

**The London School of Economics and Political Science**

*The Evolution of Taiwan's Grand Strategy:  
From Chiang Kai-shek to Chen Shui-bian*

By Chih-tung Chung

A thesis submitted to the Department of International  
Relations of the London School of Economics  
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
London, October 2012

(Student ID: 183629)

## **Declaration**

I certify that the thesis I have presented for examination for the MPhil/PhD degree of the London School of Economics and Political Science is solely my own work other than where I have clearly indicated that it is the work of others (in which case the extent of any work carried out jointly by me and any other person is clearly identified in it).

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Quotation from it is permitted, provided that full acknowledgement is made. This thesis may not be reproduced without my prior written consent.

I warrant that this authorisation does not, to the best of my belief, infringe the rights of any third party.

I declare that my thesis consists of 999,673 words.

## **Statement of use of third party for editorial help**

I can confirm that my thesis was copy edited for conventions of language, spelling and grammar by Eve Richards

## Abstract

The thesis explores the concept of grand strategy and applies it to the development of Taiwan's grand strategy between 1949 and 2008, from Presidents Chiang Kai-shek, Chiang Ching-kuo and Lee Teng-hui to Chen Shui-bian. The thesis first examines the debates between the 'classical' war-centred and 'neo-classical' peace-centred perspectives in the realm of strategic studies and argues that these need not be mutually exclusive, but can in fact supplement one another. The thesis then adopts a stance of theoretical pluralism, whereby grand strategy is regarded as a process of power practice across periods of war and peace; it defines grand strategy as a cognitive state agent taking action to create and manipulate power in furthering its desired ends in a dynamic international society. This convergent perspective of grand strategy is designed to embrace these two schools of thought, since it is equally important for those who seek a better understanding of grand strategy in general and the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy in particular to focus both on how best to wage war and how best to preserve peace.

To make sense of and to apply the concept of grand strategy, as an operational term, this thesis proposes four strategic analytical dimensions, namely, capability, choice, environment and posture, which are informed by the duality of four analytical pairs: ideational and material factors, ends and means, agency and structure, and defence and offence. Building upon this strategic analytical framework, the thesis moves to explore the perspective of leadership in Taipei against the backdrop of the political-military confrontation between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC. The thesis investigates how and how far Taiwan's grand strategy had been conditioned and developed by the influence of the Taipei-Beijing competition for sovereignty, changes in the international context, the unique strategic perspective of the successive presidents, domestic political developments and the asymmetry of national power between Taiwan and China. Through its investigation, the thesis argues that Taiwan's grand strategy over the past six decades has been fundamentally driven by one prime factor: to secure the perspective of the ROC's sovereign status as understood by Taipei's leaders, not only across the Strait but also in international society.

## **Acknowledgement**

There are many people I wish to thank and acknowledge for providing inspiration and support to my PhD studies. First of all, I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Dr Jurgen Haacke, who, over past years, has provided me with outstanding and endless amount of inspiration, guidance, patience and encouragement in my studies. I really cannot express more my gratitude to Dr Haacke's excellent supervision. I also wish to thank Mr Nicholas Sims whose support and kindness help me to pass smoothly in the early period of my PhD studies at LSE. I would also like to acknowledge crucial scholarship from Department of War Studies at King's College London sparking my research interest in strategic studies where I completed my Master degree there. I appreciate many friends in Birmingham, especially members from Department of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham, who have provided me invaluable support not just intellectually but also on a personal level too.

In Taiwan, I would like to thank friends in Department of Political Science at National Taiwan University, especially Prof. Shiao, Chyuan-jenq, who has been my mentor with endless and kindest support ever since I was his undergraduate student. During working in the Legislative Yuan for eight years as a senior legislator assistant before my studies in UK, I was lucky enough to make many good friends there but wish to mention and thank two in particular. Former legislator and Prof. Lee, Wen-lang, unfortunately passing away in 2005, was my very close friend and constantly encouraged me with a special regard to my career. Former legislator Ms Chin Tseng, Jean-li, a senior member and chair of the Defence Committee in the Legistative Yuan, was almost like my senior sister who she always concerned my work and life but sadly passed away in 2010. I am really indebted to their friendships. I would also like to thank The Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange (CCKF) in Taiwan awarding me the 2004-2005 research scholarship.

Finally, my foremost gratitude must go to my parents Chung, Fu-rong and Xu, Bing-ying for their endless love and support, which enables me to pursue my studies in UK for such a long period. It is my life regret that my father sadly passed away in September 2005 and could not see me to complete my PhD studies during his lifetime. Thus, I would like to dedicate my PhD thesis to my beloved father with my deepest love.

## Table of Contents

Declaration and Statement .....	002
Abstract .....	003
Acknowledgment .....	004
Table of Contents .....	005
Note of Romanisation .....	008
Key to Abbreviations .....	009
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>010</b>
1.1 Why This Topic? .....	011
1.2 The Concept of Grand Strategy .....	020
1.3 Strategy-Making and the Presidential Role .....	025
1.4 Methodology .....	033
1.5 The Structure of the Thesis .....	040
<b>Chapter 2 An Analytical Framework of Grand Strategy .....</b>	<b>041</b>
Introduction .....	041
2.1 Strategic Choice: Reconciling Ends and Means .....	046
2.2 Strategic Capabilities: The Ideational-Material Duality .....	052
2.3 Strategic Environment: Interplay of Agent and Structure .....	059
2.4 Strategic Posture: Synthesis of Defence and Offence .....	064
2.5 Conclusion: Toward a Convergent Understanding of Grand Strategy .....	068
<b>Chapter 3 The First and Second Taiwan Strait Crises, 1954-55 and 1958 .....</b>	<b>071</b>
Introduction .....	071
3.1 CKS's Outward-Looking Strategic Choice .....	076
The Unfinished Chinese Civil War .....	077
Defending the Legitimacy of the ROC .....	080
A Statecraft of Risk Taking .....	083
3.2 National Spiritual Mobilization .....	088
“Five Beliefs” .....	088
Anti-Communism .....	091
Optimism .....	094
3.3 Taipei's Management of the Strategic Environment .....	097
Upholding Domestic Security .....	097
Linking up with America's Global Containment Strategy .....	102
3.4 Strategic Offensive Posture for Military Counterattack .....	106
Relentless Military Preparation .....	107
The Offshore Islands and Eisenhower's “Unleash” Policy .....	111
3.5 Conclusions: Taiwan's Grand Strategy under Chiang Kai-shek in the 1950s .....	116
<b>Chapter 4 The Beginning of Taiwan's International Isolation: The Nixon Shock .....</b>	<b>120</b>
Introduction .....	120

4.1 Unfavourable Changes in Strategic Environment - Détente in Sight .....	123
The Origin of Détente .....	124
The Nixon Doctrine .....	126
Nixon's Sino-American Rapprochement .....	129
4.2 Continuity in Taipei's Outward-Looking Strategic Choice .....	131
Taipei's Threat Perception .....	132
Nationalist Sinocentrism .....	135
4.3 Backfiring of Taipei's "One China" Policy .....	138
Origins of Taipei's "One China" Principle .....	139
CKS's Perspective on International Reality .....	142
The Loss of the ROC's UN Seat .....	144
4.4 The Offensive Posture of "70 per cent Political Work and 30 per cent Military Effort" .....	148
Retaking the Mainland by Political Means .....	148
From Interdependence to Dependence .....	151
Combining Political Offensive with Military Defence .....	153
4.5 Conclusions: Taiwan's Grand Strategy under Chiang Kai-shek in the 1960s and the early 1970s .....	156

## **Chapter 5 The Challenge of Taiwan's Self-Defence: The Uncertainty of Washington's Security Commitment .....** 161

Introduction .....	161
5.1 Washington's Taiwan Relations Act .....	164
Taipei's "Five Principles" .....	165
America's Formula of "Peaceful Resolution" .....	167
Problems of Taipei's Arms Acquisitions .....	169
Taipei's Triumph? The Passing of the TRA .....	172
5.2 Toward an Inward-Looking Strategic Choice .....	174
Economic Development .....	174
Political Survival .....	176
Domestic Order .....	178
Constitutional Democracy .....	180
5.3 Taipei's Counter-Measures against Beijing's "United Front" strategy .....	182
Chinese Nationalism .....	183
Domestic Consolidation .....	185
Opposing Beijing's "One Country, Two Systems" .....	187
Defending Taipei's International Status .....	189
America as Arbiter .....	191
5.4 The Beginning of Taiwan's Defensive-Oriented Military Strategy .....	192
Non-provocative Defence .....	193
Strategic Endurance .....	195
Military Modernization .....	197
Taipei's "Controversial" Nuclear Option .....	199
5.5 Conclusions: Taiwan's Grand Strategy under Chiang Ching-kuo during the 1970s-1980s	202

## **Chapter 6 The Third Taiwan Strait Crisis, 1995-1996 .....** 205

Introduction .....	205
6.1 Choosing Peaceful Coexistence .....	209
The Nature of Lee's Peaceful Coexistence Policy .....	210

The Necessity of Preserving “National Sovereignty” .....	215
The Four-Step Process of Redefining Cross-Strait Relations .....	219
6.2 The Power of “Taiwanese Subjectivity” .....	224
The Nature of Lee’s “Taiwanese Subjectivity” .....	225
The Innovation of “Taiwanese Identity” .....	227
Lee’s Blueprint for “Managing Taiwan” .....	230
6.3 Pragmatic Diplomacy against International Isolation .....	233
Promoting the Idea of “Existence” in International Society .....	235
Competing Interpretations of the Status Quo .....	238
A Dilemma between Foreign Policy and Mainland Policy .....	241
6.4 Taipei’s Passive Defensive Posture .....	244
The Doctrine of Taiwan’s Deterrent Defence .....	246
The Debate about Acquiring Theater Missile Defence .....	250
6.5 Conclusions: Taiwan’s Grand Strategy under Lee Teng-hui in the 1990s .....	254
<b>Chapter 7 More Cross-Strait Drama: The DPP’s Accession to Power and the Pursuit of Self-determination.....</b>	<b>258</b>
Introduction .....	258
7.1 Ideational Inspiration of the “New Middle Road” .....	260
Anti-radicalism .....	260
Pacifism .....	264
Progressivism .....	267
7.2 Preserving Sovereignty through Upholding the “Status Quo” .....	271
Sovereignty First .....	271
Competition over Defining the “Status Quo” .....	276
Possibilities of a Future “One China” .....	279
7.3 Internationalising the Cross-Strait conflict .....	283
Strengthening Ties with Washington .....	283
The Influence of Globalization .....	288
The Challenge of China’s Rise .....	291
7.4 Taipei’s “Active Defensive” Posture: “Effective Deterrence, Resolute Defence” .....	296
“Effective Deterrence” .....	296
“Resolute Defence” .....	299
Military Reform .....	302
7.5 Conclusions: Taiwan’s Grand Strategy under Chen Shui-bian from 2000-2008 .....	306
<b>Chapter 8 Conclusions and Implications: Continuity, Changes and Prospects in Taiwan’s Grand Strategy .....</b>	<b>310</b>
8.1 Summary of Chapters .....	312
8.2 Main Findings and Contributions .....	322
8.3 Future Research Agenda .....	331
8.4 Further Policy Suggestions .....	335
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>343</b>

### Note on Romanisation

In this thesis, I have principally used the Pinyin Romanisation system to transliterate the Chinese names and terms, both in the text and in the footnotes. However, in some cases I have also used the Wade-Giles Romanisation system, where individual names and places are presented in English-language sources published in Taiwan.

## Key to Abbreviations

AIT	American Institute in Taiwan
ARATS	The Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait
ASW	Anti-submarine Warfare
CCK	Chiang Ching-kuo
CCP	The Chinese Communist Party
CIA	The American Central Intelligence Agency
CKS	Chiang Kai-shek
CSIS	Center for Strategic and International Studies
CSIST	The National Chung Shan Institute of Science and Technology
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party
ECFA	The Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement
GPWD	The General Political Warfare Department
GSH	General Staff Headquarters
IDF	The Indigenous Defence Fighter
KMT	Kuomintang
MAAG	Military Assistance Advisory Group
MAC	Mainland Affairs Council
MDT	The ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty
MND	Ministry National Defense
NAC	National Affairs Conference
NDA	National Defense Act
NDR	National Defence Report
NMD	National Missile Defense
NPT	Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
NSC	National Security Council
NSR	National Security Report
NUC	National Unification Council
NUG	National Unification Guidelines
PLA	People's Liberation Army
PRC	People's Republic of China
ROCA	The ROC's Army
ROCAF	The ROC's Air Force
ROCN	The ROC's Navy (ROCN)
ROCOT (or ROC)	Republic of China on Taiwan
SEF	Strait Exchange Foundation
SRBM	Short Range Ballistic Missiles
TGS	Taiwan's Grand Strategy
TMD	Theater Missile Defence
TRA	The Taiwan Relations Act
UN	United Nations
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

This thesis aims to explore the development of Taiwan's grand strategy from President Chiang Kai-shek through Chiang Ching-kuo and Lee Teng-hui to Chen Shui-bian.<sup>1</sup> It does so against the background of the political-military confrontation, which has long existed between the Republic of China (ROC) and the People's Republic of China (PRC), together with the changes in the international balance of power, as well as the domestic political developments in Taiwan. It is guided by three central questions: first, what has lain at the core of Taiwan's grand strategy?<sup>2</sup> Second, in what ways has Taiwan's grand strategy been practised and, third, why has the substance of Taiwan's grand strategy changed over time during these different administrations? To answer the above questions, the thesis examines above all the perspective of Taiwan's top political leaders on the ROC's sovereign status (*zhuquan dingwei*) and their responses to the cross-Strait crises which they encountered.

