TAIWAN COMMUNIQUÉ

Published by:
International Committee for Human Rights in Taiwan
Europe : P.O. Box 31, 3984 ZG ODIJK, The Netherlands
U.S.A. : P.O. Box 45205, SEATTLE, Washington 98105-0205

European edition, January 8, 1983
Published 6 times a year
ISSN number: 1027-3999

10

Lin Yi-hsiung, portrait of a prisoner

Mr. Lin (born on August 24, 1941), a prominent member of the Taiwan Provincial Assembly, has been imprisoned by the Taiwan authorities since December 1979. He is a lawyer by profession. In 1977 he was elected as a representative to the Provincial Assembly from his native Ilan county. He was an effective legislator, wellliked by his constituency, but not so wellliked by many government officials, because he was a vocal critic of corruption in high places and of repressive practices of the secret police agencies.

He became a central figure in the "nonparty" ***tangwai*** movement, a loose coalition of mainly native Taiwanese politicians who try to work towards a democratic political system on the island. In the summer of 1979 the nowbanned **Formosa** magazine was founded, which quickly became a rallyingpoint for those advocating greater freedom and democracy in Taiwan. Mr. Lin became the circulation controller of the magazine.

Mr. Lin Yi-hsiung (right) with his family, approximately one year before the murder of his mother (left) and twin daughters

On December 10, 1979 the magazine planned a gathering in the southern portcity of Kaohsiung to commemorate International Human Rights Day. Mr. Lire was not involved in organizing the rally, nor did he plan to attend. However, during the afternoon of December 10th he received a phone call from Mr. K'ang Ninghsiang, a prominent Tangwai member of the Legislative Yuan (the national parliament). Mr. Wang told him that there was some tension building up in Kaohsiung due to the beatings which two **Formosa** staff members had undergone while in police custody during the previous night. K'ang asked Lin to go along to help calm the situa-tion. The two men arrived in Kaohsiung at approximately 9:30 p.m. Earlier in the evening some confrontations had taken place between the police and the crowd, but at the time of Wang's and Lin's arrival the crowd was peacefully standing in front of the local **Formosa** office, listening to a speech by Taiwan's most prominent woman's rights leader, Ms. Lü Hsiulien (see our publication ***The Kaohsiung Tapes***).

Shortly afterwards riot troops and police approached and new fighting broke out between people at the fringes of the crowd and the approaching police. Mr. Wang addressed the rally, and also urged the police and riot troops to stay away in order to avoid further confrontations. Mr. Lire was introduced to the crowd, but did not make a speech. The police and riot troops subsequently dispersed the crowd using several dozen trucks, teargas, shields and electric prods. The gathering thus need-lessly ended in chaos.

On December 13 1979 Mr. Lire and more than 150 other "nonparty" leaders and members were arrested by the authorities. They were held incommunicado for more than two months. On February 26, 1980 Mr. Lin and eight other detained Taiwanese leaders were told that on the next day they would be allowed to in see their relatives. Mr. Lin was warned by his interrogators not to tell his family about the "treatment" he had received during 42 days of interrogation, or else "unfavorable" things could happen to his relatives (see the **New York Times** article above).

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1980

World News Briefs

Taiwan Dissident, on Trial, Says Kin Were Threatened

Special to The New York Times

TAIPEI, Taiwan, March 25 — A Taiwanese opposition politician on trial for sedition told the military court today that his interrogators threatened him, saying that "unfavorable" things could happen to his family two days before his mother and twin daughters were murdered.

Lin Yi-hsiung, 39 years old, a provincial legislator and one of eight opposition activists standing trial for "attempting to overthrow the Government by illegal means," made the accusation when the court was investigating whether the confessions of the defendants were obtained improperly.

Mr. Lin told the court that on Feb. 26, the day before he was allowed his first family visit after being held incommunicado for two months, his interrogators warned him that he should not disclose to his family members the "treatment" he had received during 42 days of interrogation.

One day after Mr. Lin was visited by his family, his mother and 6-year-old twin daughters were stabbed to death in their Taipei home. Another 9-year-old daughter was severely wounded but survived.

The police say they have found no clues in their search for the killer.

On February 27, 1980 Mr. Lin's wife and mother visited him. His mother asked him repeatedly: "*Have you been tortured ?"* He responded: *"Don't ask me such questions;*

you know what kind of things happen here." The next day at around noontime his mother and sevenyears old twindaughters were stabbed to death in their home. A third daughter was seriously wounded. The house had been under police surveillance since Mr. Lin's arrest in midDecember. However, the police declared that they hadn't seen anybody enter the house, and ***until now, February 1983, the authori-ties say that the perpetrators of this terrorist act "cannot be found***."

In March 1980 Mr. Lin and seven other opposition leaders went on trial for "attempting to overthrow the government" and "inciting a riot." The prosecutor charged that Mr. Lin had "incited the crowd to attack the police" at the Kaohsiung rally. The tape recordings of the Kaohsiung incident prove this contention to be utterly false. However, the mili-tary court refused to hear the tapes and decided that Mr. Lin's confes-sion (extracted under torture) was "sufficient evidence" and sentenced him to twelve years imprisonment.

Right after the murders took place Mr. Lin was released for a number of weeks. During this time he wrote an account of his interrogation, titled "My Detention", which was published in the summer 1980 issue of **SPEAHR--head**, the Bulletin of the Society for the Protection of East Asians' Human Rights (SPEAHR, P.O. Box 1212, New York, 10025).

Mr. Lin is being held at Hsintien prison near Taipei. Friends and rela-tives in Taiwan have expressed the fear that the continued incarceration will permanently damage his mental health. Both the Taiwan Provincial Assembly and opposition publications such as **The Eighties**, **Cultivate**, and **Care** as well as the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan have appealed to the Government to release Mr. Lin, but to no avail.

We urge our readers to send letters requesting the release of Mr. Lin on humanitarian grounds to:

President Chiang Chingkuo
Chiehshou Hall
Chungking South Road
Taipei, TAIWAN

Prime Minister Sun Yunsuan
Executive Yuan
1, Chunghsiao East Road, Section 1
Taipei, TAIWAN

In your appeals to these officials you may say that Mr. Lin's release would be warmly welcomed, both in Taiwan and abroad. You may refer to the petition of the Taiwan Provincial Assembly, signed by 52 of its members in the summer of 1982, which asked the central government to grant amnesty to Mr. Lin. Also mention the fact that in November 1982 all members of the county council of Ilan County (on the east coast of Taiwan) signed an appeal urging the government to release Lm Yi-hsiung. In an editorial, Taiwanbased **The Asian Monthly** magazine (no. 20, January 1983) called these appeals *the major news-story of Taiwan in 1982*. The magazine's editors state:

"Of all the political prisoners, Mr. Lin Yihsiung has received the most sympathy from all the people in Taiwan and overseas. He is a kind and softspoken man. His enthusiasm and righteousness radiated out to other people. His work in the Provincial Assembly was praised by everyone. Even the most conservative KMTofficials and the hostile officials of the security organizations respected him.

He has suffered the most unbearable of human tragedies. Every citizen in this country shares his grief. However, the leadership of the KMT is not moved at all. They don't even dare to discuss the possibility of amnesty.

The New Year has just begun. Only if Lin Yihsiung is released, then can we begin to have hope for the future of our country. Taiwan's road to democracy will be very rough and bumpy if Mr. Lin and the other political prisoners are not released."

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Kaohsiung, three years after

Press conference in Washington

On the occasion of the third anniversary of the Kaohsiung incident U.S. Senator Edward M. Kennedy organized a press conference to appeal for the release of political and religious prisoners in Taiwan, and for full demo-cracy and respect for human rights on the island. The press conference took place on Friday December 10, 1982 in the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington D.C. Senator Kennedy was joined by:

Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA)

Mr. William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk of
the General Assembly
of the United Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A.

Professor James D. Seymour, Member, National
Advisory Committee
Amnesty International U.S.A.

Dr. Trong R. Chai, President
Formosan Association for Public Affairs

Senator Kennedy's statement

"Today marks the 34th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations. That document served notice that concern for human rights transcends national boun-daries. It committed the world community to speak out against human rights abuses wherever they occur, and challenged international leaders to prevent future violations. The declaration symbolized the entitlement of all peoples in ,all parts of the world to obser-vance of uniform standards of human rights.

But now, December 10 has assumed a double significance for the cause of human rights. On this date in 1979, the authorities cracked down on a human rights rally in Taiwan's second largest city, Kaohsiung. Eight opposition leaders were arrested, convicted for sedition, and received prison sentences ranging from 12 years to life. There was no evidence that their testimony about torture was ever seriously investigated.

Subsequently, the General Secretary of the Presbyterian Church of Taiwan, Reverend C.M. Kao, and nine other church leaders, were arrested for working with the opposition. These politicians and reli-gious leaders remain imprisoned today, and the martial law provi-sions under which these punishments were imposed remain in effect. In fact, martial law has been in force on Taiwan for 33 years.

