

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

China/Taiwan: Evolution of the “One China” Policy – Key Statements from Washington, Beijing, and Taipei

Updated March 12, 2001

Shirley A. Kan
Specialist in National Security Policy
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

This CRS Report was initiated upon a request from Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott in the 106th Congress.

China/Taiwan: Evolution of the “One China” Policy – Key Statements from Washington, Beijing, and Taipei

Summary

On July 9, 1999, questions about the “one China” policy arose again after Lee Teng-hui, then-President of Taiwan, characterized cross-strait relations as “special state-to-state ties.” The Clinton Administration responded that Lee’s statement was not helpful and reaffirmed the “one China” policy and opposition to “two Chinas.” Beijing, in February 2000, issued its second White Paper on Taiwan, reaffirming its “peaceful unification” policy but with new warnings about the risk of conflict. There also have been questions about whether and how President Chen Shui-bian, inaugurated in May 2000, might adjust Taiwan’s policy toward the Mainland.

In Part I, this CRS report discusses the policy on “one China” since the United States began in 1971 to reach understandings with the People’s Republic of China (PRC) government in Beijing. Part II documents the evolution of the “one China” principle as articulated in key statements by Washington, Beijing, and Taipei.

Despite apparently consistent statements over almost three decades, the critical “one China” principle has been left somewhat ambiguous and subject to different interpretations among Washington, Beijing, and Taipei. Apart from questions about what the policy entails, issues have arisen about whether successive Administrations have changed the U.S. position since 1971, in response to changing conditions.

The U.S. policy on “one China” has evolved to cover three issues: sovereignty, peaceful resolution, and cross-strait dialogue. First, the United States did not explicitly state its own position on the status of Taiwan in the three communiqués, but “acknowledged” the “one China” position of both sides of the Taiwan Strait. Nonetheless, some have contended that the U.S. position, since originally formulated in 1972, in the first of three Communiqués, has adopted the “one China” principle and shifted closer to that of the PRC’s. Some in Congress and elsewhere contended that President Clinton’s statement on “Three Noes” was a change in U.S. policy. Second, successive Administrations have expressed the consistent U.S. stance – in increasingly stronger ways – that any resolution of the Taiwan question be peaceful. Third, the Reagan Administration agreed to “Six Assurances” with Taiwan in 1982, including promises that Washington will not mediate and will not pressure Taipei to negotiate with Beijing. With intermittent cross-strait talks and military tensions in the 1990s, however, President Clinton has urged dialogue and a peaceful resolution “as soon as possible.” In July 1999, U.S. encouragement of dialogue culminated in President Clinton’s articulation of a new phrase: that U.S. policy has “three pillars” (one China, cross-strait dialogue, and peaceful resolution).

Since 1979, Congress has exercised oversight of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), which governs U.S. policy toward Taiwan, or the Republic of China (ROC). Under the rubric of the “one China” policy, issues include: U.S. arms sales to Taiwan and how U.S. statements might be ambiguous or clarified for deterrence against provocations or conflict; how to maintain peace and stability, including the U.S. political and military roles in the cross-strait dispute; and how to support Taiwan’s quest for “international space.”

Contents

Part I: U.S. Policy on “One China”	1
Introduction	1
Ambiguity in the Key Statements	2
Has U.S. Policy Changed?	3
Sovereignty	4
Use of Force	6
Cross-Strait Dialogue	7
Policy Issues	8
Part II: Excerpts of Key Statements by	
Washington, Beijing, and Taipei	10
Statements During Nixon Administration	10
Henry Kissinger’s Private Meeting with PRC Premier Zhou Enlai	10
Nixon’s Private Talks with Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai	10
U.S.-PRC Joint Communique (Shanghai Communique)	11
Mao on Use of Force	12
Statements During Ford Administration	12
President Ford’s Address to a Joint Session of Congress	12
Statements During Carter Administration	13
U.S. Statement on Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and the People’s Republic of China	13
PRC Statement on Establishing China-U.S. Diplomatic Relations	13
ROC President Chiang Ching-kuo’s Statement on Relations with the United States	14
PRC’s New Year’s Message to Compatriots in Taiwan	14
U.S.-PRC Joint Communique on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations (Normalization Communique)	15
Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), P.L. 96-8	15
Statements During Reagan Administration	17
PRC Leader Ye Jianying’s Nine-Point Proposal	17
Letter from President Reagan to Vice Chairman Deng Xiaoping	18
U.S.-PRC Joint Communique on Arms Sales (1982 Communique)	18
President Reagan’s Statement on U.S. Arms Sales to Taiwan	19
PRC’s Statement on the Communique	20
Republic of China’s Statement and the “Six Assurances”	20
Assistant Secretary of State John Holdridge and Six Assurances	21
PRC Leader Deng Xiaoping on “One China, Two Systems”	22
Statements During Bush Administration	22
Toast at the Welcoming Banquet in Beijing	22
Taiwan’s Guidelines for National Unification	23
Taiwan on the Meaning of “One China”	23
President Bush on the Sale of F-16s to Taiwan	23
Beijing and Taipei Agree to Disagree on “One China”	24
Statements During Clinton Administration	25
PRC Premier Li Peng Warns Taiwan	25
Mainland-Taiwan “Koo-Wang” Talks (Singapore)	25
Taiwan’s Bid to Gain Parallel Representation at the U.N	27

PRC's White Paper on Taiwan	27
Taiwan's White Paper on Cross-Strait Relations	28
Washington's Taiwan Policy Review	29
PRC President Jiang Zemin's "Eight Points"	30
Taiwan President Lee Teng-hui's "Six Point" Response	31
U.S. Visa For Lee Teng-hui's Private Visit to Cornell University	32
Clinton's Secret Letter to Jiang Zemin and "Three Noes"	33
U.S. Department of State and March 1996 Taiwan Strait Tensions	33
President Clinton's Meeting with Japanese Prime Minister	34
Secretary of State Christopher on Improving Relations with China	34
Taiwan's First Direct Presidential Election and Inaugural Address	35
Taiwan's Multi-Party National Development Conference	36
President Clinton's Statements at the 1997 Summit (Washington)	36
1997 Clinton-Jiang Summit and Joint U.S.-China Statement	37
1997 Summit and the State Department on the "Three Noes"	38
1998 Clinton-Jiang Summit in Beijing	38
1998 Summit and Clinton's Statement on the "Three Noes"	39
Taiwan's Lee Teng-hui on "One Divided China"	39
Second "Koo-Wang Talks" (Shanghai)	40
U.S. Assistant Secretary Stan Roth on "Interim Agreements"	40
Taiwan's Lee Teng-hui on "Special State-to-State" Relations	41
President Clinton on the "Three Pillars" of Policy Toward Taiwan	42
Taiwan's Position Paper on "Special State-to-State Relationship"	42
Presidents Clinton and Jiang at APEC Meeting	43
PRC's Second Taiwan White Paper and "Three Ifs"	44
President Clinton on Resolution with Assent of Taiwan's People	45
Taiwan President Chen Shui-bian's Inauguration Speech	45
PRC Vice Premier Qian Qichen's New Formulation	46
Taiwan President on "Integration"	46

China/Taiwan: Evolution of the “One China” Policy – Key Statements from Washington, Beijing, and Taipei

Part I: U.S. Policy on “One China”

Introduction

Questions about the “one China” policy arose again after Lee Teng-hui, then-President of Taiwan (also called the Republic of China (ROC)), characterized cross-strait relations as “special state-to-state ties” on July 9, 1999. Beijing responded vehemently with calls for Lee to retract the perceived deviation from the “one China” policy and reiterated longstanding threats to use force if necessary to prevent a declaration of independence by Taiwan. The People’s Republic of China (PRC) also questioned U.S. commitment to the “one China” principle and expressed opposition to any U.S. military intervention. The Clinton Administration responded that Lee’s statement was not helpful and reaffirmed the “one China” policy and opposition to “two Chinas.”¹ Some questioned whether U.S. law, the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), requires U.S. defense of Taiwan against an attack from the People’s Liberation Army (PLA). Congress paid greater attention to arms sales to Taiwan.

Senator Helms, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said at a July 21, 1999 hearing that Lee’s statement has “created an opportunity to break free from the anachronistic, Beijing-inspired one-China policy which has imprisoned U.S. policy toward China and Taiwan for years.” Representative Gilman, Chairman of the International Relations Committee, wrote in a September 7, 1999 letter to President Clinton that it is a “common misperception” that Washington conceded officially that Beijing is the capital of the “one China” that includes Taiwan. He declared that “under no circumstances should the United States move toward Beijing’s version of ‘one China’.”²

The purpose of this CRS Report is to discuss the policy on “one China” since the United States (under the Nixon Administration) began in 1971 to reach understandings with the PRC government in Beijing. This report also reviews

¹ Department of State, Press Briefing by James Rubin, July 15, 1999; Secretary of State Madeleine Albright’s remarks on visit of Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak, July 20, 1999.

² Dalrymple, Mary, “Taiwanese President’s Comment Inspires GOP to Renew Attack on Clinton’s ‘One China’ Policy,” *Congressional Quarterly*, July 24, 1999; Letter from Representative Benjamin Gilman to President Clinton, September 7, 1999.

comprehensively the evolution of the “one China” principle as it has been articulated in key statements by Washington, Beijing, and Taipei.³

Ambiguity in the Key Statements

Four documents stand out among the many U.S. statements on policy concerning Taiwan: Shanghai Communique of 1972, Normalization Communique of 1979, the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) (P.L. 96-8), and August 17, 1982 Communique on arms sales.⁴ (See excerpts of these and other statements in Part II.) Despite apparently consistent formal and private statements over almost three decades, the “one China” principle has been left somewhat ambiguous and subject to different interpretations among Washington, Beijing, and Taipei. The idea of “one China” has been complicated by the co-existence of the PRC government ruling the mainland and the ROC government on Taiwan since 1949. The political and strategic context of those key statements has also experienced significant change. Since political reforms began in 1986, Taiwan became a democracy, with new legitimacy for the government and greater say by opponents of unification with the PRC. The Tiananmen crackdown of 1989 in the PRC dramatically proved the limits to liberal change on the mainland. The original strategic rationale for U.S.-PRC rapprochement faded with the end of the Cold War.

There are several complicating issues about the language in the statements. First, “China” in the “one China” principle was not defined in the three joint communiqués. In the Normalization Communique, the United States recognized the PRC government as the sole legal government of China, but the PRC has never ruled Taiwan and other islands under the control of the ROC government. Deng Xiaoping’s 1984 proposal of “one China, two systems” tried to define Taiwan as a Special Administrative Region under the PRC after unification. On the other hand, “Taiwan” was defined in Sec. 15(2) of the TRA essentially to be the islands of Taiwan and the Pescadores, plus the people, entities, and governing authorities there.

Second, there has been disagreement as to whether the Taiwan issue actually was resolved or determined. President Nixon’s notes from his private talks with PRC leaders in 1972 indicate that he expressed a U.S. policy that the status of Taiwan “is determined” to be part of one China. The PRC’s December 1978 statement on normalization of diplomatic relations with the United States said that the Taiwan question “has now been resolved between the two countries.” However, the U.S. statement of December 1978 on normalization stated the expectation that the Taiwan question “will be settled” peacefully by the Chinese themselves. The TRA also stipulated the U.S. expectation that the future of Taiwan “will be determined” by

³ For background, see also: CRS Issue Brief IB98034, *Taiwan: Recent Developments and U.S. Policy Choices*, updated regularly, by Kerry Dumbaugh, and CRS Report 98-837, *Taiwan: the “Three No’s,” Congressional-Administration Differences, and U.S. Policy Issues*, October 1, 1998, by Robert Sutter.

⁴ Some observers say that the U.S. position on “one China” goes back more than three decades. (See for example, Henry Kissinger, “Storm Clouds Gathering,” *Washington Post*, September 7, 1999, p. 19.) This CRS report discusses the policy on “one China” since the United States began in 1971 to reach understandings with the PRC government in Beijing.

peaceful means. President Reagan's 1982 statement on arms sales to Taiwan declared that "the Taiwan question is a matter for the Chinese people, on both sides of the Taiwan Strait, to resolve." Moreover, "settlement" or "resolution" – not stated as "unification" – of the Taiwan question is left open to be determined by both sides.

Third, the issues of the PRC's possible use of force, U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, and possible U.S. defense of Taiwan have remained contentious. Washington has consistently stated its strong interest that there be a peaceful settlement, but the PRC has not renounced its claimed sovereign right to use force if necessary. Washington has not promised to end arms sales to Taiwan, although the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954 was terminated in 1980.⁵ In the surprise announcements of December 1978 on establishing diplomatic relations, the United States stated its interest in a peaceful resolution, but the PRC countered that Taiwan is China's internal affair. President Reagan agreed to the 1982 Communique on reducing U.S. arms sales to Taiwan provided that the PRC pursues a policy of peaceful unification. Since the early 1990s, the PLA has built up its missile force and acquired modern arms, especially from Moscow. The United States has provided for Taiwan's defense capabilities, including significant arms sales, and deployed two aircraft carrier battle groups to waters near Taiwan during the March 1996 missile firings from the PRC.

The 1979 TRA requires the United States to provide defense articles and services to Taiwan, and to consider with "grave concern" any non-peaceful means to determine Taiwan's future. In deciding on that language in 1979, Members of Congress had discussed whether the wording on U.S. military intentions was clear or ambiguous. Since the late 1990s, a new debate has arisen over whether ambiguity in U.S. statements about the U.S. military role continues to serve U.S. interests in a peaceful outcome.⁶ Policy issues include whether and how U.S. statements of intentions might be clarified to specify the conditions under which the U.S. military will defend Taiwan and the U.S. stance on any actions taken by Taiwan to change its declared political status.⁷

Has U.S. Policy Changed?

Apart from questions about the language in the key statements on "one China," policy questions have arisen about whether successive Administrations have changed the U.S. position since 1971. The Clinton Administration, like previous ones, maintained that U.S. policy has not changed. Some in Congress and others, however, have contended that U.S. policy has changed in some important areas. The "one China" policy has evolved to cover three issues: sovereignty, use of force, and cross-

⁵ According to the treaty, it is terminated one year after notice is given by one side (in 1979).