These questions are important because they will go some way to providing an understanding of the perspective of the leadership in the ROC in managing over time the question of state sovereignty (*quojia zhuquan*) contested with the PRC. Clearly Taipei's leaders have regarded Beijing as a constant and serious threat to the ROC's sovereignty. Notably, only a limited number of works have so far been published that systematically investigate how, in the period from 1949 to the present, Taiwan's grand strategy has evolved, or which focus on its underlying assumptions and practical effects. In this regard, this thesis seeks to

---

<sup>1</sup> This thesis in its concluding chapter will briefly examine the grand strategy of the current president, Ma Ying-jeou, since Ma's administration is just beginning its second four-year spell under his presidency.

<sup>2</sup> The term 'Taiwan' here refers to the Republic of China (ROC) or the Republic of China on Taiwan (ROCOT), all three of which are interchangeable.

fill a gap in the academic literature concerning Taiwan's grand strategy. It also contributes to the literature some important implications for the study of grand strategy, in particular in relation to debates about the way in which Taiwan's grand strategy has continued to develop.

### C.1.1 Why This Topic?

Taiwan's grand strategy is worth exploring for its regional and wider international significance and its profound implications for regional and strategic studies. Because of Taiwan's unique geopolitical position, the rising PRC places Taiwan at the very core of its national interests. From Beijing's perspective, the Taiwan issue concerns not only China's sovereignty and its territorial integrity, but also the distinctive geostrategic importance of this island for China's future development.<sup>3</sup> There is a widespread belief that the cross-Strait conflict is 'the only issue in the world today that could realistically lead to war between the two major powers [the PRC and the United States]'.<sup>4</sup> As some have described it, the Taiwan Strait is 'the most dangerous place on the planet' and 'a tinderbox for war between US and China'<sup>5</sup> because the cross-Strait conflict represents one of the most intractable political antagonisms in the world. Essentially, the cross-Strait confrontation is a consequence of the unfinished Chinese civil war in which the PRC has controlled Mainland China while the ROC has commanded the islands of Taiwan. More than six decades from its inception, the conflict remains unresolved because Beijing and Taipei

---

<sup>3</sup> Allan M. Wachman (2007) *Why Taiwan? Geostrategic Rationales for China's Territorial Integrity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), Chapter 7; You Ji (1999) *The Armed Forces of China* (London: I.B.Tauris), pp.212-213.; Martin L. Lasater (1993) *U.S. Interests in the New Taiwan* (Boulder: Westview Press), Chapter 7.

<sup>4</sup> Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, 'Dangerous Strait: An Introduction', in Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press); Michael S. Chase, 'US-Taiwan Security Cooperation: Enhancing an Unofficial Relationship', in Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait*, p.161; Swaine, M. D. and J. C. Mulvenon, et al. (2001). *Taiwan's Foreign and Defense Policies: Features and Determinants*. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND), p.1; Wachman, Allan M. (2007) *Why Taiwan?* p.2.

<sup>5</sup> Edward Friedman, 'China's Dilemma on Using Military Forces', in Edward Friedman (ed.) (2006) *China's Rise, Taiwan's Dilemmas and International Peace* (London: Routledge), p.205.

have failed to agree on mutually acceptable terms for a settlement of the contested sovereign statehood across the Strait. Ever since Deng Xiaoping proposed ‘one country, two systems’ in the early 1980s, Beijing seems increasingly over the years to have sought to compromise over political differences across the Strait, but still firmly declines to accept the claim of sovereign statehood by the ROC on Taiwan. On the other side, Taipei has so far preferred the status quo, neither unification nor formal independence across the Strait, which has also been well described as a ‘deadlock’ across the Strait which is unlikely to break.<sup>6</sup> However, due to the ROC’s reluctance to compromise its state sovereignty, Taipei has every now and again had to deal with major instances of a peaceful united-front strategy, coercive diplomacy and military intimidation instigated by Beijing, which have had a profound impact on regional stability and security in East Asia.<sup>7</sup>

To understand the evolution of Taiwan’s grand strategy, not only the questions of what has been Taiwan’s grand strategy, but also the vital question of how and why it has changed should be considered. The main argument of this thesis is that it is the perspective of Taipei leaders on the ROC’s sovereign status that has been decisive in shaping Taiwan’s grand strategy. Moreover, this grand strategy has been designed and redesigned ever since 1949, to secure the leaders’ different perspectives of the ROC sovereign status in the sense of the state’s political independence and jurisdictional rights.<sup>8</sup> According to F. H. Hinsley, the core meaning of sovereignty is ‘that there is a final and absolute political

---

<sup>6</sup> Taipei’s preference as the status quo power mainly began in Lee Teng-hui’s administration when Lee unilaterally announced the end of the civil war between the ROC and the PRC. But Lee, even later than Chen Shui-bian’s administration, did not rule out the option of unification in terms of Taiwan’s future. For discussions about the deadlock in the relations of Taiwan’s democratization, cross-Strait sovereign disputes and Beijing’s Taiwan policy, see Christopher R. Hughes (1999) ‘Democratization and Beijing’s Taiwan Policy’, in Steve Tsang and Hung-mao Tien (eds.) (1999) *Democratization in Taiwan: Implications for China* (London: Macmillan), pp. 143-144

<sup>7</sup> Beijing’s ‘united front’ strategy, see Christopher R. Hughes (2001) ‘Living with “One Country, Two Systems”? The Future of Beijing’s Taiwan’s Policy’, in *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol.14 (2) (April 2001), pp. 130-135.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of sovereignty in these terms, see Alan James (1999) ‘The Practice of Sovereign Statehood in Contemporary International Society’, *Political Studies*, Vol.47(3), (Specially Issue, 1999), pp. 457-473.

authority in the political community ... and no final and absolute authority exists elsewhere.'<sup>9</sup> Although meanings of sovereignty have varied across different theories and practices, the term sovereignty in the present thesis, thus, is embedded in this classic institutional perspective referring to an independent state's supreme political authority within an exclusive territory.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, the ROC's sovereignty issue has proven to be a much more difficult and complex situation, because the ROC and the PRC have not been able to reach a mutually satisfactory institutional arrangement such as was reached in Germany and Korea, for example, in the context of the divided China.<sup>11</sup> In fact, the ROC's claim as a sovereign state is constantly under threat from Beijing, while the ROC's international legal sovereignty has been seriously undermined as a consequence of Taipei's losing its UN seat and diplomatic recognition by most major countries in international society since the early 1970s. At present the ROC has formal diplomatic relations with only 23 countries, although its international isolation has been mitigated to some degree by the initiation of Chiang Ching-kuo's pragmatic 'total diplomacy' (*quan fangwei waijiao*), by means of association with some countries, notably the United States, which has made comprehensive alternative arrangements to provide the functional equivalent of recognition under the Taiwan Relation Acts (TRA).<sup>12</sup> Moreover, as Christopher R. Hughes points out, the practice of the ROC's sovereignty by the population of Taiwan, in particular since Taiwan's democratization in the

---

<sup>9</sup> F. H. Hinsley (1986) *Sovereignty* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p.26.

<sup>10</sup> See Robert Jackson (1999) 'Sovereignty in World Politics: a Glance at the Conceptual and Historical Landscape', *Political Studies*, Vol.47 (3), (Special Issue, 1999), pp. 431-456. Further discussions of different theories and practices of sovereignty include Robert Jackson (1999) 'Introduction: Sovereignty at the Millennium', *Political Studies*, Vol.47(3), (Special Issue, 1999), pp. 423-430. Classifying the term "sovereignty" in four different ways: 'domestic sovereignty', 'interdependence sovereignty', 'international legal sovereignty' and 'Westphalian sovereignty', Stephen D. Krasner applies the concepts of "authority" and "control" in these four usages of sovereignty to conclude that "authority" refers to a mutual recognised right among states and "control" refers to the use of a unilateral power without the mutual recognition of authority. See Stephen D. Krasner (2009) *Power, the State, and Sovereignty* (London: Routledge), pp. 179-253.

<sup>11</sup> On issues of the divided nations and states, see Gregory Henderson, Richard Ned Lebow and John G. Stoessinger (eds.) (1974) *Divided Nations in a Divided World* (New York: David McKay Company).

<sup>12</sup> *The ROC Yearbook 2011*, p.74, at <http://www.gio.gov.tw/taiwan-website/5-gp/yearbook/docs/ch05.pdf> (accessed on 23 August 2012). Taiwan's unique international sovereign status, see Krasner (2009) *Power, the State, and Sovereignty*, p.210 and pp. 229-230. Discussions of Chiang Ching-kuo's 'total diplomacy' strategy, see Chapter 5.3 of this thesis.

early 1990s, has presented Taipei's leader as not merely China's 'provincial leader' and has posed serious challenges for Beijing's cross-Strait unification policy, which is fundamentally embedded in Beijing's position of there being in principle only 'one China'.<sup>13</sup> Taking account of competing sovereignty claims between the ROC and the PRC, this thesis defines the meaning of the ROC's sovereign status in two major aspects: on the one hand, the ROC's jurisdictional sovereignty is to continue as an independent sovereign state in terms of its effective control on Taiwan; on the other hand, the ROC's political sovereignty is dynamically to proceed with reference to varying domestic and international perceptions of what the ROC is in terms of its relations with Mainland China. Accordingly, as this thesis will argue, it is this jurisdictional and political sovereign concern to secure what the ROC is, that lies at the heart of the making of Taiwan's grand strategy from Chiang Kai-shek's formula of 'the ROC as China', through Chiang Ching-kuo's notion whereby 'the ROC as the free China' and Lee Teng-hui's argument that 'the ROC on Taiwan' to Chen Shui-bian's dictum that 'the ROC as Taiwan'. In short, the much contested sovereignty issue matters fundamentally for the ROC, in that it represents the core value for the state's very survival.

Accordingly, Taiwan's national grand strategy has served either to recover Mainland China or to deter an invasion or forced unification by Beijing. Significantly, Taiwan's grand strategy has been adapted over and over again to fit new circumstances and developments, both international and domestic, as well as those in Mainland China. For instance, in the period immediately after the retreat to Taiwan in 1949, the defeated forces of the Kuomintang (KMT) had to fight to survive against the prevailing Chinese Communist forces and they did so without external assistance. This unfavourable strategic situation dramatically changed with the outbreak of the Korean War during which the ROC began to emerge as a key military ally of the United States, which could be relied upon to want to see all Communist expansion contained. The ensuing defence alliance

---

<sup>13</sup> Hughes (1999) 'Democratization and Beijing's Taiwan Policy', pp. 143-144.

was nonetheless dissolved during the Cold War period, when Washington decided to establish diplomatic relations with Beijing in 1979. Ever since, Taipei's decision-makers have been obliged to design and reconsider their grand strategy in the face of new strategic developments at the global and regional level. But equally, Taipei has had to respond in the post-Cold War era to a more aggressive tone in Beijing's rhetoric vis-à-vis the island.

While the cross-Strait confrontation has involved two polities, the ROC on Taiwan has long been overshadowed by the PRC not only in international society but also in the academic community. This is because Taiwan is generally regarded as in the category of Chinese issues. Nevertheless, as long as unification with Taiwan represents the core of the PRC's national interests, Taipei's grand strategy will have a decisive impact on Beijing's strategic behaviour.<sup>14</sup> However, unlike the number of studies of China's security and strategy,<sup>15</sup> the literature on Taiwan's grand strategy is still very limited. Although some works have dealt with Taiwan's security policy, these have not yet given enough attention to explicitly and systematically engaging with the strategic literature to trace the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy.<sup>16</sup> Rather, these works have either mostly involved truncated or merely descriptive accounts of Taiwan's military posture and defence capabilities or been guided by the framework of foreign policy analysis, including studies of the US-China-Taiwan "strategic triangle".<sup>17</sup> Bernard D. Cole's work, for instance,

---

<sup>14</sup> The studies of China's rise include Rex Li (2009) *A Rising China and Security in East Asia: Identity Construction and Security Discourse* (New York: Routledge); and Avery Goldstein (2005) *Rising to the Challenge: China's Grand Strategy and International Security* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

<sup>15</sup> An excellent literature review of the discourse of China's security and strategy is offered by Rex Li (2009) *A Rising China and Security in East Asia*, chapter 1, pp.1-46.

<sup>16</sup> For authors focusing on Taiwan's security policy, see Bernard D. Cole (2006). *Taiwan's Security: History and Prospects*. (London: Routledge); Michael S. Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy: External Threats and Domestic Politics* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers); M. D. Swaine and J. C. Mulvenon, et al. (2001). *Taiwan's Foreign and Defense Policies: Features and Determinants*. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND).

