUFI, such that the organization swelled to probably about 300 persons.

But the sequel was also an ordeal for WUFI. The organization raised a very large sum to bail out the assailant (a Cornell student, Huang Wen-Hsiung 黃文雄) and his brother-in-law who had provided the gun (Tseng Tze-Tsai 鄭自才), both members of WUFI, but then paid for legal assistance only to plead disassociation of the organization from the assassination attempt. The defendants felt abandoned and, fearing deportation to Taiwan or murder, skipped bail a few days before the case came to trial in early 1971. About \$150,000 was lost; many contributors were stuck with second mortgages. In the estimate of Cary Hong (see interview reference), a WUFI member since 1968, the brief climax of Taiwanese fervor overseas in 1970 was a point of initiation, but was not sufficiently sustained to carry through the construction of a solid organization.

The aftermath of 4-2-4 was that the commitment of the organization's leaders (at that time Chai Trong-Rung 蔡同榮, chairman) was called into question, since in disclaiming responsibility for the assassination attempt WUFI swore to U.S. authorities that it had no intention of overthrowing the KMT by force – though its propaganda to the Taiwanese audience then and since has extolled the use of weapons. The more progressive and active elements departed from WUFI, and the remainder, among which community representatives were now the majority, regrouped under Chang Tsan-Hung, George Chang (張燦鑒).

These early WUFI dissenters, such as Kang Tai-Shan (康泰山) and Wang Chiu-Sheng (王秋生), were progressive in the sense of concern for social justice and popular participation, but for the most part were not students of Marxism. An exception, however, was Tseng Tze-Tsai, who set up a leftist Taiwanese organization in Europe, from his refuge in Sweden. These dissenters sent their critiques of WUFI to Shih Ming's Independent Taiwan (獨立台灣) in Japan, which continued publication until 1974, and they also promoted Shih Ming's views and contacts within the U.S.

Oriented as it was towards explaining the Taiwanese position to American society, WUFI published an English magazine, and early on gained the sympathy of American public figures such as Edward Kennedy

and Ramsey Clark. It was not until March 1972 that they began to publish Taiwan Independence Monthly (台獨月刊) in Chinese characters. George Chang's policy since has been to assiduously cultivate the nostalgic support of the Taiwanese-Americans, and avoid public controversy. So already in this period the social base and political character of WUFI was set.

Despite vigorous persecution by the KMT spy network and "professional students" in the U.S., Taiwanese Associations have gradually become a routinized element of life abroad. The First World Conference of Taiwanese Associations (世界台灣同鄉會) was held in 1973.

I attended the Third World Conference, held in July 1975 at Pepperdine University near Los Angeles, together with my first husband, sports director of the Taiwanese group in the San Francisco Bay Area. About 300 persons attended, among them nearly 50 rowdy mainlander youths whose expenses had been paid by the KMT, and who tried unsuccessfully to take over the microphone, make the assembly speak Mandarin, and protest the recurrent slurs on the regime.

In a pattern oft repeated in following years, one session was devoted to political debate on the future of Taiwan. Although Republic of China and Peoples' Republic of China were also formally invited, it was stated, only Taiwan Independence had chosen to appear. (This is not necessarily a subterfuge. The ROC and PRC, as I have known consistently from many sources and experiences, still refuse to send officially-accountable representatives to Taiwanese gatherings. In the earlier years a few semi-official persons would "fortuitously" appear to say a few good words for the KMT. Now these are entirely absent, but since 1982 a few Taiwanese from Beijing usually arrive, saying humbly they don't understand politics and only wish to observe, and certainly their country has sincere intentions for its dear Taiwan compatriots.) The TIM speakers and their fiery speeches were warmly received. When a skit in traditional Taiwanese sing-song verse satirized social conditions in Taiwan and the arrogant Chinese elites, first fights with the mainlanders broke out in the audience.

The Diaoyutai Movement, 1970-72, began to force the issue of Taiwan nationalism from an entirely different direction. At first Taiwanese, mainlander and Hong Kong students in the U.S. demonstrated together outside the PRC consulates and gleefully published exposes of the KMT past. This was the first heady taste of mass political action, breaking through the terrors and taboos of Taiwanese and mainlander parents alike. The marchers were sometimes attacked by Chinatown gangs, KMT hirelings. Their relatives in Taiwan were warned, and even injured by hit-and-run drivers – in one case of my personal acquaintance the student was informed of his mother's "unfortunate accident" when called to a private session at the consulate.

Later, as the movement came under the influence of the PRC Ambassador in Canada and ended with an orchestrated fervor for the motherland and the Great Cultural Revolution, Taiwanese students lapsed into silence. It was the sons and daughters of KMT officials, now reborn as Red Guards, who insisted most shrilly that Taiwan was the sacred territory of China, and the Taiwanese had no prerogative to question this fact.

From 1971-72, the Republic of China was dealt a series of diplomatic defeats – Nixon's visit to China (announced July 1971, realized in February 1972), the ROC's replacement by the PRC in the United

Nations, and Japan's recognition of the PRC (September 1972). Although within Taiwan the demonstration at National Taiwan University over Japanese seizure of the Diaoyutai Islands had subsided, intellectual currents set in motion there continued an onslaught on government ideology, on issues of Chinese nationalism, internal democracy and adjustment to international realities. Several of the later leaders of the Taiwan Democratic Movement served at this time on the mouthpiece publication of this intellectual movement, The Intellectual (大學雜誌). Their main perspective was liberal democracy. But before his removal from the Philosophy Department of NTU, and after a visit to the United States, Professor Chen Ku-Ying (陳鼓應) interjected new issues of social justice (Mab Huang, 1976).