⁶ In the 106th Congress, the House International Relations Committee debated this issue of "ambiguity" and other issues in the markup of H.R. 1838, "Taiwan Security Enhancement Act," October 26, 1999.

⁷ E.g., Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "A Taiwan Deal," *Washington Post*, March 8, 1998; Heritage Foundation and Project for the New American Century, "Statement on the Defense of Taiwan" by 23 conservatives, including Richard Armitage and Paul Wolfowitz, August 20, 1999; Thomas J. Christensen, "Clarity on Taiwan," *Washington Post*, March 20, 2000.

strait dialogue. (See excerpts of key statements in Part II.) There are issues as to whether any elements of the “one China” policy should be reviewed for changes.

Sovereignty. The United States did not explicitly state its own position on the status of Taiwan in the three communiques. In 1972, while still recognizing the ROC, Washington declared that it “acknowledges” that “all Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Strait” maintain that there is one China and Taiwan is a part of China, and that the United States did not challenge that position. After shifting diplomatic recognition to the PRC, the United States, in 1979 and 1982, again “acknowledged the Chinese position”⁸ of one China and Taiwan is part of China. However, the 1982 communique further stated that the United States has no intention of pursuing a policy of “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan,” while President Reagan’s accompanying statement said that “the Taiwan question is a matter for the Chinese people, on both sides of the Taiwan Strait, to resolve.” The TRA did not discuss the “one China” principle. In 1994, the Clinton Administration stated after its Taiwan Policy Review that the United States had “acknowledged” the Chinese position on one China and that “since 1978, each Administration has reaffirmed this policy.” In the May 1995 announcement on granting a visa to Lee Teng-hui to visit Cornell University, the Clinton Administration stated “the United States also acknowledges the Chinese position that there is but one China, and Taiwan is a part of China.”

Despite these apparent similarities in U.S. policy statements, some contend that the U.S. position, since originally formulated in 1972, has adopted the “one China” principle and shifted closer to that of the PRC’s rather than steadily maintaining equal distance from Beijing and Taipei. In 1982, Senator Glenn criticized both the Carter and Reagan Administrations:

The ambiguous formulation agreed upon in the 1979 joint communique went considerably further in recognizing the PRC’s claim to Taiwan. Although the word “acknowledged” remained, the object of our acknowledgment shifted noticeably. We no longer just acknowledged that both Chinas asserted the principle that there was one China, but instead acknowledged the Chinese position that there is but one China. By dropping the key phrase “all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain” one could interpret that we had moved from the position of neutral bystander noting the existence of a dispute, to a party accepting the Chinese assertion that there is one China. Clearly, this was the PRC’s interpretation. ... More recently, Peking’s threats to downgrade relations with the United States, unless Washington agreed to end all arms sales to Taiwan, prompted President Reagan to write to China’s Communist Party Chairman, Hu Yaobang, in May 1982, and assure him that, “Our policy will continue to be based on the principle that there is but one China. ...” We now assert that it is our policy, U.S. policy, that there is but one China, and although not stated, indicate implicitly that Taiwan is a part of that one China. The use of the qualifier “acknowledged” has been dropped altogether. ... I do not believe that anyone can dispute that the U.S. policy toward China and Taiwan has changed dramatically over the last 10 years. Let me reiterate one more time, in 1972, we acknowledged that the Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Strait maintained that there was but one China. Today it is U.S. policy that there is but one China. Despite this

⁸ The Chinese text said “recognized China’s position.”

remarkable shift over time, the State Department, at each juncture, has assured us that our policy remained essentially unchanged.⁹

In August 1995 – earlier than public statements showed in 1997 – President Clinton reportedly sent a secret letter to PRC President Jiang Zemin in which he stated as the U.S. position that we would (1) “oppose” Taiwan independence, (2) would not support “two Chinas” or one China and one Taiwan, and (3) would not support Taiwan’s admission to the United Nations.¹⁰ The opposition to Taiwan independence seemed to go beyond the promises made by former National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger and President Nixon in 1971 and 1972 of no U.S. support for Taiwan independence. Later, that wording was apparently changed from opposition to a more neutral stance of non-support. This letter reportedly formed the basis of what were later known publicly as the “Three Noes.”

At the 1997 Clinton-Jiang summit in Washington, the two leaders issued a joint statement which included a U.S. position: “the United States reiterates that it adheres to its ‘one China’ policy and the principles set forth in the three U.S.-China joint communiqués.” While that joint statement did not include the “Three Noes,” the Administration decided to have a State Department spokesperson say two days later that: “we certainly made clear that we have a one-China policy; that we don’t support a one-China, one-Taiwan policy. We don’t support a two-China policy. We don’t support Taiwan independence, and we don’t support Taiwanese membership in organizations that require you to be a member state.” While in China for a summit in June 1998, President Clinton chose an informal forum to say: “I had a chance to reiterate our Taiwan policy, which is that we don’t support independence for Taiwan, or two Chinas, or one Taiwan-one China. And we don’t believe that Taiwan should be a member in any organization for which statehood is a requirement.”

Some have questioned whether the statement on “Three Noes,” especially as it was publicly declared by the U.S. President while in the PRC, was a change in U.S. policy.¹¹ U.S. non-support for a one China, one Taiwan; or two Chinas can be traced to the private assurances of the Nixon Administration in the early 1970s. However, the Clinton Administration, beginning with its Taiwan Policy Review of 1994, added non-support for Taipei’s entry into the United Nations (U.N.), which became an issue

⁹ Statement of Hon. John Glenn, U.S. Senator from Ohio, on China-Taiwan Policy, July 22, 1982, in: Lester L. Wolff and David L. Simon, *Legislative History of the Taiwan Relations Act* (New York: American Association for Chinese Studies, 1982), p. 306-307.

¹⁰ Garver, John W., *Face Off: China, the United States, and Taiwan’s Democratization* (University of Washington Press, 1997); James Mann, *About Face: A History of America’s Curious Relationship with China, From Nixon to Clinton* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999).

¹¹ For example: Stephen J. Yates, “Clinton Statement Undermines Taiwan,” Heritage Foundation, July 10, 1998; Ted Galen Carpenter, “Let Taiwan Defend Itself,” Policy Analysis, Cato Institute, August 24, 1998; Stephen J. Yates, “Promoting Freedom and Security in U.S.-Taiwan Policy,” Heritage Foundation, October 13, 1998; James Lilley and Arthur Waldron, “Taiwan is a ‘State,’ Get Over It,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 14, 1999; Harvey J. Feldman, “How Washington Can Defuse Escalating Tensions in the Taiwan Strait,” Heritage Foundation, August 19, 1999.

after Taipei launched its bid in 1993. In response to President Clinton's "Three Noes," concerned Members in both the Senate and the House nearly unanimously passed resolutions in July 1998, reaffirming the U.S. commitment to Taiwan.

The Clinton Administration, nonetheless, argued that the "Three Noes" did not represent a change in U.S. policy on Taiwan. Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 25, 1999, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth stated that "every point made there [in the "Three Noes"] had been made before by a previous Administration and there was no change whatsoever." In a written response to a question from Senator Helms, Roth cited as precedents for the "Three Noes" a 1971 statement by Kissinger, a 1972 statement by Nixon, a 1979 statement by Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, and President Reagan's 1982 Communique.

Use of Force. The PRC has never renounced its claimed right to use force in what it sees as an internal problem and, moreover, has voiced more explicitly and demonstrated clearly its willingness to adopt a military solution – despite its announced policy of "peaceful unification" since 1979. Since the early 1990s, the PRC has purchased modern arms from the Soviet Union/Russia and built up its missile force.¹² In December 1992 and March 1993, PRC President Jiang Zemin and Premier Li Peng began to warn of having to use "drastic" or "resolute" measures to prevent Taiwan independence. Then, in 1995-1996, the PRC launched provocative military exercises, including missile "test-firings," to intimidate voters in Taiwan.

In February 2000, on the eve of another presidential election in Taiwan, the PRC issued its second White Paper on Taiwan, reaffirming the peaceful unification policy but adding a new precondition for the use of force. As one of "three ifs," the PRC officially warned that even if Taiwan indefinitely refuses to negotiate a peaceful settlement, the PRC would be compelled to use force to achieve unification. However, no deadline was issued. The White Paper also warned the United States not to sell arms to Taiwan or pursue any form of alliance with Taiwan, including cooperation in theater missile defense (TMD).¹³

As a result, successive Administrations have expressed the consistent U.S. stance – in increasingly stronger ways – that any resolution of the Taiwan question be peaceful. Congress passed and President Carter signed the TRA of 1979, adding a more forceful U.S. commitment and a potential U.S. role in maintaining peace in the strait. However, the TRA left U.S. involvement somewhat ambiguous. Section 2(b)(4) states that the United States will consider with "grave concern" any non-peaceful means to determine Taiwan's future. The TRA also excluded the islands off the mainland (e.g., Quemoy and Matsu) in its security coverage over Taiwan.

¹² See CRS Report 97-391, *China: Ballistic and Cruise Missiles*, by Shirley A. Kan, and CRS Report RL30700, *China's Foreign Conventional Arms Acquisitions: Background and Analysis*, October 10, 2000, by Shirley Kan, Christopher Bolkcom, and Ronald O'Rourke.

¹³ On Congress' interest in possible TMD sales to Taiwan: CRS Report RL30379, *Missile Defense Options for Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan: A Review of the Defense Department Report to Congress*, November 30, 1999, by Robert D. Shuey and Shirley A. Kan.

In 1982, President Reagan issued the Joint Communiqué on reducing arms sales to Taiwan, but he also stated that U.S. arms sales will continue in accordance with the TRA and with the full expectation that the PRC's approach to the resolution of the Taiwan issue will continue to be peaceful. President Bush decided in September 1992 to sell 150 F-16 fighters to Taiwan, citing concerns about the cross-strait balance. Deploying two carrier battle groups to waters off Taiwan in March 1996, during the PRC's second set of missile firings to intimidate voters in Taiwan, the Clinton Administration demonstrated that there may be grave consequences, as well as "grave concern," to non-peaceful efforts to determine Taiwan's future.

Despite unofficial relations, U.S. arms sales to Taiwan have been significant. Arms deliveries to Taiwan (primarily from the United States) totaled \$20.6 billion from 1992-1999, with Taiwan ranking 2nd in the developing world (after Saudi Arabia).¹⁴ Depending on PLA threats to Taiwan, the United States may further increase arms sales and other defense support to Taiwan and adjust U.S. military deployments in Asia.¹⁵ Moreover, beginning after tensions in the Taiwan Strait in 1996, the Pentagon is said to have quietly expanded the sensitive military relationship with Taiwan to levels unprecedented since 1979. These broader exchanges reportedly have increased attention to "software," including discussions over strategy, military thinking, and plans in the event of an invasion of Taiwan.¹⁶

Cross-Strait Dialogue. President Nixon in 1972, President Carter in 1978, and President Reagan in 1982 publicly stated the U.S. expectation that the Chinese themselves will settle the Taiwan question. The Reagan Administration also agreed to "Six Assurances" with Taiwan in 1982. The assurances included promises that Washington will not mediate between Taipei and Beijing, and will not pressure Taipei to negotiate with Beijing. In a March 25, 1999 hearing, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth assured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the future of cross-strait relations is a matter for Beijing and Taipei to resolve. No Administration has taken a position on how or when they should do so."

As Taipei and Beijing's economic relationship grew to significant levels by the early 1990s and the two sides began to talk directly through "unofficial organizations," the United States has increasingly voiced its support for the cross-strait dialogue. Like a bystander, the Clinton Administration said in its Taiwan Policy Review of 1994 that "the United States applauds the continuing progress in the cross-

¹⁴ CRS Report RL30640, *Conventional Arms Transfers to Developing Nations, 1992-1999*, August 18, 2000, by Richard F. Grimmer.

¹⁵ Some Members in the 106th Congress supported the "Taiwan Security Enhancement Act." Other Members and the Clinton Administration opposed the bill as unnecessary and provocative in a delicate situation, while saying the Pentagon has exercised the authority under the TRA to provide arms to and deepen military ties with Taiwan. In addition to supporting Taiwan's defense capability, Congress also looked at U.S. military deployments, requiring a report from the Pentagon on operational planning to implement the TRA (in FY2000 Appropriations legislation, P.L. 106-113).

¹⁶ On U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, see: CRS Report RS20365, *Taiwan: Annual Arms Sales Process*, October 21, 1999, and CRS Report RS20483, *Taiwan: Major U.S. Arms Sales Since 1990*, by Shirley A. Kan.

strait dialogue.” After talks broke off and military tensions flared, however, the Clinton Administration, after 1996, privately and publicly urged both sides to hold this dialogue as an added part of a more proactive U.S. policy. In July 1996, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake visited China and planned a meeting (later canceled) with Wang Daohan, head of the PRC’s organization for cross-strait talks. At the 1997 U.S.-PRC summit, President Clinton urged for a peaceful resolution “as soon as possible” and that “sooner is better than later.”