<sup>17</sup> For important works related to Taiwan's national security and strategy, see Michael D. Swaine, Andrew N. D. Yang, Evan S. Medeiros and Oriana Skylar Mastro (ed.) (2007) *Assessing the Threat: The Chinese Military and Taiwan's Security* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment). Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2003) *Defending Taiwan: The Future Vision of Taiwan's Defence Policy and Military Strategy* (London: Routledge Curzon); Michael D. Swaine (1999) *Taiwan's National Security, Defense Policy and Weapons*

focuses on the military aspects of Taiwan's security posture as adopted by the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) and its President Chen Shui-bian. In Cole's view, Taiwan requires greater military capabilities and a stronger popular will as necessary elements of a deterrent against the threat of an invasion by Mainland China, considering that Beijing commands a military advantage against which Taipei cannot prevail alone for long.<sup>18</sup> Michael S. Chase criticizes Taiwan's current security policy as a "puzzled response" to Chinese military modernization because of (1) Taipei's apparent belief in "free-riding" on its security ties with Washington; (2) its mistaken perceptions and analysis of both China's military capabilities and the CCP's will to consider and possibly opt for waging war against Taiwan; and (3) the island's problematic domestic politics, in so far as there is a lack of consensus in relation to its security policy.<sup>19</sup>

Western scholars of International Relations (IR) working on this topic have analysed the cross-Strait confrontation in both theoretical and empirical terms. Dennis van Vranken Hickey applies the idea of international system and argues that the transformation of the global system in the Post-Cold War era and the conjunction of long-term trends, such as US-PRC competitive relations, augurs well for Taiwan's security as long as Taiwan resists moves for de jure separation from China and maintains sufficient military capabilities to deter the PRC.<sup>20</sup> While describing Taiwan one of 'the two most dangerous flashpoints' in the security context of East Asia, William T. Tow observes that Taipei's policy makers have pursued a multi-dimensional strategy which incorporates both a realist and a liberal perspective.<sup>21</sup> Regarding the Taiwan issue as 'an

---

*Procurement Process* (Santa Monica: RAND); Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (1994) *United States-Taiwan Security Ties: From Cold War to Beyond Containment* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger); Lin Cheng-yi (1989) *A Triangle Lesson of Taiwan's Security: The Influence of the Communist China and the United States* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Laureate Publishers); Bau, Tzong-ho and Wu Yu-shan (eds.) (1999) *Contending Approaches to Cross-Strait Relations* (Taipei: Wu-Nan Publishers).

<sup>18</sup> Cole (2006), *Taiwan's Security*, pp.169-170.

<sup>19</sup> Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy*, pp. 4-9.

<sup>20</sup> Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (1997) *Taiwan's Security in the Changing International System* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers), pp.197-98. Hickey's systematic approach also see Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (2007) *Foreign Policy Making in Taiwan: From Principles to Pragmatism* (London: Routledge).

<sup>21</sup> William T. Tow (2001) *Asia-Pacific Strategic Relations: Seeking Convergent Security*

internationalized territorial dispute', rather than simply a Chinese domestic conflict, Alan M. Wachman opts for a geostrategic approach to explain why Taiwan is worth fighting for, since from Beijing's point of view foreign powers, mainly the U.S. and Japan, might seek to draw Taiwan into their own strategic realm and use Taiwan as a "bridgehead" to undermine China's national interests.<sup>22</sup> Within the Cold War context, John W. Garver empirically analyses the ROC-US alliance, which was a central feature of their national strategy during the 1950s and 1960s.<sup>23</sup> Regarding the American roles in the ROC-PRC confrontation, Nancy Bernkopf Tucker argues that 'strategic ambiguity' remains 'safer, smarter and more realistic' than 'strategic clarity'<sup>24</sup>, while Richard Bush sees Washington's 'dual deterrence' policy as being designed to constrain both Taipei and Beijing from escalating their bilateral confrontation into a full-scale conflict.<sup>25</sup> While these valuable studies in IR provide insights about Taiwan, there still remains a lack of comprehensive case studies to account for the overall development of Taiwan's grand strategy. The vast majority of case studies related to Taiwan in the field of security and strategy analysis have mainly focused on either the PRC or the United States.

Moreover, it is also worth noting that those in the mainstream of Taiwan's academics on this subject have primarily applied realist approaches, neorealism in particular, with a concomitant focus on the importance of material structures in the context of great powers' politics. This academic preference can be understood by considering the distinct feature of the power asymmetry across the Strait: that Taipei has evidently continued to pursue external powers to compensate for its weaknesses compared to Beijing. Wu Yu-shan, for example, one of the leading Taiwanese scholars working on international and cross-Strait

---

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.106-108.

<sup>22</sup> Wachman (2007) *Why Taiwan? Geostrategic Rationales for China's Territorial Integrity*, chapter 8, pp.153-164.

<sup>23</sup> Garver, John W. (1997) *The Sino-American Alliance: Nationalist China and American Cold War Strategy in Asia* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe).

<sup>24</sup> Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (2005) 'Strategic Ambiguity or Strategic Clarity', in Tucker (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait*, pp. 186-211.

<sup>25</sup> Richard Bush (2006) 'The US Policy of Dual Deterrence', in Steve Tsang (2006) *If China Attacks Taiwan: Military Strategy, Politics and Economics* (New York: Routledge), pp 35-53.

relations, in order to rationalise Taipei's mainland policy, applies theories of 'balancing and bandwagoning' with reference to the US-China-Taiwan "strategic triangle", but fails to identify the origins of the cross-Strait confrontation which plays a decisive role in fundamentally shaping Taiwan's grand strategy.<sup>26</sup> Similarly applying the "strategic triangle" approach, Lin Cheng-yi argues that a strategy of alliances is indispensable for a small state's security against its much stronger foes.<sup>27</sup> In a research report from Taiwan's government, Chan Man-jung, Lin Wen-chen and Lin Bih-jaw adopt the neo-functionalism approach, which relies on supranational institutions for a collective security mechanism to deal with the cross-Strait confrontation.<sup>28</sup> The consequence of this structural focus is that it pays insufficient attention to the evolution of strategic thinking by strategic agents, namely Taipei's leaders, and too much to an analysis which seems exclusively preoccupied with the international system and its effects on foreign policy.

With regard to the implications of democratization for Taiwan's security and strategy in the cross-Strait sovereign confrontation, Bernice Lee observes that 'Taiwan's democratization' stands as 'the most important' factor lying behind the dispute between Taiwan and China.<sup>29</sup> Concerning Beijing's possible

---

<sup>26</sup> Wu Yu-shan's structural perspective is mainly derived from Kenneth N. Waltz (1959) *Man, the State and War* (New York: Columbia University Press) and Stephen M. Walt (1987) *The Origin of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), see Wu Yu-shan (1999) 'Taiwan's Mainland Policy: Structure and Rationality', in Bau Tzong-ho and Wu Yu-shan (eds.) (1999) *Contending Approaches to Cross-Strait Relations* (Taipei: Wu-Nan Publishers), pp. 155-210.

<sup>27</sup> Lin Cheng-yi (1995), "Taiwan's Security Strategies in the Post-Cold War Era", *Issues and Studies* (Taipei), Vol.31, No.4 (April 1995), pp.78-97.

<sup>28</sup> Research, Development and Evaluation Commission (1996) *A Construction of the Asia-Pacific Collective Security System and the Role of Our State* (Taipei: Research, Development and Evaluation Commission, Executive Yuan). On collective security, see David B. Dewitt (1994) 'Concept of Security for the Asia-Pacific Region', in Bunn Nagara and K.S. Balakrishnan (eds.) (1994) *The Making of Security Community in the Asia-Pacific* (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Institute of Strategic and International Studies), pp.9-43. On the origins and ideas of neo-functionalism see, for instance, Ernst B. Haas and Philippe C. Schmitter (1964) 'Economics and Differential Patterns of Political Integration: Projections about the Unity in Latin America', in *International Organization*, Vol.18, No.4 (Autumn, 1964), pp.705-737; Ernst B. Haas (1968) 'Technocracy, Pluralism, and the New Europe', in Joseph S. Nye Jr, *International Regionalism: Readings* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown), pp.149-176; Norman D. Palmer (1991) *The New Regionalism in Asia and the Pacific* (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books).

<sup>29</sup> Bernice Lee (1999) *The Security Implication of the New Taiwan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 331), pp.9-11.

misperception of the evolution of Taiwan's national identity movements as steps toward separatism, Cal Clark argues that democracy in Taiwan can go for a "clear and present danger" to its national security if democratisation becomes inflamed and polarises ethnic tensions within the society and cross-Strait relations with Beijing.<sup>30</sup> Analysing the impact of democratisation on Taiwan's national identity and national security, Chia-Lung Lin argues that Taiwan's democratisation involves a mechanism for forging domestic consensus and enables Taipei to redefine its roles and relations with the region's major actors (the US, China, Japan and the ASEAN) as a way of building Taiwan as a nation and state.<sup>31</sup>

The main weakness of the above works and other relevant publications is that they have resulted in studies with what is arguably a limited focus and a truncated understanding of the context and in particular the development of Taiwan's security and strategy. Indeed, a major oversight of the literature on the cross-strait conflict is that it lacks works which examine the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy in theoretical and historical terms. Even where the literature discusses strategy, it largely fails to acknowledge that Taiwan's grand strategy is the product of a dialectical interplay of material and ideational factors and that the formulation of this strategy can itself be grasped only by way of an understanding of the decision-makers as agents situated in the dynamic of strategic contexts.<sup>32</sup> Equally, this strategic literature does not consider in much

---

<sup>30</sup> Cal Clark (2001) 'Successful Democratisation in the ROC: Creating a Security Challenge', in Alexander C. Tan, Steve Chan, Calvin Jillson (2001) *Taiwan's National Security: Dilemmas and Opportunities* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 18-59. For the interaction between democratisation and national identity, Christopher R. Hughes rightly observes that, for greater access to the mainland and more recognition in international society, Taipei has moved to 'a more sophisticated attempt to articulate the meaning of one China than opting for either independence or unification.' see Christopher R. Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism – National Identity and Status in International Society* (London: Routledge), p.94.

<sup>31</sup> Chia-lung Lin (2001) 'National Identity and Taiwan Security', in Alexander C. Tan, Steve Chan, Calvin Jillson (eds.) (2001) *Taiwan's National Security*, pp. 60-83.

<sup>32</sup> This shortage mainly stems from the reliance on neorealist analysis, such as the 'balancing and bandwagoning' analysis adopted by Wu Yu-shan. For Wu's structural realist perspective on the 'strategic triangle' model analysis, see Yu-shan Wu (2003) 'Does Chen's Election Make Any Difference? Domestic and International Constraints on Taipei, Washington and Beijing', in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) (2003) *Taiwan's Presidential Politics: Democratization and Cross-Strait Relations in the 21st Century* (Taiwan in the Modern World) (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Paperback), pp. 155-192.

detail the complex and interdependent relationship of means and ends or dwell for long on the notions of offence and defence, as seen from Taipei's viewpoint. The existing literature is also virtually oblivious to changes in Taiwan's grand strategy over time and pays only limited attention to the impacts of cross-Strait crises. As a result, it is worthwhile to explore and display a bigger picture in the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy, which might enrich regional and strategic studies dealing the conflict across the Taiwan Strait.

### C.1.2 The Concept of Grand Strategy

The term grand strategy has generally been applied when studying national powers, constituted by military, economic, social and political means, by which a state aims at producing its intended effects.<sup>33</sup> This usage points to the core of grand strategy: the pursuit of a combination of military and non-military instruments to promote and preserve national interests. Instead of considering the military dimension of strategy in isolation, this thesis will understand by grand strategy an overarching policy design which takes into consideration different factors to fulfil proposed national goals as defined by national policy through the interpretation and implementation of the prime strategic actors, e.g. political leaders. As such, it adds to the existing literature of grand strategy which has mainly focused on historical or policy analysis as necessary, but has not necessarily dwelt much on the general concept or theorized about its

---

<sup>33</sup> Lawrence Freedman (2006) *The Transformation of Strategic Affairs*. (Abingdon, New York: Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 379), pp.8-9. For another broad understanding of grand strategy, as distinct from military strategy, see also Paul Kennedy (1991) 'Grand Strategy in War and Peace: Toward a Broader Definition', in Paul Kennedy (ed.) (1991) *Grand Strategies in War and Peace* (New Haven: Yale University Press); John M. Collins (1973) *Grand Strategy: Principles and Practices* (Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press); Barry R. Posen (1984) *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain and Germany between the World Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Richard Rosecrance and Arthur A. Stein (eds.) (1993) *The Domestic Basis of Grand Strategy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Thomas J. Christensen (1996) *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958* (Princeton: Princeton University Press); James C. Gaston (ed.) (1992) *Grand Strategy and the Decisionmaking Process* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press).

meaning and significance, as Avery Goldstein observes.<sup>34</sup>

Accordingly, the analytical framework adopted in the present thesis is based on a particular formulation of grand strategy (which will be the subject of Chapter 2): one which does not simply regard the concept as relating to conventional strategic analytical dimensions, namely the ‘diplomatic, economic, military and informational’ perspectives and their hierarchy of importance for national security.<sup>35</sup> The main weakness of this conventional framework is arguably the limitation as regards identifying, exploring and conceptualising the core value of national strategy, given its focus on the operational convenience for conducting the strategic analysis. To make sense of grand strategy, this thesis examines four strategic analytical dimensions, namely, choice, capability, environment and posture, which are informed by the duality of four analytical pairs: ideational-material factors, ends-means, agency-structure and defence-offence.<sup>36</sup> Also, I believe that the concept of grand strategy highlights a process of power practice.<sup>37</sup> This implies that the focus of analysis should rest principally on the state as a political entity which is dedicated to its own survival and prosperity. Notably, grand strategy is a form of agency pursued by decision-makers. Consequently, by applying the four strategic dimensions, I define grand strategy for the purpose of this thesis as a process in which a cognitive state agent takes actions to create and manipulate power to achieve its perceived ends in a dynamic international society. Obviously, this is not a traditional definition often encountered in the analysis of grand strategy although the concepts of

---

<sup>34</sup> Goldstein (2005) *Rising to the Challenge: China’s Grand Strategy and International Security*, pp.17-18. Goldstein highlights the role of diplomacy in the concept of grand strategy, which refers to ‘the central logic that informs and links those [foreign] policies, the regime’s vision about it can most sensibly serve the national interests (goals) in light of the country’s capabilities (means) and the international constraints that it faces (the context of interdependent choice), see Goldstein (2005) *Rising to the Challenge*, p.19.