In 1970 a small and secret organization of radical Taiwanese intellectuals formed, probably through networks at Berkeley, an organization called the Socialist Alliance (社會主義聯盟), and soon evolving into Taiwan People (台灣人民). Some had been members of WUFI at one time or another. But unlike the U.S. community leaders who were still WUFI members, Taiwan People decided that they must return to Taiwan to carry out the historic revolutionary task of Marxist intellectuals, to awaken the working class. Many did so, and in fact had considerable impact in intellectual circles in Taiwan, as seen in the crucial 1978 election campaign, in which leftist intellectuals ran in elections and spoke directly to the people for the first time (albeit often with an air of pretentious sympathy). However, as one reminisced later back in the States, they found the institutionalized barriers between intellectuals and workers too high to overcome; they were able to neither learn deep lessons from nor to lead the working class at that time.

Aside from these problems, Taiwan People did not exist long in its original form, because by 1975 it had split on the issue of nationalism. One group took up the line of Shih-Ming – strident Taiwanese nationalism, as a necessary element in a national liberation movement against the imperialist forces and their puppets. Their publication, full of abstruse Marxist jargon translated into characters, was named Taiwan Era (台灣時代). As a group they have avoided public attention except on strategically-chosen occasions, and have maintained the strictest secrecy. Only a few spokesmen have appeared, e.g. the central theorist Tso Hsiung (nom de guerre “left hero” 左雄). Despite its stated Taiwan nationalism, this group could not before about 1982 escape the public-opinion assumption, both in Taiwan and the U.S., that those who criticize capitalism and U.S. imperialism must be equated with partisans for the PRC.

The other line within Taiwan People (represented by Li Yi-Hsiung (李義雄), pseudonym of John Yen) refused to take a stand on the issue of nationalism, citing internationalism and socialism as the highest goal and the only standard; but these people were also interested in and made considerable effort to communicate with China, and they incorporated mainlanders within their group. They move towards semi-public activities of information dissemination and intellectual discourse.

Although the Li Yi-Hsiung 李義雄 (John Yen) line within Taiwan People were mostly people who at one time endorsed Taiwan independence, in later years they moved into contact and alliance with groups that had sprung from Diaoyutai movement pro-China current, such as Committee in Support of the

Taiwan Democratic Movement (台灣民主運動支援會), run by Lin Hsiao-Hsin (林孝信) in Chicago, who also claimed no prejudgment on the future of Taiwan.

Although interested in public education and propaganda for the socialist camp, Li Yi-Hsiung and Lin Hsiao-Hsin were often severely ostracized by overseas Taiwanese community leaders, who categorized them in the so-called “absorb –and-swallow” camp (併吞派), i.e. those who wanted China to take over Taiwan regardless.

Up to the late 1970’s, most persons participating in the Taiwanese community activities overseas would probably not have even heard of the radical groups. The public stage was taken by figures like Chen Lung-Chu, who presented the case for Taiwan independence to the United Nations, and Chai Trong-Rung, first chairman of WUFI, both active in lobbying the US Congress. It does not seem that such lobbying had a lasting effect. However, an aide to a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee told me in 1980 that the U.S. had in 1971 actually considered jettisoning the Chiang regime and seeking a liberal pro-U.S. Taiwanese-run state.

By 1979 Taiwanese had entered secure professional life in great numbers. Beginning about 1973, Taiwanese capitalists also began migrating to the U.S., due to new immigration regulations that allowed application for permanent residence within a certain level of investment in the U.S.; or they latched onto whatever relatives that may have already arrived by the student route. They helped drive up the real estate markets in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York. The businessmen, when they joined activities, have been able to carry out the cultural and political activities on an expanded scale. In summer 1983 they rented the Crystal Cathedral, in a south suburb of Los Angeles, for a Taiwanese musical celebration attended by 5,000.

But as Taiwanese have moved to the suburbs – particularly in cities with large Taiwanese communities in middle-class suburbs, such as Monterey Park in Los Angeles and Flushing in New York – there has also been a shift in the political balance on the campuses. Since the mid-70’s the expansion in research and educational institutions has dropped off. U.S. immigration regulations have tightened up. There are fewer scholarships available and less assurance of professional jobs in the land of opportunity. Many American colleges, in dire financial straits, accept any students of a reasonable level who can pay the tuition. The Taiwanese bourgeoisie and the mainlanders want to get their children and their money out of Taiwan before the communists take over. Now a large portion of students from Taiwan, perhaps the majority, are those paying their own way.

These students are politically apathetic, even if they know much better than the previous student generation the real nature of the KMT. It would be more correct to say they are crass and recognize the self-interest of their own class. On the other hand, there are also among the current student crop a small minority who are very militant, already tested in the Formosa Magazine period, and who return immediately to Taiwan after their studies. Some even come from Taiwan already trained in anti-imperialist and Marxist-Leninist concepts. I will say more about this student factor later. Overall, the KMT has retaken the U.S. campuses – or rather the KMT representatives have reached an accommodation of non-aggression with the now-numerous PRC student population.

This has been the social base for a struggle that has approximated a successful resolution, setting up the Taiwanese Associations, and rooting the KMT spies out of them. Aside from the World Conference activity, each summer there are four or five regional camps in the U.S. alone, each attended by several hundred families. In the last few years, as the second generation has matured into its teenage years, the meetings take on an increasingly Americanized orientation. Cultural events which used to be performed purely in Hokkien, with traditional trappings such as puppet theatre (topics almost always political, e.g. the Kaohsiung Incident or the Lin family murders; I was once depicted as a ferocious female puppet fighting off burly agents as Shih escapes), are replaced to a greater extent by the second generation's display of virtuoso skills in classical piano and violin, or crude teenage skits.