I have had a longstanding interest in the relationship between the United States and those who live on Taiwan. I am proud of my role in the Senate as a principal sponsor of the Taiwan Security Reso-lution in 1979, now part of the law of our land. In that Resolu-tion, Congress reassured the people of Taiwan about our concern for their security and prosperity and for lasting peace in the area.

But political repression on Taiwan blights our mutual interests and undermines ties between our two peoples. I have spoken out against serious human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China, with which we are building an important new relationship, and I believe that the American people cannot stand aloof from capricious imprison-ment and persecution in Taiwan.

Last May, Senator Pell, Speaker O'Neill and Congressmen Solarz and Leach joined me in calling for an end to martial law and for pro-gress toward restoring individual freedoms and human rights for all the people of Taiwan. We called then, and I reaffirm this call today, on the authorities in Taiwan to release the political and re-ligious leaders imprisoned after the Kaohsiung incident. I have sought improvements in the prison conditions endured by Reverend Kao and Lin Yihsiung, the brave assemblyman whose mother and two

daughters were murdered after his arrest, and I am pleased to hear that conditions have improved to some extent.

Last August, the Taiwan Provincial Assembly called for the release of Assemblyman Lin, and just last month the Governor of Taiwan agreed to transmit the Assembly's request to government and party officials who share responsibility for this decision. I hope that the authorities will respond favorably to this and other pleas for the release of Reverend Kao and too many other citizens who are still jailed in Taiwan. Their only crime has been to express their political beliefs and defend their human rights.

I am therefore renewing my call for the leaders of Taiwan to release all political and religious prisoners, to end the repressive reign of martial law, to guarantee basic rights for all, and to permit increased participation in government by the island's people.

I welcome the fact that the proportion of native Taiwanese serving as local officials has increased, that fair local elections have taken place, and that restrictions have been reduced on freedom of speech and association. However, a small minority of mainland Chinese living on Taiwan still retain virtually full control of national affairs; genuine opposition political parties are outlawed, and press censorship and other political controls persist on the island. I believe a more broadlybased government, with greater support for democracy and respect for human rights, offers the best hope for Taiwan's continued peace, stability and wellbeing.

In an eloquent appeal last September, four of the leading political and religious prisoners called democracy "the most effective way to counter the threat of communism." They argued that "the strongest force in modern society is freedom of choice expressed by the people through voting." They petitioned the authorities "to end repressive rule and quickly return political power to the people." Immediately after this statement was made public, it was banned by an official order prohibiting any person or organization from reproducing it.

On this 34th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, let us recommit ourselves to the cause of human dignity -in Taiwan as well as in other parts of the world and in the United States itself and above all, let us recommit ourselves to up-holding the cause of human rights in this country's foreign policy. Let us show that the American heritage of concern for human rights remains as vigorous as ever, and that the cause of full human rights for all peoples on this earth shall never die."

Senator Kennedy then proceeded to introduce the three other speakers at the press conference, Mr. William Thompson, Professor James Seymour, and Dr. Trong Chai, who each made a statement, after which the four respon-ded to questions from the reporters present.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Democracy and/or unification?

During the past few months the question of "democracy" versus "unifi-cation" has been a hot topic in Taiwan. The debate started on September 28, 1982 when four imprisoned native Taiwanese leaders issued a joint statement from prison in which they said:

"The long separation between Taiwan and mainland China has resulted in distinct differences between the two societies. Unification of Taiwan and China is a traditional desire of old Chinese rulers, but democracy is the common goal of people in our time. ***As we cannot have both, we would prefer to have democracy*** [Emphasis added -Ed.]. Unification without the support of the people will cause much injury and suffering to most of our (Taiwanese) people." (See the full text of the joint statement in ***Taiwan Communiqué*** no. 9, October 28, 1982).

During the weeks following September 28th, the joint statement was vici-ously attacked by the proKuomintang press in Taiwan. The few nonKuo-mintang publications were prohibited from even reproducing the statement.

Mrs. Hsü Jung-shu's interpellation

The discussion also reached the Legislative Yuan, when on October 15, 1982, legislator Mrs. Hsü Jungshu, wife of imprisoned Taiwan Provincial Assemblyman Chang Chünhung, urged Premier Sun Yunsuan in an interpel-lation to adopt the principle of selfdetermination for Taiwan, that is "the future of Taiwan should be decided by the 18 million people on the island." She said that she was compelled to raise this issue because in the "Shanghai Communiqué no. 2" of August 17, 1982 U.S. President Reagan promised China to gradually reduce weapon sales to Taiwan. It was the first time in the history of Taiwan that the issue of selfdetermination was discussed in the Legislative Yuan. Mrs. Hsü requested the Executive Yuan to answer the following questions:

I a. When will the eighteen million people of Taiwan enjoy full member-ship in the United Nations again?

b. When will the eighteen million people of Taiwan be able to get pass-ports that are recognized by all countries in the world?

c. When will the eighteen million people of Taiwan be able to partici-pate fully in all activities of the international community?

II a. When will the eighteen million people of Taiwan enjoy true demo-cratic rule?

b. When will the eighteen million people of Taiwan be allowed to deter-mine their own future?

Here follow some excerpts from Mrs. Hsü's interpellation:

"Whether we like it or not, the reality is that the international community recognizes the Chinese communists as the government representing China. Stubbornly clinging to the dream of recovering China [by the Nationalist Chinese authorities on Taiwan] will not change this. We must face this reality and recognize that the political and economic policies promulgated here do not stretch beyond Taiwan. For instance, we don't consider that the Election Law applies to the one billion people in China, nor do we claim that the Ten Construction Projects benefit all those people in China.

We talk about democracy in Taiwan. The principle of Democracy implies that sovereignty lies in the hands of the people, i.e. the eighteen million people on Taiwan. The wishes of these people must be respected by the authorities. This is a basic requirement of a democratic political system. If the authorities sincerely want to implement democratic rule, then they must respect the wishes of the eighteen million Taiwanese people.

The "outsidetheparty" politicians have been accused of being "too ambitious." We have indeed an ambition, and that is to promote democratic rule. We have also been accused of "separatism." We indeed want to separate a democratic Taiwan from a dictatorially--ruled China.

Therefore, I recommend that the authorities allow an open discussion on the future of Taiwan. There should be public hearings on this issue, so that our people can form their opinions as to what model might be most appropriate for Taiwan. There have been a number of scholars, who have proposed a variety of solutions, such as:

1. Wei Yung's "multisystem" model.
2. Professor Parris Chang's "Singapore" model.
3. At one point in time the U.S. Government was very enthusiastic about the "German" model.
4. Some scholars have proposed to let the people decide according to the principle of self determination.

Prime Minister Sun Yun-suan's response

Here follows some excerpts from the statement which Prime Minister Sun made in response the questions posed by Mrs. Hsü's and those of several other nonKuomintang members of the Legislative Yuan:

According to our Constitution, the territory of our Republic of China includes mainland China, Taiwan and the Pescadores. The population of the Republic of China is thus comprised of our compa-triots on the mainland China, on Taiwan, and the 25 million overseas Chinese. Taiwan is inseparable from China from the ethnic, cultu-ral, historical and geographic point of view. Furthermore Taiwan was freed from the Japanese occupation after millions of people sacrificed their lives in the SinoJapanese war.

In view of what I have said, it follows that the "Taiwan question" does not exist [!!?? Ed.], but that there is only a "China question." Only if this "China question" can be solved that is the unification of China under the banner of the Three Peoples' Principles then can we guarantee a free and prosperous future of Taiwan. This is not only a cultural and historical fact, but it is also an international political reality. This reality cannot be denied or changed by a few people.

Therefore, under these circumstances we have to unite. Only unity can guarantee security and prosperity for the people in Taiwan. All separatist ideas and independencemindedness must be abolished. During the conference I held for the foreign press on June 16, 1982 I said: "The China question can be solved through the joint effort of the people on Taiwan, the 25 million overseas Chinese, and our suffering compatriots in mainland China." Therefore any solution which only focuses on Taiwan without mentioning the unification of China will not solve the problem facing us, but will only have serious consequences.

The Eighties' editorial

During the weeks following this exchange of views in the Legislative Yuan the pro government press again made vicious attacks against Mrs. Hsu and praised Premier Sun's statement as if it contained the ultimate wisdom. In December **The Eighties Monthly** magazine (No. 29, Dec. 1982, published by opposition leader K'ang Ninghsiang) printed an editorial giving a rebuttal. When reading this editorial one must keep in mind that outspoken opposition against the idea of unification is not allowed in Taiwan (and punishable by imprisonment).

1. The question of the Tangwai's advocacy of selfdetermination: we have stated that *"The future of Taiwan should be decided by the 18 million people on Taiwan."* This is labeled by KMT as "separatism" and "independentmindedness." In fact, our diplomatic officers abroad have used the same argument to counter the Communists' peace initiative. This is the most powerful and persuasive argument against Communists' claim of sovereignty over Taiwan.

