

台灣的將來

—光子—

紐約時報與舊金山觀測報的社論
與一封Major教授給紐約時報的信

台灣的將來，我們非常關切，美國有識之士和很有名望的報社都為正義所驅，在為我們台灣人說話了，我們還能默默地等待嗎？朋友們，站起來吧！讓我們積極地參與吧！請寫信給福特總統，美國國會議員和報社，表明我們台灣人自己決定自己命運的決心吧！

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1975

The New York Times

The Future of Taiwan

Twenty-five years ago last month the demoralized Nationalist Chinese leaders under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sought refuge on the offshore island of Formosa, proclaiming themselves sovereign over not only ten million residents of the island but over the whole of the mainland from which they had just been routed. Some two million military and civilian refugees from the mainland lent strength to the claim. The anniversary passed unmarked and largely unnoticed in Taiwan.

The Chinese province of Taiwan fell under the sovereignty of Imperial Japan in 1895. From that day to this, and despite its ancient heritage, Taiwan has lived apart from the mainland. For their different reasons, the governments in Peking and Taipei cling to their common claim that Taiwan remains an integral province of China whatever may have been its fate during the past eight years of separation. For still different reasons, most other governments of the world find it convenient to their own interests to echo this formula.

The problem now is that Peking seems to be pressing for an end to the contrived ambiguity which has been tolerated over Taiwan's status for the past three years, ever since former President Nixon's landmark visit

to the mainland early in 1972. The continuance of a defense treaty with the United States and the maintenance of an American Embassy in Taipei are the central issue up for resolution during President Ford's scheduled visit to Peking later this year.

For the sake of smoother relations between two superpowers, an independent society which has developed a life, an economy, and perhaps a nationality of its own over many decades is in danger of being abandoned. No one seems interested in finding out whether the fourteen million people now resident in Taiwan, 85 per cent of them native to the island, what to become another province in what, despite their indubitable cultural, linguistic and historic ties, has become a largely alien society on the mainland.

Before the political deliverance of Taiwan to China is accomplished with the acquiescence of the United States--which for the past quarter-century has for better or for worse had deep responsibilities in Taiwan--it might be appropriate to consider the genuine wishes of the island's whole population. Perhaps the generation of Taiwanese who chose to overlook the anniversary of the Nationalists' arrival would freely decide to associate themselves with the powerful mainland, with which they share a cultural heritage, perhaps they would not. By rights, the decision should be theirs alone, and neither that of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek or his followers, nor that of the Chinese rulers in Peking.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1974

Letters to the Editor



China Issue: The Forgotten Taiwanese

To the Editor:

The continuing debate over the issue of "One China" or "Two Chinas" (recent letters of Professor Wilbur, Professor Fairbank and Mr. Kreps) finds proponents of all sides predictably overlooking a point of central importance: that the overwhelming majority of the population of Taiwan has had no substantial connection with the mainland for centuries. While they are ethnically Chinese, they also have distinctive cultural and linguistic differences, and they describe themselves as Taiwanese. Taiwan has been ruled by a government actually based on mainland China

for only four of the past 79 years. Thus it is not necessarily true, as Professor Fairbank would have it, that to ponder the future of Taiwan is to "intervene further in Chinese affairs."

Professor Fairbank accurately states that "all Chinese (i.e. Mao, Chiang, and their respective supporters) agree that Taiwan is part of China." The important question, however, is whether the majority of the Taiwanese consider it to be so. In the 1945-49 period the people of Taiwan recognized that the Nationalists they had welcomed as liberators would become oppressors in their turn; the Taiwanese were not allowed to determine their own future, and Chiang's generals consolidated their control by the murder of thousands of Taiwanese-nationalist students.

In arguing for the Nationalist version of "One China," Mr. Kreps raises the red-herring issue of electoral legitimacy, the legislature of Nationalist China was last elected in 1947-48, and has no mandate from the Taiwanese people, while the repeated re-elections of President Chiang are a meaningless exercise in one-party rule.