The KMT government did have reason to fear that native Taiwanese propaganda was damaging its U.S. public relations, glossy ads in which it tried to package itself as the shining "Free China" alternative to godless communism. In about 1972-73 the KMT, by my casual impression, had tried to dilute the implicitly political character of the Taiwanese Associations by inciting mainlanders to join, but this did not last long. After failing to stem the rise of Taiwanese Associations in every major city, in about 1979 the KMT set up its own chain, the "Taiwanese Friendship Associations", to claim to be the real representatives of Taiwanese overseas, and to make statements of support for the regime. These, however, are limp affairs speaking Mandarin and are attended by no more Taiwanese than mainlanders.

In sum, all Hokkien-speaking organizations overseas – whether for church, sports, community feasting, or education, and often even business – are social bases for the Taiwan independence movement, albeit a conservative one. Though such organizations often claim to eschew politics, and they try to absorb Taiwanese who are non-committed or frightened on political issues, the community organizations will still welcome and give a round of applause for any visiting opposition figure. The officers of these organizations will also make all the arrangements for talks by visiting political activists and will channel contributions. They will do this in their "private" capacity, if not, as most commonly, by official agreement of all the association's directors. But there are recently also subtle and progressive changes in the community organizations, as will be understood later.

Under the early conditions of struggle with the KMT it was not surprising that the charters of the Taiwanese associations usually specified rather autocratic structures, with power vested solely in the association head. That is, once the majority elected a TIM supporters – and KMT supporters had no reason to go about encouraging the set-up of Taiwanese associations – then there was little leeway for KMT disruption.

Also, the communities, though geographically dispersed, were informally coordinated on a national and international scale by their local "big men", usually previous or incumbent association heads, who are very often members of WUFI, or strong supporters.

Although such membership was supposed to be secret, it was generally rather an open supposition that could be deduced from public activities, since WUFI's activities were largely directed towards the overseas communities, providing information about the opposition in Taiwan, claiming bomb attacks in Taiwan or against KMT targets abroad, feeding the communities nostalgic cultural materials, and

collecting contributions. WUFI often even offered membership to major contributors. WUFI's combination of boastfulness and conspicuous secrecy has often, especially since the challenges it has faced in the last five years, exposed its role in national coordination.

The habitually autocratic structures both of the Taiwanese associations and of WUFI have in recent years been a seemingly insuperable blockage to political development. WUFI is a creation of the Taiwanese-American mentality, and that mentality is only likely to become more conservative and removed from Taiwan as the years pass. And yet in the last year WUFI has not only cracked, but nearly collapsed, and yielded the political initiative to groups farther to the left. But on the way to an explanation of this we must see the role of communication between the opposition in Taiwan and its U.S. supporters, and the political issues that evolve within Taiwan and are played out in the far-flung communities of Taiwanese abroad.

LINKS BETWEEN THE OPPOSITION IN TAIWAN AND ITS OVERSEAS SUPPORTERS

1975 inaugurated a period of increasing contact between the overseas Taiwanese and opposition intellectuals and politicians in Taiwan. Kang Nin-Hsiang (康寧祥), editor of the short-lived Taiwan Political Review (台灣政論) and newly elected National Legislator, toured the U.S. and astounded his listeners with outspoken attacks on the KMT. Three of the eight Formosa leaders later on military trial in March 1980 for sedition, following the Kaohsiung Incident, were in 1975 studying in the United States, and had wide circles of acquaintances. News of increasing popular protest and contested elections in Taiwan sparked overseas hopes.

This development culminated in the founding in 1978 of the Formosan Association for Human Rights under the sponsorship of WUFI. Although WUFI claimed FAHR was independent and neutral, the fact that FAHR's first director was George Chang's wife, Tina, made that claim very suspect. But it was not until somewhat later that any tension would arise out of the matter.

Not long after, the Voice of Taiwan (台灣之音) telephone news network was initiated as a service of the Taiwanese Association of New York. It was perhaps November 1978 that Ms Eileen Yang Yi-Yi, founder of the first Voice of Taiwan, thought to call Taiwan directly by international telephone, to enliven the community reports with news of the impending election campaigns. At that time I did briefing for foreign visitors, and Shih Ming-Teh served as General Secretary of the Non-KMT Candidates Campaign Coalition (黨外後援會). How Yang Yi-Yi found our telephone number I don't know; but as a foreigner I was under less danger of arrest and could readily relate opposition reactions and KMT reactions. The call forged a channel of direct and immediate communication between the opposition and overseas supporters.

Stimulated by snowballing development of the Democratic Movement in Taiwan from December 1978 on (with daily reports of opposition proclamations, marches and rallies attended by thousands; seizures of publications and arrests; island-wide joint action and an expanding network of public offices) both FAHR and Voice of Taiwan quickly established branches throughout Taiwanese communities worldwide. At one time VOT had some thirty telephone lines, most with recorded messages in Hokkien, but also

some in Mandarin and English. In times of crisis the lines could be busy for hours on end. The listener would hear a five to ten minute message, updated at least twice a week – and including even on-Teh-spot tape-recordings of shouting matches between Formosa Magazine personalities and the security agents.

To explain the next stage of overseas developments, I must return to the scene of the Taiwan Democratic Movement. The long-term process of political development in the general case of a dependent developing country is best described by a Filipino theorist, Walden F. Bello, in a booklet entitled “Elite Democracy or Authoritarian Dictatorship?”, published by the Philippine Solidarity Network in 1979.