   Furthermore, if the future of Taiwan is not to be decided by the people who live on Taiwan, ***by whom*** should it then be decided ? By the KMTparty alone, or by the Chinese Communists Party, or by the one billion people in China, or by the 20 million overseas Chinese ?

   The ***tangwai*** have never claimed that the future of Taiwan should be decided by the ***tangwai*** alone. We are in favor of bringing this issue before the people in order to let the people discuss it. We want to hear the opinions of all the people, both Taiwanese and mainlanders. We believe that no country in the world which claims itself to be a democracy would dare oppose the principle of self--determination.

2. The KMT has accused the ***tangwai*** of not wanting unification with China. Our response is that we consider democracy to be more urgent than unification. This is a matter of priority. We do not consider democracy and unification mutually exclusive, but we consider unifi-cation to be meaningless without democracy. The Communists want uni-fication but not democracy, so their lack of democracy is the most important argument we can use against the unification proposals of the Chinese Communists. In other words, the more democratic Taiwan becomes, the more pressure is being exerted on the Communist regime. This will not impede the process of unification, this will only speed up the process of unification."

WALL STREET JOURNAL
The dwindling importance of Taiwan-mainland unification

On October 18, 1982 this New Yorkbased businesspaper published an inte-resting article on the question of the "Taiwan factor" in China's atti-tudes and policies towards Hongkong. Mr. Robert Keatley, editor of **The Asian Wall Street Journal**, presented a perceptive analysis of this situ-ation. Below, we present some quotes that are of direct relevance to the discussion of the future of Taiwan:

Peking gives unification with Taiwan the highest priority, far ahead of the Hongkong issue. China's "fervent aspiration for reunifi-cation has become a strong historical

trend that no one can resist," Foreign Minister Huang Hua said in New York the other day, and is "the common aspiration of one billion Chinese people."

But the truth is more complex. Many people on the mainland, accor-ding to those with connections there, don't really care all that much about Taiwan. They'd prefer to see it join the rest of China, naturally, yet can't get as excited about it as they do about more immediate issues particularly domestic economy and political matters that affect them personally.

Meantime, much the same is true on Taiwan, other experts say. Unifi-cation remains a burning desire for the elderly men who command the Kuomintang (Nationalist) Party, though obviously not on Peking's terms. They are refugees from the mainland who hold, as do their communist rivals, a vision of China strong and united. (That KMT version also includes absorbing Hongkong someday). But the Taiwa-nese themselves those who lived there before the Nationalists took over after 1945, plus their descendants don't share that view. They're not antagonistic toward China, but for the sake of their own political and economic wellbeing, they don't want to become part of it.

The article then focuses on the consequences of the facts described above upon the attitudes of China's leaders towards Hong Kong. Further on it switches to Taiwan again:

Taiwan was never integrated closely into the mainland's political life, nor was it of crucial economic value. Chinese people didn't settle there in large numbers before the 17th century recent days in Chinese terms and there were only 30,000 by 1624 when the Dutch seized the island. The Dutch soon drove out rival Spaniards but later lost out to a Chinese invader known in the West as Koxinga. He tried to keep the island apart from Peking's rule but was overpowered by the Manchus in 1683.

Yet, this didn't make Taiwan vital to the empire. For two centuries it was mainly a refuge for poor Chinese emigrants, and wasn't a province until 1886, long after the British settled in Hong Kong. And even that didn't last long. Japan seized Taiwan in 1895 and kept it as a colony for 50 years. The Nationalists arrived after World War II, ***brutally suppressed local opposition*** [emphasis added Ed.] and then after their mainland defeat turned it into the economic success it is today.

But its success is quite unrelated to the mainland. Despite histo-rical and cultural links, Taiwan never had a broad interchange with the continent, which made it known, admired and coveted throughout Chinese society.

Meantime, many Taiwanese consider the KMT officials as interlopers who impose an imperfect rule. Mutual prosperity long ago muted these resentments but some linger. In particular, Taiwanese fear the Nationalists may try to strike a deal with Peking, risking their freedoms and affluence for a theoretical unity of little meaning to them. Chances of such a deal may be slim, but they'll certainly be slimmer when the present Nationalist leaders, who recall their main-land days wistfully, give way to officials who have never crossed the Taiwan Straits.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

You Ch'ing's proposal for a new political party

The following is a translation of an editorial from **Taiwan Panorama,** the new monthly magazine published by Control Yuan member dr. You Ch'ing, who is one of Taiwan's foremost lawyers. The editorial appeared in issue no. 2 of the magazine, which was confiscated by the Taiwan Garrison Command on October 4, 1982 and subsequently banned because of this editorial (see ***Taiwan Communiqué*** no. 9, page 21) and because of another article discussing the various attempts which had been made since 1960 to get permission to start a new party. The editorial was written by Dr. You himself and was titled "What is the basis of the Government's ban on the formation of new parties ?"

"On September 24, Lin Yangkang, the Minister of Interior said, in a reply to an inquiry about the formation of new political parties, that if an attempt is made to form a new party, the executive branch must resort to the law to stop such activities.

The Executive Yuan gave two reasons: 1) We are facing the Chinese Communists across the Taiwan Straits, therefore the country is in a very precarious situation. 2) To grant permission to form new parties will result in the proliferation of parties. This could cause instability.

We consider the two reasons given by the Executive Yuan to be far-fetched, and not based on historical evidence: the multiparty systems in other countries of the world were also developed when those countries faced difficult circumstances. We also feel that the executive branch cannot "resort to the law" to prevent new parties from being formed, because neither the Constitution nor any other law specifically forbids the formation of new parties. Below we present our arguments point by point in order to make our posi-tion clear.

1. War should not present a barrier to the formation of new parties.

Israel is virtually the only country in the world which is constant-ly engulfed in wars. However, their opposition Labor Party was still able to protest in the parliament the massacre of the Pales-tine refugees in West Beirut. They even demonstrated in the streets of Jerusalem. They demanded Begin to resign. The NATO coun-tries in Europe and the Warsaw Pact countries all have soldiers and weapons stationed on their borders. South and North Korea are only separated by the 38 degree demilita-rized zone. There is no natural barrier between the two countries. It is very likely that a war can break out any minute there. We are facing the Chinese Communists across the relatively wide Taiwan Channel. If Israel can have many active political parties, while they are actually engaged in fighting, why can't we when war looms only as a potential threat over the horizon ?

2. The time is right to form new parties.

The most important aspect of political life for citizens of a demo-cracy is to engage in the activities of political parties. Freedom of speech allows the citizens to voice their opinions. But poli-tical parties are the means by which political opinions can have any impact on policies. At present over ninety percent of the residents on Taiwan and Penghu (the Pescasdores) are not members of the KMT or the two small parties Taiwan Youth Party and Democratic Socia-list Party. Even many members of the KMT are disenchanted, and do not identify themselves with the KMT. Even prominent KMT members who have been member of the KMT for ten or twenty years have all departed. They should be given the opportunity to look for alter-natives.

The three principles of party politics in a democracy are (1) the existence of more than one party, (2) freedom to join and leave a political party, and (3) fair competition. The freedom to join and leave a political party is the basic principle of democracy. The formation of new political parties in Taiwan would offer a choice and freedom of affiliation to both those who have never been member of a political party ,and to KMT members.

3. To have "too many political parties" should be the least of our worries.

In many democratic countries, the law stipulates that a political party must receive a minimum of five percent of the vote in national or local elections, otherwise they cannot be represented in the parliament or the city council. Under this restriction, it would be possible to establish three, four or five political parties. With regard to

the question whether forming a political party is against the interest of the country and the people or not, thAt should be decided by the public opinion, and not just by the arbi-trary decision of the party in power.

4. There is no legal barrier to the formation of a new party.

Our Constitution guarantees the freedom of forming political parties. At present there is no law which prohibits the formation of political parties. Even under Martial Law there is no provision stipulating a "party ban." Therefore we have to rely on our Consti-tution. If someone argues that article no. 11 of the Martial Law is the basis for "party ban", then this is a twisted interpretation of the words of the law. Article no. 11 says that in the area where martial law is imposed, the highest commander has the authority to stop or dissolve any organization which jeopardizes military operations. The formation of a political party has nothing to do with military affairs. How can it jeopardize military operations ?

In no democratic country is there a need to ask for permission to form a new political party. Only if the political party acts against the Constitution, th6n the courts have the authority to dissolve it. In constitutional democracies one never hears the statement that forming or dissolving of a political party should be decided by the executive branch. We have not found any legal barrier to the formation of new political parties. The reply by the Executive Yuan given in the inquiry in the Legislative Yuan is only an indication of its policy. It does not have any legal implication. It would be against the spirit of our Constitution if the Executive Yuan tries to turn this policy into an executive order, or try to enact it into law. If that happens, we will fight in the court.