In March 1999, Assistant Secretary of State Stan Roth publicly raised the possibility of “interim agreements” between Beijing and Taipei, after several prominent former Clinton Administration officials made similar proposals.¹⁷ In July 1999, the U.S. stance on the cross-strait dialogue culminated in President Clinton’s articulation of a new phrase: that U.S. policy has “three pillars” (one China, cross-strait dialogue, and peaceful resolution), a phrase then repeated by other top Clinton Administration officials, such as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

Policy Issues

In short, since 1971, U.S. Presidents and other top officials – both privately and publicly – have consistently articulated a “one China” policy in understandings with the PRC. Nonetheless, policymakers have continued to face unresolved issues, while

¹⁷ Roth’s mention of possible “interim agreements” raised concerns in Taipei that it was a proposal by the Clinton Administration to pressure Taipei into negotiating with Beijing, according to Taiwan media reports. Roth’s remarks also came in the context of academic suggestions to reduce cross-strait tensions issued by former or future Clinton Administration officials. In January 1998, a delegation of former officials led by former Defense Secretary William Perry visited Beijing and Taipei, reportedly passing a message from the PRC that it was willing to resume talks with Taiwan. The February 21, 1998 *Washington Post* reported that the delegation was part of the Administration’s effort to have a “track two” dialogue with Beijing and Taipei and to encourage resumption of cross-strait talks. At a February 1998 conference in Taipei, Kenneth Lieberthal (a University of Michigan professor who joined the National Security Council as the Senior Director for Asian Affairs in August 1998) proposed a 50-year “interim arrangement” in which the PRC (as “China”) would renounce the use of force against Taiwan, and the ROC (as “Taiwan, China”) would agree not to declare independence (*Reuters*, March 1, 1998). In the March 8, 1998 *Washington Post*, Joseph Nye (former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs) proposed a “three-part package” that would include a clarification that Washington would not recognize or defend Taiwan independence but also would not accept the use of force against Taiwan, and a “one country, three systems” approach. Also in March 1998, former National Security Advisor Anthony Lake visited Taiwan and reportedly encouraged resumption of cross-strait talks. In *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 1998), Chas. Freeman (former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs) urged Washington to encourage Beijing and Washington to defer negotiations on their long-term relationship for a certain period, such as 50 years, and to reevaluate arms sales to Taiwan. In February-March 1999, Perry led another delegation, including retired Admiral Joseph Prueher (later nominated in September 1999 to be ambassador to Beijing), and the group made suggestions to the PRC and Taiwan on how to reduce cross-strait tensions, according to *Notes from the National Committee* (Winter/Spring 1999). On September 5, 1999, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Susan Shirk mentioned “one country, three systems” as a possible approach for “one China,” Taiwan media reported.

the political and strategic context of the policy has changed dramatically since the early 1970s. Throughout these decades, there have been criticisms, especially from Congress, that successive Administrations have shifted the U.S. position closer to that of Beijing's – on questions of sovereignty, arms sales, or cross-strait dialogue. Yet, since the 1990s, various Administrations have also increasingly shown stronger opposition – through arms sales and military deployments – to PRC efforts to use force to determine Taiwan's future.

Thus, Congress and the Administration continue to face critical issues under the rubric of the “one China” policy, including:

- ! Are current cross-strait political, economic, and military trends in U.S. interests, and what is the risk of war with U.S. involvement?
- ! What are probable outcomes (e.g., status quo, unification, confederation, conflict), and how might U.S. interests be affected?
- ! What are the strategies and objectives of Beijing and Taipei?
- ! What should be the degree of diplomatic and military involvement in the U.S. strategy?
- ! Should Washington change any elements of policy, including past assurances to Beijing or Taipei (e.g., “Three Noes,” “Six Assurances”)?
- ! Should U.S. policy statements of intentions be clarified (e.g., on U.S. military intervention, Taipei's declarations of independence, or Taiwan's international participation) and the U.S. role deepened (e.g., facilitation, mediation) to work towards cross-strait dialogue or negotiations?
- ! How should defense policies (e.g., on arms sales, military cooperation with Taiwan, U.S. military deployments, missile defense) be carried out to deter conflict and maintain stability?
- ! How well are U.S. policies coordinated with those of our allies and friends in Asia?

Part II: Excerpts of Key Statements by Washington, Beijing, and Taipei

In Part II below, this CRS Report provides documented excerpts from key statements on “one China” as articulated by Washington, Beijing, and Taipei, in addition to the three Communiques and the TRA, since the United States reached understandings with the PRC in 1971. The selected statements also give a comprehensive look at significant policy statements and events in Washington, Beijing, as well as Taipei. This compilation identifies relatively significant statements, especially those indicating a new element in policy of those governments. The statements also include authoritative accounts of private presidential assurances on U.S. policy. The three perspectives on “one China” are placed in chronological order under successive U.S. Administrations. The actual texts are placed in italics.

Statements During Nixon Administration

Henry Kissinger’s Private Meeting with PRC Premier Zhou Enlai.¹⁸ July 9, 1971

National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger told Premier Zhou Enlai that the United States did not seek “two Chinas, a one-China, one-Taiwan solution, nor an independent Taiwan.”

Nixon’s Private Talks with Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. February 22, 1972

Accounts of President Nixon’s secret talk with Chinese Chairman Mao Zedong and Premier Zhou Enlai during his trip to China in 1972 say that Nixon made promises on the question of Taiwan that went beyond the communique issued at the end. In what the Carter Administration later called “Nixon’s Five Points,” Nixon’s notes said the following.

¹⁸ Holdridge, John, *Crossing the Divide: An Insider’s Account of Normalization of U.S.-China Relations* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1997), p. 90. See also: James Mann, *About Face: A History of America’s Curious Relationship with China, From Nixon to Clinton* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), p. 33 (citing a declassified chronology from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) by Richard Solomon, *U.S.-PRC Political Negotiations, 1967-84, An Annotated Chronology*, December 1985, released to Mann (a *Los Angeles Times* reporter) under the Freedom of Information Act). Mann reports that what Kissinger pledged to Zhou went beyond previous U.S. promises and contradicted the official U.S. position that sovereignty over Taiwan was “an unsettled question subject to future international resolution.” At a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on March 25, 1999, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth also cited Kissinger’s promise as recorded in the CIA’s chronology in his written response to Senator Helms’ question about precedents for President Clinton’s June 1998 “Three Noes” statement. Also see: Patrick Tyler, *A Great Wall* (New York: PublicAffairs, 1999), p. 98.

Taiwan:

I reiterate what our policy is:

1. *Status is determined – one China, Taiwan is part of China –*
2. *Won't support Taiwan independence*
3. *Try [original emphasis] to restrain Japan – [from increasing influence in Taiwan]*
4. *Support peaceful resolution*
5. *Will seek normalization —.*¹⁹

Also, according to Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth's March 1999 testimony, Nixon pledged no U.S. support for Taiwan independence (second time after Kissinger's 1971 promise):²⁰

We have not and will not support any Taiwan independence movement.

U.S.-PRC Joint Communiqué (Shanghai Communiqué).

February 27, 1972

The Chinese reaffirmed its position: The Taiwan question is the crucial question obstructing the normalization of relations between China and the United States; the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government of China; Taiwan is a province of China which has long been returned to the motherland; the liberation of Taiwan is China's internal affair in which no other country has the right to interfere; and all U.S. forces and military installations must be withdrawn from Taiwan. The Chinese Government firmly opposes any activities which aim at the creation of "one China, one Taiwan," "one China, two governments," "two Chinas," and "independent Taiwan" or advocate that "the status of Taiwan remains to be determined."

The U.S. side declared: The United States acknowledges²¹ that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait²² maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan

¹⁹ Mann, p. 46; Harding, Harry, *A Fragile Relationship: The United States and China Since 1972* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1992), p. 43-44. The full transcripts of Nixon's private talks have not been made public. According to Holdridge, Nixon reiterated the position against an independent Taiwan that Kissinger told Zhou in July 1971.

²⁰ Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on United States-Taiwan Relations: The 20th Anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, March 25, 1999, written response to Senator Helms' question about precedents for President Clinton's June 1998 "Three Noes" statement, citing a Memorandum of Conversation, Tuesday, February 22, 1972, 2:10 pm-6:00 pm (declassified version).

²¹ The Chinese text used "*ren shi*" ("to acknowledge"). The Chinese term was changed in the 1979 communiqué to "recognize."

²² Holdridge (p. 89), then a senior staff member for East Asia at the National Security Council under Henry Kissinger, wrote that "it was helpful that both the CCP [Chinese Communist Party] and the Kuomintang [(KMT) or Nationalist Party] regarded Taiwan as part of China, for by accepting this point and affirming our interest in the settlement of the sovereignty question 'by the Chinese themselves' we would affront neither side." Holdridge (p. 93) also

(continued...)

is a part of China. The United States Government does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves. With this prospect in mind, it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes.

Mao on Use of Force.²³

November 12, 1973

As for the question of our relations with Taiwan, that is quite complex. I do not believe in a peaceful transition. ... They are a bunch of counter-revolutionaries [the Nationalists on Taiwan]. How could they cooperate with us? I say that we can do without Taiwan for the time being, and let it come after “100 years.”

Statements During Ford Administration

President Ford’s Address to a Joint Session of Congress.²⁴

August 12, 1974

To the People’s Republic of China, whose legendary hospitality I enjoyed, I pledge continuity in our commitment to the principles of the Shanghai communique. The new relationship built on those principles has demonstrated that it serves serious and objective mutual interests and has become an enduring feature of the world scene.

²² (...continued)

recounted that the wording of “all Chinese” was originally formulated as “all people,” and the State Department objected to the word “people,” because some on Taiwan regarded themselves as “Taiwanese” and did not agree that Taiwan was a part of China.

²³ Tyler, p. 172, citing Henry Kissinger, Memorandum of Conversation with Mao Zedong, Chairman Mao’s residence, November 12, 1973. One year later, in a meeting with Deng Xiaoping in Beijing, Tyler writes that Kissinger stated his understanding that Mao had said that the leadership would ultimately have to solve the Taiwan question by force and it could take 100 years. Deng said that “100 years” was symbolic. Kissinger was concerned about a military solution to the Taiwan question shortly after U.S.-PRC normalization.

²⁴ *Public Papers of the Presidents, Gerald Ford, 1974.*

Statements During Carter Administration

U.S. Statement on Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and the People's Republic of China.²⁵

December 15, 1978

As of January 1, 1979, the United States of America recognizes the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China.

In the future, the American people and the people of Taiwan will maintain commercial, cultural and other relations without official government representation and without diplomatic relations. The Administration will seek adjustments to our laws and regulations to permit the maintenance of commercial, cultural, and other non-governmental relationships in the new circumstances that will exist after normalization. The United States is confident that the people of Taiwan face a peaceful and prosperous future. The United States continues to have an interest in the peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue and expects that the Taiwan issue will be settled peacefully by the Chinese themselves.

PRC Statement on Establishing China-U.S. Diplomatic Relations.²⁶

December 16, 1978

As is known to all, the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government of China and Taiwan is a part of China. The question of Taiwan was the crucial issue obstructing the normalization of relations between China and the United States. It has now been resolved between the two countries in the spirit of the Shanghai Communique and through their joint efforts, thus enabling the normalization of relations so ardently desired by the people of the two countries. As for the way of bringing Taiwan back to the embrace of the motherland and reunifying the country, it is entirely China's internal affair.

²⁵ For full text, see: Harding. In great secrecy, the Carter White House made its final decision to normalize relations with the PRC. President Carter, along with National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and his aid, Michel Oksenberg, did not consult with Congress nor Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary Warren Christopher, nor Assistant Secretary Richard Holbrooke on the timing and final wording of the communique. Secretary Vance and Congress were surprised to be informed hours before the December 15, 1978 announcement. See: Patrick Tyler, "The (Ab)normalization of U.S.-Chinese Relations," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 1999; Cyrus Vance, *Hard Choices* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983); Robert G. Sutter (CRS), "Executive-Legislative Consultations on China Policy, 1978-79," Foreign Affairs Committee Print, June 1980.

²⁶ "Statement of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Connection with the Establishment of China-U.S. Diplomatic Relations," printed in Harding.

ROC President Chiang Ching-kuo's Statement on Relations with the United States.²⁷

December 29, 1978

The Republic of China is an independent sovereign state with a legitimately established government based on the Constitution of the Republic of China. It is an effective government, which has the wholehearted support of her people. The international status and personality of the Republic of China cannot be changed merely because of the recognition of the Chinese Communist regime by any country of the world. The legal status and international personality of the Republic of China is a simple reality which the United States must recognize and respect.

PRC's New Year's Message to Compatriots in Taiwan.²⁸

January 1, 1979

Taiwan has been an inalienable part of China since ancient times. ... Taiwan's separation from the motherland for nearly 30 years has been artificial and against our national interests and aspirations, and this state of affairs must not be allowed to continue. ...

Unification of China now fits in with the direction of popular feeling and the general trend of development. The world in general recognizes only one China, with the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government. The recent conclusion of the China-Japan Treaty of Peace and Friendship and the normalization of relations between China and the United States show still more clearly that no one can stop this trend. ...

We place great hopes on the 17 million people on Taiwan and also the Taiwan authorities. The Taiwan authorities have always taken a firm stand of one China and opposed an independent Taiwan. This is our common stand and the basis for our cooperation. ...

The Chinese Government has ordered the People's Liberation Army [PLA] to stop the bombardment of Quemoy and other islands as of today. A state of military confrontation between the two sides still exists along the Taiwan Strait. This can only create artificial tension. We hold that first of all this military confrontation should be ended through discussion between the Government of the People's

²⁷ "President Chiang Ching-kuo's Five Principles on U.S.-ROC Relations in the Post-Normalization Period," December 29, 1978, printed in Martin L. Lasater, *The Taiwan Issue in Sino-American Strategic Relations* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984). Lasater notes that Chiang informed U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher that future U.S.-ROC ties must rest on five underlying principles of reality, continuity, security, legality, and governmentality. The statement was summarized by James Soong, Deputy-Director of the ROC's Government Information Office.

²⁸ "Text of NPC Standing Committee Message to Taiwan Compatriots," *New China News Agency*, December 31, 1978, in *FBIS*, January 2, 1979. This policy of "unification" replaced the earlier one of "liberation" of Taiwan. The PRC later elaborated on this policy of peaceful unification in Marshal Ye Jianying's "Nine-Point Proposal" of September 30, 1981.

Republic of China and the Taiwan authorities so as to create the necessary prerequisites and a secure environment for the two sides to make contacts and exchanges in whatever area. ...

U.S.-PRC Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations (Normalization Communiqué).

January 1, 1979

The United States of America recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China. Within this context, the people of the United States will maintain cultural, commercial, and other unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan.

The Government of the United States of America acknowledges²⁹ the Chinese³⁰ position that there is but one China and Taiwan is part of China.

Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), P.L. 96-8.