<sup>35</sup> U.S. Department of Defense (1995) *Dictionary of Military Terms* (London: Greenhill Books), pp. 257-258.

<sup>36</sup> For details of the analytical framework of grand strategy adopted in this thesis, see Chapter 2.

<sup>37</sup> The idea that the concept of strategy should be regarded as a process draws upon Williamson Murray and Mark Grimsley (1994) ‘Introduction: On Strategy’, in Williamson Murray, MacGregor Knox and Alvin Bernstein (eds.) *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.1-23.

process and power are not new in relation to strategic analysis.<sup>38</sup> The conceptual framework of grand strategy as a process of power practice echoes André Beaufre's idea that '[the nature of] strategy cannot be a single defined doctrine; it is a method of thought.'<sup>39</sup>

Traditionally, the idea of grand strategy is part of a conceptual hierarchy which in the context of war ranges the subordinate concepts according to their degree of specialisation, from tactics and operations to strategy.<sup>40</sup> In Michael Howard's definition, 'grand strategy in the first half of the twentieth century consisted basically in the mobilization and deployment of national resources of wealth, manpower and industrial capacity, together with the enlistment of those of allied and, when feasible, of neutral powers, for the purpose of achieving the goals of national policy in wartime.'<sup>41</sup> Edward Mead Earle likewise pointed out that state and society have become so interwoven in the era of modern war that 'strategy must be considered as the art of controlling and utilizing the resources of a nation ... The highest type of strategy – sometimes called grand strategy – is that which so integrates the policies and armaments of the nation that the resort to war is either rendered unnecessary or is undertaken with the maximum chance of victory.'<sup>42</sup> By such a definition, Earle, along with others, not only regards war as a political instrument reflecting Clausewitz's dictum whereby 'war is a continuation of politics by other means', but also extends the realm of grand strategy from wartime to peacetime. These classical concepts of grand strategy present the notion of strategy as action, which is focused in the main on

---

<sup>38</sup> For the application of the concept of power in strategic studies here, I draw on Lawrence Freedman (1992) 'Strategic Studies and the Problem of Power', in Lawrence Freedman, Paul Hayes and Robert O'Neill (eds.) (1992) *War, Strategy and International Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

<sup>39</sup> André Beaufre (1965) *An Introduction to Strategy* (tr. R.H. Barry) (London: Faber & Faber), PP.11-13.

<sup>40</sup> Iver B. Neumann and Henrikki Heikka (2005) 'Grand Strategy, Strategic Culture, Practice: The Social Root of Nordic Defence', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol.40 (1) (March 2005), p.12.

<sup>41</sup> Michael Howard (1972) (History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Military Series) *Grand Strategy Vol. IV: August 1942- September 1943* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office), p.1.

<sup>42</sup> Edward Mead Earle (1943) 'Introduction', in Edward Mead Earle (ed.) (1943) *Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), p. viii.

preparations for war and then the putting into effect of those war preparations in order to secure and promote their proposed national interests.<sup>43</sup> Building on this classical concept of strategy, strategic analysis focuses on the way in which states and their leaders coordinate and direct all the available resources of the nation for the pursuit of its political ends. This is a convincing aspect that the classical analysis proposes, taking in on the way a major selection of national resources, but centring on the war effort for strategic analysis. Nevertheless, the war-centred kind of traditional strategic analysis, a “classical” school, which stresses the application of military force as an indispensable and effective political instrument in the context of strategy, does not dwell on the importance of the element of flexibility pervading strategic considerations, whereby military fighting power is just one of grand strategy’s possible instruments. Adopting a broader vision of strategy allows the analyst to take account of other available dimensions, including the non-military one, to enrich the analysis.

The traditional war-centred strategist has always regarded victory as the ultimate value in the context of strategy. To rethink the war-centred strategic analytical framework, a peace-centred strategic perspective, in a “neo-classical” school, emerges to further scrutinise the very meaning of victory. Liddell Hart opted for this rethinking, as follows: ‘The object of war is to obtain a better peace ... Victory in the true sense implies that the state of peace and of one’s people, is better after the war than before. Victory in this sense is only possible if a quick result can be gained or if a long effort can be economically proportioned to the national resources. The end must be adjusted to the means.’<sup>44</sup> This peace-centred argument led to the conclusion, in Paul Kennedy’s phrase, that ‘a true grand strategy was now concerned with peace as much as (perhaps even more than) with war.’<sup>45</sup> This was in line with the fact that the advent of nuclear weapons had encouraged mainstream strategic studies to focus on theories of deterrence, in so far as it laid a new emphasis on the use made by military forces

---

<sup>43</sup> Hew Strachan (2008) ‘The Lost Meaning of Strategy’, in Thomas G. Mahnken and Joseph A. Maiolo (eds.) *Strategic Studies: A Reader* (London: Routledge), pp.428, 432.

<sup>44</sup> Liddell Hart, B. H. (1991) *Strategy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed’n.) (London: Meridian), p.357.

<sup>45</sup> Paul Kennedy (1991) ‘Grand Strategy in War and Peace: Toward a Broader Definition’, p.4.

mainly of the threat of war.<sup>46</sup> Thomas Schelling, in *Arms and Influence*, thus regards military strategy as ‘the diplomacy of violence’, that is, the art of coercion, intimidation and deterrence, which deals with the exploitation of potential force rather than the efficient application of force for military *victory*.<sup>47</sup> As a result, a new approach in strategic studies has taken the peace-centred strategic perspective, by drawing on all national resources to preserve peace and avoid war instead of engaging in war for the pursuit of national interests. However, Hew Strachan blames the non-military dimension of strategic studies for ‘losing the meaning of strategy’ because in his view ‘the control and direction of war’ are at the core of strategy, which, as he put it, is designed ‘to make war useable by the state, so that it can, if need be, use force to fulfil its political objectives.’<sup>48</sup>

While researchers may debate the relative insights and limitations of war-centred and peace-centred perspectives in analysis, these need not be mutually exclusive but can instead supplement one another. It is obvious that, analysts who draw on either of them exclusively are unlikely to have a full understanding of a state’s grand strategy. For example, in the context of the cross-Strait confrontation, a war-centred notion of strategy fails to explain how Taiwan as a small state, when compared to China, can have survived as an independent political entity by focusing only on military preparation against its much stronger foe. By comparison, those concentrating on what I would call strategy’s peace-centred aspects cannot fully explain why Taipei has rejected any international intervention in the pursuit of a peace settlement across the Strait from the 1950s to the 1970s. In this thesis, therefore, I intentionally adopt a posture of theoretical pluralism, whereby I regard grand strategy as a process of power practice which embraces both these schools of thought, since it is equally important to focus on how best to wage war and how best to preserve peace. I believe that viewing things from a perspective of power practice is a

---

<sup>46</sup> Hew Strachan (2008) ‘The Lost Meaning of Strategy’, p.428.

<sup>47</sup> Thomas C. Schelling (1966) *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press), pp.26-34.

<sup>48</sup> Hew Strachan (2008) ‘The Lost Meaning of Strategy’, p.432.

better way to avoid distortion in favour of any partisan perspective and hence to gain a better understanding of strategic analysis in general and the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy in particular.

### **C.1.3 Strategy-making and the Presidential Role**

As this thesis is explicitly concerned with Taiwan's grand strategy under particular administrations during the period from Chiang Kai-shek to Chen Shui-bian and to some extent with making comparisons between administrations where possible, it is worth explaining in advance why a presidency-centred perspective has been adopted for the analysis of the strategic decision-making processes under discussion. This actor-specific orientation speaks to both theoretical and empirical concerns of the analysis of strategy.

First, strategies are fundamentally made and practised by people. As Colin S. Gray observes, 'strategists have personalities that are the product of their biology and life experience'.<sup>49</sup> While demonstrating other necessary components to make sense of strategy, Gray argues that 'the human dimension of strategy is so basic and obvious that it often escapes notice by scholars with a theoretical bent. At all relevant levels of analysis strategy is done by individuals'.<sup>50</sup> Gray's approach of decoding strategy thus stresses the vital role in the analysis of strategy of the behaviour of particular individuals. It also offers explanations for some phenomena of the existing strategic literature, showing why many national strategic doctrines have been initiated and made by certain individual leaders, which has given rise to labels such as the Eisenhower Doctrine.<sup>51</sup> To be sure, adopting such a leader-oriented perspective does not

---

<sup>49</sup> Colin S. Gray and Jeannie L. Johnson (2010) 'The Practice of Strategy', in Baylis, John, James Wirtz and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2010): *Strategy in the Contemporary World - An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (Third Ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p. 377.

<sup>50</sup> Colin S. Gray conceptualises the general theory of strategy along three major dimensions: 'people and politics', 'preparation for war' and 'war proper'. See Colin S. Gray (1999) *Modern Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 23-47.

<sup>51</sup> See, for example, Robert R. Bowie and Richard H. Immerman (1998) *Waging Peace: How*

mean that the ROC President alone can make decisions without interacting with other key factors within the structure and process of national security policy-making in Taiwan. This is because, in the context of a given strategic environment, there is an interrelated ‘strategic-relation’ between ‘strategic actors’ and the ‘strategically selective context’, as Colin Hay argues. In other words, this thesis holds that strategic actors purposively engage comprehensive external structural factors to achieve their perceived goals.<sup>52</sup> In fact, rather than focusing exclusively on external structural factors, as the neorealist approach does, the adopted presidency-centred perspective can be regarded as a domestic-orientation of strategic analysis by other means. Moreover, the human-actor-specific perspective makes it more useful, sensible and accessible to understand how and explain why ideational factors, e.g. perception and belief, can play a decisive role in making national strategy.<sup>53</sup> With their desired goals in mind, the strategic actors, in fact, are versatile enough to pursue all available means and respond to external structural constraints on purpose to map out their strategies. National grand strategy is the product, and the outcome, of the

---

*Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Robert S. Litwak (1984) *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); John Lewis Gaddis, Philip H. Gordon, Ernest R. May, and Jonathan Rosenberg (ed.) (1999) *Cold War Statesman Confront the Bomb: Nuclear Diplomacy since 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Richard L. Russell (1999) *George F. Kennan's Strategic Thought: The Making of an America Political Realist* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger); Gordon A. Craig (1998) ‘The Political Leader as Strategist’, in Peter Paret (ed.) (1998) *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 481-510; Donald Cameron Watt (1963) *Personalities and Politics: Studies on the Formulation of British Foreign Policy in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* (London: Longmans).

<sup>52</sup> For a further discussion, see Chapter 2.3 in this thesis ‘Strategic Environment: Interplay of Agent and Structure’. For a comprehensive discussion also see Colin Hay (2002) *Political Analysis - A Critical Introduction* (New York: Palgrave), pp. 126-134 and Bob Jessop (2008) *State Power* (Cambridge: Polity), pp.21-52.

<sup>53</sup> The constructivist approach provides an insight and some fruitful research about how the role of the idea affects states in international politics. See Alexander Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Studies about political elites in policy-making and the relationship between their beliefs and actions include Nathan C. Leites (1953) *A Study of Bolshevism* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press); Alexander L. George (1969) ‘The “Operational Code”: A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making’, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 13(2), (June, 1969), pp.190-222; and Ole R. Holsti and James N. Rosenau (1997) ‘The Meaning of Vietnam: Belief System of American Leaders’, *International Journal*, No.32 (Summer, 1977), pp. 452-474. A study of the importance of decision-makers’ perceptions in international politics is contained in Robert Jervis (1976) *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

dynamic process, which is centred on prime strategic actors' perspectives with regard to national choices, capabilities, situation and pose.<sup>54</sup> As a result, in the analysis of strategy, the actor-specific perspective is designed mainly to understand the strategic actors' goals and motivations and, accordingly, to explain their actions on the nation's behalf that may enable the much-neglected human element to be brought back to centre stage in making national grand strategy.

The analytical framework of national grand strategy is also a policy-relevant element of theory which policymakers may find useful in making strategy. At the heart of national grand strategy is an overarching national security policy, a setting of interdependent choices, 'in the pursuit of viable solutions', according to Bernard Brodie.<sup>55</sup> As it partakes of policy in its nature, the concept of national grand strategy can be substantialized only by the action of a strategic actor in a dynamic strategic environment. 'The crux of grand strategy lies in policy', as Paul Kennedy rightly argues, 'that is, in the capacity of the nation's leaders to bring together all of the elements, both military and non-military, for the preservation and enhancement of the national's long term best interests.'<sup>56</sup> Accordingly, the prime strategic actors, their policies and the actor-policy relations stand as the principal objects for strategic analysis.

