

Beijing sharpens its stance on eve of Taiwan election

by Jonathan Tennenbaum

With the March 18 Taiwan Presidential election just days away, and the outcome uncertain, the Chinese government and military continue to sound dire warnings about the consequences of any new moves toward formal “Taiwan independence.”

In his report on the work of the government, delivered at the newly opened Ninth National People’s Congress in Beijing, Prime Minister Zhu Rongji reiterated the Chinese government’s basic position on Taiwan, as laid out in the Feb. 22 White Paper on the “One China” policy (excerpted below). Later in that session, the Vice Chairman of the China’s Central Military Commission, Zhang Wannian, gave a speech whose strong language was reported in the March 6 edition of the *People’s Liberation Army Daily* under the title “‘Taiwan Independence’ Means War.” Referring to Zhang’s remarks, the article states that “putting an end to the separation situation across the Taiwan Straits and realizing full reunification of the Motherland at an early date concerns the fundamental interests of the Chinese nation and is an irreversible trend. . . . China is consistently opposed to any foreign forces meddling in the Taiwan issue and is against a handful of U.S. Congressmen who attempted to sell advanced weapons to Taiwan by concocting the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act and utilizing all kinds of pretexts. . . . We will do our utmost to seek peaceful reunification. However, we must explicitly point out that ‘*Taiwan independence*’ means war. . . . There is no room for compromise on this important matter of principle which concerns the future and fate of the Chinese nation.”

A ‘better concept’ is needed

In the meantime, more rational voices in the United States are reflecting on the fact, that the major danger of a military escalation across the Taiwan Straits, does not come from Taiwan per se, but from influences outside the region, including via the United States itself (see *International* lead article on p. 50, in last week’s *EIR*). In testimony before the U.S. Congress following his return from a visit to Beijing, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Command, Adm. Dennis Blair warned against passage of the deliberately provocative Taiwan Security Enhancement Act. Admiral Blair declared that the bill, which purportedly is designed to strengthen the defense of Taiwan, “doesn’t give me the ability to do my job better than I can today,” and, in fact, “*would move us away*

from peaceful resolution” of the Taiwan conflict. He further expressed the desire to see a change in policy away from “balance of power and containment thinking, to a better concept.”

Unfortunately, voices of moderation, including from President Clinton himself in his call to Congress to ratify China’s permanent normal trading status with the United States, will not suffice to defuse a situation in which operations like Richard Mellon Scaife’s “Blue Team” (see last week’s *EIR*) are allowed to run wild trying to provoke a military conflict between the United States and China. The neo-McCarthyite anti-China hysteria generated by such tools of the “flight-forward” faction in the Wall Street and London financial oligarchy—the same ones most strongly backing both Bush and Gore at this point—is not only calculated to undermine any positive U.S. policy toward China, but also to evoke as much *anger* as possible inside China itself.

An indispensable insight into nature of the situation as seen through Beijing’s eyes, and the dangerous way the United States is being played off against China, is provided by the Chinese government’s “White Paper” itself. The circumstance, that no substantial part of this important policy statement has been published or even covered in the Western media until now, speaks for itself.

Documentation

The following are excerpts from the government of the People’s Republic of China’s (P.R.C.) White Paper on “The One-China Principle and the Taiwan Issue,” released by the Information Office of the State Council on Feb. 22. Subheads have been added.

. . . Taiwan is an inalienable part of China. . . . In April 1895, through a war of aggression against China, Japan forced the Qing government to sign the unequal Treaty of Shimonoseki, and forcibly occupied Taiwan. In July 1937, Japan launched an all-out war of aggression against China. In December 1941, the Chinese government issued the Proclamation of China’s Declaration of War Against Japan, announcing to the world that all treaties, agreements, and contracts concerning Sino-



The Cairo Conference during World War II. Left to right: Kuomintang leader Chiang Kai-shek; U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt; British Prime Minister Winston Churchill; Madame Chiang. "In December 1943, the Cairo Declaration was issued by the Chinese, U.S., and British governments, stipulating that Japan should return to China all the territories it had stolen from the Chinese, including Northeast China, Taiwan, and the Penghu Archipelago," China's White Paper reads. The "One China" policy was the policy of both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China, until the latter's Lee Teng-hui came along.