Enacted April 10, 1979

Section 2(b) It is the policy of the United States

(1) to preserve and promote extensive, close, and friendly commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people on Taiwan, as well as the people on the China mainland and all other peoples of the Western Pacific area;

(2) to declare that peace and stability in the area are in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States, and are matters of international concern;

(3) to make clear that the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China rests upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means;

(4) to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States;³¹

²⁹ In the Chinese text, the word for “acknowledge” is “*cheng ren*” (recognize), a change from “*ren shi*” (acknowledge), used in the 1972 Shanghai Communiqué. During debate on the TRA in February 1979, Sen. Javits noted the difference and said that “it is very important that we not subscribe to [the Chinese position on one China] either way.” Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher responded that “we regard the English text as being the binding text. We regard the word ‘acknowledge’ as being the word that is determinative for the U.S.” See Wolff and Simon, p. 310-311.

³⁰ Instead of the phrase “all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait” in the 1972 Shanghai communiqué, the 1979 Normalization communiqué used “the Chinese position” (in the English text) and “China’s position” (in the Chinese text).

³¹ On this language in the TRA, the House report and statements of key Members of Congress (such as Rep. Zablocki, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee) clarified the expectation that there would be a “prompt response” by the United States to a use of force against Taiwan, but the TRA would not specify in advance what the situation or response

(continued...)

(5) to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character; and
 (6) to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan.

Sec. 3(a) In furtherance of the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act, the United States will make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

(b) The President and the Congress shall determine the nature and quantity of such defense articles and services based solely upon their judgment of the needs of Taiwan, in accordance with procedures established by law. Such determination of Taiwan's defense needs shall include review by United States military authorities in connection with recommendations to the President and the Congress.

(c) The President is directed to inform the Congress promptly of any threat to the security or the social or economic system of the people on Taiwan and any danger to the interests of the United States arising therefrom. The President and the Congress shall determine, in accordance with constitutional processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger.

Sec. 4(b)(1) Whenever the laws of the United States refer or relate to foreign countries, nations, states, governments, or similar entities, such terms shall include and such laws shall apply with respect to Taiwan.

Sec. 15(2) The term "Taiwan" includes, as the context may require, the islands of Taiwan and the Pescadores,³² the people on those islands, corporations and other entities and associations created or organized under the laws applied on those islands, and the governing authorities on Taiwan recognized by the United States as the Republic of China prior to January 1, 1979, and any successor governing authorities (including political subdivisions, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof).

³¹ (...continued)

might be. Members also stated the expectation that the President would promptly inform Congress of anticipated dangers to Taiwan, and the President and the Congress would both determine the appropriate U.S. response according to the Constitution. Some Members, such as Rep. Dodd, considered the language on "grave concern" to be "strong" and "unambiguous," but Rep. Quayle noted that "of grave concern" is a "very ambiguous term we read every day in the newspapers." Thus, he added language that became section 2(b)(6) of the TRA. See: Wolff and Simon, p. 77-91.

³² Congress considered the security implications for the United States of whether the definition of "Taiwan" includes the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu (only several miles off the mainland coast). The House report (p. 16) on the TRA noted that the definitions are "illustrative, not limiting." Nonetheless, Rep. Zablocki (chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee) explained that his committee had excluded Quemoy and Matsu from the definition. He pointed out that these islands had been "deliberately left out of the mutual defense treaty," and "we should not be expanding the U.S. security commitment beyond what was in the treaty." He noted that "Quemoy and Matsu are considered by both Taipei and by Peking to be part of mainland China." He concluded that "as far as the reference in the committee report is concerned, it does not extend our security commitment in its referral to Quemoy and Matsu." (Wolff and Simon, p. 282-283.)

Statements During Reagan Administration

PRC Leader Ye Jianying's Nine-Point Proposal.³³

September 30, 1981

Now, I would take this opportunity to elaborate on the policy concerning the return of Taiwan to the motherland for the realization of peaceful unification [proclaimed on New Year's Day 1979]:

1. *In order to bring an end to the unfortunate separation of the Chinese nation as early as possible, we propose that talks be held between the Communist Party of China and the Kuomintang [Nationalist Party] of China on a reciprocal basis so that the two parties will cooperate for the third time to accomplish the great cause of national unification. The two sides may first send people to meet for an exhaustive exchange of views.*
2. *It is the urgent desire of the people of all nationalities on both sides of the strait to communicate with each other, reunite with their relatives, develop trade and increase mutual understanding. We propose that the two sides make arrangements to facilitate the exchange of mail, trade, air and shipping services, and visits by relatives and tourists as well as academic, cultural, and sports exchanges, and reach an agreement thereupon.*
3. *After the country is reunified, Taiwan can enjoy a high degree of autonomy as a special administration region, and it can retain its armed forces. The central government will not interfere with local affairs in Taiwan.*
4. *Taiwan's current socio-economic system will remain unchanged, so will its way of life and its economic and cultural relations with foreign countries. There will be no encroachment on the proprietary rights and lawful right of inheritance over private property, houses, land and enterprises, or on foreign investments.*
5. *People in authority and representative personages of various circles in Taiwan may take up posts of leadership in national political bodies and participate in running the state.*
6. *When Taiwan's local finance is in difficulty, the central government may subsidize it as is fit for the circumstances.*

³³ "Ye Jianying Explains Policy Concerning Return of Taiwan to Motherland and Peaceful Unification," *Xinhua [New China News Agency]*, September 30, 1981, in *FBIS*. According to the Chinese report, Ye spoke as the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (the PRC's legislature). However, Ye enjoyed significant stature in the Chinese leadership largely because he was a Marshal, the highest rank in the PLA. Harding (p. 113, 155) wrote that Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang later described the plan to President Reagan at a meeting in Cancun in October 1981, seeking reductions in and an end to U.S. arms sales to Taiwan.

7. *For people of all nationalities and public figures of various circles in Taiwan who wish to come and settle on the mainland, it is guaranteed that proper arrangements will be made for them, that there will be no discrimination against them, and that they will have the freedom of entry and exit.*
8. *Industrialists and businessmen in Taiwan are welcome to invest and engage in various economic undertakings on the mainland, and their legal rights, interests, and profits are guaranteed.*
9. *The unification of the motherland is the responsibility of all Chinese. We sincerely welcome people of all nationalities, public figures of all circles, and all mass organizations in Taiwan to make proposals and suggestions regarding affairs of state through various channels and in various ways.*

Taiwan's return to the embrace of the motherland and the accomplishment of the great cause of national unification is a great and glorious mission history has bequeathed on our generation. ... We hope that the Kuomintang authorities will stick to their one-China position and their opposition to "two Chinas" and that they will put national interests above everything else, forget previous ill will and join hands with us in accomplishing the great cause of national unification and the great goal of making China prosperous and strong, so as to win glory for our ancestors, bring benefit to our posterity, and write a new and glorious page in the history of the Chinese nation!

Letter from President Reagan to Vice Chairman Deng Xiaoping.³⁴
April 5, 1982

Clearly, the Taiwan issue had been a most difficult problem between our governments. ... The United States firmly adheres to the positions agreed upon in the Joint Communiqué on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and China. There is only one China. We will not permit the unofficial relations between the American people and the people of Taiwan to weaken our commitment to this principle.

U.S.-PRC Joint Communiqué on Arms Sales (1982 Communiqué).³⁵
August 17, 1982

In the Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations on January 1, 1979, issued by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China, the United States of America recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China, and it acknowledged the Chinese position³⁶ that there is but one China and Taiwan is part of China.

³⁴ Printed in Lasater.

³⁵ *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Ronald Reagan.*

³⁶ The Chinese text says that the United States "recognized" ("cheng ren") "China's" ("zhongguo de") position, repeating the formulation of the 1979 communiqué.

The question of United States arms sales to Taiwan was not settled in the course of negotiations between the two countries on establishing diplomatic relations.

The Chinese government reiterates that the question of Taiwan is China's internal affair. The Message to the Compatriots in Taiwan issued by China on January 1, 1979, promulgated a fundamental policy of striving for peaceful unification of the Motherland. The Nine-Point Proposal put forward by China on September 30, 1981 represented a further major effort under this fundamental policy to strive for a peaceful solution to the Taiwan question.

The United States Government attaches great importance to its relations with China, and reiterates that it has no intention of infringing on Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity, or interfering in China's internal affairs, or pursuing a policy of "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan."³⁷ The United States Government understands and appreciates the Chinese policy of striving for a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan question as indicated in China's Message to Compatriots in Taiwan issued on January 1, 1979 and the Nine-Point Proposal put forward by China on September 30, 1981. The new situation which has emerged with regard to the Taiwan question also provides favorable conditions for the settlement of United States-China differences over the question of United States arms sales to Taiwan.

Having in mind the foregoing statements of both sides, the United States Government states that it does not seek to carry out a long-term policy of arms sales to Taiwan, that its arms sales to Taiwan will not exceed, either in qualitative or in quantitative terms, the level of those supplied in recent years since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and China, and that it intends to reduce gradually its sales of arms to Taiwan, leading over a period of time to a final resolution. In so stating, the United States acknowledges China's consistent position regarding the thorough settlement of this issue.

President Reagan's Statement on U.S. Arms Sales to Taiwan.³⁸
August 17, 1982

Regarding future U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, our policy, set forth clearly in the communique [issued on the same day], is fully consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act. Arms sales will continue in accordance with the act and with the full expectation that the approach of the Chinese Government to the resolution of the Taiwan issue will continue to be peaceful. We attach great significance to the Chinese statement in the communique regarding China's "fundamental" policy, and it is clear from our statements that our future actions will be conducted with this peaceful policy fully in mind. The position of the United States Government has

³⁷ In response to a question at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing of March 25, 1999, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth cited this phrase as a precedent for President Clinton's June 1998 statement in China that the United States does not support Taiwan independence, as part of the "Three Noes."

³⁸ "Statement on United States Arms Sales to Taiwan," August 17, 1982, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Ronald Reagan*.

always been clear and consistent in this regard. The Taiwan question is a matter for the Chinese people, on both sides of the Taiwan Strait, to resolve. We will not interfere in this matter or prejudice the free choice of, or put pressure on, the people of Taiwan in this matter. At the same time, we have an abiding interest and concern that any resolution be peaceful. I shall never waver from this fundamental position.

PRC's Statement on the Communiqué.³⁹

August 17, 1982

In the joint communiqué, the Chinese Government reiterates in clear-cut terms its position that “the question of Taiwan is China’s internal affair.” The U.S. side also indicates that it has no intention of infringing on Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity, or interfering in China’s internal affairs, or pursuing a policy of “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan.”

Republic of China’s Statement and the “Six Assurances”.⁴⁰

August 17, 1982

On July 14, 1982, the U.S. side, through appropriate channels, made the following points known to the Republic of China that the U.S. side:

1. *Has not agreed to set a date for ending arms sales to the Republic of China;*
2. *Has not agreed to hold prior consultations with the Chinese Communists on arms sales to the Republic of China;*
3. *Will not play any mediation role between Taipei and Peiping [Beijing];*
4. *Has not agreed to revise the Taiwan Relations Act;*
5. *Has not altered its position regarding sovereignty over Taiwan;*⁴¹
6. *Will not exert pressure on the Republic of China to enter into negotiations with the Chinese Communists.*

³⁹ Harding.

⁴⁰ Harding.

⁴¹ Holdridge (p. 232) confirms that Taiwan had concerns about U.S.-PRC negotiations on a joint communiqué and “indirectly” passed “six points” to him to accept and pass on to the U.S. Congress. According to Holdridge, the Reagan Administration agreed to the six points, and he informed the Congress on or about July 27, 1982. He writes that the U.S. position regarding sovereignty of Taiwan was that “while we would continue to regard Taiwan as part of China, the question of unification would be left to the Chinese themselves, with our only stipulation being that unification be by peaceful means.” In this account, points 5 and 6 are combined as point 5, and point 6 is that “the United States would not formally recognize China’s sovereignty over Taiwan.”

Assistant Secretary of State John Holdridge and Six Assurances.⁴²
August 18, 1982

*[On the August 17, 1982, communique], let me recapitulate and emphasize a few key features; then I'll take your questions. First, **the document must be read as a whole**, since the policies it sets forth are interrelated [original emphasis].*

*Second, as I have previously noted, the communique **contains a strong Chinese statement that its fundamental policy is to seek to resolve the Taiwan question by peaceful means** (Para 4) [original emphasis]. ...*

*Third, the **U.S. statements concerning future arms sales to Taiwan (Para 6) are based on China's statements** as to its fundamental peaceful policy for seeking a resolution to the Taiwan question and on the "new situation" created by those statements (Para 5) [original emphasis]. ...*

*Fourth, **we did not agree to set a date certain for ending arms sales to Taiwan** and the statements of future U.S. arms sales policy embodied in the Communique do not provide either a time frame for reductions of U.S. arms sales or for their termination. ... **We see no mediation role for the U.S. nor will we attempt to exert pressure on Taiwan to enter into negotiations with the PRC.** ... **There has been no change in our long-standing position on the issue of sovereignty over Taiwan.** The communique (Para 1) in its opening paragraph simply cites that portion of the joint communique on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the P.R.C. in which the U.S. "acknowledged the Chinese position on this issue" (i.e., that there is but one China and Taiwan is a part of China). ... It has been reported in the press that **the Chinese at one point suggested that the Taiwan Relations Act be revised. We have no plans to seek any such revisions.** ... [Para 9] should not be read to imply that we have agreed to engage in prior consultations with Beijing on arms sales to Taiwan. [original emphasis]*

⁴² U.S. House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearing on China-Taiwan: United States Policy, "Prepared Statement of Hon. John H. Holdridge, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs," August 18, 1982.

PRC Leader Deng Xiaoping on “One China, Two Systems”.⁴³

February 22, 1984

*There are many disputes in the world that always require solutions. I have had the belief for many years that, no matter what solutions are used to solve these problems, don't use means of war, but use peaceful ways. Our proposal for unification between the mainland and Taiwan is fair and reasonable. After unification, Taiwan will still be allowed to engage in its capitalism, while the mainland implements socialism, but there will be one unified China. One China, two systems. The Hong Kong problem will also be treated the same: one China, two systems.*⁴⁴

Statements During Bush Administration**Toast at the Welcoming Banquet in Beijing.**⁴⁵

February 25, 1989

We remain firmly committed to the principles set forth in those three joint communiques that form the basis of our relationship. And based on the bedrock principle that there is but one China, we have found ways to address Taiwan constructively without rancor. We Americans have a long, historical friendship with Chinese people everywhere. In the last few years, we've seen an encouraging expansion of family contacts and travel and indirect trade and other forms of peaceful interchange across the Taiwan Strait, reflecting the interests of the Chinese people themselves. And this trend, this new environment, is consistent with America's present and longstanding interest in a peaceful resolution of the differences by the Chinese themselves.