In the analysis to identify what major factors affect state behaviour in international politics, there is a level-of-analysis debate among IR scholars. While Kenneth Waltz famously framed three distinct 'images'- human nature, the nature of states, and the nature of the international system - to explain the sources and causes of war. David Singer, in response, introduced the 'level-of-analysis' concept to International Relations and focused mainly on two levels: the international system and the national state.<sup>57</sup> Although the concept of

---

<sup>54</sup> For details of the analytical framework of grand strategy developed here, see Chapter 2 in this thesis.

<sup>55</sup> Bernard Brodie (1973) *War and Politics* (London: Cassell), pp. 452-453.

<sup>56</sup> Paul Kennedy (ed.) (1991) *Grand Strategies in War and Peace*, p.5

<sup>57</sup> Kenneth Waltz (1959) *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia

levels of analysis has offered many insights for the development of theoretical thinking in IR, challenges to the level-of-analysis approach remain, in particular in terms of how to integrate the different levels of analysis for a comprehensive understanding of national policy.<sup>58</sup> In the analysis of grand strategy, the proposed ‘strategic-relational’ approach enables the analysis to cut across the levels of individual agency and the structure of international relations in a systematic manner. As a result, as regards explaining state strategy or behaviour, the selected level of analysis (which may focus our attention, for example, on individual leaders, bureaucracy, the state, the region or global relations) does not necessarily lead to the kind of ‘reductionist’ or ‘holistic’ perspective that Waltz identified. Instead, the approach looks at causal factors (explanans) or sources of explanation. And the objects of analysis all depend on the criteria by which the objects’ principal units are defined and the question(s) being asked of the research subject. In short, coined as foreign policy analysis, while focusing on the selected prime strategic actors, the policy-centred analysis of grand strategy claims a position in multi-causal explanations and interdisciplinarity.<sup>59</sup>

Secondly, addressing the empirical question of specifying the prime strategic actors in the studies of the governmental decision-making processes, Melvyn D. Read proposes a ‘central and marginal’ policy network theory to classify and identify the important figures in various agencies, both public and private, in

---

University Press); J. David Singer (1960) ‘International Conflict: Three Levels of Analysis’, *World Politics*, Vol. 12 (3) (April, 1960), pp. 453-461; J. David Singer (1961) ‘The Level-of Analysis Problem in International Relations’, *World Politics*, Vol. 14(1) (October, 1961), pp. 77-92.

<sup>58</sup> On the problem concerning the level-of-analysis and foreign policy analysis, see Valerie M. Hudson (2007) *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield), pp. 165-185 and Walter Carlsnaes (2007) ‘Actors, Structure, and Foreign Policy Analysis’, in Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne (eds. ) (2007) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 85-100. For other critics of the level of analysis, see Barry Buzan (1993) ‘The Level of Analysis Problem Reconsidered’, in Barry Buzan, Charles Jones, and Richard Little (1993) *The Logic of Anarchy-Neorealism to Structuralism Realism* (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 198-216.

<sup>59</sup> The actor-specific position incorporates interdisciplinary perspectives in foreign policy analysis. See Valerie M. Hudson (2007) ‘The History and Evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis’, in Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne (eds.) (2007) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, pp.11-29; Valerie M. Hudson (2007) *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield).

terms of their influence, involvement and commitment to policy formulation.<sup>60</sup> The question of who is the prime actor in the strategic decision-making process, therefore, is about the question of political power: how to identify who is really in charge. With regard to the nature and scope of policy-centred national grand strategy, it is typical for the study of national strategy to put its analytical lens on the most powerful strategic actor, the leader of a state.<sup>61</sup> The crucial role of leaders explains why in the study of American grand strategy, for example, the President has always remained in central focus. As Robert J. Art rightly points out, the vital relations between grand strategy and national leaders, ‘grand strategy is a broad subject: a grand strategy tells a nation’s leaders what goals they should aim for and how best they can use their country’s military power to attain these goals.’<sup>62</sup> In the context of who is making Taiwan’s grand strategy, despite the variety of agencies and individuals involved in the governmental decision-making process, the President has consistently played the role of the prime strategic actor who possesses exclusive and decisive power to dictate national grand strategy.<sup>63</sup> In fact, if anything extended over the course of the

---

<sup>60</sup> Melvyn D. Read (1992) ‘Policy Networks and Issue Network: The Politics of Smoking’, in David Marsh and R. A. W. Rodes (eds.) (1992) *Policy Networks in British Government* (Oxford: Clarendon Press). Also see William Zimmerman (1980) ‘Elite Perspective and the Explanation of Soviet Foreign Policy’, in Erik P. Hoffmann and Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. (eds.) (1980) *The Conduct of Soviet Foreign Policy* (New York: Aldine Publishing Company), pp. 18-35. For other useful analyses of the decision-making process in international relations, see Richard C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (2002) ‘The Decision-Making Approach to the Study of International Politics’, in Richard C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (eds.) (2002), *Foreign Policy Decision-Making (Revisited)* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 1-20; Fred Greenstein (1967) ‘The Impact of Personality on Politics: An Attempt to clear Away Underbrush’, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 61(3) (September, 1967), pp. 629-641.

<sup>61</sup> James C. Gaston (ed.) (1992) *Grand Strategy and the Decisionmaking Process* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press); Sam C. Sarkesian (ed.) (1984) *Presidential Leadership and National Security: Style, Institution, and Politics* (Boulder: Westviews Press); Edward R. Drachman and Alan Shank (1997) *Presidents and Foreign Policy* (New York: State University of New York Press); Erwin C. Hargrove and John E. Owens (eds.) *Leadership in Context* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield); Michael Nelson (ed.) (1998) *The Presidency and the Political System* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) (Washington, D.C.: A Division of Congressional Quarterly Inc.); Richard E. Neustadt (1990) *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan* (New York: The Free Press); William Murray, Richard Hart Sinnreich, and James Lacey (eds.) (2011) *The Shaping of Grand Strategy: Policy, Diplomacy, and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Anja V. Hartmann and Beatrice Heuser (eds.) (2001) *War, Peace and World Orders in European History* (London: Routledge).

<sup>62</sup> Robert J. Art (2003) *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), p.1.

<sup>63</sup> Chen Ching-Pu (2006) ‘Defense Policy-Making and Civilian Roles’, in Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2006) *Taiwan’s Defense Reform* (Oxon: Routledge).

authoritarian period under Presidents Chiang Kai-Shek and Chiang Ching-Kuo, the scope of presidential power and the prerogatives of the presidency have also been jealously guarded by subsequent leaders of the executive, regardless of party affiliation and the intervening domestic political changes which have brought about significant democratization. Presidential power in mapping out Taiwan's grand strategy is particularly identifiable, as are the finer details of the country's national policy, which continue to rest on executive privilege. During Chiang's authoritarian period (1949-1988), imposing their hard-line cross-Straits policy against Beijing, the so-called "Communist bandit" (*gongfei*) in the period of martial law, the roles and responsibilities as commander in chief, chief executive and head of state gave the presidents exclusive and distinctive power to control government policy, the military forces and intelligence-gathering instruments in an overall unchallenged status. Despite Taiwan's democratization associated with the political and organizational developments after the authoritarian period, the President still enjoys exclusive power and responsibility in making national security strategy, in relation to foreign and defence policy in particular, as well as cross-Straits issues. The dominant power in Taiwan currently is guarded by and derived from the French-style presidential constitutional framework.<sup>64</sup> Consequently, the president has generally been regarded as the prime strategic actor, who plays a leading and representative role in the making of the country's foreign and national security policies.

Nevertheless, too little attention for its full meaning and significance, some exceptions notwithstanding, is still paid to the role of the President in foreign policy making in general and in particular as regards comparisons of the styles of different presidents in the analysis of Taiwan's grand strategy. Chin-Pu Chen, in his research on Taiwan's defence policy-making process, has concluded that

---

<sup>64</sup> For further discussion of the president's power and its practice in Taiwan's political system, see Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) (2003) *Taiwan's Presidential Politics: Democratization and Cross-Straits Relations in the 21st Century* (Taiwan in the Modern World) (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Paperback); Shelley Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (London: Routledge), Chapter 8; Linda Chao and Ramon H. Myers (1998) *The First Chinese Democracy: Political Life in the Republic of China on Taiwan* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press), Chapters 10, 11, 12.

the President is at the very core of Taiwan's policy network and as such the major decision-maker who leads, commands and controls Taiwan's defence and also security policy.<sup>65</sup> In related research on the formulation of Taiwan's national security policy and Taipei's policy on weapons procurement, Michael D. Swaine likewise points out that the President exercises "supreme authority" over national grand strategy, together with the broad contours of foreign and defence policy.<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, Swaine also finds that, during President Lee Teng-Hui's series of administrations in the 1990s, despite his supreme power, 'no formal, institutionalised and regularized interagency process' was observed in the government for making national security policy; indeed, the President relied on his few senior civilian and military officials for professional suggestions.<sup>67</sup> This lack of a formal mechanism for coordinating the decision-making processes regarding national security policy under Lee Teng-Hui's administration can be regarded as the legacy of former authoritarian regimes. Before the 1990s, Taipei's leaders were political and military strong men, who exclusively shaped the boundaries of their responsibilities, determined policy directions and identified the critical issues and points under which to map out Taiwan's grand strategy. The greatest challenge to the exercise of the President's power in determining the decision-making process with regard to grand strategy emerged in 2000 when, for the first time in Taiwan's history, not only did the President's party lose its majority in Parliament (Legislative Yuan) but Taiwan's military institutions in consequence had to deal with a non-KMT government.<sup>68</sup> As the head of state and supreme commander of the armed forces, President Chen Shui-bian could continue to rely on the framework of the Constitution and the National Defence Law to bear the primary role and responsibilities in the formulation of Taiwan's grand strategy but, as the leader of a minority government, the President inevitably had his authority undermined

---

<sup>65</sup> Chen Ching-Pu (2006) 'Defense Policy-Making and Civilian Roles', in Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2006) *Taiwan's Defense Reform* (Oxon: Routledge), pp.93-94.

<sup>66</sup> Michael D. Swaine (1999) *Taiwan's National Security, Defense Policy and Weapons Procurement Process* (Santa Monica: RAND), pp.6-7

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, p. ix.

<sup>68</sup> The civil-military relations in Taiwan at the time are explored by Bernard D. Cole (2006). *Taiwan's Security*, Chapter 9.

and hindered, so that he could not enjoy as much power as his predecessors from the KMT had.<sup>69</sup> As the structure and decision-making process in relation to the making of Taiwan's national security strategy has changed dramatically since the end of the martial law era, democratization has surely complicated the national strategy-making process in Taiwan. In addition to the president, new main participants in the decision-making process now include the prime minister (*xingzhengyuan yuanzhang*), the National Security Council (NSC), the Ministry of National Defense and General Staff Headquarters, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the National Security Bureau, the Legislative Yuan, the Mainland Affairs Council, political parties and the president's private advisors. For instance, the NSC was established in 1967 as an advisory body to the president and its role has increased significantly since Lee Teng-hui's era. In a private interview with the author, a former member and later Deputy General of the NSC told him that 'the NSC has been consulted by the president on a regular basis and does play a vital role in providing policy advices for national security strategy, although the NSC does not get involved in the practical implementation because that is the authority belonging to the president and the Executive Yuan'.<sup>70</sup> However, he stressed that 'the role of the NSC all depends on the president's instructions and trust'.<sup>71</sup>

In conclusion, the making of Taiwan's grand strategy is certainly not a one-man mission, but the main argument here is that the role of the President, as the prime strategic actor in making national policy, is not sufficiently emphasised and should be more systematically examined in a comparative way. As Hudson argues, in writing on foreign policy, '[t]he ground of the human decision-makers

---

<sup>69</sup> York W. Chen and Martin Edmonds (2006) 'An Overview of Taiwan's Defense Reform', in Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2006) *Taiwan's Defense Reform* (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 63-78.

<sup>70</sup> This confidential interview was conducted in the NSC, Taipei, Taiwan, in early 2003. The practice and function of the NSC, see discussions in Chen Ching-Pu (2006) 'Defense Policy-Making and Civilian Roles', pp. 89-91; Cole (2006) *Taiwan's Security*, pp. 52-60; Su Chi (2004) 'Dividing Forces Behind Taiwan's Mainland Policy', in Steve Tsang (ed.) (2004) *Peace and Security across the Taiwan Strait* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 64-65.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

lead us toward an emphasis on agent-oriented theory'.<sup>72</sup> While affirming that the President acts as the prime strategic actor at the core of Taiwan's decision-making processes with reference to the formulation of national security policy, this thesis aims to identify and explore the principal elements of the respective national grand strategy of successive administrations, which is sometimes also encapsulated in the term "doctrine".<sup>73</sup> For instance, this thesis distinguishes between the "outward-looking" doctrine of Chiang Kai-shek, the "inward-looking" doctrine of Chiang Ching-kuo, the "existing" doctrine of Lee Teng-hui, and the "third-way" doctrine of Chen Shui-bian. In response to the cross-Strait challenges centred on the sovereignty question, the President's perspective of the ROC's sovereignty status continues to have a critical bearing on the formulation and conduct of Taiwan's grand strategy. Thus, I find it essential, in seeking to capture the essence and evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy at any point and to effectively relate particular security strategy proposals to basic policy, not only to clarify the thinking and implementation of the main ideas by the country's particular administrations, but also to do so by comparing the background of some analysis of the way in which preceding administrations shaped policy development in dealing with the selected crucial cross-Strait crises during their terms in office.