5. The people of our country should decide whether to form new politi-cal parties or not.

As the law doesn't ban the formation of new political parties, then the question whether to form or not to form new parties should be presented to the people and they should decide in a referendum. Prohibiting the formation of a new political party is not a chal-lenge to the organizers [of a potential new party Ed.], it is rather a challenge to see whether our country abides by the prin-ciples of democracy. It is a challenge to our country's image in the international community.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The Kuomintang's spying in the USA

Recently the issue of spying by Taiwan government agents at university campuses in the United States was in the news again. On November 5, 1982 the campus newspaper of the University of Illinois, **The Daily Illini**, published an extensive article by its reporter Larry Cohler. The article, titled "Made in Taiwan" presents in depth information on the setup of the Kuomintang's spynetwork in the United States and on the practices of the agents.

The article starts with a reference to cases of spying at other univer-sities in the U.S. (see list of articles below) and discusses the case of Professor Chen Wencheng of CarnegieMellon University, who went on a familyvisit to Taiwan in the summer of 1981 and was found murdered after a thirteenhour interrogation by the Taiwan Garrison Command (see our report "It was murder" in ***Taiwan Communiqué*** no. 5, December 25, 1981 and "CarnegieMellon University report" in ***Taiwan Communiqué*** no. 9, October 28, 1982). The **Daily Illini** article reports that even Taiwan's own officials acknowledge the spying:

> Finally, the official daily newspaper of Taiwan's ruling (and effec-tively only) party reported that martial law authorities had received "accusations" about Chen's activities in the United States which led to his interrogation. Commander Wang Chinghsu of the Taiwan Garrison Command explained to Chinese scholars from the United States that not every returning professor need fear being brought in for questioning only those whose files indicate a need. Then, he said, authorities are quite willing to hear the interviewee's ideas and not base its action "exclusively on reports filed by informants."

The article continues with a brief description of several other cases which occurred at universities in different parts of the United States from 1966 through 1981. It then focuses on the attention paid to it by the U.S. government:

> In 1979, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued a report addressing [the problem]. With access to government intelli-gence sources, committee legal counsel Michael Glennon reported that in 1978, the total number of Taiwan intelligence officers in the United States was estimated by the CIA at 45, with nine on univer-sity campuses. The FBI estimate cited in the report, however, was 25 on campuses. This network, in turn, relied on paid informants to infiltrate the U.S. Chinese community. Although the report acknow-ledged that "some agents who spied on their fellow students were apparently volunteers," the fulltime agents reportedly received $ 1,100. per month, plus a car. None were registered [with the U.S. Attorney General; a requirement under U.S. law Ed.].

CIA sources also told Glennon that by August, 1978, the Republic of China had recruited four wellknown American professors as part of its operations. Each received an allowance and instructions from the Ministry of Defense in Taipei. The report said this network's primary job was to mobilize proTaiwan crowds on politically impor-tant occasions, to monitor dissident groups, and to recruit sympa-thizers. It operated with the full knowledge of the State Department.

Former Committee Chairman Frank Church commissioned this report, which inves-tigated several foreign government intelligence opera-tions in the United States. Though classified, it was obtained by columnist Jack Anderson and the **Far Eastern Economic Review**.

At their House Foreign Affairs subcommittee hearings [on July 30, 1981] Congress-men Solarz and Leach located one source who had been recruited as a campus informant by the KMT, according to Fulton Arm-strong, Leach aide on Asian affairs. The source mostly corroborated information the congressional staff had developed elsewhere. The committee members learned that all ROC students going abroad for study are briefed by the Ministry of Education before departure. They get useful orientation on America which often includes a section on the great danger posed by the "Taiwan Independence Move-ment" or the "Chicom United Front." Names of people and groups they should avoid here are often included.

Special restricted briefings are arranged for KMT members who have been especially supportive during their military service or under-graduate study. Here they learn of specific problems on campuses they are bound for. It is also here that some offer to "help out" with information about people once they reach their campus. A Uni-versity student in the KMT here emphasized that the number involved in this is very small.

Once on campus, monitoring activities are coordinated by a campus squad leader, who is also responsible for the budget. These leaders are chosen with great care in Taiwan, and are usually aware of most surveillance activities on their campuses. They are often the main liaison between campus informants and the nearest government office (embassy or consulate). Hard evidence on payments for reports is hard to come by. Armstrong admitted the subcommittee found none. Informants told of scholar-ships or airline discounts being used. A KMT member close to several in the active circle here [at the University of Illinois] reported as "stronger than rumor" that useful information on three dissidents could net $ 75.-"It used to be $ 50. " he said, "but inflation drove it higher."

The article then continues with a detailed description of the activities and methods of the Kuomintang agents at the University of Illinois. A week later, on November 12, 1982, **The Daily Illini** printed a strong edi-torial, titled *"Campus informers must be checked,"* condemning the activi-ties of the agents and urging the University of Illinois to take appro-priate action, as had happened at other universities.

Previous newspaper reports about KMT spying

Below we give a listing of previous newspaper articles about this issue, both in campuses newspapers and in regular U.S. newspapers and weekly magazines. We must emphasize that this list is by no means exhaustive: there have been a considerable number of other publications throughout the U.S. which have paid attention to the problem. For example, the **Honolulu Advertiser** of May 30, 1978 refers to articles in the **Daily Californian** of the University of California at Berkeley (1976), the **Gainesville Sun** (Georgia, 1976), and the campus newspaper at Columbia University New York, 1978). We were not able to obtain the exact dates of appearance and titles of these articles yet. The purpose of publish-ing this list is to give an indication of the extent and "longevity" of the problem.

1976: **Christian Science Monitor,** March 30, 1976: *'Spy charges surface at MIT.'*

The Tech (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), April 2, 1976: *'MIT investi-gating spy charges.'*

The Graduate (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), April 8, 1976: *'Taiwan deal: military or peaceful project ?'*

The Harvard Crimson, April 14, 1976: *'MIT students hit Taiwan aid, discuss campus spy charges.'*

1977: **University of Washington Daily**, December 57, 1977*: 'Students charge Taiwan government spies.'*

1978: **The Honolulu Advertiser**, May 30, 1978: *'National KMT spy network re-ported through campuses.'*

The Honolulu Advertiser, December 17, 1978: *'Spying on the University of Hawaii campus.'*

1981: **University of Minnesota Daily**, January 10, 1981: *'Spying feared among Taiwanese students.'*

University of Minnesota Daily, January 29, 1981: *'Taiwanese espionage continued from the 1960's'.*

Chicago Tribune, July 30, 1981: *'Spying on foreign students.'*

Chicago SunTimes, July 31, 1981: *'Taiwan spies on U.S. students.'*

Washington Post, August 6, 1981: *'Spy story.'*

The Tech (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), October 9, 1981: 'International *students report spying by foreign government agents.'*

1982: **Wall Street Journal**, March 8, 1982: *'Taiwanese students bring fierce rivalries to U.S. campuses.'*

Newsweek, May 17, 1982: *'Spies in the classroom.'*

International Herald Tribune, June 2, 1982*: 'Taiwan's spies wage skillful covert war inside the U.S.'*

The Daily Illini, November 5, 1982: *'Campus spies, made in Taiwan.'*

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Prison Report

After the publication of their joint statement on September 28, 1982, the four **Formosa** prisoners were not allowed to see their families for three weeks (see ***Taiwan Communiqué*** no. 9, October 28, 1982). On October 27 the families were finally permitted to enter Chingmei prison for half an hour to visit their loved ones.

Following are excerpts from an interview) of two of the wives with **CARE** magazine No. 11. In the first interview Mrs. Hsü Jungshu, herself a member of Taiwan's Legis-lative Yuan, talks about her visit to her husband, Chang Chünhung. In the second interview Mrs. Chou Chingyu, member of the National Assem-bly, relates what happened during her visit to her imprisoned husband, lawyer Yao Chiawen.

Hsü Jung-shu's prison visit

Q: How is your husband Chang Chün-hung? Did he receive any "special treatment" ? [This refers to possible mistreatment of the imprisoned opposition leaders as a result of the publication of their joint statement Ed.].

Mrs. Hsu Jung-shu

A: When I saw him, he was very calm. I could feel that he was not subjected to any "special treatment." Immediately he began to ask me about what happened outside. I told him about the series of events after the publication of the joint statement on September 28 such as the attacks in the media against the joint state-ment. I told him about the session in the Legislative Yuan -including the discussion on the future of Taiwan, and Fei Hsiping's inquiry on the China issue. I also told about the reply of Premier Sun, who stated that only the China issue exists, and that the Taiwan issue does not exist. So Fei Hsiping [a courageous main-lander member of the ***tangwai*** group Ed.] said that if only the issue of China exists, then he wants to discuss it in the session. Premier Sun replied that discussing such an issue is "against our fundamental national policy." I told my husband that such a conclusion is not logical and contradictory. All of a sudden, our conversation was interrupted by a rude warning "You cannot talk about politics, you can only discuss your household matters." I was furious and shouted back "Only household matters ? ***These*** are our household matters !!" My husband changed the subject by asking about the children.