In the period after World War II, and after the formal achievement of independence in most of the former colonies, the colonial powers could still maintain adequate control – i.e. economic penetration of the neo-colony – because the parliamentary forms only brought to power one or another faction of traditional elites. Whichever elites reigned, they could be coerced and corrupted by the metropolitan power. This was due partly to the localism of interests, i.e. elites represented contending territorial interests as well as their class. The masses had not yet transcended localism and developed a recognition of their class interests. However, the process of economic penetration and modernization under dependent development itself breaks down localism and forces the creation of popular consciousness for common people as workers, peasants, petty traders, etc., versus central government policy and its concessions to foreign powers. The masses gradually begin to realize how to use the processes of constitutional democracy. This realization is also promoted by the out-of-power elites, who use the cry of nationalism to rally supporters in their own bid for power. When polarization has proceeded to this point, the parliamentary procedures can no longer contain the challenge to the underlying power structures. The imperialist power must step in to establish, usually with a military coup, a dictatorship which can clamp down on all dissent and forcibly restore hospitable conditions for foreign investment. This is Bello’s explanation for the rise of dictatorships with modern trappings in the period of expansion of U.S. capital, from Brazil 1964 to Philippines 1971.

Another aspect of political dynamics is elucidated in Filipino writings. The elite rivals stop short of a challenge that might really trouble the dictatorship, for fear of unleashing uncontrollable popular demands. They are often coopted by partial reforms or by their own incorporation into the division of spoils. Localist leaders in particular can be domesticated by a government settlement allowing them partial authority in a local fief.

As I wrote in “The Social Origins of the Taiwan Democratic Movement” in 1981, this general scheme is quite applicable to Taiwan, although in the case of Taiwan there is no previous real parliamentary period to look back to. Through the 1960’s, native opposition to the KMT was led mostly by local small businessmen, with peasant followings. Especially in rural areas the line of contention was often between rival clans, and their alignment against or with KMT policies could shift according to their position of advantage. Even local heroes who had gone to jail and suffered torture for the sake of their ideals were not immune to corruption; their popular followings meant that they were worth a particularly high price to the KMT (the carrot), and they were usually entrapped as well in suspended prosecutions on

trumped-up charges (the stick). Their mentality has usually been that the survival of themselves, their family, and its financial resources, are necessary to continue the struggle for Taiwanese freedom.

The rapid industrialization of Taiwan from the last 1960's on, however, created a new youth mass society which overlaid the old local interests. It also created a Taiwanese bourgeoisie – ranging from petty satellite industries to massive conglomerates within financial function – oriented to the export market. The differentiation within this bourgeoisie cannot be overlooked. The small capitalists in Taiwan, like those in Brazil, have suffered from the collusion of the big bourgeoisie with the government and security forces (i.e. the small native Taiwanese capitalists are in particular cut out of credit availability, import licenses, and government contracts) and have played a role in setting off the Democratic Movement.

In November 1977 a crowd in Chungli, a center of modern export industry as well as an agricultural heartland (incidentally Hakka), burned down the central police station. The matter that inflamed them was KMT manipulation of the ballot box. The candidate for county head at issue, Hsu Hsin-Liang, was a young native Taiwanese politician breakaway from the KMT, with a degree in political science from England, previous service on The Intellectual (大學雜誌) staff, and a role in founding the Junior Chamber of Commerce. It seems that he in fact masterminded the riot to accomplish his election. But this first outburst or public retribution, which caught the KMT unprepared, set a new political equation. Mass protest and disregard of the martial law authorities were now political weapons.

Hsu was clearly supported by middle-size Taiwanese capitalists. However, his populist techniques included advocacy of farm issues and exposure of injustices to workers in foreign-owned factories of the area. For the December 1978 campaign for national assemblies, He put forth a policy of alliance with the leftist intellectuals, even if they were pro-China in nationalist sentiments. He said, in effect, we (native Taiwanese politicians) have the masses, they (leftist intellectuals) have the social theory.

But Hsu did not represent the only trend among Taiwanese bourgeoisie. Kang Ning-Hsiang, originally a local demagogue supported by gangs in an old proletarian area of the capital city, Taipei, had from his position as National Legislator cultivated ties with the big entrepreneurs, and attracted a following of young mainlander election helpers. The common element to this constituency was a desire to “reform and preserve Taiwan” (革新保台), i.e. allow an orderly transition to meeting current international realities, without upsetting the social order. For the Taiwanese bourgeoisie, this meant increasing their role in the polity, but preserving its structure. For young mainlanders this meant perhaps a continuation of the de facto independence of Taiwan, with also assurance of their prominent role.

The split between the Kang Nin-Hsiang line and the new populist challengers (later the leaders of Formosa Magazine) became obvious first in the December 1978 campaign coalition, when Kang refused to join in statements demanding the end of martial law. Even as a miraculous tide of mass protest broke forth and overcame all threats from the Taiwan Garrison Command, he stood aside, counseled mediation, tried to defuse the confrontation and warned that everyone would be arrested. The crackdown he correctly predicted finally came in December 1979, but only after a year of quick

development of opposition organization. The Democratic Movement leaders had by then already stated their willingness to sacrifice themselves for their ideals and for the future of Taiwan.

As a participant in the Democratic Movement prelude and high tide, I would say that as the Taiwanese intellectuals and professionals (the generation then in their early and mid-forties, the first Taiwanese educated class to reach maturity since the 2-2-8 purges) moved into confrontation with the security forces, their natural route was to call upon the Taiwanese masses, and themselves move tentatively towards a populist program. In espousing popular causes, they legitimized their opposition to the regime and also staved off their own arrests, through the threat of public reaction. However, the authorities were likewise wary of inciting more incidents like the Chungli Incident.