⁴³ Deng's talk on “A New Way to Stabilize the World Situation,” translated from *Deng Xiaoping Lun Guofang He Jundui Jianshe* [Deng Xiaoping Discusses National Defense and Military Construction], Junshi Kexue Chubanshe [Military Science Press], May 1992. During PRC-British talks on the future of Hong Kong, Deng conveyed his proposal for a “one country, two systems” formula in a meeting with former U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who visited China as part of a delegation from Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies. The meeting and Deng's decision of “effecting two systems within one country” was reported in *Wen Wei Po* (a PRC newspaper in Hong Kong), February 24, 1984; translated in *FBIS*, February 28, 1984. Deng's formula has been often translated as “one country, two systems,” rather than “one China, two systems.”

⁴⁴ Mann (p. 153-154) writes that after the conclusion of negotiations over Hong Kong, Deng launched a secret, intensive effort to settle with the Reagan Administration on the future of Taiwan. When British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher signed the Hong Kong agreement in December 1984, Deng passed a message through her to Reagan, asking that the same formula of “one country, two systems” be applied to Taiwan. However, the message was not conveyed, but some Americans lobbied for the proposal. In the end, the Administration decided not to settle on Taiwan's future.

⁴⁵ *Public Papers of the Presidents, George Bush.*

Taiwan's Guidelines for National Unification.⁴⁶

March 14, 1991

[Unification is] to establish a democratic, free, and equitably prosperous China. ... It should be achieved in gradual phases under the principles of reason, peace, parity, and reciprocity. ... [In the short term,] to enhance understanding through exchanges between the two sides of the Strait and eliminate hostility through reciprocity; and to establish a mutually benign relationship by not endangering each other's security and stability while in the midst of exchanges and not denying the other's existence as a political entity while in the midst of effecting reciprocity.

Taiwan on the Meaning of "One China".⁴⁷

August 1, 1992

Both sides of the Taiwan Strait agree that there is only one China. However, the two sides of the Strait have different opinions as to the meaning of "one China." To Peking, "one China" means the "People's Republic of China (PRC)," with Taiwan to become a "Special Administration Region" after unification. Taipei, on the other hand, considers "one China" to mean the Republic of China (ROC), founded in 1911 and with de jure sovereignty over all of China. The ROC, however, currently has jurisdiction only over Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen, and Matsu. Taiwan is part of China, and the Chinese mainland is part of China as well.

President Bush on the Sale of F-16s to Taiwan.⁴⁸

September 2, 1992

I'm announcing this afternoon that I will authorize the sale to Taiwan of 150 F-16A/B aircraft, made right here in Fort Worth. ... This sale of F-16s to Taiwan will help maintain peace and stability in an area of great concern to us, the Asia-

⁴⁶ Text published in: Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan, Republic of China, "Consensus Formed at the National Development Conference on Cross-Strait Relations," February 1997. The Guidelines were adopted by the National Unification Council on February 23, 1991, and by the Executive Yuan (Cabinet) on March 14, 1991. These guidelines asserted the principle of "one China, two political entities," recognized the PRC's jurisdiction over the mainland, and called for eventual unification on the basis on "parity" between the two sides. Then, on May 1, 1991, Taiwan terminated the 1948 National Mobilization for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion, thus ending the civil war against the Communists and recognizing the political authority of the PRC on the mainland.

⁴⁷ Text published in: Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan, Republic of China, "Consensus Formed at the National Development Conference on Cross-Strait Relations," February 1997. "The Meaning of 'One China'" was adopted by the National Unification Council.

⁴⁸ Remarks to General Dynamics Employees in Fort Worth, Texas, September 2, 1992, *Administration of George Bush, 1992 (Public Papers of the Presidents)*. In addition to this arms sale decision, the Bush Administration also broke new ground in high-level exchanges with Taiwan. Visiting Taiwan from November 30 to December 3, 1992, U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills was the first cabinet member to do so since U.S. recognition of the PRC in 1979.

Pacific region, in conformity with our law. In the last few years, after decades of confrontation, great strides have been made in reducing tensions between Taipei and Beijing. During this period, the United States has provided Taiwan with sufficient defensive capabilities to sustain the confidence it needs to reduce those tensions. That same sense of security has underpinned Taiwan's dramatic evolution toward democracy.

My decision today does not change the commitment of this Administration and its predecessors to the three communiques with the People's Republic of China. We keep our word: our one-China policy, our recognition of the PRC as the sole legitimate government of China. I've always stressed that the importance of the 1982 communique on arms sales to Taiwan lies in its promotion of common political goals: peace and stability in the area through mutual restraint.

Beijing and Taipei Agree to Disagree on "One China".

November 16, 1992

PRC's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS): *At this working-level consultation in Hong Kong, SEF representatives suggested that each side use respective verbal announcements to state the one China principle. On November 3rd, SEF sent a letter to ARATS, formally notifying that "each side will make respective statements through verbal announcements." ARATS fully respects and accepts SEF's suggestion.*⁴⁹

Taiwan's Strait Exchange Foundation (SEF): *Peking has agreed to a Taipei proposal that both sides "orally state" their respective "one China" positions. ... Though both sides of the Taiwan Strait insist on the "one China" principle in the process of joining efforts to pursue national unification, they have different understandings about the substance of "one China." ...*⁵⁰

⁴⁹ *Renmin Ribao (People's Daily)*, Beijing, November 6, 1992. Also, at an October 18, 1998 press conference after Politburo Member and Vice Premier Qian Qichen met with visiting SEF Chairman Koo Chen-fu, Tang Shubei, ARATS executive vice chairman, cited the letter sent from ARATS to SEF on November 16, 1992. Tang repeated what ARATS said: "Both sides of the strait stick to the 'one China' principle and will strive to pursue national unification. However, negotiations on routine matters across the strait do not involve the political meaning of one China," according to *Xinhua Hong Kong Service*, October 18, 1998, translated in *FBIS*.

⁵⁰ "Straits Group Agrees to State Positions 'Orally'," *Central News Agency*, Taipei, November 18, 1992, in *FBIS*, November 18, 1992.

Statements During Clinton Administration

PRC Premier Li Peng Warns Taiwan.⁵¹

March 15, 1993⁵²

We advocate that both sides hold talks as soon as possible on bringing hostility between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait to an end and gradually fulfilling peaceful unification. ... The forces advocating Taiwan independence on and off the island have resurged in recent years. Certain international forces have also deliberately created obstacles to impede China's peaceful unification. They cannot but arouse serious concern by the Chinese Government and all the Chinese people. We are resolutely opposed to any form of two China's or one China and one Taiwan; and we will take all necessary drastic measures to stop any activities aimed at making Taiwan independent and splitting the motherland.

Mainland-Taiwan "Koo-Wang" Talks (Singapore).⁵³

April 27-29, 1993

PRC (Wang Daohan): *There are many questions that need to be solved because contacts between the two sides of the strait began only after a separation of more than 40 years. We have said repeatedly that as long as both sides sit down to talk, we can discuss any question. Proper methods for solving problems will be found as long as the two organizations observe the spirit of mutual respect, consult on equal footing, seek truth from facts, and seek common ground while reserving differences.*⁵⁴

⁵¹ PRC Premier Li Peng, Government Work Report to the First Session of the 8th National People's Congress, Beijing, *Central Television Program*, March 15, 1993; translated in *FBIS*, March 15, 1993. According to analysis by *FBIS Trends* (March 31, 1993), by saying "both sides" (not the Communist Party and the Nationalist Party), Li changed the formulation in his report from previous years, signaling greater PRC concern about pro-independence activities in Taiwan and urgency to hold unification talks, "as soon as possible." The analysis also noted that, when warning of "all necessary drastic measures," Li echoed the "unusually harsh language" used by General Secretary Jiang Zemin in December 1992. According to *Beijing Review* (January 4-10, 1993), Jiang warned that Beijing would take "resolute measures" to prevent Taiwan independence, while reiterating a policy of peaceful unification.

⁵² PRC concern apparently increased after the first fully democratic legislative election was held in Taiwan on December 19, 1992. The ruling Nationalist Party won 96 out of 161 seats, while the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) gained 50 seats. The DPP has advocated a "Republic of Taiwan," instead of "Republic of China."

⁵³ Mainland Chinese and Taiwan authorities held their first talks and signed their first agreements since 1949. Represented by "authorized nongovernmental organizations," the PRC's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS) and Taiwan's Straits Exchange Foundation (SEF) met in Singapore and agreed to institutionalize contacts. ARATS Chairman Wang Daohan and SEF Chairman Koo Chen-fu agreed that the talks were not political, but were nongovernmental, economic, practical, and functional.

⁵⁴ *Xinhua* (New China News Agency), Beijing, April 27, 1993, translated in *FBIS*, April 27, 1993.

Taiwan (Koo Chen-fu): *There exist not only the same geographical, historical, and cultural origins between the two sides, but also a “blood is thicker than water” sentiment shared by our people. President Lee Teng-hui’s proclamation that: “Taiwan’s relationship with the entire Chinese people cannot be severed” could not have said it more clearly.*⁵⁵

Taiwan: *The subjects discussed in the Koo-Wang Talks were planned by the government in accord with the goals of the short-term phase in the Guidelines for National Unification. ... The Koo-Wang Talks were obviously in no way political. ... During the talks, SEF delegates steadfastly upheld the principle of parity in such matters as meeting procedures, conference site, seating, as well as the topics and scope of discussion. This made it impossible for the other side to slight the fact that the ROC is an equal political entity.*⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Dr. Koo’s Arrival Address at Singapore Airport, April 26, 1993, “A Resume of the Koo-Wang Talks,” Straits Exchange Foundation, December 1993.

⁵⁶ Mainland Affairs Council, ROC, “Our Views on the Koo-Wang Talks,” May 1993.

Taiwan's Bid to Gain Parallel Representation at the U.N.⁵⁷August-September 1993⁵⁸

[In 1991], we accepted the fact that the nation was divided and that, prior to the unification of China, the political authority of both the ROC government and the Chinese communists exist. Both the ROC government and the Chinese communists exercise political authority in the areas under their de facto control. Each is entitled to represent the residents of the territory under its de facto control and to participate in the activities of the international community. ... It is now the fixed policy and goal of the government and the opposition parties in the ROC to participate in the United Nations. ...

PRC's White Paper on Taiwan.⁵⁹

August 31, 1993

There is only one China in the world, Taiwan is an inalienable part of China, and the seat of China's central government is in Beijing. This is a universally recognized fact as well as the premise for a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question. The Chinese government is firmly against any words or deeds designed to split China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It opposes "two Chinas," "one China, one Taiwan," "one country, two governments," or any attempt or act that could lead to "independence of Taiwan." The Chinese people on both sides of the strait all believe that there is only one China and espouse national unification. Taiwan's status as an inalienable part of China has been determined and cannot be changed. "Self-determination" for Taiwan is out of the question.

⁵⁷ Jason Hu, Director General of the ROC's Government Information Office, "The Case For Taipei's U.N. Representation," speech at the Atlantic Council on September 17, 1993. See also, Fredrick F. Chien, (ROC Foreign Minister),"UN Should Welcome Taiwan," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, August 5, 1993; "Divided China in the United Nations: Time for Parallel Representation" (advertisement), *New York Times*, September 17, 1993. According to Hu, Taiwan's bid was submitted in a letter sent by seven South American countries to the U.N. Secretary General on August 6, 1993. He also said that the bid included flexibility on the name to use at the U.N.

⁵⁸ On April 27-29, 1993, the landmark "Koo-Wang" talks had been held in Singapore between Koo Chen-fu (chairman of Taiwan's Strait Exchange Foundation (SEF)) and Wang Daohan (chairman of the PRC's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS)), the first meeting between the heads of the two organs set up for cross-strait dialogue. Later in 1993, according to Mann (p. 290), the State Department drafted a policy review to restore high-level dialogue with Beijing and submitted it to the White House in July 1993. As part of the new policy of engagement toward China, President Clinton invited PRC President Jiang Zemin to attend the first summit of leaders in the Asia Pacific Economic (APEC) Forum in Seattle, Washington, in November 1993. The *Far Eastern Economic Review* (October 7, 1993) reported that Taipei was unhappy that Washington agreed with Beijing that Taiwan, despite its status in APEC equal to other members, would not be represented by Lee Teng-hui, but by Vincent Siew, head of economic planning.

⁵⁹ "The Taiwan Question and the Unification of China," *Xinhua [New China News Agency]*, August 31, 1993, translated in *FBIS*, September 1, 1993.

Peaceful unification is a set policy of the Chinese Government. However, any sovereign state is entitled to use any means it deems necessary, including military ones, to uphold its sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Chinese Government is under no obligation to undertake any commitment to any foreign power or people intending to split China as to what means it might use to handle its own domestic affairs.

It should be pointed out that the Taiwan question is purely an internal affair of China and bears no analogy to the cases of Germany and Korea which were brought about as a result of international accords at the end of the Second World War.

Taiwan's White Paper on Cross-Strait Relations.⁶⁰

July 5, 1994

It is an incontrovertible historical fact that the ROC has always been an independent sovereign state in the international national community since its founding in 1912. However, relations between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait are not those between two separate countries, neither are they purely domestic in nature. In order to ensure that cross-strait relations develop toward benign interaction, the ROC government has formulated the concept of a "political entity" to serve as the basis of interaction between the two sides. The term "political entity" has extensive meaning, it can refer to a country, a government, or a political organization. At the current stage of cross-Strait interaction, only when we set aside the "sovereignty dispute" will we untie the knots that have bound us for more than the past 40 years and progress smoothly toward unification. ...