Q: You have to pay a price for your ideals. For instance, when you decided to issue the joint statement, you knew you had to pay a price for it, and your were all prepared to do it. What is your view on this ?

A: From the past until the present many Taiwanese have been working towards the ideal of a free and democratic Taiwan. In the future many more people will follow. The **Formosa** people are only a very small part. They all came from welltodo families, they have a decent profession and have received higher education. They don't have to go to prison. Why have, during the past 30 years, so many people been willing to sacrifice their lives, their own future, their family? These conscientious Taiwanese are trying to prove that democracy is the ideal of all the Taiwanese people.

For many years, not only people abroad have considered Taiwan as an independent political entity, even the *KMT* regime's own political and economical policies have only Taiwan as the framework of ope-ration. The political and economical policies of the *KMT* regime are designed for the 18 million people on Taiwan, not for the one billion people in China. If *KMT* says that their policy of encou-raging foreign investment applies to the whole China, would any-body believe it ? If the *KMT* regime also claims that the ten construction projects are for the benefit of the one billion people in China, would anybody believe it ?

The reason why I am saying all this is that I want to point out the fact that is, not only the foreign countries, even the *KMT* regime has the same views as the Taiwanese people they all regard Taiwan as an independent entity. This has been an obvious fact for several decades. But the *KMT* refuses to recognize this fact. This refusal to face reality has created a crisis for Taiwan. *KMT's* pragmatic politics and its economic policy are all based on Taiwan as its framework. But subjectively the *KMT* strongly denies that they are restricted by this framework, that this framework functions as an independent unit. Unless the *KMT* faces reality, Taiwan can never evade a crisis and the *KMT* regime will continue face the challenge of those who love Taiwan, and who are concerned about Taiwan.

The publication of the Shanghai Communiqué No. 2 again crystallized the crisis of Taiwan. The *KMT* cannot avoid this crisis. Anyone who is concerned about the future of Taiwan, whether he is in prison or outside prison will show their concern about this crisis. The four of them, although they are already languishing in prison, they are not afraid of further mistreatment. They continue to publish their views on the national affairs, because they cannot bear not to recognize the reality of Taiwan. We as their families, will carry on in their spirit and work toward this goal."

Chou Ching-yü: "They cut off the telephone"

Q: October 27 is the first visit after the threeweek ban. How is lawyer Yao ?

A: He looks the same. Perhaps it is due to my own anxiety, but I felt that he looked paler than before, he has more grey hair. But we could not talk about what happened inside the prison during these past three weeks.

Q: There are rumors that they might have received some kind of mistreatment. Do you think so ?

The fact that they were not allowed to see their families for three weeks is itself a very severe punishment. Al-though we don't think that they should be punished, we cannot do much about it. Although they are in prison, they are still citizens of this country. The loss of physical freedom does not diminish their concern for the country. It is due to this deep concern for the coun-try that they tried to express their views.

Chou Ching-yü

Compared to those who do not care and do not think, they deserve more of our respect. We didn't expect that part of this statement would be quoted out of context. It also became the subject of malicious attacks and criticism. Thus I feel that our husbands were severely punished by being denied to see their families for three weeks.

I could not see any signs that he was mistreated. He wanted me to thank all the friends for their concern.

Q: Can you describe the details of your visit?

A: Taking with me special dishes, fruits, the concern of many people and with much excitement in my heart, I went to the prison. But instead I was confronted with extreme tension and oppressive atmos-phere. The guards gave me an icy warning: "From now on, we have to be very strict. The high authorities have ordered that you can only talk in Chinese, no Taiwanese or English during your meeting. You cannot display photographs, books, newspapers, magazines or index cards in front of the window. Even a glance [at any written or printed information] is forbidden."

During the meeting, we are separated by iron bars and glass and con-verse through telephone. We have heard that the detention center has a new deputy chief who is famous for his "cleverness." He has sworn that he is going to take very good care of them. They have strengthened all their surveillance. Even the gutters are covered to prevent any possible opportunity of contact between the prisoners.

Less than 10 minutes after we started to talk, there was another voice in our telephone: "Mrs. Yao, you cannot speak English. You receive one warning." It is only our habit that we would mix one or two English words in our conversation. We tried to explain to the voice in the air. Beyond our expectation, the reply was: "Your time is over." Our telephone was disconnected.

Q: What is your reaction then?

A: I knew that protest to the air is completely useless. I began to write on the index cards and tried to start a written conversation. The guard immediately stopped me. He said: "The order from the higher authorities forbids writing on paper." I wanted him to tell me which law and regulation says that writing on paper is forbidden. We received only empty answers: "Orders from above."

The telephone was disconnected, we were not allowed to converse by writing. He was prevented from writing on the paper "buy SKB ballpoint pen filling." Even under their continuous interruptions, we tried to carry our conversation by writing intermittently. Then a military officer appeared. After all they cannot too overtly abuse their power, so they finally restored our telephone connection.

Where is YangChin-hai?

Mr. Yang Chinhai was the campaign manager for Mr. Yen Min-shen, a nonKuomintang politician in Kaohsiung who ran for a seat in the Legislative Yuan in the elections of 1975. In the Spring of 1976 they were arrested and accused of "sedition." They were tried in closed military court. Mr. Yen was sentenced to ten years imprison-ment, while Mr. Yang received a life sentence. Both men have been adopted by Amnesty International as prisoners of conscience.

The following is a translation of an article by Mrs. Yang, which appeared in **CARE Magazine** no. 11. On November 5, 1982 this issue was banned by Taiwan Garrison Command (TGC), apparently because of this article. Since then the TGC has announced that Mr. Yang has "disappeared" from the mili-tary hospital where he was being treated. The TGC says that Mr. Yang "fled" on November 8, 1982, but the Command didn't make this information public until November 22th after questions had been asked about Mr. Yang's whereabouts in the Legislative Yuan. Mrs. Yang (who wrote the article below) says that it was impossible for Mr. Yang to flee, because he was severely ill and the military hospital is heavily guarded.

During the third week of January the Taiwan Garrison Command announced that Mr. Yang had been "captured" on the evening of January 16th at a bus station in Kaohsiung. However, at the time of this writing (February 13, 1983) nobody not even his wife had been allowed to see Mr. Yang.

Save my Husband Yang Chin-hai

written by Yang Su Hoying (Mrs. Yang Chinhai)

"My husband, Yang Chinhai, was arrested on May 31, 1976 on sedition charges. I believe his involvement in some election disputes resulted in his arrest. He was taken directly to the Investigation Bureau in Taipei. For 56 days, he lived in hell, he could not see day or night. During this period of interrogation, he was subjected to all kinds of torture. The Investigation Bureau interrogators told my husband: "If you don't write in accordance with the confession we prepared for you, we will beat you to death. Then we will declare that you committed sui-cide for fear of punishment."

Mr. Yang Chin-hai

My husband refused to write such a confession which did not conform to the facts. The Investigation Bureau interrogators began to torture him by inserting needles under his finger nails. Then he was beaten severely by six people at a time. Several times the interrogations con-tinued nonstop for 36 hours. He was told by the interrogators again and again: "We don't care whether you have done it or not. As long as you show cooperation, we will forgive you. Refusal to write indicates that you have no intention to cooperate. We cannot forgive you. As long as you write in accordance with the confession we prepared for you, we will forgive you. Within a week you can go home." Under coercion and deceit, my husband still refused to write. He therefore suffered 19 kinds of torture. They are as follows:

1. Beating with fists, elbows and arms. He was beaten so severely that his chest, back, and legs and feet were all covered with blood and scars. Blood came out his mouth. He lost two teeth.

2. Slapping. The interrogators slapped his face and beat his neck until his mouth and gums began to bleed.

3. Kicking. His whole body was kicked by an interrogator with leather shoes on. His feet were so severely injured that he could not even walk anymore.

4. Nonstop interrogation. He went through seven times of nonstop interrogation. Each session lasted for three days and nights. The deprivation of sleep broke him down.

5. He was stripped naked and forced to crawl and bark like a dog on the ground and was given all kinds of verbal smears and humiliation. He was beaten if he didn't perform the way the interrogators wanted.

6. He was stripped naked, forced to kneel down and was ordered to hold onto his feet and jump like a rabbit and was given verbal smears and beating if the interrogators were not satisfied with his answers.

7. The interrogators knew that Yang Chinhai did not smoke. So they put five cigarettes in his mouth at a time and forced him to smoke. He choked and tears came out of his eyes, his nose started to run. He was ordered to stand with his knees bent, his two hands holding onto a ash tray. The cigarette butts were burning his lips but he was not allowed to spit them out.

8. He was ordered to kneel on bamboo sticks, chopsticks and ballpoint pens for several hours until his legs became completely numb.

9. He was ordered to eat one pound of salt and was not given water to drink for a whole day. When he went to the toilet, he took the opportunity to drink the water in the toilet bowl. For a long time he suffered chest pain, numbness in his neck, fever and had difficulty urinating.