Though the core of leadership in the Democratic Movement embraced an ideology of liberal democracy and utopian social welfare, this description does not circumscribe the movement. A younger component, in their twenties to mid-thirties, had been imprinted by the racial currents of the Diaoyutai movement. Some were rethinking Maoism for the Taiwan context. An important group of young cadres in the Formosa Magazine organization came from the Tainan Theological Seminary; the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan (membership over 100,000) was founded in the 1890's, and has an internally democratic structure deeply rooted in Taiwanese history and language. The young ministers took their inspiration from South American liberation theology; their nationalism is unequivocally Taiwanese. They injected the demand for economic democracy into mass protest.

But while the Democratic Movement was kindling the dynamic merger of Taiwanese consciousness and social issues, the Taiwanese professionals overseas only saw "sweet potatoes" (Taiwanese) versus "taroos" (mainlanders). They had left Taiwan in their mid-twenties, before entering society as adults; they only remembered an idyllic preindustrial society where family values were sacred, and where the cruel mainlander tyrants were the only enemy. Their world view was rather similar to that of the local leaders in Taiwan; and even those who called themselves professional revolutionaries, such as members of WUFI, disdained social science and saw no reason to study revolutions in other countries. "There is no need to make a lot of empty talk about theory; first we must be united to overthrow the KMT, and then we will hold elections."

TAIWANESE POLITICS ABROAD AFTER THE KAOHSIUNG INCIDENT

Visits of young activists of the Taiwan Democratic Movement to America in 1979, e.g. Chang Fu-Chung (張富忠), one of the left-leaning editors of Formosa Magazine, were among the earlier occasions for friction with the overseas conservative organizations. After the December 1979 crackdown, several Democratic Movement figures were stranded in exile in the U.S. (Hsu Hsin-Liang 許信良, Hsieh Tsung-Ming (Roger Hsien 謝聰敏, a well-known former political prisoner), Ms. Chen Wan-Chen (陳婉真), Ms. Ai Lin-Da (艾琳達) (Linda Gail Arrigo). On one hand, the Taiwanese communities rallied in a strong show of support for the Democratic Movement, and anger at the abortion of their hopes. The Formosan Association for Human Rights led in petitions and demonstrations. Offices of the Taiwan government were picketed weekly. Many were ransacked or bombed.

But on the other hand, the leaders of WUFI rebuffed an effort by Hsu Hsin-Liang to subsume under a united front. In early 1980 Hsu Hsin-Liang dropped his populist rhetoric and stopped proposing a broad definition of “Taiwanese-Chinese” which could have incorporated a broad spectrum of views in Taiwan on the emotional issue of ethnic identity. Like a good politician creating an image for a campaign, he sought to conform to the mind-set of Taiwanese overseas. But the leaders of WUFI, although they knew very little about political conditions in Taiwan and should logically have accepted his leadership, were not about to yield up their fiefdom. The precedents were that heroes escaping from Taiwan had been swallowed up in praise, rendered politically impotent, and paraded as icons when donations were solicited.

Taiwanese overseas were displeased to hear of the contribution of pro-China leftists to the Democratic Movement, of the weaknesses and middle-class shortsightedness of the Democratic Movement leadership, and of the pattern of American neocolonialism over Taiwan – topics that Ai Lin-Da could not be persuaded to drop. WUFI members were particularly incensed over an analysis of Kang Ning-Hsiang as an example of the collaborationist position of the big Taiwanese bourgeoisie.

To add insult to injury, in early 1980 Chang Ching-Tse 張金策 (an activist from the Taiwan Political Review struggle, of lower-class origin, who had escaped from prosecution in Taiwan in 1976) split from WUFI, and began to vociferously attack its lack of revolutionary spirit and vision, with examples from his intimate knowledge of the organization. Chang Ching-Tse allied himself with the Marxist-Leninist group Taiwan Era, which for the first time appeared in public debate. He called himself “the revolutionary right”, i.e. an anti-imperialist democrat, and attacked as well “opportunistic politicians like Hsu Hsin-Liang.

Still trying to be inoffensive to Taiwanese-Americans, Hsu Hsin-Liang called on his Formosa Magazine mystique (he was one of the core of five), and established Formosa Weekly 美麗島週報 in Los Angeles in August 1980. After failing to garner sufficient support from the right, however, he was glad to have the Li Yi-Hsiung group pitch in and help him. He said that differences in opinion would work themselves out democratically in the course of the editorial work, just as they had with the Taiwan magazine. But without the immediate enemy, a united front of left/right, Taiwan/China nationalism could not be maintained. Instead, within about two months, the liberal editors refused to tolerate leftist carping any further, and with a despotic proclamation Hsu limited the privileges of the left and suspended editorial board meetings. The Li Yi-Hsiung group withdrew and started its own journal, Taiwan Intellectual Tide 台灣思潮, to attempt an intellectual analysis of Taiwan’s society. Both finances and labor input for Hsu’s magazine were in critically short supply.

Finally Hsu Hsin-Liang concluded that the best defense against the silent WUFI siege was an offense, and in April 1981 he dug up and printed the dirt from the 4-2-4 Incident aftermath. Now the feud was public, and WUFI set off a campaign to cancel Formosa Weekly subscriptions. The magazine was only saved from internal embroilments and financial collapse through the quick intercession of Shih Ming. Following this alliance of convenience (for which Shih Ming soon came under fire from the Taiwan Era group), Hsu began to style himself a representative of the proletariat, and a student of Lenin in a

strategic plan for leading the bourgeoisie. Formosa Weekly began to publish a potpourri of Marxist jargon, which was a considerable shock to much of the Taiwanese community.

The mass of people in the Taiwanese-American community organizations were bewildered by these struggles. Some were angry that airing dirty linen could give advantage to the KMT. Their basic instinct was to help any Taiwan independence figure that had made a credible contribution, and avoid choosing among them. But WUFI did hold a near-monopoly over national coordination and contributions (in particular through the tax-free status of FAHR). Through its “secret” community-leader members, WUFI publicly called for unity and cessation of acrimonious accusations, and stifled debate in community forums. At the same time it unleashed along its networks a campaign of rumor-mongering, and tried to activate a boycott of Hsu Hsin-Liang, Ms. Ai Lin-Da, Ms. Chen Wan-Chen, and others.