The ROC Government is firm in its advocacy of "one China" and is opposed to "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan." But at the same time, given that division and divided rule on the two sides of the Taiwan Strait is a long-standing political fact, the ROC Government also holds that the two sides should be fully aware that each has jurisdiction over its respective territory and that they should coexist as two legal entities in the international arena. As for their relationship with each other, it is that of two separate areas of one China and is therefore "domestic" or "Chinese" in nature. ...

The ROC Government takes "one China, two equal political entities" as the structure for handling cross-strait relations and hopes that cross-strait relations will develop in the direction of being peaceful, pragmatic, and sensible. .. The CPC [Communist Party of China] should dismiss any misgivings it has concerning the ROC Government's determination to achieve unification. What the CPC authorities should give urgent consideration to is how, given the fact that the country is divided under two separate governments, we can actively create favorable conditions for unification and gradually bring the two different "political entities" together to form "one China." ... At the same time, the Chinese people cannot strive for unification just for the sake of unification; instead, unification should be realized under a reasonable and benign political, economic, and social system and way of living.

⁶⁰ Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan (Cabinet), Republic of China, "Explanation of Relations Across the Taiwan Strait," July 5, 1994, translated in *FBIS*, July 11, 1994.

Therefore, we hold that the two sides of the strait should go all out to build a democratic, free, equally wealthy, and united China. ...

Washington's Taiwan Policy Review.⁶¹

September 7, 1994⁶²

U.S. policy toward Taiwan is governed, of course, by the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979. Three communiques with the People's Republic of China—the Shanghai Communique of 1972, the Normalization Communique of 1979, and the Joint Communique of 1982—also constitute part of the foundation. In the joint communique shifting diplomatic relations to the PRC 15 years ago, the United States recognized “the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China.” The document further states that “Within this context, the people of the United States will maintain cultural, commercial, and other unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan.” The United States also acknowledged “the Chinese position that there is but one China and Taiwan is part of China.” These formulations were repeated in the 1982 communique. Since 1978, each Administration has reaffirmed this policy.

The policy has been essential in maintaining peace, stability, and economic development on both sides of the Taiwan Strait and throughout the region. ... We have made absolutely clear our expectation that cross-strait relations will evolve in

⁶¹ Announced on September 7, 1994 and described in the Clinton Administration's only public statement on the Taiwan Policy Review, which was given by Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Winston Lord, “Taiwan Policy Review,” Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, September 27, 1994 (in *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*, October 17, 1994). Lord noted that “the lengthy, detailed inter-agency policy review that we have conducted is the first of its kind launched by any Administration of either political party since we shifted recognition to Beijing in 1979.” While opposing legislation to specifically allow visits by top leaders of Taiwan, the Administration decided to send high-level economic and technical officials to visit Taiwan, establish a sub-cabinet level economic dialogue with Taiwan, allow Taiwan's office in the United States to change its name to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO), and support Taiwan's membership in international organizations where statehood is not a requirement and Taiwan's voice to be heard in organizations where its membership is not allowed.

⁶² The review came after the Congress passed and the President signed (on April 30, 1994) the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (P.L. 103-236) which directed the State Department to register foreign-born Taiwanese-Americans as U.S. citizens born in Taiwan (rather than China); called for the President to send Cabinet-level officials to Taiwan and to show clear U.S. support for Taiwan in bilateral and multilateral relationships; and declared that Sec. 3 of the TRA (on arms sales) takes primacy over statements of U.S. policy (the 1982 communique). In addition, in May 1994, the State Department had allowed Taiwan President Lee Teng-hui to make a refueling stop in Hawaii but denied him a visa to enter the United States. In response, the Senate, from July to October, passed amendments introduced by Senator Brown to ensure that Taiwan's President can enter the United States on certain occasions. Two amendments (for S. 2182 and H.R. 4606) that passed were not retained, but the amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 was enacted. Upon signing the bill into law (P.L. 103-416) on October 25, 1994, President Clinton, nonetheless, said that he would construe sec. 221 as expressing Congress' view.

a peaceful manner. We neither interfere in nor mediate this process. But we welcome any evolution in relations between Taipei and Beijing that is mutually agreed upon and peacefully reached. ...

In the end, it is only the two parties themselves Taiwan and the PRC that will be able to resolve the issues between them. In this regard, the United States applauds the continuing progress in cross-strait dialogue. ...

We will continue to provide material and training to Taiwan to enable it to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability, as mandated by the Taiwan Relations Act. ...

Within this framework, the President has decided to enhance our unofficial ties with Taiwan. ... the Administration strongly opposes Congressional attempts to legislate visits by top leaders of the “Republic of China” to the U.S. ...

Recognizing Taiwan’s important role in transnational issues, we will support its membership in organizations where statehood is not a prerequisite, and will support opportunities for Taiwan’s voice to be heard in organizations where its membership is not possible.

We do not seek and cannot impose a resolution of differences between Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China. Nor should we permit one to manipulate us against the other.

PRC President Jiang Zemin’s “Eight Points”.⁶³

January 30, 1995

1. *We must firmly oppose any words or actions aimed at creating an “independent Taiwan” and the propositions “split the country and rule under separate regimes,” two Chinas over a certain period of time,” etc., which are in contravention of the principle of one China.*
2. *We do not challenge the development of non-governmental economic and cultural ties by Taiwan with other countries. ... However, we oppose Taiwan’s activities in “expanding its living space internationally,” which are aimed at creating “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan.” ...*
3. *It has been our consistent stand to hold negotiations with the Taiwan authorities on the peaceful unification of the motherland. ... I suggest that, as the first step, negotiations should be held and an agreement reached on officially ending*

⁶³ Jiang Zemin, “Continue to Promote the Unification of the Motherland,” January 30, 1995. As part of the context of his speech, Jiang looked to the 100th anniversary of the Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed between China and Japan on April 17, 1895, which ceded Taiwan to Japan as a colony until the end of World War Two. Jiang also cited the transfer of control to the PRC of Hong Kong in 1997 and Macau in 1999, and said that “now it is high time to accomplish the unification of the motherland.”

the state of hostility between the two sides in accordance with the principle that there is only one China. ...

4. *We should strive for the peaceful unification of the motherland, since Chinese should not fight fellow Chinese. Our not undertaking to give up the use of force is not directed against our compatriots in Taiwan but against the schemes of foreign forces to interfere with China's unification and to bring about the "independence of Taiwan." ...*
5. *Great efforts should be made to expand the economic exchanges and cooperation between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait...*
6. *People on both sides of the Taiwan Strait should inherit and carry forward the fine traditions of Chinese culture.*
7. *The 21 million compatriots in Taiwan, whether born there or in other provinces, are all Chinese... We also hope that all political parties in Taiwan will adopt a sensible, forward-looking, and constructive attitude and promote the expansion of relations between the two sides. ...*
8. *Leaders of Taiwan authorities are welcome to pay visits in appropriate capacities. We are also ready to accept invitations from the Taiwan side to visit Taiwan. ... The affairs of the Chinese people should be handled by ourselves, something that does not take an international occasion to accomplish. ...*

Taiwan President Lee Teng-hui's "Six Point" Response.⁶⁴

April 8, 1995

1. *The fact that the Chinese mainland and Taiwan have been ruled by two political entities in no way subordinate to each other had led to a state of division between the two sides and separate governmental jurisdictions, hence, the issue of national unification. ... Only by facing up to this reality can both sides build greater consensus on the "one China" issue and at the earliest possible date.*
2. *In Taiwan, we have long taken upon ourselves the responsibility for safeguarding and furthering traditional Chinese culture, and advocate that culture be the basis for exchanges between both sides to help promote the nationalistic sentiment for living together in prosperity and to foster a strong sense of brotherliness. ...*
3. *We will continue to assist the mainland in developing its economy and upgrading the living standards of its people based upon our existing investments and trade relations. As for trade and transportation links with the mainland, the agencies concerned have to make in-depth evaluations as well as careful plans since these are very complicated issues. ...*

⁶⁴ Lee Teng-hui, "Address to the National Unification Council," April 8, 1995.

4. *I have indicated on several occasions that if leaders on both sides could meet with each other on international occasions in a natural manner, this would alleviate the political confrontation between both sides and foster a harmonious atmosphere for developing future relations. ... It is our firm belief that the more international organizations both sides join on an equal footing, the more favorable the environment will become for the growth of bilateral relations and for the process of peaceful unification. ...*

5. *We believe the mainland authorities should demonstrate their goodwill by publicly renouncing the use of force and refrain from making any military move that might arouse anxiety or suspicion on this side of the Taiwan Strait, thus paving the way for formal negotiations between both sides to put an end to the state of hostility.*

...

6. *Hong Kong and Macau are integral parts of the Chinese nation ... Post-1997 Hong Kong and post-1999 Macau are naturally a matter of great concern to us. In this regard, the ROC government has reiterated its determination to maintain normal contact with Hong Kong and Macau, further participate in affairs related to Hong Kong and Macau, and provide better services to our compatriots there. ...*

U.S. Visa For Lee Teng-hui's Private Visit to Cornell University.⁶⁵

May 22, 1995

President Clinton has decided to permit Lee Teng-hui to make a private visit to the United States in June for the express purpose of participating in an alumni reunion event at Cornell University, as a distinguished alumnus. The action follows a revision of Administration guidelines to permit occasional private visits by senior leaders of Taiwan, including President Lee.

President Lee will visit the U.S. in a strictly private capacity and will not undertake any official activities. It is important to reiterate that this is not an official visit. The granting of a visa in this case is consistent with U.S. policy of maintaining only unofficial relations with Taiwan. It does not convey any change in our relations with or policies towards the People's Republic of China, with which we maintain official relations and recognize as the sole legal government of China.

We will continue to abide by the three communiqués that form the basis of our relations with China. The United States also acknowledges the Chinese position that there is but one China, and Taiwan is a part of China. ...

⁶⁵ Department of State's announcement by spokesperson, Nicholas Burns, May 22, 1995. Congress' view was an important factor acknowledged by the Administration in its reversal of policy to grant the visa. Congress had overwhelmingly passed the bipartisan H.Con.Res. 53 expressing the sense of Congress that the President should promptly welcome a visit by Lee Teng-hui to his alma mater, Cornell University, and a transit stop in Anchorage, Alaska, to attend a conference. The House passed the resolution by 396-0 on May 2, and the Senate passed it by 97-1 on May 9, 1995. Some analysts believe that another factor was the contrast posed by the Administration's March 1995 decision to grant visits to Gerry Adams (leader of Sinn Féin, the political wing of the Irish Republican Army (IRA)), to the United States, including meetings with Clinton in the White House — despite objections from London.

Clinton's Secret Letter to Jiang Zemin and "Three Noes".⁶⁶

August 1995

At a meeting in Brunei in August 1995, Secretary of State Warren Christopher reportedly delivered a letter from President Clinton to Chinese President Jiang Zemin. In the letter, which has not been made public, Clinton is said to have assured Jiang that the United States would (1) "oppose" Taiwan independence; (2) would not support "two Chinas," or one China and one Taiwan; and (3) would not support Taiwan's admission to the United Nations.

U.S. Department of State and March 1996 Taiwan Strait Tensions.⁶⁷

March 14, 1996

Our fundamental interest on the Taiwan question is that peace and stability be maintained and that the PRC and Taiwan work out their differences peacefully. At the same time, we will strictly avoid interfering as the two sides pursue peaceful resolution of differences.

The Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) of 1979 forms the legal basis of U.S. policy regarding the security of Taiwan. ... However serious, the present situation does not constitute a threat to Taiwan of the magnitude contemplated by the drafters of the TRA. The PRC pressure against Taiwan to date does not add up to a "threat to the security or the social or economic system" of Taiwan. ...

Overall U.S. China policy, including the Taiwan question, is expressed in the three joint communiqués with the PRC as follows:

- *The United States recognizes the Government of the PRC as "the sole legal Government of China."*
- *The U.S. acknowledges the Chinese position that "there is but one China and Taiwan is part of China." In 1982, the U.S. assured the PRC that it has no intention of pursuing a policy of "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan."*

⁶⁶ Garver, p. 79; Mann, p. 330. These promises apparently formed the basis for the Administration's later public statements issued in 1997 and 1998, including one by President Clinton in China, that became known as the "Three Noes." However, "opposing" Taiwan independence was changed to a more neutral stance of "not supporting" it. Clinton's letter was sent after the People's Liberation Army (PLA) launched its first test-firing of M-9 short-range ballistic missiles toward Taiwan in July 1995, as part of the PRC's reaction to Lee Teng-hui's visit to Cornell University in June 1995.

⁶⁷ Department of State, Winston Lord, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Testimony before the House International Relations Committee, Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, March 14, 1996. The PRC followed its July 1995 missile test-firings with more military exercises and additional missile test-firings in March 1996 — to intimidate voters in Taiwan on the eve of their first democratic presidential election. The United States deployed two carrier battle groups east of Taiwan to underscore the American commitment to regional peace and stability.

- *Within this context, the people of the U.S. will maintain cultural, commercial, and other unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan.*
- *The U.S. has consistently held that resolution of the Taiwan issue is a matter to be worked out peacefully by the Chinese themselves.*

President Clinton’s Meeting with Japanese Prime Minister.⁶⁸

April 17, 1996

Clinton: Yes, we discussed Taiwan and China extensively, as well as the recent tension in the strait. It is obvious that our partnership is designed to try to preserve the peace for all peoples in this region. And I believe that I can say we both agree that, while the United States clearly observes the so-called one China policy, we also observe the other aspects of the agreement we made many years ago, which include a commitment on the part of both parties to resolve all their differences in a peaceable manner. And we have encouraged them to pursue that. Therefore, we were concerned about those actions in the Taiwan Strait.

Secretary of State Christopher on Improving Relations with China.⁶⁹

May 17, 1996

Since 1972, the foundation for deepening engagement between our nations has been the “one China” policy that is embodied in the three joint communiques between the United States and the People’s Republic of China. ...

The United States strongly believes that resolution of the issues between the PRC and Taiwan must be peaceful. We were gravely concerned when China’s military exercises two months ago raised tensions in the Taiwan Strait. Our deployment of naval forces to the region was meant to avert any dangerous miscalculations. We are encouraged that both sides have now taken steps to reduce tensions.