10. With his hands tied in the back, his feet cuffed, he was stripped naked. His mouth was stuffed with his own dirty underwear. And the five or six interrogators continued beating and kicking him.

11. With his hands handcuffed, needles were inserted under his finger-nails. Blood streamed out. He screamed with pain.

12. His hands and feet were cuffed together, and he was thrown on the ground. He was kicked continuously by guards with leather shoes on. His body was covered with blood and he was not able to move at all. He was taken to his cell by two guards.

13. The interrogators put ballpoint pen and sticks between his fingers and then squeezed his hands to inflict pain.

14. The interrogators beat him with the pointed end of ballpoint pens, holding on to the tail end of four or five ballpoint pens.

15. He was not allowed to go to the toilet for several days. As a result he had to urinate and excrete in his own pants.

16. He was ordered to eat phlegm from his nose and throat.

17. He was forcefed hot pepper water, which caused a relapse of his ulcer.

18. He had to kneel on ice for several hours.

19. Electric shock. Being tied to a special chair, he was forced to hold on to a telephone which was connected to electricity.

After repeated torture, he was forced to "confess" his crime. Before the case was closed, he had written me a letter asking me to hire a defense lawyer. His letter was confiscated and never reached me. On July 27, 1976, he was sentenced to life imprisonment. The government claims it was an open trial. But the family was not notified at all. It was a mock trial. After two appeals for retrial, his original sentence was upheld. During the retrials, we were not allowed to call our own witnesses to testify.

My husband has been inprisoned on the Green Island for six years. He suffered severe stomach and duodenum ulcer. As a result his stomach has bled many times. The record showed nine times. Each time the bleeding lasted for approximately two weeks. Several times my husband submitted a written application to the prison authorities to go to a hospital for treatment. He was never allowed.

On April 2, 1982 I wrote to the Military Law Bureau of the Ministry of Defense to ask for permission to allow my husband to go to a private hospital for treatment. The reply was negative. On May 20, my husband's stomach bled again. It was so severe that he almost became unconscious. He was then taken to the Army hospital in Taitung.

On July 9, for the second time I asked for permission to help my husband to go to a private hospital for treatment. But on July 14, he was taken back to Green Island. Three days later, his stomach started to bleed again. They waited until August 17 to send him to the army hospital in Taitung.

It has been three months now since July 14, when I applied for my husband to go to a private hospital for treatment. I have not re-ceived any reply from the authorities. On September 19, I went to the no. 832 army hospital in Taitung to visit my husband. On October 15, I went there again to see my husband. During the conver-sation, I

realized that my husband's letter of September 21 had not been sent to me, but had been confiscated. His four other letters were also confiscated. My husband used to write one letter home each week. Except for those which he had to rewrite at the request of prison authorities, all the rest arrived on time. But since September 19, I have not received any letter.

I pray our benevolent government will bestow us a special favor so that my husband can be released to come home for treatment of his illness. Your immense benevolence will never be forgotten."

On December 24, 1982 the U.S.based **Formosan Association for Human Rights** (FAHR) started a campaign to help Mrs. Yang find out the where-abouts of her husband. In an appeal to U.S. Congressmen and to Amnesty International FAHR said:

"Mrs. Yang has maintained that her husband was too ill to make such an escape. When police did visit her they were more interested in finding out who helped her writing her formal appeal than in ob-taining information about her husband's whereabouts. So far, the KMTregime has uncharacteristically shown no sign of urgency in the searching of Mr. Yang.

Suspicion is thus heightened that this may turn out to be a replay of the "suicide" of Dr. Chen Wencheng, a CarnegieMellon University professor who was on a homevisit to Taiwan, and was found dead on a Taipei campus in July 1981 after being detained by the Taiwan Garrison Command.

Another cause for concern is the fact that Mr. Yang's brother who had been actively publicizing Mr. Yang's ordeal was mysteriously murdered in Hong Kong in March 1981. The circumstance surrounding his death are remini-scent of the fate suffered by Mr. Lin Yihsiung's mother and twin-daughters. They were brutally murdered after the mother revealed Mr. Lin's abuse while he was held in connection with the Kaohsiung Incident.

All of the above circumstances cause us to suspect foul play in the case of Mr. Yang Chinhai. We hereby urgently ask you to inquire with the Taiwan authorities on the "disappearance" of Mr. Yang Chinhai."

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Articles and Publications

1. **Taiwan Church News: English language edition**. In October 1982 this publication of the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan started an occa-sional bulletin in English. The first issue carried news about the esta-blishment of Gikong Presbyterian Church in the former residence of imprisoned Provincial Assemblyman Lin Yihsiung in Taipei. The issue also reported on the weekly fasting and prayer meetings, which are held for the families of those who were imprisoned after the Kaohsiung inci-dent. On the condition of imprisoned General Secretary Kao Chunming the **Taiwan Church News** reports:

   "Now in his third year in prison, Dr. C.M. Kao ... is currently per-mitted to be outside of his cell for three hours a day. Once a week he can go to the laundry or prison library. ***Though there is still no table, no chair, no bed in the cell,*** [emphasis added Ed.] he spends many hours in personal Bible study and accepts the succes-sion of cellmates as his new field of mission. His concern and prayers for the church in Taiwan and around the world are constant. His hope remains steadfast that people may live in peace and that Taiwan may contribute to peacemaking in the world."

   The bulletin further discusses the negative impact of the government's opening up of mountain reserves on the lives of aborigines; the reaffir-mation of the importance of human rights by the Presbyterian Church; and the possible introduction of a religious law by the government, which would further restrict the activities of the Presbyterian Church. **Taiwan Church News's** address is 27423 Youth Road, Tainan 700, TAIWAN.

2. **NEWSWEEK: "Taiwan's times of troubles."** On November 1, 1982 this U.S.based weekly magazine published a fivepage article about Taiwan. The article was accompanied by an interview with President Chiang Ching--kuo in which the President gave evasive answers to correspondent Larry Rother's questions about democracy and human rights in Taiwan. The article focused on Taiwan's vulnerability after Mr. Reagan's "Shanghai Communiqué no. 2" and also discussed the country's internal political developments. Below are some excerpts:

   "Taiwan is also plagued by a host of domestic problems. Chiang, who inherited control from his father, the generalissimo, heads a small, aging clique of Kuomintang (K MT) diehards who have maintained a tight paternalistic grip since they fled the

mainland in 1949. But 87 percent of Taiwan's inhabitants were born on the island, and a new class of affluent native Taiwanese is demanding a larger share of political power at a time when Chiang may be looking to step down. Moreover, Taiwan's once booming economy is in the throes of its worst slump in three decades: the government is trying to modernize and upgrade the island's industries just when many investors are wary of taking a gamble in troubled Taiwan."

Further on in the article Mr. Rother discusses martial law:

"To enforce vigilance, KMT officials vow to keep the island on "seri-ous alert" until the "communist insurrection" in China is over. And indeed a state of martial law has already lasted on Taiwan for more than three decades. The government forbids its opponents to form political parties, it often bans magazines that publish articles delving too deeply into sensitive topics and military officers keep a watchful eye on campuses to prevent political activities there. Such policies have drawn censure from human rights groups abroad. They were particularly disturbed by the long sentences ranging up to life imprisonment that were handed out in 1980 to opposition leaders accused of sedition, and by the mysterious death last year of Taiwanese professor Chen Wenchen, who was suspected of antiKMT sympathies. (....)

The "serious alert" does more than just keep Taiwan's Army prepared to defend the island against an attack from Peking; it also keeps the KMT in power and the native Taiwanese out. The opposition has called on the Nationalists to relax their oneparty hold and, as a result, it has done progressively better in local elections. Some opposition leaders have even suggested off the record that the KMT relinquish its claim to being the sole legitimate government of all of China and declare Taiwan independent. President Chiang has tried to diffuse localist sentiment by appointing more Taiwan--born KMT members to secondlevel government posts, but he has no intention of allowing them to rule the island. (…….)

Despite such obstacles, the native Taiwanese have time on their side. The KMT leaders are a decidedly elderly lot; and their chil-dren who often marry indigenous islanders are less obsesses with Chinese reunification and more resigned to sharing power in Taipei. But the native Taiwanese are by no means assured of a victo-ry by attrition. Their nightmare is that somehow the KMT will even-tually agree to a reunion with the mainland. Indeed, the depth of this local feeling only helps reinforce Chiang's hardline stand against rapprochement. "For the KMT to enter into negotiations of any kind with the mainland would be to provoke disorder," says one foreign political analyst. "They would be inviting insurrection."

The article then goes on to discuss the prime actors in the succession struggle which could develop once President Chiang Chingkuo dies, and closes with an economic outlook.