Japanese relations, including the Treaty of Shimonoseki, had been abrogated, and that China would recover Taiwan. In December 1943, the Cairo Declaration was issued by the Chinese, U.S., and British governments, stipulating that Japan should return to China all the territories it had stolen from the Chinese, including Northeast China, Taiwan, and the Penghu Archipelago. The Potsdam Proclamation signed by China, the United States, and Britain in 1945 (later adhered to by the Soviet Union) stipulated that "The terms of the Cairo Declaration shall be carried out." In August of that year, Japan declared surrender and promised in its instrument of surrender that it would faithfully fulfill the obligations laid down in the Potsdam Proclamation.

On Oct. 25, 1945, the Chinese government recovered Taiwan and the Penghu Archipelago, resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Taiwan.

On Oct. 1, 1949, the Central People's Government of the P.R.C. was proclaimed, replacing the government of the Republic of China to become the only legal government of the whole of China and its sole legal representative in the international arena, thereby bringing the historical status of the Republic of China to an end.

This is a replacement of the old regime by a new one in a situation where the main bodies of the same international laws have not changed and China's sovereignty and inherent territory have not changed therefrom, and so the government of the P.R.C. naturally should fully enjoy and exercise China's sovereignty, including its sovereignty over Taiwan.

Since the KMT [Kuomintang] ruling clique retreated to Taiwan, although its regime has continued to use the designa-

tions "Republic of China" and "Government of the Republic of China," it has long since completely forfeited its right to exercise state sovereignty on behalf of China and, in reality, has always remained only a local authority in Chinese territory. . . .

On the day of its founding, the Central People's Government of the P.R.C. declared to governments of all countries in the world, "This government is the sole legitimate government representing the entire people of the People's Republic of China. . . ." Shortly afterwards, the Central People's Government telegraphed the United Nations, announcing that the KMT authorities had "lost all basis, both de jure and de facto, to represent the Chinese people," and therefore had no right to represent China at all. One principle governing New China's establishment of diplomatic relations with a foreign country is that it recognizes the government of the P.R.C. as the sole legitimate government representing the whole of China, [and] severs or refrains from establishing diplomatic relations with the Taiwan authorities.

These propositions of the Chinese government met with obstruction by the U.S. government. On Jan. 5, 1950, the U.S. President Truman issued a statement, saying that the U.S. and other Allied countries recognized China's exercise of sovereignty over Taiwan Island in the four years since 1945. However, after the start of the Korean War in June 1950, to isolate and contain China the U.S. government not only sent troops to occupy Taiwan, but it also dished out such fallacies as "the status of Taiwan has yet to be determined," and later, step by step, lobbied for "dual recognition" among the international community in order to create "two Chinas." Natu-

rally, the Chinese government resolutely opposed this. China has evolved the One-China Principle precisely in the course of the endeavor to develop normal diplomatic relations with other countries and the struggle to safeguard state sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The above propositions constitute the basic meaning of the One-China Principle, the crucial point being to safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

During the 30 or 40 years after 1949, although the Taiwan authorities did not recognize the legitimate status of the government of the P.R.C. as the representative of the whole of China, they did insist that Taiwan is a part of China and that there is only one China, and opposed "two Chinas" and "Taiwan independence." This shows that for a long time there has been a common understanding among the Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Straits on the fundamental question that there is only one China and Taiwan is a part of Chinese territory. . . .

In October 1971, the United Nations General Assembly adopted at its 26th session Resolution 2758, which expelled the representatives of the Taiwan authorities and restored the seat and all the lawful rights of the government of the P.R.C. in the United Nations. In September 1972, China and Japan signed a Joint Statement, announcing establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, and that Japan recognizes the government of the P.R.C. as the only legitimate government of China, fully understands and respects the Chinese government's position that Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the P.R.C., and promises to adhere to the position as prescribed in Article 8 of the Potsdam Proclamation. In December 1978, China and the U.S. issued the Joint Communiqué on the establishment of diplomatic relations, in which the U.S. "recognizes the government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China" and "acknowledges the Chinese position that there is but one China and Taiwan is a part of China. . . ."