#### **C.1.4 Methodology**

The use of particular methodologies and sources in strategic studies is the subject of considerable debate.<sup>74</sup> Such debate reflects differences and

---

<sup>72</sup> The discussion of relations and distinctions between foreign policy analysis and IR theory, see Hudson (2007) *Foreign Policy Analysis*, pp. 3-37.

<sup>73</sup> Roland Dannreuther and John Peterson (2006) 'Introduction: Security Strategy as Doctrine', in Roland Dannreuther and John Peterson (eds.) (2006) *Security Strategy and Transatlantic Relations* (London: Routledge), p.5; Heiko Meiertons (2010) *The Doctrines of US Security Policy: An Evaluation under International Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

<sup>74</sup> John Baylis and James J. Wirtz (2010) 'Introduction', in John Baylis, James Wirtz and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2010) *Strategy in the Contemporary World- An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (Third ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 9-14; Garnett, John (1987) 'Strategic Studies and Its Assumption', in John Baylis, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I: Theories and Concept* (London: Croom Helm), pp. 20-27; Ken Booth

preferences regarding particular approaches to the social sciences and the related conceptual and theoretical approaches. The research focus also influences one's choice of methodology. This thesis employs a case study with qualitative methodology, in line with the proposed convergent analytical framework derived from the strategic studies literature, to explain the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy with a focus on the role played by the president, the prime strategic actor making national strategy. The qualitative case study, rooted in a historical context, is especially vital for strategic analysis because Taiwan's grand strategy is policy-oriented in nature. As Alexander L. George suggests, the qualitative case study enables us to proceed to theory testing and apply established theories to explain specific cases.<sup>75</sup> Stephen Van Evera and Robert K. Yin have also suggested that the case study approach is often regarded as the most effective method for studying how and why types of question.<sup>76</sup> When opting for a qualitative methodology, the researcher is usually guided by the principle that reality is subject to perceptive interpretation. While quantitative research is rooted in the positivist position, presupposing an objective reality and requiring the pursuit of this reality through a 'scientific' approach, qualitative methodology, deriving from the philosophical thinking of interpretivism, is considered a better approach for 'culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world'.<sup>77</sup> Indeed, with regard to concepts of 'meaning, process and context' within analysis, qualitative methods are 'most appropriately employed where the aim of research is to

---

and Eric Herring (1994) *Strategic Studies* (London: Mansell), pp.19-22.

<sup>75</sup> Alexander L. George (1979) 'Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison', in Paul G. Lauren (ed.) (1979) *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, Problem* (London: Collier Macmillan), pp. 43-68.

<sup>76</sup> Stephen Van Evera (1997) *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); and Robert K. Yin (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Method* (Thousands Oak, CA: Sage).

<sup>77</sup> Michael J. Crotty (1998) *The Foundation of Social Research: Meaning and Perspectives in the Research Process* (London: Sage), p.67. Discussions of quantitative research for example, see John A. Hughes and Wesley W. Sharrock (1997) *The Philosophy of Social Research* (London: Addison Wesley Longman) and W. L. Miller (1995) 'Quantitative Methods', David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (ed.) (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science* (London: Macmillan), pp. 154-172. Rex Li provides a useful comparison between qualitative and quantitative methods in his analysis of the subject of Chinese security: see Rex Li (2009) *A Rising China and Security in East Asia: Identity Construction and Security Discourse* (New York: Routledge), pp. 40-41.

explore people's subjective experiences and the meaning they attach to those experiences'.<sup>78</sup> The advantage of qualitative methodology, as Fiona Devine points out, goes 'to the study of mass political behaviour by seeking to understand political actors as conscious social beings who shape the world of politics as well as being shaped by it'.<sup>79</sup> As a result, drawing particular attention to the method of structured, focused comparison<sup>80</sup>, the qualitative case study is considered appropriate in the context of the research questions posed herein.

This thesis adopts a convergent approach, building on diverse but complementary strategic analytical perspectives. It is both war-centred and peace-centred. The convergent framework focuses on eight analytical concepts combined in four pairings (ideational-material factors, ends-means, agent-structure and defence-offence), which are operationally presented in relation to four strategic dimensions (capability, choice, the environment and posture) to establish the analytical structure. For the selected cases, the thesis investigates the development of Taiwan's grand strategy in relation to four administrations, those of Chiang Kai-shek, Chiang Ching-kuo, Lee Teng-hui and Chen Shui-bian. The analysis of the case studies thus covers the period from 1949 to 2008. As change in the formulation of Taiwan's grand strategy generally tends to be incremental while being punctuated by crisis situations, the thesis also examines, in relation to five key events, the island's post-1949 politico-military history and the implications of these events for Taiwan's grand strategy. These five events are: (1) the first two military crises in the Taiwan Strait of 1954-55 and 1958; (2) the Nixon shocks (Nixon's visit to China in 1972 and the beginning of Taiwan's international isolation); (3) the end of Taipei-Washington formal diplomatic relations in 1979; (4) the third Taiwan Strait crisis of 1995-96; and (5) the seizure of power by the self-determination Democratic Progress Party in 2000. Because of the unique context of each crisis,

---

<sup>78</sup> Fiona Devine (1995) 'Qualitative Methods', in David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (eds.) (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science* (London: Macmillan), p.138.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, p.152.

<sup>80</sup> Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), chapter 3, pp. 67-72.

it is worth noting in advance that the research will incorporate the unique features of these crises for explaining Taiwan's grand strategy. For example, cross-Strait economic relations were not an issue among the strategic concerns of Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Ching-kuo, as there were simply no such cross-Strait economic connections as exist today. The contemporary agreements on economic exchanges were in fact forbidden under both these Presidents. Another important factor that this thesis takes into account is the changing domestic political situation. Other dynamic domestic factors, e.g. the democratisation process, have also left their own mark on the formulation of Taiwan's grand strategy mainly after Chiang Ching-kuo took power and adopted an inward-looking strategic doctrine from the early 1970s.

The historical experiences of Taipei in managing the cross-Strait confrontation since 1949 reveal that the dynamics underpinning Taiwan's grand strategy are by no means straightforward. To incorporate the three central research questions proposed at the beginning of this thesis, these complexities and contradictions of historical experiences invite three crucial questions: (1) What are the main factors which have resulted in the long-lasting cross-Strait confrontation according to the crisis? (2) Why has the conflict between Beijing and Taipei and the key political and military crises which have arisen at various times not escalated into a major war across the Strait? (3) What is the nature of the contingent advantages during the crisis which have so far have allowed the relatively small state of the ROC on Taiwan to sustain and continue conflict with that great power, the PRC? By focusing on these three questions, this thesis is able to standardise comparisons of the implications of the way in which Taipei's policy-makers have perceived and engaged in these crucial cross-Strait crises to formulate and reconstruct Taiwan's grand strategy.

Furthermore, to explore in more detail how these crises and developments influenced Taiwan's grand strategy, the analysis of these key events attempts to explicate the following questions: 1) In what ways have the above crises and

events led Taipei's decision-makers to re-evaluate the island's grand strategy? In particular, how has Taipei's top leadership interpreted China's strategy toward the island? 2) In what ways have re-evaluations of cross-Straits relations also led to the formulation of actual changes to Taiwan's grand strategy? 3) To what extent has the nature of the threat posed by Beijing been re-interpreted as a consequence of the various cross-Straits crises or important developments in the strategic relations between the major powers? Did these events undermine Taiwan's longstanding geostrategic position? 4) To what extent has Taiwan's grand strategy depended on US deterrence? To what extent has the grand strategy nevertheless built on an autonomous military capability for Taiwan? 5) To what extent have Taiwan's decision-makers sought to win an even greater commitment on the part of the United States to defend Taiwan? 6) What has been the importance of developments in military technology in Taiwan's reassessment of the island's grand strategy? What significance has been attributed to China's arms acquisitions and upgrades? 7) To what extent has Taiwan's grand strategy been the function of the political purposes of the ruling party? 8) To what extent has Taiwan's grand strategy been the subject of domestic political dispute? At the end of each of the empirical chapters of the thesis I also highlight and assess the following: first, key elements of Taiwan's grand strategy in the intervening period between two key events; second, whether Taiwan's grand strategy led at the time to an improvement or deterioration in cross-Straits relations?; and third, whether it has been Taiwan's grand strategy or other factors that have shielded Taiwan from forced unification with China?

To address these issues, this thesis draws mainly on published primary and secondary materials with extensive use of primary sources in the Chinese language. The evidence employed includes official reports and documents issued by Taipei, Beijing and Washington; official speeches and statistics; and both newspaper articles and scholarly studies. As the thesis adopted a perspective which focuses heavily on the role of the president; particular

emphasis is placed on publications highlighting the Presidents' thoughts and reasoning: i.e., his speeches, diaries, as well as relevant articles, interviews and official autobiographies, such as the forty-volume collection of Chiang Kai-shek organised by Qin Xiaoyi from the Kuomintang (KMT) Historical Committee, '*Complete Collection of President Chiang's Ideas and Speeches*' (*Xian zongtong jianggong sixiang yanlun zongji*); the twenty-four-volume collection of Chiang Ching-kuo from the ROC Government Information Office, '*Collected Speeches of Chiang Ching-Kuo*' (*Jiang jingguo xiangsheng quanji*); Lee Teng-hui's '*The Road to Democracy: Taiwan's Pursuit of Identity*' and the four-volume comprehensive interview with him organized by Zhang Yan-xian from Academia Historica, '*An Interview and Narration of Lee Teng-hui*' (*Li denghui zongtong fangtan lu*); as well as Chen Shui-bian's own books '*The Son of Taiwan*', '*The Maiden Voyage into the New Century*' (*Shiji shouhang*) and '*Believe Taiwan*' (*Xiangxin taiwan*).<sup>81</sup> Additional important official sources include the bi-annual national defence reports from the ROC Ministry of Defense (MND) since 1992, press releases from the ROC MND, the Mainland Affairs Council (MAC) and the Presidential Office, and other official documents such as the Taiwan National Security Council's first and only National Security Report, published in 2006. For secondary sources, while Lee Teng-hui and Chen Shui-bian have many of their own books and firsthand interviews to show their thoughts about how they managed Taiwan, Jay Taylor's books, '*The Generalissimo: Chiang Kai-shek and The Struggle for Modern China*' and '*The Generalissimo's Son: Chiang Ching-kuo and the Revolutions in China and*

---

<sup>81</sup> Some selected primary sources include Chiang Kai-shek (1984) *Complete Collection of President Chiang's Ideas and Speeches* (*Xian zongtong jianggong sixiang yanlun zongji*), Vol. 1-40 (ed. by Qin Xiaoyi) (Taipei: the Kuomintang (KMT) Historical Committee). The collection can also be found at <http://www.chungcheng.org.tw/thought/default.htm> (accessed on 19 August 2012). Chiang Ching-kuo (1992) *Collected Speeches of Chiang Ching-Kuo* (*Jiang jingguo xiangsheng quanji*), Vol.1-24 (Taipei: Government Information Office). Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy: Taiwan's Pursuit of Identity* (English version) (Tokyo: PHP Institute); Zhang Yan-xian (ed.) (2008) *An Interview and Narration of Lee Teng-hui* (*Li denghui zongtong fangtan lu*), Vol. I-IV (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication). Chen Shui-bian (2000) *The Son of Taiwan: The Life of Chen Shui-bian and his Dreams for Taiwan* (English edition, tr. by David J. Toman) (Taipei: Taiwan Publishing Co., Ltd); Chen Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century: Meditation of Political Parties Rotation, Five Hundred Days After* (*Shiji shouhang: zengdang lunti wubaitian di chensi*) (Taipei: Eurasian Press) and Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan: President A-bian Reports to the People* (*Xiangxin taiwan: abian zongtong xiang renmin baogao*) (Taipei: Eurasian Press).

*Taiwan*', provide valuable updated information and comprehensive analysis for the study of Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Ching-kuo, two traditional political-military strong men who did not express themselves in such an explicit fashion as Lee and Chen did, about their ways of handling national strategy. In addition to international scholars' works, this thesis also draws on Taiwan's leading academic journals (e.g. *Issues and Studies*), MND military periodicals (e.g. *National Defense Journal* and *Air Force Science Monthly*), monographs and policy papers published by Taiwan's major think tanks (e.g. Institute for National Policy Research, National Policy Foundation, Prospect Foundation and Taiwan Thinktank) and articles from Taiwan's major newspapers, including *China Times*, *Central Daily News*, *United Daily News* and *Liberty Times*.<sup>82</sup>

This study moreover draws on some interviews conducted with participants in Taiwan's national strategy and defence policy process. The interviewees include current and former ROC government officials, legislators, military officers, think tank researchers, and academic strategic experts. The dates of the interviews range from 2003 to the present and the interviews were conducted mainly in Taiwan.<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, it is recognised that interviews tend to have their limitations, including the challenges of gaining access to key individuals, the sensitive nature of the subject of national security strategy, and inaccuracies due to the fallibility of memory and either intentional or unintentional attempts to mislead or misinform the interviewer.<sup>84</sup> This however is not to suggest that interviews are not important and unworthy of consideration. On the contrary, interviews may sometime fill in gaps left by the published sources and provide

---

<sup>82</sup> *Issue and Studies* is published by The Institute of International Relations at National Chengchi University, Taiwan. MND military periodicals see <http://www.mnd.gov.tw/Publish.aspx?cnid=35> (accessed on 20 August 2012). Detail lists and relevant connections for secondary sources see in the bibliography of this thesis.