While aspersions were being cast on the recently-exiled Democratic Movement figures, FAHR sought to prove its authority and close relationship with the Taiwan opposition by tightly controlling the itineraries of visiting legislators and former political prisoners, who were coming in even greater numbers. Controlling the itineraries meant also controlling their appeals for donations – of which FAHR could usually garner the lion’s share.

WUFI’s other reactions was to start a newspaper in New York to rival Formosa Weekly, entitled Taiwan Tribune 台灣公論報. In its pages the Taiwanese-American orientation soon became explicit. Indeed, one section of WUFI, led by Chai Trong-Rung, set up an allied organization in 1981, Formosan Association for Public Affairs (FAPA) to bind the immigrant bourgeoisie to it more tightly. FAPA does do significant lobbying to the U.S. Congress on Taiwan human rights issues, but only for Taiwan as an individual and somehow particularly misguided case of an American-influenced regime. It also lobbies to separate Taiwan’s immigration quota from that of China. It educates the second generation into American elitist politics. The Taiwanese communities made their mark on the PAC process when they bestowed over \$100,000 on Edward Kennedy’s 1980 bid for the Presidency, FAPA’s ideal is the Jewish-American Citizens' League.

In April 1984 a group of about thirty of the younger and more active cadres broke from WUFI, under the lead of Hong Tze-Sheng (Cary Hong, 洪哲勝). They had previously failed at an effort of internal renewal. Only with this major crack in the façade was it apparent that critiques of the pro-American line had actually hit their mark. All persons serious about revolution knew, if only in the crudest way, that there are no pro-American national liberation movements within the American orbit. The only successful movements have been led by Marxists, or they have turned to Marxism in the end. Then to be a serious revolutionary one must at least be able to use Marxist terminology. Once the Taiwanese community got over its shock, socialism could be explained in its Northern European form.

On January 1, 1985 the group that broke away from WUFI proclaimed itself the Taiwan Revolutionary Party (TRP), and incorporated Hsu Hsin-Liang into the membership. Eventually it voted through a socialist-sounding charter.

It was in fact WUFI’s increasingly obvious attempts at manipulation of the community organizations, in order to isolate the new rivals, that has led to resentment against it, more than any ideological battle or

leftist critique. These attempts have been even more desperate since the split-off, at which time also WUFI's lack of internal security was exposed by the KMT. There has been a new and successful move for democratization of the structures of the Taiwanese associations. WUFI candidates have been largely defeated in the last year.

There is of course a political position implicit in WUFI's behavior. The communities know that WUFI has not been able to answer the question, why it has been deserted by virtually all activists who have come out of the struggle in Taiwan. The lowest level of answer is that WUFI has insufficient will and intelligence for either armed or political struggle for liberation in Taiwan.

Another level of answer is that WUFI's unspoken political position is analogous to that of Kang Ning-Hsiang in Taiwan, i.e. the social order must not be disturbed, but Taiwanese should take over. This may well be due to WUFI's major source of funds, reportedly businessmen. In April 1982 Kang Ning-Hsiang broke a boycott brought by the opposition legislators to force the Taiwan garrison Command, the martial law authority, to report to the legislature. Even after this open betrayal, WUFI still refused to repudiate support for Kang, rationalizing "Kang may still be useful". The denunciations of Kang built up in Taiwan, and he lost the next election. Gradually the Taiwanese overseas have come to understand the issues in the critique of Kang as an opportunistic power broker, and put WUFI in the same category.

Then it may be seen that although the majority of Taiwanese-Americans are moving slowly towards an immigrant mentality, i.e. as an aspiring minority in the U.S., this position has clearly lost the political initiative, and can no longer claim legitimacy among the majority that sincerely hopes for Taiwan's deliverance from the KMT. It is in fact an unintended service of WUFI that the Taiwanese-American and the (comparatively) revolutionary lines have been separated, better late than never.

THE DEFINITION OF TAIWAN NATIONALISM

The issue on which Taiwan Era first attacked WUFI was nationalism. Taiwan Era claimed that WUFI's understanding of the Taiwan problem was simple prejudice and ethnicism, not nationalism. A modern nationalism is founded not on race or language, but on the political will to be a nation. Then mainlanders from Taiwan are Taiwanese, actually or potentially.

But this explanation does not have the same connotations in the Asian language, to the unsophisticated listener, that it does in the above English. The word for "nationalism", "bin-chok chu-yi" 民族主義 in Taiwanese dialect, is more literally "people-tribe central-idea". "Chok" can also mean "race". Then Taiwan Era's cry for nationalism can be interpreted as a call for more militant ethnicism, rather than a more rational one. In fact, some critics said that this was Taiwan Era's ploy, to exhibit a more strident nationalism than WUFI's. However that may be interpreted, Taiwan Era's use of the word "nationalism" was accepted throughout the Taiwanese community within a year or so.

As I see it, the word is in fact a litmus test for a political position. It announces the demand for a Taiwanese state. It is rejected by those who say they want socialism but are willing to wait for the People's Republic to bring it to Taiwan. It is rejected by the Taiwanese bourgeoisie, who like to talk about "Taiwanese consciousness" but want accommodation rather than confrontation with the

dictatorship. It is rejected by the young mainlanders who really want to secure the goose that laid the golden egg for a long prosperous future, by a de facto independence policy, but do not want to risk their privileged position in that future through popular empowerment. It is word for powerful identification, and for struggle.