'One country, two systems'

The One-China Principle is the foundation stone for the Chinese government's policy on Taiwan. On Comrade Deng Xiaoping's initiative, the Chinese government has, since 1979, adopted the policy of peaceful reunification and gradually evolved the scientific concept of "one country, two systems." On this basis, China established the basic principle of "peaceful reunification, and one country, two systems." The key points of this basic principle and the relevant policies are: China will do its best to achieve peaceful reunification, but will not commit itself to rule out the use of force; will actively promote people-to-people contacts and economic and cultural exchanges between the two sides of the Taiwan Straits, and start direct trade, postal, air, and shipping services as soon as possible; achieve reunification through peaceful negotiations and, on the premise of the One-China Principle, any matter can be negotiated. After reunification, the policy of "one country, two systems" will be practiced, with the main body

of China (Chinese mainland) continuing with its socialist system, and Taiwan maintaining its capitalist system for a long period of time to come. After reunification, Taiwan will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, and the Central Government will not send troops or administrative personnel to be stationed in Taiwan. Resolution of the Taiwan issue is an internal affair of China, which should be achieved by the Chinese themselves, and there is no call for aid by foreign forces. The aforementioned principles and policies embody the basic stand and spirit of adhering to the One-China Principle, and fully respect Taiwan compatriots' wish to govern and administer Taiwan by themselves. . . .

The Chinese government's declaration in 1979 on implementing the principle of peaceful reunification was based on the premise that the Taiwan authorities at that time upheld the principle that there is only one China in the world and Taiwan is a part of China. Meanwhile, the Chinese government took into account the fact that the U.S. government, which for many years had supported the Taiwan authorities, had accepted that there is only one China in the world, Taiwan is a part of China, and the government of the P.R.C. is the only legitimate government of China, and saw this acknowledgment as being beneficial to the peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue.

The use of force

While carrying out the policy of peaceful reunification, the Chinese government always makes it clear that the means used to solve the Taiwan issue is a matter of China's internal affairs, and China is under no obligation to commit itself to rule out the use of force. This is by no means directed against Taiwan compatriots, but against the scheme to create an "independent Taiwan" and against the foreign forces interfering with the reunification of China, and is intended as a necessary safeguard for the striving for peaceful reunification. Resort to force would only be the last choice made under compelled circumstances. . . .

As for Taiwan, upholding the principle of one China indicates that it acknowledges that China's sovereignty and territory are inalienable. . . . If Taiwan denies the One-China Principle and tries to separate Taiwan from the territory of China, the premise and basis for peaceful reunification will cease to exist.

As for the United States, if it promises to follow a one-China policy, it should earnestly implement the three communiqués between the Chinese and U.S. governments and fulfill the series of promises it has made. It should maintain only cultural, commercial, and other non-governmental relations with Taiwan; oppose "Taiwan independence," "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan," and not stand in the way of the reunification of China. Acting otherwise will destroy the external conditions necessary for the Chinese government to strive for peaceful reunification. . . .

Taking Taiwan's political reality into full account and out of consideration for the Taiwan authorities' request for the

negotiations to be held on an equal footing, we have put forward one proposal after another, such as that the negotiations should be held between the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Chinese KMT on a reciprocal basis and that the talks between the two parties may include representatives from all parties and mass organizations of Taiwan, and we have never spoken of negotiations between the “central and local authorities.” The Chinese government has also proposed that dialogues may start first, including political dialogues, which may gradually move on to procedural consultations for political talks. . . . First, negotiations should be held and an agreement reached on an official end to the state of hostility between the two sides under the principle of one China, so as to jointly safeguard China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity and work out plans for the development of the future inter-Straits relations. . .