⁶⁸ “The President’s News Conference with Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan in Tokyo,” April 17, 1996, *Public Papers of United States Presidents, William Clinton*. The two leaders issued a Joint Declaration on Security to strengthen the alliance.

⁶⁹ Department of State, “American Interests and the U.S.-China Relationship,” Address by Secretary of State Warren Christopher to the Asia Society, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, New York, May 17, 1996. Christopher ended with a signal of President Clinton’s new willingness to hold regular summits with the PRC President. Then in July 1996, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake traveled to China to pursue the “strategic dialogue.” Briefing reporters on July 3, 1996, a National Security Council official said Lake was scheduled to meet Wang Daohan, chairman of the Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS), in order to do “what we can there to advance the resumption and to promote the resumption of cross-strait dialogue and to reinforce our position that the differences between Taiwan and China need to be resolved peacefully.” This item on Lake’s agenda signaled a new, proactive U.S. stance on cross-strait relations and raised questions in Beijing and Taipei of U.S. involvement. The meeting was canceled after Lake’s arrival in China.

One the eve of the inauguration next Monday of Taiwan's first democratically elected President, it is timely to reflect on the enduring value of our "one China" policy for both the PRC and Taiwan and on our common interest and responsibility to uphold it. I want to tell you publicly today what we have been saying privately to the leaders in Beijing and Taipei in recent weeks.

To the leadership in Beijing, we have reiterated our consistent position that the future relationship between Taiwan and the PRC must be resolved directly between them. But we have reaffirmed that we have a strong interest in the region's continued peace and stability and that our "one China" policy is predicated on the PRC's pursuit of a peaceful resolution of issues between Taipei and Beijing.

To the leadership in Taiwan, we have reiterated our commitment to robust unofficial relations, including helping Taiwan maintain a sufficient self-defense capacity under the terms of the Taiwan Relations Act. We have stressed that Taiwan has prospered under the "one China" policy. And we have made clear our view that as Taiwan seeks an international role, it should pursue that objective in a way that is consistent with a "one China" policy.

We have emphasized to both sides the importance of avoiding provocative actions or unilateral measures that would alter the status quo or pose a threat to peaceful resolution of outstanding issues. And we have strongly urged both sides to resume the cross-strait dialogue that was interrupted last summer.

Taiwan's First Direct Presidential Election and Inaugural Address.⁷⁰
May 20, 1996

The Republic of China has always been a sovereign state. Disputes across the Strait center around system and lifestyle; they have nothing to do with ethnic or cultural identity. Here in this country, it is totally unnecessary or impossible to adopt the so-called course of "Taiwan independence." For over 40 years, the two sides of the Strait have been two separate jurisdictions due to various historical factors, but it is also true that both sides pursue eventual national unification. ...

⁷⁰ "The President [Lee Teng-hui's] Inaugural Speech (Excerpt)," May 20, 1996, printed in *Consensus Formed at the National Development Conference on Cross-Strait Relations*, Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan, Republic of China, February 1997. With a tense military environment brought by China's military exercises that included missile test-firings, Lee Teng-hui won a landslide victory of 54 percent of the votes in Taiwan's first democratic presidential election on March 23, 1996. Pro-independence candidate Peng Ming-min received 21 percent, and pro-unification Lin Yang-kang won 15 percent of the votes.

Taiwan's Multi-Party National Development Conference.⁷¹

December 23-28, 1996

The Republic of China has been a sovereign state since 1912. Following the establishment of the Chinese communist regime in 1949, both sides of the Taiwan Strait became co-equal political entities. ...

The development of relations with the mainland must be based on safeguarding the survival and development of the Republic of China. ...

The Republic of China is a sovereign state that must actively promote foreign relations and raise its profile at international activities in its pursuit of national survival and development. Taiwan is not a part of the "People's Republic of China," and the ROC government opposes dealing with the cross-strait issue through the "one country, two systems" scheme.

The government should reduce the possibility of confrontation with the mainland by establishing sound mainland policies, and should actively make use of regional and global security and cooperation mechanisms to assure the security of Taiwan.

At this point, ROC accession to such international bodies as the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, should continue to be actively pursued.

ROC admission to the United Nations should be actively pursued as a long-term objective through flexible responses to changes in the international situation.

President Clinton's Statements at the 1997 Summit (Washington).

October 29, 1997

A key to Asia's stability is a peaceful and prosperous relationship between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. I reiterated America's longstanding commitment to a one China policy. It has allowed democracy to flourish in Taiwan and provides a framework in which all three relationships can prosper — between the United States and the PRC, the United States and Taiwan, and Taiwan and the People's Republic of China. I told President Jiang that we hope the People's Republic and Taiwan would resume a constructive cross-strait dialogue and expand

⁷¹ *Consensus Formed at the National Development Conference on Cross-Strait Relations*, Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan, Republic of China, February 1997. Also see: CRS Report 97-268, *Taiwan's National Development Conference: Proposed Policy Changes and Implications for the United States*, February 24, 1997, by Robert G. Sutter. Called by President Lee Teng-hui in his inaugural speech in May 1996, delegates from the three major political parties (Nationalist Party, Democratic Progressive Party, and New China Party) attended the conference. The conference took place as Taiwan looked to the transfer of Hong Kong as a British colony to a Special Administration Region of the PRC in July 1997.

*cross-strait exchanges. Ultimately, the relationship between the PRC and Taiwan is for the Chinese themselves to determine — peacefully.*⁷²

*First of all, I think the most important thing the United States can do to facilitate a peaceful resolution of the differences is to adhere strictly to the one China policy we have agreed on, to make it clear that within the context of that one China policy, as articulated in the communiqués and our own laws, we will maintain friendly, open relations with the people of Taiwan and China; but that we understand that this issue has to be resolved and resolved peacefully, and that if it is resolved in a satisfactory way, consistent with statements made in the past, then Asia will be stronger and more stable and more prosperous. That is good for the United States. And our own relations with China will move on to another stage of success. I think the more we can encourage that, the better off we are. But I think in the end, since so much investment and contact has gone on in the last few years between Taiwan and China, I think the Chinese people know how to resolve this when the time is right, and we just have to keep saying we hope the time will be right as soon as possible. Sooner is better than later.*⁷³

1997 Clinton-Jiang Summit and Joint U.S.-China Statement.⁷⁴

October 29, 1997

China stresses that the Taiwan question is the most important and sensitive central question in China-U.S. relations, and that the proper handling of this question in strict compliance with the principles set forth in the three China-U.S. joint communiqués holds the key to sound and stable growth of China-U.S. relations. The United States reiterates that it adheres to its “one China” policy and the principles set forth in the three U.S.-China joint communiqués.

⁷² President Clinton’s opening statement, Press Conference by President Clinton and President Jiang Zemin, Old Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C., October 29, 1997.

⁷³ President Clinton’s answer to a question about whether he sees any U.S. role in securing a permanent peaceful environment in the Taiwan Strait (after reference to U.S. roles in brokering peace in Bosnia and the Middle East), Press Conference by President Clinton and President Jiang Zemin, Old Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C., October 29, 1997.

⁷⁴ White House, “Joint U.S.-China Statement,” October 29, 1997. In preparing for the summit, the PRC desired to have a “fourth communiqué” with further U.S. assurances on Taiwan. Also, Mann wrote that the PRC wanted the joint statement to make public the “Three Noes” that President Clinton had promised President Jiang in a private letter in 1995. The Joint Statement did not mention the TRA.

1997 Summit and the State Department on the “Three Noes”.⁷⁵

October 31, 1997

We certainly made clear that we have a one-China policy; that we don't support a one-China, one-Taiwan policy. We don't support a two-China policy. We don't support Taiwan independence, and we don't support Taiwanese membership in organizations that require you to be a member state. We certainly made that very clear to the Chinese.

1998 Clinton-Jiang Summit in Beijing.⁷⁶

June 27, 1998

President Jiang: The Taiwan question is the most important and the most sensitive issue at the core of China-U.S. relations. We hope that the U.S. side will adhere to the principles set forth in the three China-U.S. joint communiqués and the joint China-U.S. statement, as well as the relevant commitments it has made in the interest of a smooth growth of China-U.S. relations.

President Clinton: I reaffirmed our longstanding one China policy to President Jiang and urged the pursuit of cross-strait discussions recently resumed as the best path to a peaceful resolution. In a similar vein, I urged President Jiang to assume a dialogue with the Dalai Lama in return for the recognition that Tibet is a part of China and in recognition of the unique cultural and religious heritage of that region.

⁷⁵ Department of State, Press Briefing by James Rubin, October 31, 1997. For the first time, the Administration publicly stated the “Three Noes,” which were not put in writing in the U.S.-China Joint Statement. Rubin made that statement in response to a question about specific assurances on Taiwan that President Clinton gave to President Jiang during the 1997 summit. Clinton reportedly had passed a secret letter to Jiang in August 1995 with an earlier version of the “Three Noes.”

⁷⁶ White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “Press Availability by President Clinton and President Jiang,” Beijing, PRC, June 27, 1998.

1998 Summit and Clinton's Statement on the "Three Noes".⁷⁷June 30, 1998⁷⁸

I had a chance to reiterate our Taiwan policy, which is that we don't support independence for Taiwan, or two Chinas, or one Taiwan-one China. And we don't believe that Taiwan should be a member in any organization for which statehood is a requirement. So I think we have a consistent policy. Our only policy has been that we think it has to be done peacefully. That is what our law says, and we have encouraged the cross-strait dialogue. And I think eventually it will bear fruit if everyone is patient and works hard.

Taiwan's Lee Teng-hui on "One Divided China".⁷⁹

August 3, 1998

The path to a democratic China must begin with a recognition of the present reality by both sides of the Taiwan Strait. And that reality is that China is divided, just as Germany and Vietnam were in the past and as Korea is today. Hence, there is no "one China" now. We hope for this outcome in the future, but presently it does not exist. Today, there is only "one divided China," with Taiwan and the mainland each being part of China. Because neither has jurisdiction over the other, neither can represent the other, much less all of China.

⁷⁷ White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Remarks by the President and the First Lady in Discussion on Shaping China for the 21st Century," Shanghai, China, June 30, 1998. The Administration maintains that the "Three Noes" represented no change in U.S. policy. Nonetheless, President Clinton chose to issue this statement verbally and at an informal "roundtable discussion," rather than at the summit in Beijing with President Jiang on June 27, 1998. In testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 25, 1999, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth cited Kissinger's 1971 promise as the origins of U.S. policy of non-support for Taiwan's independence and argued that President Clinton's June 1998 "Three Noes" statement represented no change in U.S. policy toward Taiwan.

⁷⁸ On the eve of President Clinton's trip to China, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Susan Shirk testified before the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific on May 20, 1998, stating that "there will be no fourth communique; nor will our relationship with Taiwan be diluted or sacrificed in any way." Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Kurt Campbell also assured Congress that "there will be no fourth communique and there will be no document that harms Taiwan's interest." The House, on June 9, 1998, passed (411-0) H.Con.Res. 270 (Solomon), resolving that it is the sense of Congress that "the United States abides by all previous understandings of a 'one China' policy and its abiding interest in a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan Strait issue." The House also resolved that the President should seek at the summit a public renunciation by the PRC of any use of force or threat to use force against Taiwan. After the President stated the "Three Noes" in China, the Senate passed (92-0) S.Con.Res. 107 (Lott) on July 10, 1998, affirming its expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means, but did not include language on the people of both sides of the strait determining their own future. The House, on July 20, 1998, passed (390-1) H.Con.Res. 301 (Delay) affirming its expectation that the "future status of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means, and that the people of both sides of the Taiwan Strait should determine their own future..."

⁷⁹ Lee Teng-hui, "U.S. Can't Ignore Taiwan," *Wall Street Journal*, August 3, 1998.

Second “Koo-Wang Talks” (Shanghai).⁸⁰

October 14, 1998

Taiwan: *It has been nearly 50 years since the two sides of the Taiwan Strait became two equal entities under divided rule and not subordinate to each other. A “divided China” is not only a historical fact, but also a political reality.*⁸¹

Taiwan: *China’s unification hinges upon the democratization of the Chinese mainland. Only when the Chinese mainland has achieved democracy can the two sides of the Taiwan Strait talk about unification.*⁸²

PRC: *Mr. Wang said that Taiwan’s political status can be discussed under the one China principle. On this point, both Mr. Jiang Zemin and Mr. Qian Qichen had similar comments to the effect that anything can be put on the table under the one China principle. Therefore, on the question of one China, this will be our consistent stand before the two sides across the strait are reunified: there is only one China across the strait, Taiwan is part of China, and Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity are indivisible. ... Now, the Government of the People’s Republic of China is universally acknowledged internationally as the only legitimate government representing China. In spite of this, the two sides should still negotiate on equal footing under the principle that there is but one China. The issue of whether the talks are between central or local authorities can be left aside.*⁸³

U.S. Assistant Secretary Stan Roth on “Interim Agreements”.⁸⁴

March 24, 1999

Insisting on peaceful resolution of differences between the PRC and Taiwan will remain U.S. policy in the future just as surely as it has been our policy over the past twenty years. Our belief, which we have stated repeatedly, is that dialogue between

⁸⁰ ARATS and SEF agreed on a four-point common understanding: (hold all kinds of dialogue, including political and economic dialogue; strengthen exchanges, including those at all levels; strengthen mutual assistance in cases involving lives and property; acceptance of an invitation for Wang Daohan to visit Taiwan at an appropriate time), according to *Xinhua Hong Kong Service*, October 15, 1998, in *FBIS*.

⁸¹ Koo Chen-fu, “Key Points From Remarks Made at a Meeting with ARATS Chairman Wang Daohan,” Shanghai, October 14, 1998 (issued by SEF, Republic of China).

⁸² Opening remarks of Taiwan’s SEF Chairman Koo Chen-fu at a press conference after his meeting with PRC President Jiang Zemin in Beijing, October 18, 1998.

⁸³ Statement of Tang Shubei, executive vice chairman of the PRC’s ARATS, denying inconsistency between comments of ARATS chairman Wang Daohan and Vice Premier Qian Qichen, “Tang Shubei Explains ‘One China’ Principle,” *Zhongguo Xinwen She* (China News Agency), Beijing, October 18, 1998; translated in *FBIS*.