For twenty years this country persisted in the delusion that the Nationalist regime governed China and represented the people of Taiwan; are we now to contend that the Taiwanese could be represented by the Communist Government of China? The Taiwanese had no chance in 1947 against Chiang's U.S.-armed troops; they will have no chance in the future against the strength of the mainland.

Now, while the issue remains unsettled, a plebiscite could still be held under international auspices, with guaranteed freedom of expression and freedom of choice. Only then would the voice of the Taiwanese people be heard. No one can predict what future they would choose, but no one can speak for them.

The great powers of the world seem content, however, to ignore this principle of self-determination on the unjust and historically ill-founded ground that Taiwan is an internal issue of China. As usual when the interests of the great powers are involved, a little-known and defenseless people will be sold down the river.

JOHN AND DANA MAJOR

Hanover, N.H., Sept. 12, 1974

(Mr. Major is assistant professor of East Asian Studies at Dartmouth)

San Francisco Examiner

SUNDAY, MARCH 2, 1975

Editorial Comment The Taiwan Issue

NIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate majority leader, is a professional historian with special interest and competence in Asian affairs. He is, in addition, chairman of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. He made his second visit to Peking last December. His views on the Far East thus carry special and timely significance. So when he says, as he did the other day in an interview with the United Press, that the United States should reduce its garrison on Taiwan as a new step toward improving relations with mainland China, a lot of people in the diplomatic missions in Washington were interested.

The United States has a force of 4500 on Taiwan, Senator Mansfield noted. Part of it is a military assistance mission whose purpose is to help train the Taiwanese. "Who are they training them against but the People's Republic of China?" he asked.

The military mission should be phased out, in Mansfield's view, with which we agree, and the rest of the U. S. force on Taiwan should be cut back to 3000, the number of troops we maintained there before the Vietnam war.

In 1972 former President Nixon, on his notable visit to Peking, committed the United States to reduce its military forces in the area around China. Now is certainly the time to start giving effect to that much of the 1972 Peking communique.

Later this year, President Ford hopes to make a visit to Peking. Attention will then center on all aspects of U. S. relations with Taiwan. There are more than a few Americans, well informed on China-Taiwan affairs, who would urge the Ford administration to go even farther than Mansfield

suggests by actually reducing our diplomatic relations with Taiwan to something like the status of a liaison office, in the hope thereby of enticing the mainland Chinese into elevating their relations with us to full diplomatic recognition and the exchange of ambassadors.

We are not inclined to think that politically feasible or even honorable, in the light of our long support of Taiwan and our treaty arrangements with Nationalist regime. To abrogate these arrangements or to break off diplomatic relations, Mansfield believes, and he is right in that, would be "too precipitate."

* * *

THERE ARE THREE DIFFERENT interests involved here: Mainland China's claim of a historic right to the territory of Taiwan; the Nationalists' claim, going in the other direction, to the mainland, and finally the preferences of the 14 million resident Taiwanese. The desires of the latter have never been ascertained. It seems only right that they should be. Probably if asked the question, "Who do you want to be affiliated with, the Communists or the Nationalists?" the Taiwanese would say "neither." That answer wouldn't resolve the difficulty, but it would at least be a better foundation to build on than pretensions based on ignorance.

(上接10頁 -- 隔岸觀火)

之前因後果都是在這種狀態下發生的。這種慘痛的教訓，實在值得我們台灣人好好體會，惟本身自己奮鬥，才能決定自己之命運。今日中國大陸高唱解放台灣，二二八事變，成為他們作宣傳統戰工作的好藉口。連北京都在舉行二二八起義二十八週年紀念會，高調呼喚解救台灣被壓迫之人民。老實講，台灣這幾百年已被外來之勢力「解放」了，不少次，其結果

好像一次不如一次再來一次，實在不敢領教。中共在美之統戰人員，一再強調「尊重台灣人民之願望」，我們可以相信嗎？據他們在美國發行之報紙報導，加州舊金山地區的台灣省留學生也於二月二十八日舉行二二八起義討論會，試問我們在這兒的鄉友，有幾位接到開會通知？共國民黨製造「民意」的那一套把戲還不是