Separatist forces in Taiwan

Separatist forces in Taiwan are bent on violating the One-China Principle. In 1988, after Lee Teng-hui became the leader of the Taiwan authorities, he publicly stated time and again that the basic policy of the Taiwan authorities was that “there is only one China, not two,” and “we have always maintained that China should be reunited, and we adhere to the principle of ‘one China.’ ”

However, since the early 1990s, Lee Teng-hui has gradually deviated from the One-China Principle, trumpeting “two governments,” “two reciprocal political entities,” “Taiwan is already a state with independent sovereignty,” and “At the present stage the Republic of China is on Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China is on the mainland.” Moreover, he went back on his words, saying that “I have never said that there is only one China. . . .” Under the direction of Lee Teng-hui, the Taiwan authorities have adopted a series of measures toward actual separation. In matters of Taiwan’s form of government, the Taiwan authorities are seeking to transform Taiwan into an “independent political entity” through a “constitutional reform,” so as to suit the needs of creating “two Chinas.” . . .

Since 1993, for seven years running, the Taiwan authorities have maneuvered for participation in the United Nations. In military affairs, the Taiwan authorities have bought large quantities of advanced weapons from foreign countries and sought to join the Theater Missile Defense System (TMDS), in an attempt to establish a military alliance of a disguised form with the United States and Japan. . . .

Since 1999, Lee Teng-hui has stepped up his separatist activities. In May, he published the book *The Road to Democracy*, which advocates the division of China into seven regions, each enjoying “full autonomy.” On July 9, he went so far as to publicly distort inter-Straits relations as “state-to-state relations, or at least special state-to-state relations,” in an attempt to fundamentally change the status of Taiwan as a part of China, sabotage the relations between both sides of the Taiwan Straits, especially the basis for cross-Straits political

dialogues and negotiations, and wreck the foundation for peaceful reunification. . . .

After Lee Teng-hui’s “private” visit to the United States in June 1995, the Chinese government has waged a resolute struggle against separation and against “Taiwan independence,” and made strong protests and representations to the U.S. government for openly allowing Lee Teng-hui to visit the United States, violating its promises made in the three Sino-U.S. joint communiqués, and seriously prejudicing China’s sovereignty. . . .

The relevant department of the Chinese government has clearly stated that the attempt of the Taiwan separatists to implement the “two states” theory in “legal” form was an even more serious and dangerous step toward division and a grave provocation against peaceful reunification. Were the attempt to succeed, it would be impossible for China to achieve peaceful reunification. . . .

Support for the ‘One-China’ policy

Most countries in the world have reaffirmed their position of upholding the One-China Policy. The U.S. government has also reasserted its adherence to the One-China Policy and its commitment to the “Three Non-supports” for Taiwan. Finally, the Taiwan authorities have been compelled to announce that they will not amend their “constitution” and “laws” according to the “two states” theory. Nevertheless, separatists in Taiwan are still attempting to detach Taiwan “de jure” from China in the name of the “Republic of China” by various forms. . . .

Special vigilance should be maintained to the fact that the Taiwan separatists are continually scheming to disrupt Sino-U.S. relations and provoke conflicts and confrontation between the two nations to achieve their aim of dividing China.

. . . The Chinese government remains firm in adhering to “peaceful reunification” and “one country, two systems” . . . and [is] doing its utmost to achieve the objective of peaceful reunification. However, if a grave turn of events occurs leading to the separation of Taiwan from China in any name, or if Taiwan is invaded and occupied by foreign countries, or if the Taiwan authorities refuse, sine die, the peaceful settlement of cross-Straits reunification through negotiations, then the Chinese government will only be forced to adopt all drastic measures possible, including the use of force, to safeguard China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity and fulfill the great cause of reunification. . . .

Reasoning of ‘two states’ theory is untenable

The Taiwan authorities support their position on “two Chinas,” including the “two states” theory proposed by Lee Teng-hui, with the following arguments: Since 1949, the territories on either side of the Straits have been divided and governed separately, with neither side having jurisdiction over the other; the government of the P.R.C. has never ruled Taiwan; and since 1991 Taiwan has witnessed a form of government that has nothing to do with that of the Chinese mainland.

These arguments are absolutely untenable. . . .

Firstly, state sovereignty is inseparable. The territory is the space in which a state exercises its sovereignty. In the territory of a country there can only be a central government exercising sovereignty on behalf of the state. As we have already said, Taiwan is an inalienable part of Chinese territory and, after replacing the government of the Republic of China in 1949, the government of the P.R.C. has become the sole legal government of China, enjoying and exercising sovereignty over the whole of China, including Taiwan.