⁸⁴ Stanley O. Roth, Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State, “The Taiwan Relations Act at Twenty — and Beyond,” address to the Woodrow Wilson Center and the American Institute in Taiwan, Washington, DC, March 24, 1999. On the next day, Roth testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on U.S.-Taiwan relations, but he did not discuss the possibility of cross-strait “interim agreements.”

the PRC and Taiwan fosters an atmosphere in which tensions are reduced, misperceptions can be clarified, and common ground can be explored. The exchange of visits under the SEF/ARATS framework, currently rich in symbolism but still nascent in substance, has the potential to contribute to the peaceful resolution of difficult substantive differences.

Clearly, this will not be easy, but this Administration has great confidence in the creativity of the people of Taiwan and the people of the mainland, working together, to identify the necessary human contacts and the most comfortable processes to give the dialogue real meaning. Using a phrase that has garnered much favor in Washington of late, I could imagine that “out of the box” thinking within this dialogue might contribute to interim agreements, perhaps in combination with specific confidence building measures, on any number of difficult topics. But, as the U.S. has steadfastly held, we will avoid interfering as the two sides pursue peaceful resolution of differences, because it is only the participants on both sides of the strait that can craft the specific solutions which balance their interests while addressing their most pressing concerns.

Taiwan’s Lee Teng-hui on “Special State-to-State” Relations.⁸⁵

July 9, 1999⁸⁶

The fact that disregarding the reality that the two sides of the Taiwan Strait are under separate administrations of different governments, the Chinese communist authorities have been threatening us with force is actually the main reason why cross-strait ties cannot be improved thoroughly. ... Since the PRC’s establishment, the Chinese communists have never ruled Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen, and Matsu, which have been under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China. ... Since our constitutional reform in 1991, we have designated cross-strait ties as nation-to-nation, or at least as special state-to-state ties, rather than internal ties within “one China” between a legitimate government and a rebellion group, or between central and local governments. ...

⁸⁵ President Lee Teng-hui’s interview with the Voice of Germany, Taipei, July 9, 1999, reported in *Chung-Yang Jih-Pao*, July 10, 1999, in *FBIS*. Lee was responding to a question about Beijing viewing Taiwan as a “renegade province.” Some observers note that Lee may have specifically chosen German media, because Germany was once a divided country.

⁸⁶ Three days later, Taiwan’s Mainland Affairs Council Chairman Su Chi added that “While we continue to show our goodwill, Mainland China continues to tighten its ‘one China principle.’ Therefore, it is unnecessary for us to stick to our previous position. We shall clearly define equal footing in order to usher in better cross-strait relations toward the next century.” From: “MAC Chairman Su Chi at July 12, 1999 Press Conference,” *Taipei Speaks Up: Special State-to-State Relationship, Republic of China’s Policy Documents*, Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan, Republic of China, August 1999.

President Clinton on the “Three Pillars” of Policy Toward Taiwan.⁸⁷
July 21, 1999

Clinton [on whether the United States is obligated to defend Taiwan militarily if it abandons the one China policy and would continue to provide military aid if Taiwan pursues separatism]: *Well, let me say first of all, a lot of those questions are governed by the Taiwan Relations Act, which we intend to honor. Our policy is clear: We favor the one China policy; we favor the cross-strait dialogues. The understanding we have had all along with both China and Taiwan is that the differences between them would be resolved peacefully. If that were not to be the case, under the Taiwan Relations Act we would be required to view it with the gravest concern. ...*

Clinton [on delaying a Pentagon delegation’s visit to Taiwan]: *I didn’t think this was the best time to do something which might excite either one side or the other and imply that a military solution is an acceptable alternative. If you really think about what’s at stake here, it would be unthinkable. And I want — I don’t want to depart from any of the three pillars. I think we need to stay with one China; I think we need to stay with the dialogue; and I think that no one should contemplate force here.*

Taiwan’s Position Paper on “Special State-to-State Relationship”.⁸⁸
August 1, 1999

President Lee’s remarks concerning the nature of the cross-strait relationship were based on the necessity of protecting national interests and dignity. From the political, historical, and legal perspectives, he merely clarified an existing fact. He by no means twisted or exaggerated the truth, nor did he exclude the goal of unifying both sides of the Strait as a new, democratic China. ...

Taiwan and the Chinese mainland have always differed in their definition of “one China.” Thus, in 1992, ... the two sides eventually reached an agreement on “one China, with each side being entitled to its respective interpretation.” ... However, Beijing has unilaterally abandoned this agreement in recent years. ... In the framework of the 1992 agreement, whereby each side is entitled to its respective interpretation, we have always maintained that the “one China” concept refers to the future rather than the present. The two sides are not yet unified, but are equals, ruled separately. We both exist concurrently. Therefore, the two sides can be defined as sharing a “special state-to-state relationship,” prior to unification. ...

⁸⁷ White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “Press Conference by the President,” Washington, DC, July 21, 1999.

⁸⁸ “Parity, Peace, and Win-Win: The Republic of China’s Position on the ‘Special State-to-State Relationship’,” Mainland Affairs Council, Executive Yuan, Republic of China, August 1, 1999.

Presidents Clinton and Jiang at APEC Meeting.⁸⁹
September 11, 1999⁹⁰

Clinton [on his message concerning Taiwan]: *My message is that our policy has not and will not change. We favor one China. We favor a peaceful approach to working out the differences. We favor the cross-strait dialogue. Our policy has not changed and it will not change.*

Jiang [on whether the PRC will maintain its threat to use military force against Taiwan]: *Our policy on Taiwan is a consistent one. That is, one, peaceful unification, one country-two systems. However, if there were to be any foreign intervention, or if there were to be Taiwan independence, then we would not undertake to renounce the use of force.*

⁸⁹ White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Remarks by the President and President Jiang Zemin of the People's Republic of China in Photo Opportunity," Auckland, New Zealand, September 11, 1999. In a press briefing just after President Clinton's meeting with Jiang, National Security Advisor Sandy Berger said that Clinton told Jiang that if he were to resort to military force, "there would be grave consequences in the United States." Berger said Clinton also stated that U.S. policy would continue "as it has been since the presidency of Richard Nixon," to be based on the "three fundamental pillars" of the one China policy, a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue, and the cross-strait dialogue.

⁹⁰ A few days later, on September 15, 1999, the United States spoke out, for the first time, against the ROC's bid for re-entering the United Nations, reported *Reuters*. Previously, the United States remained outside the debate on whether to place the issue of the ROC's membership on the General Assembly's agenda. This year, an unnamed U.S. official was quoted: "we wanted to make clear that our 'one-China' policy is unchanged." The annual outcome, since Taiwan's effort began in 1993, has been a failure to get the issue of its membership on the agenda.

PRC's Second Taiwan White Paper and "Three Ifs".⁹¹February 21, 2000⁹²

On October 1, 1949, the Central People's Government of the PRC 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. ... so the government of the PRC naturally should fully enjoy and exercise China's sovereignty, including its sovereignty over Taiwan. ...

The Chinese government is actively and sincerely striving for peaceful unification. To achieve peaceful unification, the Chinese government has appealed time and again for cross-strait negotiations on the basis of equality and the One China principle. ... The Chinese government has also proposed that dialogue (that includes political dialogue) may start first, which may gradually move on to procedural consultations for political negotiation (to resolve issues for formal negotiation, such as the name, topics for discussion, and format), then political negotiation may begin. Political negotiation may be carried out step-by-step. ...

However, since the early 1990s, Lee Teng-hui has gradually deviated from the One China principle... In military affairs, the Taiwan authorities have bought large quantities of advanced weapons from foreign countries and sought to join the TMD system, attempting to covertly establish certain forms of military alliance with the United States and Japan. ...

⁹¹ The PRC's Taiwan Affairs Office and Information Office of the State Council, "The One China Principle and the Taiwan Issue," February 21, 2000, the English version as published by *Xinhua* [*New China News Agency*] and translated in *FBIS*, and the Chinese version as published by *People's Daily Online*.

⁹² The PRC issued this white paper just after a U.S. delegation left Beijing. The delegation included Deputy National Security Advisor James Steinberg, Under Secretary of Defense Walter Slocombe, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Joseph Ralston, and Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, who were given no indication that the white paper would be issued. The white paper was also issued on the eve of Taiwan's presidential election scheduled for March 18, 2000, with the possibility that Chen Shui-bian would win. Moreover, the House had passed (341-70) H.R. 1838, "the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act," on February 1, 2000, which was still pending in the Senate and opposed by Beijing and the Clinton Administration. News reports also said that Taipei and Washington were discussing Taiwan's possible procurement of Aegis-equipped destroyers, missile defense systems, and other advanced U.S. weapons, leading to annual arms sales talks in April. In his response to the PRC's White Paper on Taiwan, Undersecretary of Defense Walter Slocombe, who just returned from Beijing, warned on February 22 that the PRC would face "incalculable consequences" if it used force against Taiwan as the White Paper threatened (*Washington Post*, February 23, 2000). On the same day, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth testified to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs that "the threat of the use of force to resolve the Taiwan question is contrary to the commitments contained in the communiques that are the bedrock of U.S. policy." In his comments about the White Paper, Roth also reiterated the Administration's "three principles" (peaceful resolution, cross-strait dialogue, and one China).

Facts prove that a serious crisis still exists in the situation of the Taiwan Strait. To safeguard the interests of the entire Chinese people, including compatriots in Taiwan, and maintain the peace and development of the Asia-Pacific region, the Chinese government remains firm in adhering to “peaceful unification, one country/two systems;” upholding the eight propositions put forward by President Jiang Zemin for the development of cross-strait relations and the acceleration of the peaceful unification of China; and doing its utmost to achieve the objective of peaceful unification. However, if a grave turn of events occurs leading to the separation of Taiwan from China in any name, or if there is foreign invasion and occupation of Taiwan, or if Taiwan authorities indefinitely refuse to peacefully resolve the cross-strait unification problem through negotiations, then the Chinese government will only be forced to adopt all possible drastic measures, including the use of force, to safeguard China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, and fulfill the great cause of China’s unification. ...

Countries maintaining diplomatic relations with China must not sell arms to Taiwan or enter into any forms of military alliance with Taiwan ... or help Taiwan to produce weapons. ...

President Clinton on Resolution with Assent of Taiwan’s People.⁹³
February 24, 2000

We’ll continue to reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question. We’ll also continue to make absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan.

Taiwan President Chen Shui-bian’s Inauguration Speech.⁹⁴
May 20, 2000⁹⁵

Today, as the Cold War has ended, it is time for the two sides to cast aside the hostilities left from the old era. We do not need to wait further because now is a new opportunity for the two sides to create an era of reconciliation together.

The people across the Taiwan Strait share the same ancestral, cultural, and historical background. While upholding the principles of democracy and parity,

⁹³ Remarks by the President to the Business Council, February 24, 2000. Later, Clinton added a third point, saying also that “there must be a shift from threat to dialogue across the Taiwan Strait, and we will continue to encourage both sides to seize this opportunity after the Taiwan election” (Remarks by the President on China, March 8, 2000).

⁹⁴ ROC, Office of the President, “Taiwan Stands Up: Toward the Dawn of a Rising Era,” May 20, 2000 (English and Chinese versions via the Government Information Office).

⁹⁵ On March 18, 2000, Chen Shui-bian of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) won the presidential election in Taiwan with 39 percent of the vote. Independent candidate James Soong won 37 percent. The ruling Kuomintang (KMT), or Nationalist Party’s, Lien Chan won 23 percent. The DPP has leaned toward favoring Taiwan’s independence. Chen’s DPP administration brought Taiwan’s first democratic transfer of power from one party to another, after 55 years of KMT rule.

building upon the existing foundations, and constructing conditions for cooperation through goodwill, we believe that the leaders on both sides possess enough wisdom and creativity to jointly deal with the question of a future “one China.”

I fully understand that as the popularly elected 10th-term President of the Republic of China, I must abide by the Constitution, maintain the sovereignty, dignity, and security of our country, and ensure the well-being of all citizens. Therefore, as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force against Taiwan, I pledge that during my term in office, I will not declare independence, I will not change the national title, I will not push forth the inclusion of the so-called “state-to-state” description in the Constitution, and I will not promote a referendum to change the status quo in regards to the question of independence or unification. Furthermore, the abolition of the National Unification Council or the Guidelines for National Unification will not be an issue.

PRC Vice Premier Qian Qichen’s New Formulation.⁹⁶

July-August 2000⁹⁷

With regard to cross-strait relations, the one China principle we stand for is that there is only one China in the world; the mainland and Taiwan all belong to one China; and China’s sovereignty and territorial integrity are indivisible.

Taiwan President on “Integration”.⁹⁸

December 31, 2000

I have always felt that the people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait came from the same family and that they all pursue the same goals of peaceful coexistence and mutual prosperity. Since both sides wish to live under the same roof, we should be more understanding and helpful rather than harming or destroying each other. ... The integration of our economies, trade, and culture can be a starting point for gradually building faith and confidence in each other. This, in turn, can be the basis for a new framework of permanent peace and political integration.

⁹⁶ *Xinhua* [New China News Agency], August 25, 2000, in FBIS.

⁹⁷ In July 2000, Qian Qichen had articulated, to visiting Taiwan lawmakers and journalists, a more flexible formulation of the “one China” principle, particularly in saying that the mainland and Taiwan both belong to one China (vs. that Taiwan is a part of the PRC or China), according to Taiwan media (e.g., *Central News Agency*, July 18, 2000). Later, looking towards an incoming Bush Administration, Qian granted an interview at Zhongnanhai (the leadership compound) to the *Washington Post* to reiterate what he described as a new flexibility on Taiwan to the United States (John Pomfret, “Beijing Signals New Flexibility on Taiwan,” *Washington Post*, January 5, 2001). In a speech on January 11, 2001, outgoing Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth praised the “significant formulation by Vice Premier Qian Qichen to the effect that the PRC and Taiwan are both parts of China.”

⁹⁸ Chen Shui-bian, President of the Republic of China, “Bridging the New Century: New Year’s Eve Address,” December 31, 2000. For “integration,” Chen used “*tong he*.”