Shih Ming's position is that Taiwanese nationalism was already born in Taiwan's rebellions against Ching rule in the 1880's. Other TIM theorists ascribe it to oppression under Japanese imperialism. Prior to Japan's surrender in WWII, the Chinese Communist Party encouraged resistance movements in Taiwan, without claiming Chinese sovereignty over the island.

My view is that whatever went before, there is now an objective social force that may be called Taiwan nationalism, and that it is not merely an artificial creation of the bourgeoisie. This force is born of four decades of exploitation and terror under the Chiang regime. In the climax of the Democratic Movement, the human rights day rally of over 30,000 people in Kaohsiung on December 10, 1979, the cry "Beilido si lan-e!", "Formosa is ours!", seemed to resonate endlessly. The middle-class leadership was only beginning to redefine the content of national self-determination, and to tap the strength of popular feeling.

The present policy of the People's Republic of China in fact reinforces the Taiwanese view of the Chinese as predators under the excuse of their own nationalism. The PRC's line is that Taiwan is a part of China, and the residents have no veto power on the issue of reunification. That is in itself already a violation of the rights to self-determination affirmed by Lenin. It also ignores the objective material interests of the people of Taiwan. While Taiwan would no doubt benefit from free trade with the mainland – in April 1979 in Taipei the opposition did urge the KMT to accept Beijing's proposal for trade, travel and mail – there is a huge gap in industrial capacity and standard of living. Nor is there any sign that the political rights of the people of Taiwan would be better protected by Beijing, since civil rights and legal process are no better observed in China than in Taiwan. Finally, the example of Tibet does not bode well for the cultural rights of the Taiwanese, though they might find cultural stimulation in contact with the areas of South China from which their ancestors migrated.

Secondly, Beijing has clearly set the Kuomintang in Taipei as its object of reconciliation. Last March the Premier, Li Hsien-Nien, in a visit to Burma, stated that if the Kuomintang will only pledge its allegiance to Beijing, it can keep not only its social and economic system and military and civil police – but its secret police system. Even Beijing's publication Taiwan Voice (台聲), run by Taiwanese expatriates in China to proclaim Beijing's benevolent intentions, has recently been chastised by officialdom for attempting to promise native Taiwanese autonomy. Quite explicitly the PRC has proposed entering into an alliance with the KMT against the popular demands of the people of Taiwan (from talk by Roger Hsieh, October 5, 1985).

The PRC is also wooing Taiwanese capitalists, and Hsu Hsin-Liang does believe that the Chinese market is a considerable temptation for them.

On both counts of political control and economic system for Taiwan the PRC no longer upholds the socialist line, and is rather seeking an accommodation with U.S. imperialism. This is apparent not just in

its policy towards Taiwan, but cessation of support for the Thai Communist Party, and Malaysian Communist Party, and the New People's Army in the Philippines, since 1979.

The subjective history of the people of Taiwan is that the last time the Chinese mainland took control of Taiwan, the Taiwanese were massacred in great numbers, and subjected to a reign of terror. The PRC's current threat of forced reunification renews that fear. Teng Hsiao-Ping has stated that under any of five conditions the PRC will "reunify" Taiwan by force: 1) Taipei aligns with Moscow 2) Taipei decides to develop the nuclear bomb 3) Taiwan demands independence 4) a crisis of succession in Taipei causes internal instability 5) Taipei continues to refuse negotiations on reunification over a long period of time. Chinese officials in U.S. visits have also said that the PRC would send troops if Taiwanese overthrew the KMT and declared independence.

In other words, it appears that the PRC treats its old nemesis, the KMT, as a mechanism for holding its interests in Taiwan. It can also be seen that the PRC has no confidence that the Taiwanese will themselves, if freely given the choice, affirm their place in the Chinese polity and cultural heritage.

The effect of Beijing's policy on political currents within Taiwan and among Taiwanese overseas is to drive a portion of the bourgeoisie who do have some democratic demands into the arms of the KMT. The far right TIM forces would opt for an accommodation with the KMT if they were given crumbs of power; it cannot yet be judged whether the KMT has sufficient internal flexibility to do that. The KMT itself has redefined demands for internal democracy as "Taiwan independence" sedition.

A second effect has been to abort further potential development of pro-China democratic groups among Taiwanese. Rather, groups such as China Tide have withdrawn from mass activities, and begun a cynical line of discourse ridiculing the Democratic Movement. Pro-China intellectuals, whether mainlanders or Taiwanese, now rarely appear in public forums to argue for reunification; privately they are anguished that the PRC has ignored their pleas for a more enlightened and socialist-principled policy.

Now it is the pro-China or anti-nationalistic groups, i.e. represented by Li Yi-Hsiung and Lin Hsiao-Hsin, who have no confidence in the power of the people, despite previous proclamations of socialist ideals. The bottom line is that they are resigned to China's takeover, but not enthusiastic about it.

In sum, only the left line of the Democratic Movement successors, and the left line of the Taiwan Independence Movement abroad, remains seriously engaged in the issues of democratic struggle. Within Taiwan a portion of youth has gone directly to social issues, and they are learning to act with the population on issues of labor and environment. Among Taiwanese organizations overseas, the standard of discourse now is the language of national liberation movements, although there is still a great gap between theory and practice. When I apply the label "left", I mean progressive compared to the ideologies and organizations that have been displaced.