Although the two sides of the Straits have not been reunified, Taiwan's status as a part of Chinese territory has never changed, neither, therefore, has China's sovereignty over Taiwan ever changed. Secondly, the international community recognizes that there is only one China, that Taiwan is a part of China, and that the government of the P.R.C. is the sole legitimate government of China. Thirdly, the reason that the Taiwan question has not been settled for such a long period of time is mainly due to the intervention of foreign forces and the obstruction of the separatist forces in Taiwan. . . .

. . . The Taiwan separatists' attempt to change Taiwan's status as a part of China by referendum on the pretext that "sovereignty belongs to the people" is futile. Firstly, under both domestic and international laws Taiwan's legal status as a part of Chinese territory is unequivocal, and there can be no premise for using referendum to decide any matter of self-determination. Secondly, the phrase "sovereignty belongs to the people" refers to all the people of a state, and not certain people or the people of a certain area. The sovereignty over Taiwan belongs to all the Chinese people including Taiwan compatriots, and not to some of the people in Taiwan. Thirdly, at no time in history has Taiwan been a state in its own right, and since 1945 Taiwan has not been a foreign colony, nor has it been under foreign occupation. The issue of national self-determination, therefore, does not exist. . . .

'Two German states' analogy does not apply

Some people in Taiwan have suggested that cross-Straits relations should be dealt with according to the "two German states formula," since Germany was divided into two states after World War II, and was later reunified. This proposal shows a misunderstanding of history and reality. The division of Germany after the war and the temporary division between the two sides of the Straits are questions of a different nature, the difference lying mainly in three aspects. The first is the reasons for, and the nature of, the division. After its defeat in World War II in 1945, Germany was divided into zones occupied separately by the four victorious nations of the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union according to a declaration on the defeat of Germany and the assumption of supreme authority and the subsequent Potsdam Agreement. The reunification of Germany became a focus of the confrontation in Europe between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic were estab-

lished in the zones occupied by the United States, Britain, and France, and that occupied by the Soviet Union. Thus Germany was divided into two states. Obviously, the German question arose entirely from external factors, while the Taiwan issue, left over by China's civil war, is a matter of China's internal affairs. The second aspect is the difference in status between the two under international law. Germany was divided according to a series of international treaties during and after World War II, while the Taiwan question involves provisions of the Cairo Declaration, the Potsdam Proclamation, and other international treaties, stating that Japan must return Taiwan, which it had stolen from China, to the Chinese. The third is the difference between the two in their actual conditions of existence.

Against the backdrop of the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two German states had foreign troops stationed in their territories and so were compelled to recognize each other and co-exist in the international community. The Chinese government has always persisted in the principle of one China. Before Lee Teng-hui assumed power, and during his early days in office, the Taiwan authorities recognized only one China and opposed "two Chinas," and the One-China Principle has also been widely accepted by the international community.

For these reasons, the Taiwan issue and the German issue cannot be placed in the same category, nor can the "two German states formula" be copied to settle the Taiwan question. . . .

In recent years the Taiwan authorities have repeatedly declared that "democratization on the China mainland is the key to the reunification of China" and that "the real essence of the cross-Straits issue is a contest between systems." The demand for democracy should not be used as a reason for refusing reunification. The essence of the difference between the two sides of the Straits on this question lies by no means in the controversy over whether to practice democracy or in the controversy over what system to practice, but rather a controversy over the choice between reunification and separation.

The Taiwan question is the most crucial and most sensitive issue in the relations between China and the United States. The three Sino-U.S. joint communiqués are the basis for the healthy and steady development of relations between the two countries. . . . Regrettably, the United States has repeatedly contravened its solemn understandings with China made in the August 17 Communiqué and continued its sale of advanced arms and military equipment to Taiwan. Recently, some people in the U.S. Congress have cooked up the so-called Taiwan Security Enhancement Act and are attempting to include Taiwan in the TMDS (Tactical Missile Defense System). This is gross interference in China's internal affairs and a grave threat to China's security, obstructing the peaceful reunification of China, and jeopardizing the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large.