3. **ASIAWEEK:** ***Can Taiwan survive ?*** On November 26, 1982 this Hong Kong-based magazine published an article by its reporter Linda Jaivin. The article contained several parts: The main article, titled "Facing the future"; a subarticle about the opposition, "Outside the party"; a "box" on several young KMT members playing increasingly leading roles in the government; and an interview with Prime Minister Sun Yunsuan. Below we present some quotes from the article about the ***tangwai*** ("outsidetheparty"):

   An assessment of how many political parties Taiwan has depends on how the counting is done. From a strict, official standpoint, there are three: the Kuomintang, the Young China Party and the Democratic Socialist Party. In practice, however, only the KMT can boast of any real presence on the local political stage, dominating as it does government, legislative and even military organisations. Indeed, the very phrase "party member" automatically connotes a KMT belonger in ordinary Taiwan parlance. Yet in another important sense sense there are two parties. With its monthly meetings, tight communications network and shared ideals, the socalled tangwai ("outsidetheparty") group of oppositionist politicians and their supporters is in fact just about a party in everything but name.

   Now the ***tangwai*** want the name too. But that's almost as difficult said as done. Government officials snatched the October issue of the ***tangwai***symphasizing magazine **Taiwan Panorama** from the printers as soon as it rolled off the presses: the issue was from cover to cover an impassionate call for the lifting of the governmentimposed ban on the formation of new political parties. (....)

   Indeed, ***tangwai*** activists mince few words when it comes to such sensitive issues as the continuance of martial law (they want it ended), labour protection (they'd like to see better conditions for the working classes, including the right to form unions) and so on. The dramatic history of the movement has contributed greatly to its feisty character. Most ***tangwai*** supporters date it back over three decades to reaction to the "February 28 Incident" of 1947 [Many native Taiwanese remember the incident as a horrifying massacre of local people by KMT troops. Official accounts divide the responsibility for the incident and lessen the death toll. Whatever the truth, it's an event which stands out in the local consciousness as a symbol of KMTTaiwanese

conflict] and other controversial events of early KMT rule on the island. "***Tangwai***," explains threeterm antiKMT legislator K'ang Ninghsiang, "was born of a deep dissatisfaction among local people with unjust aspects of KMT rule, from the party's system of special privileges to its lack of attention to important local issues. from the Japanese period to the present day, local people's opinions have never been given the attention or respect they deserve."

The term "***tangwai,***" however, has only gained household status in Taiwan over the past four years. AntiKMT candidates for the Legis-lative Assembly banded together openly for the first time in late 1978. Their coordinated campaign sparked unprecedented vigorous public debate on political issues. It was a ***tangwai*** watershed in many ways: according to K'ang, it was only that year and the one preceding in which a significant number of intellectuals and profes-sionals joined the ranks of ***tangwai*** supporters.

Just one week before the balloting was to be held, however, U.S. President Jimmy Carter announced that his country had decided to break diplomatic relations with Taipei to normalize them with the rival regime in Peking. Immediately, the government postponed the elections and the subsequent, widely supported calls for spiritual unity forced oppositionists temporarily to adopt a low profile. As the emotional and political climate returned to normal, ***tangwai*** activists established **Formosa Magazine** as a voice for their move-ment and, through its numerous branch offices, as a tool for cultivating a grassroots base.

The article then discusses the Kaohsiung incident of December 1979 and its aftermath. It continues:

The ghost of the Kaohsiung Incident, however, continues to haunt Taiwan politics. Several months ago, a glossily printed onepage declaration allegedly authored by four of the imprisoned leaders was circulated by ***tangwai*** activists [for the full text, see ***Taiwan Communiqué*** no. 9, page 1]. It stated that if it weren't possi-ble to strive for both reunification with mainland China and for democracy, then the choice should be for democracy. According to the prisoners' families, the subsequently banned document was drafted on the basis of telephone conversations with the prisoners, though one former military policeman who'd done duty in their prison told **Asiaweek** that such chats would automatically have been discon-nected by the monitoring guards. In any case, the prisoners' fami-lies argued in a joint letter published in the **Statesman** last month that "everyone, including those in prisons, has the right to be concerned about the society of which they are a part."

The section of the declaration which caused most controversy was the statement that if it were impossible to achieve both reunification with China and democratization, "we happily opt for democracy." Some observers read this as a possible call for formal independence. For three decades the notion of Taiwan independence has been the single most sensitive, passionarousing issue that the Nationalist government has faced. Because proindependence groups outside Taiwan openly support ***tangwai*** activities on the island, ***tangwai*** sympathisers are frequently suspected of being proindependence. Consistent reference to "selfdetermination" as a necessary guiding principle of government reinforces the worst fears of the establishment.

The article closes with a survey of how various people in Taiwan view the ***tangwai***.

4. **NRCHANDELSBLAD: "Taiwan, made in Holland."** On November 27, 1982 this Rotterdambased newspaper carried a feature article by its repor-ter Willem van Kemenade. The article surveys the relations between Taiwan and the Netherlands from the times the East Indies Company had a settlement in the Southwest of Taiwan (16241662) until the present day. A few excerpts:

   What are those Chinese making so much fuss about ? If you examine early historical records closely then you find out that Taiwan was in essence never Chinese territory, but was a creation of the Dutch East Indies Company. For almost forty years the Dutch colonized Taiwan. A piece of forgotten history.

   Each year on October 25 the government on Taiwan commemorates that on this date in 1945 the Japanese armies surrendered to the represen-tatives of Chiang Kaishek. That day is called "Restoration Day" because it was thén that Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan was res-tored after 50 years of Japanese colonization. In 1982 the festivities were accompanied by the unveiling of a statue in Taipei, not the tenthousandandfirst statue of Chiang Kaishek, but this time a statue of the seventeenthcentury warlord and seabaron Cheng Ch'engkung, known in the West as Koxinga. In a golden inscription on a marble plaque Koxinga is praised for two "immortal services": the chasing away of the Dutch colonialists in 1662 and the "resto-ration" of Chinese rule over Taiwan; his faithfulness to the cause of national restoration.

   The second point mentioned here refers to his loyalty to the de-feated Mingdynasty and his military attempts to destroy the new Ch'ingdynasty and restore the Ming's to power. The authorities in Taiwan don't mention that those attempts by Koxinga

failed, because in that respect the comparison between Koxinga and Chiang Kaishek and his sons is not convenient anymore. The Kuomintang leaders indeed continue to maintain that they will win the war against communism more with psychological means than with mili-tary means in order to reestablish their own "dynasty" to power.

The article then gives an example of how the Chinese in Peking use Koxinga for ***their*** political propaganda purposes. It continues:

The Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Straits are thus masters in the use (and misuse) of history for presentday political purposes. However, the position, held by both Chinese regimes, that Taiwan has belonged to China since ancient history and that the Dutch in 1624 invaded Chinese territory is based on nothing. Dutch Sinologist Jan Huber, who has done many years of research in both Chinese and Dutch historical records, says: *"From historical records it is clear that before the Dutch arrived in Taiwan in 1624 the island did not belong to the Chinese empire. The historical reality is that the Dutch -under Chinese pressure withdrew [from the coast of China] to Taiwan, where at that time there were approximately 100.000 abori-gines of the Melanesian stock and only a few thousand Chinese. It is ironical that the Dutch East Indies Company contributed signifi-cantly to the "sinification" of Taiwan by bringing great numbers of Chinese over from the mainland."*

The article continues with a detailed description of the events in the seventeenth century, including the tenmonth battle between Koxinga's troops and the Dutch, who were led by Frederick Coyett, the last Dutch governor of Formosa. Coyett later wrote a book, titled **"'t Verwaer-loosde Formosa"** in which he bitterly attacked his East Indies Company superiors in Batavia (now Djakarta) for not coming to his aid in spite of his repeated requests for assistance.

5. **Far Eastern Economic Review: "Tight little island."** During the third week of December 1982 this Hong Kongbased weekly published a coverstory on Taiwan. The article consists of three parts: a main article on the economic and political developments; an interview with President Chiang Chingkuo, and a story on the persons who might succeed him. Some excerpts from the first article, titled "The politics of prosperity":

The late generalissimo Chiang Kaishek, a man given to aphorisms, once made the point that maintaining the status quo tends to retro-gression. It was an apt observation, the truth of which has become increasingly apparent during the 10year rule of

Chiang's elder son and successor, Chiang Chingkuo. Chiang the younger became Taiwan's prime minister in 1972, three years before his father died at the age of 87. It was the year that the then United States President Richard Nixon cast the die in favour of recognizing Peking and severing formal links with Taiwan and since then the government in Taipei has not only failed to maintain the status quo in the field of international relations but has also seen a steady erosion of its foreign backing.

The article then discusses economic and political developments during the past decade. It continues:

As economic and social conditions have improved, the government has shown a willingness to widen the scope of political partici-pation. However, Taiwan is certainly not in any danger of being labeled a liberal parliamentary democracy in the near future. Martial law has been in force since the government arrived from the mainland 33 years ago and the security authorities have sweeping powers to arrest and after conviction by military court exe-cute those threatening national security. By law, only three poli-tical parties are allowed: the KMT and two feeble and electorally insignificant puppet parties, the China Youth Party (the chairman of which is approaching 90) and the Democratic Socialist Party.