<sup>83</sup> As I used to be a senior legislative assistant in the ROC Legislative Yuan from 1991 to 1999, I have had some access to the aforementioned interviewees either in personal meetings or by telephone discussions. These interviews were conducted informally, to protect the confidentiality of my interlocutors, so that most interviewees are not identified by name in this study.

<sup>84</sup> Other general discussions about the strengths and weakness of interviews include Devine (1995) 'Qualitative Methods', in David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (ed.) (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science* (London: Macmillan), pp. 142-145; Yin (2003) *Case Study Research*, pp. 85-88.

insight into the decision-making process. Nevertheless, considering the limitations of interviews and the many available existing primary sources, wealth of well organised interview materials by others (e.g., for Lee Teng-hui and Chen Shui-bian) and more systematic explanations in the relevant researchers' own works on the subject, this study thus focuses mainly on existing documentary sources and the related literature, and considers interviews as a supplementary source only.<sup>85</sup>

### C.1.5 Structure of Thesis

The thesis is divided into three parts. Part I, 'Introduction and analytical framework', consists of the first two chapters, which first outline in greater detail the argument, importance, aims, claims and methodology of the thesis and set up a framework in which to conceptualise and analyse "grand strategy". Part II consists of five chapters, which investigate how and to what extent the content and practice of Taiwan's grand strategy were encapsulated and transformed in the context of particular politico-military events under different administrations. Part III offers 'conclusions and implications'. The conclusion chapter also draws on the findings to explore some general theoretical implications, while also offering some policy suggestions for Taiwan's political leadership

---

<sup>85</sup> Although only a limited number of interviews were conducted for this thesis, it does draw on many interviews and biographical accounts of key participants' publications. For example see Fredrick F. Chen (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 1&2: Diplomatic Dynamics (Qian Fu huiyi lu: waijiao fengyun dong)* (Chinese Edition) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing Group); Hau Pei-tsun (2000) *Diary of Eight Years as Chief of the General Staff, Vol.1 & 2 (Banian canmou zongzhang riji)* (Chinese Edition) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing); Lee Teng-hui (2004) *Witness Taiwan: President Chiang Ching-kuo and Me (Jianzheng taiwan: jiang jingguo zongtong yuwo)* (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication); Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui's Regime (Li denghui zhizheng gaobai shilu)* (Chinese version) (Taipei: INK Publications); James C. H. Shen (1983), *The US & Free China: How the US Sold Out its Ally* (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books Ltd); David Tawei Lee (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act: Twenty Years in Retrospect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Richard C. Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot: Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press); Hsu Hsin-liang (1995) *The Rising People (Xinxing minzu)* (Taipei: Yuan Liu Chubanshe); Yen Wan-chin (2003) *Mainland Policy of Democratic Progress Party during an Opposition Party (Zaiye shiqi mingjindang dalu zhengce)* (Taipei: New Wun Ching Developmental Publishing Co. Ltd.); Su Chi (2009) *Taiwan's Relations with Mainland China: A Tail Wagging Two Dogs* (London: Routledge).

## Chapter 2

### An Analytical Framework of Grand Strategy

#### Introduction

Following a brief introduction of the concept of grand strategy in the previous chapter, the purpose of this theoretical chapter is to develop a further analytical framework for understanding “grand strategy”, the term also interchangeable with “national strategy” in this thesis<sup>1</sup>. The approach is based on the works of those who for some time have sought to conceptualize the idea of grand strategy. Conceptualizing grand strategy encourages diversity because the use of particular methodologies and sources in relation to grand strategy involves considerable debate. The diverse approaches in grand strategy can be classified along the spectrum between “war” and “peace” perspectives. The war-centred aspect of strategic analysis, also considered the ‘classical’ strategic approach, is dictated by the context of war. Here the focus is on ways to apply military force associated with all other national resources to achieve the proposed political objectives. Carl von Clausewitz is the classical representative of this war-centred strategic approach.<sup>2</sup> While declaring that ‘strategy was nothing without fighting’<sup>3</sup>, Clausewitz argued that ‘War [as the means] in general is entitled to require that the trend and design of policy [as the goal] shall not be inconsistent with these means.’<sup>4</sup> ‘The political object of war can be of two kinds’, according

---

<sup>1</sup> According to *Dictionary of Military Terms*, the term ‘grand strategy’ is also called ‘national strategy’ or ‘national security strategy’. See U.S. Department of Defense (1995) *Dictionary of Military Terms* (London: Greenhill Books), pp.255-256.

<sup>2</sup> For representative studies of Clausewitz see, for instance, Michael Howard (1983) *Clausewitz* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Michael I. Handel (2001) *Masters of War – Classical Strategic Thought* (third ed.) (London: Frank Cass); Azar Gat (2001) *A History of Military Thought: from the Enlightenment to the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Beatrice Heuser (2002) *Reading Clausewitz* (London: Pimlico).

<sup>3</sup> Michael Howard (1983) *Clausewitz*, p.16.

<sup>4</sup> Carl von Clausewitz (1976) *On War* (ed. and tran. Michael Howard and Peter Paret) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), p. 87.

to Clausewitz: ‘either to totally destroy the adversary, to eliminate his existence as a State, or else to prescribe peace terms to him.’<sup>5</sup> Clausewitz’s war-centred strategic perspective was based on two assumptions, namely, the unique status of force and the perspective of the strategic realm as a zero-sum competition, which are generally accepted by Clausewitzan scholars such as Edward Mead Earle, Michael Howard, Colin S. Gray, Hew Strachan, Robert J. Art and Barry Buzan.<sup>6</sup> As Michael Howard argues, ‘it is the element of force which distinguished “strategy” from the purposeful planning in other branches of human activity to which the term is often loosely applied.’<sup>7</sup> Accordingly for Howard, the concept of grand strategy refers to how a state is to mobilize and deploy national resources, e.g. wealth, manpower, industrial capacity and alliance, to achieve the goals of national policy in the context of waging war.<sup>8</sup> For the American scholar Robert J. Art, the concept of grand strategy has an even narrower definition. For him grand strategy is about military means being used in support of foreign policy goals.<sup>9</sup> While emphasizing international political structure as one of two fundamental variables in the analysis of strategy, Barry Buzan argues that the variable of military technology is another fundamental factor that affects the application of military force and sets a basic context of strategy.<sup>10</sup> As a result, the reason why the classical approach of grand strategy tends to highlight the role of military power can be understood by the analytical attention that scholars give to the context of war, which includes assessments about the best ways of preparing for war and of applying it as a decisive instrument to secure and promote national interests.

---

<sup>5</sup> Michael Howard (1983) *Clausewitz*, p.16.

<sup>6</sup> Edward Mead Earle (1943) ‘Introduction’, in Edward Mead Earle (ed.) (1943) *Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler* (Princeton: Princeton University Press); Michael Howard (1971) *Studies in War and Peace* (New York: The Viking Press); Colin S. Gray (2007) *War, Peace and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History* (London: Routledge); Hew Strachan (2008) ‘The Lost Meaning of Strategy’, in Thomas G. Mahnken and Joseph A. Maiolo (eds.) *Strategic Studies: A Reader* (London: Routledge), pp. 421-436; Robert J. Art (2009) *America’s Grand Strategy and World Politics* (London: Routledge); Barry Buzan (1987) *An Introduction to Strategic Studies: Military Technology and International Relations* (London: Macmillan/IISS).

<sup>7</sup> Michael Howard (1971) *Studies in War and Peace*, p. 154.

<sup>8</sup> Michael Howard (1972) (History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Military Series) *Grand Strategy Vol. IV*, p.1.

<sup>9</sup> Robert J. Art (2009) *America’s Grand Strategy and World Politics*, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Buzan (1987) *An Introduction to Strategic Studies*, pp. 5-7.

In contrast, a peace-centred strategic analysis, or as referred as “neo-classical” strategic approach here, is dictated by the context of peace, which in the discourse of strategy is pursued as a primary value. While not eliminating the strategic role of military force, the peace-centred strategic perspective revises the classical war-centred approach, which fundamentally focuses on means rather than ends in the realm of strategy. The neo-classical approach not only demands a more balanced perspective between ends and means, but also prefers and advocates non-violent ways to achieve strategic goals. Basil Liddell Hart, in his book *Strategy*, argues that ‘grand strategy looks beyond the war to the subsequent peace. It should not only combine the various instruments [including war], but also regulate their use as to avoid damage to the future state of peace – for security and prosperity.’<sup>11</sup> When nuclear weapons were developed, in association with heat of the cold war, the fear of atomic warfare led the increasing doubts about whether the classical war-centred approach could deal adequately with the modern context of warfare in particular and a normative guide of strategy in general, since the consequence of nuclear war was in effect unacceptable. Theories of deterrence along with other non-violent approaches (e.g. diplomacy, economics and arms control) have been adopted in lieu and been made the main concern of the peace-centred strategic approach in the nuclear era.<sup>12</sup> Thomas Schelling, for instance, brings game theory, or what he calls the ‘game of strategy’, to bear on strategy, intending to combine the mechanics of the analytical method of game theory with the application of ideas on threat and bargaining. While assuming common interests between the adversaries, e.g. in the context of nuclear deterrence, the game of strategy is designed to find a rational and interdependent solution in situations of conflict.<sup>13</sup>

Ken Booth argues that because general war has become unthinkable,

---

<sup>11</sup> B. H. Liddell Hart (1991) *Strategy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed’n.) (London: Meridian), p. 322.

<sup>12</sup> Paul Kennedy (ed.) (1991) *Grand Strategies in War and Peace* (New Haven: Yale University Press); Terry L. Deibel (2007) *Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Hedley Bull (1965) *The Control of the Arms Race: Disarmament and Arms Control in the Missile Age* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger); Christopher Layne (2006) *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press); Lawrence Freedman (1989) *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy* (2<sup>nd</sup>.) (London: Macmillan/IISS); Albert Wohlstter (1959) ‘The Delicate Balance of Terror’, in Thomas G. Mahnken and Joseph A. Maiolo (ed) (2008) *Strategic Studies: A Reader* (London: Routledge), pp.224-239; Robert Ehrlich (1985) *Waging Nuclear Peace: The Technology and Politics of Nuclear Weapons* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

<sup>13</sup> Thomas C. Schelling (1980) *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), pp. 3-20.

brinkmanship and military demonstration has in fact replaced coercive threats.<sup>14</sup> In *Strategy and Conscience*, Anatol Rapoport accuses the classical war-centred strategic approach, with its zero-sum perspective, of adopting a ‘closed system of thought in which the only reality [of strategy] is a struggle between participants with diametrically opposed interests’.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, it becomes clear that the neo-classical perspective of grand strategy contests the classical approach’s assumption of zero-sum military competition and seeks to establish a compromise relationship between adversaries, to live and let live, for the objective of preventing war so as to preserve peace, even if only from each state’s point of view. The peace-centred strategic approach echoes the teaching of the ancient Chinese strategist Sun Tzu: ‘to subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill’.<sup>16</sup> In this, the neo-classical perspective distinguishes itself from the classical war-centred approach, which fundamentally rests on Clausewitz’s belief that ‘war is merely the continuation of politics by other means’.<sup>17</sup>

Among the diverse perspectives of grand strategy, one main line divides the classical approach, which regards strategy as a means in the context of war and seeks merit in the application of war, from the neo-classical approach, which takes strategy as an end in the context of peace and studies the ways associated with the prevention of war. The lack of an agreed definition and the varied theoretical approaches to examining grand strategy indicate the researchers’ diverse perspectives on possible ontological assumptions and epistemological choices regarding the context of strategy. The central concern of these diverse perspectives is to ascertain how far the subject of grand strategy shall and can focus on the role of military force, or war. To rethink the military factor in strategic studies represents a broader attempt to re-conceptualize the notion of what grand strategy entails and to reassess the agenda for acquiring and making grand strategy. Notably, there has been a general move towards attempts that claim to widen the strategic agenda more than to narrow it. As a result, rather

---

<sup>14</sup> Ken Booth (1973) *The Military Instrument in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Aberystwyth: The United Service Institute for Defence Studies), pp. 42-46.

<sup>15</sup> Rapoport, Anatol (1964) *Strategy and Conscience* (New York: Harper & Row), p.110.

<sup>16</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, (tr. Samuel B. Griffith) (Oxford: Oxford University), p. 77.

<sup>17</sup> Clausewitz (1976) *On War*, p.87.

than from the military perspective only, it is believed that the subject of strategy is ‘best studied from an interdisciplinary perspective.’<sup>18</sup>

The discourse of grand strategy involves analysis, design and implementation since strategy is about a theory of action as Bernard Brodie well put.<sup>19</sup> I argue that a better understanding of grand strategy, by the interdisciplinary way, builds on the juxtaposition and reconciliation of the war-centred and peace-centred perspectives, as well as assessing their limitations and benefits. It requires the clarification of both concepts and also requires methods for pursuing a wider strategic understanding in a coherent way. As strategy is a policy relevant activity, which refers to the process of power practice, it essentially requires us (1) to understand what strategic capabilities are involved; (2) to explain why particular strategic choices are made; (3) to identify how strategic environments are constructed; and (4) to know how a given strategic posture is adopted in response to a proposed strategic choice. Furthermore, it is worth noting that strategy is fundamentally a self-referential practice, because it is in the context of the practice of strategy, or strategization, that the relevant issues are contextualized as strategic issues.<sup>20</sup> Grand strategy can thus be defined here as a process in which a cognitive state agent takes actions in a dynamic context to create and manipulate power as a means to achieve its desired ends. Regarding the desired ends at stake for a state agent, grand strategy involves a process of who gets what, where and how during periods of war as well as peace.