I do not yet take the proclaimed Marxism of the Taiwan Revolutionary Party and of Hsu Hsin-Liang very seriously, though many of the members are sincerely seeking the correct course, and may be expected to develop over time. They have been too quick to declare themselves the party of the proletariat; their program can only devolve to that of populist party bourgeoisie. The progress is that they do not call

mindlessly and empty for armed uprising that cannot be carried out, as did WUFI, but have set the line that "the masses must save themselves", in the first with popular organization and open political struggle against the regime. In Taiwan, unlike in the Philippines and Central America, it is not easy for people to understand and feel at the gut level the analysis of American imperialism, because the Americans have appeared in their history as the fair-haired saviors rather than as the bloody invaders. This historical background will no doubt impede general acceptance of the neo-colonial analysis until some incident such as the Kwaengchu uprising in Korea, March 1980, occurs.

Despite the ideological and programmatic shortcomings, there is all the same a new sense of purpose among this group. In the community organizations that have been democratized there is a confidence in solid social support, and a program for sending delegates to Taiwan for open participation in opposition civil disobedience.

POSTSCRIPT

I would like to conclude with a note on the lessons that I have learned in the last few years of intermittent political struggle, lessons that likewise recapitulate the recent events related above.

The progressive political line does not advance among the mass audience by abstract academic expositions, but by controversy and challenge over concrete issues. The reactionary line is not proven to be logically incorrect in the mass perception, it is only shown that the people who hold that line hesitate, hold back, and finally sabotage the innovators when a level of struggle that transcends them is advanced. The intellectual understanding comes later, for the mass audience. Intellectual Marxists as well as vacillating liberals can be left behind in the process of political struggle.

There is within a society such as Taiwan's a reservoir of social forces which is the emotional and rational reaction to past oppressions and past struggles. These social forces can be invisible in daily life, and yet have a continuous cost to the dictatorship and the potential for sudden outpouring. The aspirations for liberation continue to exist even when their fulfillment seems dim. What that means, I believe, is that Taiwan nationalism and demand for democracy is not dampened by pessimistic prognosis by political scientists. If those who embody popular aspirations and carry on the concrete struggle for democracy and social justice profess Taiwan nationalism, then Taiwan nationalism as a political demand takes on the aura of all the ideals of democracy and legal process and justice. An armed invasion by China will confirm, not extinguish, Taiwan nationalism.

Despite their Americanization and their distance from the most direct danger (the KMT brings its oppression even to the U.S.), Taiwanese-Americans and the revolutionary organizations among them reflect, with a time lag, the lessons learned in Taiwan. The ideological evolution among them is not trivial, because they represent a source of financial and other support for movements in Taiwan, and they can openly compile and disseminate the materials of historical record and current debate.

On a personal level I have learned that there is a certain pace to political and ideological change, and that it is an extremely diffuse process, for which patience and an even temper should be maintained. In 1981 I was desperately disappointed at apparent lack of immediate results. Two or three years later I

have seen the impact made on persons whom I thought at the time rejected the radical analysis. This is a source of hope for the value of my actions and my studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Linda Gail Arrigo, "The Social Origins of the Taiwan Democratic Movement", serialized in Chinese in *Formosa Weekly*, Los Angeles, beginning 1981.

Linda Gail Arrigo, "The Industrial Work Force of Young Women in Taiwan", *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 1980, 12(2):5-37.

Linda Gail Arrigo, "Economic and Political Control of Women Workers in Multinational Electronics Factories in Taiwan" *Martial Law Coercion and World Market Uncertainty*, presented at the Second Conference of the Center for the Study, Education and Advancement of Women, University of California at Berkeley, April 14-16, 1983; also printed in the *Bulletin of the Taiwanese Professors of America*, 1984. Also in *Contemporary Marxism*, Fall 1985.

John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*. Manchester University Press, 1982.

K.N. Brutents, *National Liberation Movements Today*. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1977.

Djung-Ren Chien, U. Chicago master's thesis on the Taiwan Communist Party, in preparation.

Lung-chu Chen, *Formosa, China and the United Nations: Formosa in the World Community*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1967.

Frank C.C. Hsiao, "The Taiwan Communist Party.....", 1983, reference to be completed.

Mab Huang, *Intellectual Ferment for Political Reforms in Taiwan, 1971-73*. Ann Arbor, Center for Chinese Studies, U. Michigan, 1976.

Shu-min Huang, *Agricultural Degradation: Changing Community Systems in Rural Taiwan*. Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1981.

Neil H. Jacoby, *U.S. Aid to Taiwan: A case of Foreign Aid, Self-Help, and Development*. New York, Praeger, 1967.

George H. Kerr, *Formosa Betrayed*. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1965.

George H. Kerr, *Formosa: Licensed Revolution and the Home Rule Movement, 1895-1945*. Honolulu, University of Press of Hawaii, 1974.

Arthur J. Lerman, *Taiwan's Politics: The Provincial Assemblyman's World*. Washington, D.C., U. Press of America, 1978.

Victor H. Li, ed., *Future of Taiwan: A Difference of Opinions*. White Plains, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe, 1980.

Ching-yuan Lin, Industrialization in Taiwan, 1949-72; Trade and Import-Substitution Policies for Developing Countries. New York, Praeger, 1973.

Ming-min Peng, A Taste of Freedom: Memoirs of a Formosan Independence Leader. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Manfred Steinhoff, Prestige and Profit: The Development of Entrepreneurial Abilities in Taiwan, 1880-1972. Cranberra, Development Studies Center, 1980.

A. Zenger, "Taiwan: The Floating Export Platform", Ampo magazine, Tokyo, 1976. (reference incomplete).

INTERVIEWS, OCTOBER 1985

Taiwan Revolutionary Party (台灣革命黨): Hong Tze-Sheng (Cary Hong, 洪哲勝), Chairman. Huang Tzai-Tien (Patrick Huang, 黃再添).

Formosa Weekly: Hsu Hsin-Liang, Hsieh Tsung-Min (Roger Hsieh, 謝聰敏).

Taiwan Era: Interview requested and declined for the time being.