The article goes on to describe the differences between the approach chosen by Chiang Chingkuo and the methods used by his father. It then focuses on the ***tangwai***:

Although the government refuses to sanction the formation of new political parties, ***tangwai*** (nonparty) candidates regularly capture 25 percent of the vote in local, provincial and "national" elec-tions. In the Taipei citycouncil elections a year ago, ***tangwai*** candidates bagged 40 percent of the popular vote, though the distri-bution was such that they carried only eight of the 51 seats.

Tangwai figures claim that the KMT's real objection to the formation of new parties is that these would in time undermine the ruling group's power and privileges. There is probably a good deal of truth in this, even if it is also true that the opposition leaders tend to exaggerate the boost such a move would give to ***tangwai*** candi-dates. "The KMT uses reunification and its 'historic mission' to avoid implementing democracy," Antonio Chiang, 38, editorinchief of the political monthly, **The Eighties,** told the *REVIEW*. "That is our main criticism."

The government's objection to a lifting of martial law are like-wise based on "threats to national security." However, some senior KMT officials privately concede that the

retention of martial law also confers important practical advantages. Chief among these is that it allows the government to skirt the constitutional require-ment that the National Assembly be elected every six years and keep in office the aging mainlanders who were elected in 1948 and "frozen" in office pending the return to the mainland. "Martial law gives these people who are outdated a way to lawfully stay there," says a senior official in a government agency, "because their con-stituencies [in China] are in rebel hands." he adds, without apparent irony: "Otherwise the whole government would be groundless."

As the National Assembly is the body that elects the president, the retention of the aged K MT hardliners has obvious advantages. By way of consolation, government officials make the point that martial law in Taiwan in not like martial law in other countries and hardly interferes with the daily life of most citizens. This is true enough if the citizens in question have no political aspirations.

The article then discusses the "tendency towards the liberalisation of politics" [note the careful wording Ed.] since the mid1970's and the crackdown after the Kaohsiung incident. It continues:

Other incidents have stained the government's image and embar-rassed it overseas, particularly in the U.S. The case of Chen Wencheng, a USbased Taiwanese statistics professor who was found dead in Taipei in July last year after being interrogated by the Taiwan Garrison Command, has never been satisfactorily explained. Nor has the case involving the brutal murder of the mother and two daughters of a detained Formosa magazine activist who was in jail awaiting trial. "These cases have stained the reputation of the security authorities," says a knowledgeable source in Taipei. "They were not able [or willing ? Ed.] to identify or apprehend the people responsible, which is very embarrassing precisely because the security forces are known to be very vigilant and not undermanned."

The article continues with a survey of the views of various Taiwanbased observers on the status of democratisation in Taiwan. It concludes that the person succeeding Chiang Chingkuo will have his work cut out main-taining harmony.

The third article, focusing on the persons who might succeed Chiang, is titled "The shoes of the strongman will be difficult to fill." Some excerpts:

In Taiwan's authoritarian system of government ultimate power lies to a very great extent in the hands of 72yearold President Chiang Chingkuo and the group of civilian

and military advisers in his immediate circle. Like his father, the late Chiang Kaishek, Chiang has a firm understanding of the uses of power. But Chiang is not simply a carbon copy of "the man who lost China" and he has used his power in different ways, ruling with astuteness and craft and in a manner well geared to Taiwan's changing circumstances.

Chiang dominates the four key centers of power the ruling Kuomin-tang (KMT), the government, the army and the securityintelligence network and is said to have maintained his position by balancing one faction against another. The president, says one authoritative source, is a "ruthless intriguer" or was, at any rate, in his early days in Shanghai. A foreign scholar allows, a little more charitably perhaps, that Chiang is "a very intelligent and very secretive man."

As Taiwan has reaped the benefits of rapid economic growth, Chiang has presided over a situation in which the scope of political compe-tition has slowly begun to widen. This has been no small achieve-ment, periodic crackdowns on dissent notwithstanding, particularly as the reforms have been undertaken by a ruling party totally discre-dited at the time it fled the Chinese mainland in 1949.

The article then discusses each one of the persons who might succeed Chiang: Prime Minister Sun Yunsuan, KMT partysecretary Tsiang Yiensi, Minister of Interior Lin Yangkang, and others who might be part of some sort of collective leadership, which the article concludes looks most likely in the postChiang era.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Freedom of the Press?

During the past three months again a number of magazines were banned, con-fiscated or censored because they published information which was not to the liking of the authorities. In the past ***Taiwan Communiqué*** has published such information on an irregular basis. We now feel it neces-sary to start a regular column under the heading "Freedom of the press ?" In each issue we will give an account of which publications were recent-ly banned or confiscated by Taiwan's secret police agencies.

1. **TSUNG HENG magazine censored.** On October 11, 1982 agents of the Taiwan Garrison Command (TGC) visited the printing shop where issue no. 19 of

Vertical-Horizontal magazine (*Tsung Heng*) was being readied for publication. They read through the printing proofs and ordered part of one article changed.

2. **MING JEN magazine banned.** On October 20, 1982 the Garrison Command banned issue no. 7 of **Famous People**), a magazine published in central Taiwan. The reasons given by the TGC were that four articles would "confuse the public." The titles of the articles are: a) Taiwan needs new political parties, b) Dr. You Ch'ing's ideas on the organization and operation of new political parties, c) Refute Minister of Interior Lin Yangkang's statement on the banning of a new party, and d) An eyewitness account of Su Chiucheng's press conference in Tokyo.

3. **The POLITICIAN Magazine banned for one year.** On October 20, 1982 the Taiwan authorities ordered the confiscation of issue no. 40 of The Politician. Again, the Garrison Command stated that an article in the magazine would "confuse the public." The article in question discussed democratization of the political system in Taiwan. On November 6, 1982 the TGC issued a banning order for a whole year.

4. **TAI YISHI magazine confiscated.** On October 21, 1982 the Kaohsiung office of the Garrison Command confiscated issue no. 7 of **The Repre-sentative**. The offending article discussed Taiwan's increasing political isolation on the international scene.

5. **CARE magazine no. 11 banned.** On November 5, 1982 the Garrison Command issued a banning order for no. 11 of **Care** magazine, which had already appeared on the newsstands. The TGC charged that the magazine "seriously confuses the public." The issue contains articles on the prison visits by several wives of imprisoned opposition leaders, and an article by Mrs. Yang about her imprisoned husband Yang Chinhai, in which she describes the torture her husband underwent at the hand of his police interrogators in 1976 (see "Prison Report" in this issue of ***Taiwan Communiqué***).

6. **CULTIVATE magazine censored.** On December 9, 1982 agents of the TGC rushed into the printing shop where issue no. 23 of **Cultivate** had been printed. However, just on the previous day the publication had brought all copies of the magazine over to their new office on Roosevelt Road. Forewarned by the TGC raid the publisher, editors and staff stayed with the finished copies and thus prevented a confiscation. Negotiations were started between the publisher and the TGC, the outcome of which was that the magazine would "voluntarily" blacken out the offending lines. What was so unbearable for the TGC ? On the cover the magazine announced that the issue carried a number of pictures of opposition leaders impri-soned after the Kaohsiung incident.

As shown below, inside the magazine several lines in a translation of an article about "Hongkong beyond 1997" from Hongkongbased **Asiaweek** (October 22, 1982) were blacked out.

海二號公報」的內幕消息，據說美國一直希望中共同意和平解決台灣問題，但是中共拒絕了。中共說，他們一旦放棄了武力攻台的機會，台灣會對統一問題更不積極。鄧小平說：「等待的耐心和能力是有限的。」他警告美國人，如果中共以武力犯台的話，美國人最好不要介入，據說雷根回答鄧小平說：「我只希望你在我任內不要這麼做就好了。」我也問了北美辦事處的蔡維屏，如果中共以武力犯台的話，美國會不會幫助台灣。蔡維屏十分自信地回答我說美國一定會來幫忙的。但是大多數觀察家都認為，美國對兩方面都不會做什麼真正的允諾。

李：[redacted]

亞洲週刊：這先生曾經寫過一篇文章，預測香港問題會在一九九七年以前解決。這個論點和台灣問題有沒有什麼關聯？

[redacted]

圍：我這麼說是基於中共領導階級曾經表示過在一九九七年以前解決香港問題而[redacted]第三，進行文化大革命；鄧小平也說過他要完成三大工作，但是至今為止，一件都沒有實行。如果鄧小平完成了統一中國的工作，包括香港和台灣，他知道，他的名字一定會留在歷史上的。我不知道有關蔣經國身體健康的報導是否正確，但是北京方面都認為他身體狀況不好。

深耕雜誌・第23期・71年12月10日 48

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

FROM:
TAIWAN COMMUNIQUÉ
P.O. Box 31
3984 ZG ODIJK
The Netherlands

Port betaald
Port Payé
Odijk

ISSN Number: 1027-3999

CONTENTS

Taiwan Communiqué no. 10
January 1983

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