Accordingly, the conceptual framework of grand strategy in this chapter presents a convergent approach by building on current strategic theories and social constructivist perspectives.<sup>21</sup> The convergent strategic framework here

---

<sup>18</sup> John Baylis, James Wirtz (2001) ‘Introduction’ in John Baylis, James Wirtz, Eliot Cohen and Colin S. Gray (ed.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World- An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.3.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, p.4

<sup>20</sup> The method of textual analysis, e.g. ‘politicalization’, ‘securitization’, is applied here to identify strategic issues. See Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, Jaape de Wilde (1998) *Security- A New Framework for Analysis* (London: Lynne Rienner), Chapters 1 & 2.

<sup>21</sup> The constructivist perspective is referred here because the constructivist position stresses the importance of the interaction between the way of the defined cognitive state agent understood the world and how the state agent act within it. The relations between the constructivism and

has identified eight analytical elements, which are presented in four pairs to advance a holistic framework for strategic analysis. By emphasizing the complementary nature of a constructive process on the interdependent duality of these elements, the framework avoids attributing significance to only one or the other of the paired elements: these are the ends and the means, the ideational and material aspects, agency and structure, and defence and offence. In this chapter, the first section explains the need to reconcile ends and means in terms of making strategic choices. The second section examines the nature of strategic capabilities in terms of the duality of ideational and material factors. The third section investigates how the strategic environment emerges from the interplay between agency and structure. Finally, the fourth section addresses the formulation of the strategic posture adopted in response to challenges by exploring the synthesis of two basic orientations: defence and offence.

### **C.2.1 Strategic Choice: Reconciling Ends and Means**

The first dimension of strategic analysis concerns the reconciliation process of making a strategic choice between ends and means. The reconciliation process involves the needs of three notions: pragmatism, rationality and creativity. By “ends”, I mean the strategic actors’ predetermined demands to pursue their preferences. “Means” refers to an assemblage of instruments to fulfill the predetermined aims. There are three steps that strategic choices involve ends-means analysis by strategic actors. They are, first, to identify the content of desirable ends; second, to maximize the composition of available means; and finally, to reconcile the available means with the desired ends. According to Lawrence Freedman, ‘Effective strategy requires a clear sense of the dynamic relationship between ends and means; knowing how ends are defined in the first

---

strategic studies see Freedman (2002) ‘*The Future of Strategic Studies*’ in Baylis, John, etc. (eds.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, p.338. For the main works on constructivism, see Alexander Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Martha Finnemore (1996) *National Interests in International Society* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Peter J. Katzenstein (eds.) (1996) *The Culture of National Security – Norms and Identity in World Politics* (New York: Columbia).

place is critical to whether means will be adequate.<sup>22</sup> The dynamic relationship represents the reconciliation process between desirable ends and available means, or in James C. Gaston's term, the 'marriage of ends and means', which indicates neither simply a specification of objectives nor a choice of instruments for their attainment, but a union of the two.<sup>23</sup> The ends-means reconciliation results in a strategic choice whereby the ends prescribe the means to be applied and the available means impose not only a constraint on the ends which can be desired but also, more importantly, are likely to be attained in practice.

One of the distinctive features of strategy is its teleological character, in the sense that it makes the desired outcome of the anticipated ends as the basis for principles of evaluation and of conduct.<sup>24</sup> The term "strategic choice" simply cannot be understood without reference to an expected outcome (the desired ends), which is associated with the means to achieve them. The attainment of the ends applies as much to the possession of strategy as it does in the more obvious case of its exercise. It is unlikely that anyone will possess or exercise strategy unless there is an objective which strategic choice intends and an outcome which strategic choice expects. This is the reason why for decision-makers the first task is to define the content of desirable ends and also simultaneously to consider the potential outcome in making a strategic choice. According to the teleological character of strategy, the rightness of any action depends only on the success of achieving a desired outcome – even if only from the strategic actor's own point of view. The significance accorded to achieving strategic objectives appears to be greatest in the context of war for the pursuit of victory. When states go to war, 'there can be no substitute for victory,' in General Douglas Macarthur's dictum, 'and it is fatal to enter any war without the will to win it.'<sup>25</sup> War is miserable but defeat is more miserable still, since the stakes of war, either survival or ruin, are so high for states that the expected

---

<sup>22</sup> Freedman (2002) 'The Future of Strategic Studies' in Baylis, John, etc. (ed.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, p.338.

<sup>23</sup> James C. Gaston (1992) 'A Conceptual Foundation for the Development of Strategy', Gaston, C. James (ed.) (1992) *Grand Strategy and the Decision-making Process* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press), p.73

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. For a definition of teleological ethics, see in Mautner (2000) *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy*, p.558.

<sup>25</sup> John M. Collins (2002) *Military Strategy: Principles, Practices and Historical Perspectives* (Washington, D.C.: Brassey), p.38.

consequences of war will and do dictate the strategy. As Thucydides demonstrated in his account of *the Peloponnesian Wars*, ‘It is a common mistake in going to war to begin at the wrong end, to act first and wait for disaster to discuss the matter.’<sup>26</sup> The identification of the desired ends associated with their expected outcomes is, therefore, the necessary starting point in any analysis of strategic choice.

Despite the advice to let the ends dictate the means, for most strategic analyses undertaken by the analyst and strategic actors it is the means, rather than the ends, that dominate the concerns in the realm of strategy.<sup>27</sup> Seen as ‘an intellectual approach to a specific problem’<sup>28</sup>, strategy refers to power, choices and actions that are meant to deal with the problems under review. All forms of this power, choices and actions are functional in order to know how strategic actors can remove, eliminate or overcome the problems preventing them from attaining the desired ends. From this aspect of its “know how to do it” character in strategy, the means represent an instrumental dimension of strategy. Strategy, as Bernard Brodie argues, should be seen as ‘an instrumental science for solving practical problems’.<sup>29</sup> Brodie’s means-oriented scientific approach to strategy assumes and emphasizes the concept of rationality, which has had a profound influence in strategic studies. Along with Brodie, scholars such as Herman Kahn, Thomas Schelling, Glenn Snyder and Albert Wohlstetter are preoccupied by the way in which strategic actors make rational choices in the decision-making process and behave in a rational manner in the pursuit of the desired ends.<sup>30</sup> As John Garrnett puts it, the rationality assumption results in the

---

<sup>26</sup> Thucydides (1950) *The History of the Peloponnesian War* (tr. Richard Crawley) (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.), p.52.

<sup>27</sup> John Garnett (1987) ‘Strategic Studies and its Assumptions’ in Baylis, John, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I*, p.5

<sup>28</sup> Freedman (2002) ‘The Future of Strategic Studies’ in Baylis, John, etc. (ed.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, p.337.

<sup>29</sup> Brodie later made a ‘mid-course correction’ of his scientific perspective in strategy. See James Wirtz (2001) ‘Introduction’ in Baylis, John, etc. (ed.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, p.5; for Brodie’s overall scientific approach see Bernard Brodie (2008) ‘Strategy as a Science’, Thomas G. Mahnken and Joseph A. Maiolo (eds.) (2008) *Strategic Studies: A Reader* (London: Routledge), pp.8-21.

<sup>30</sup> Herman Kahn (1965) *On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios* (Baltimore: Penguin Books); Thomas C. Schelling (1980) *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press); Glenn H. Snyder (1961) *Deterrence and Defense – Toward a Theory of National Security* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press); Albert Wohlstetter (1959) ‘The Delicate Balance of Terror’, Mahnken and Maiolo (eds.) (2008) *Strategic Studies*.

tendency of strategic studies to focus on the means for achieving the ends rather than the ends themselves since one can only comment on the rationality of the means chosen to pursue such ends as generally relate to the subject of values and beliefs, which are difficult to assess and manage in a rational way.<sup>31</sup> The means-oriented dimension of strategy is much taken for granted, since the means represent the ways by which strategic actors pass from the state of not having attained their ends to the state of having attained them. A well-known proverb in China encapsulates the need for means to bring about the desired ends: ‘even the cleverest housewife cannot cook a meal without rice’ (*qiao-fu nan-wei wu-mi zhi-chui*). Just as in cookery, without the means, the rice, to attain the end, the meal, all the actors’ intellectual process in relation to an assigned mission is mere illusion, no matter how brilliant a cook the housewife is. Nevertheless, the means need to be adjustable, since the means must be subordinated to the proposed ends, even if to some extent the means have an impact on and influence the ends because of the relationship of reconciliation between them.

Moreover, the means have an intermediate and dynamic character, since means may itself be an end with reference to some other means and each end may be a means to further ends. The judgment of the strategic actors whether means are available and acceptable, therefore, usually owes nothing to the relationship of the means to any intermediate end, and everything to the relation to the proposed ultimate ends and must be seen in the light of them. In the case of a nation debating war, the notion of national power, for instance, presents its intermediate and contradictory character in the ends-means dimension of strategic analysis. The national power is a means to some ends, such as national security. What are the means by which national power can be established? Such means can be generally classified into four types of power: diplomatic, economic, psychological and military influence. But these means do not always exist; they may still have to be achieved. So they are themselves ends. If economic power is an end, it is also a means – not only to the overall notion of

---

<sup>31</sup> John Garnett (1987) ‘Strategic Studies and Its Assumptions’, John Baylis, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I: Theories and Concept* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (London: Croom Helm), pp. 16-20.

the national power but many other ends. Each of these other ends can similarly be a means to acquire and sustain power but to various other ends. With regard to the ends-means transition, even power itself is an end as well as a means, depending on context. The fact is that the need for means is a need for effective agencies wherewith to overcome the gulf between a certain beginning-point as a means, and a certain stopping-point, as an end.<sup>32</sup> According to traditional strategic analysis in the ends-means discussion, the political end usually stands for a certain stopping-point and the military means emerge as an accepted beginning-point. ‘Strategy is the bridge’, as Colin Gray argues, ‘that relates military power to political purpose; it is neither military power *per se* nor political purpose.’<sup>33</sup>

In conclusion, why strategic choices are made with respect to what is at stake as the expected outcome is the central concern of ends-means analysis in strategy. In this regard, strategy stands as an effective agency not only for linking but, more importantly, for reconciling the ends-means complexity. In strategy, it is vital to identify the content of the desirable ends associated with their expected outcomes and to maximize for these ends the possible options among the available means. Nevertheless, to implement strategy is neither dogmatically to specify the desirable ends nor to instrumentalise their attainment only, but eventually to reconcile the two. The ends do dictate the means to be employed, but at the same time the ends are constrained by the availability of the means: actors’ value assumptions, external structural obstructions, etc. The fact of making a strategic choice is that no strategic actors can have complete freedom to pursue what they want and to apply whatever means they like. They have to reconcile themselves to this limited freedom. Such reconciliation refers to a process of pursuing a balance between the ends and the means. And how the reconciliation process unfolds is intimately linked to the use of pragmatism, rationality and creativity by those involved.

---

<sup>32</sup> K. S. Shelvankar (1938) *Ends Are Means: A Critique of Social Values* (London: Lindsay Drummond LTD.), p.39.

<sup>33</sup> Colin S. Gray (1999) *Modern Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.17

First, the notion of pragmatism stresses flexibility and sensitivity to the corresponding relative capabilities and situations. As Bernard Brodie argues, ‘strategic thinking, or “theory” if one prefers, is nothing if not pragmatic.’<sup>34</sup> Consequently, the resort to pragmatism will influence the relationship between ends and means as well as the practical consequences. Second, rationality refers to all forms of logical choices produced to manage the ends-means interactions in the interests of the consequences expected by the strategic actors. Rational reconciliation, based on the available information, is thus about making a decision among those existing choices, which are approached in terms of instrumental calculations to bring forth the most suitable result with reference to cost-effectiveness reasoning.<sup>35</sup> This rationality makes scientific strategic reasoning possible, allowing grand strategy to be defined not only as an art but also as a science.<sup>36</sup> Third, there is creativity. Creativity represents the human intellectual gift of resolving problems with a unique and unburdened vision, which can be beyond scientific understanding and command. The notion of creativity in relation to reconciliation of ends and means, in Clausewitz’s terms, suggests that some may have a natural talent for developing solutions the grammar of which eludes the realm of instrumental rationality.<sup>37</sup> Accordingly, the notion of creativity makes the realm of strategy not only a science of rationality but also an art of possibility.

As one of the dimensions in strategy, the ends-means reconciliation concerns the decision-making process in the pursuit of expected favourable outcomes by making strategic choices. The notion of reconciliation seeks to emphasize the decision-making process as a method of treating the value-rooted ends and the rationality-centred means as a whole rather than in separately. As Lawrence Freedman suggests, ‘A key aspect of strategy is the interdependence of decision-making. This does not only refer to the need to take the goals and capabilities of opponents into account. It must take in the need to motivate one’s

---

<sup>34</sup> Bernard Brodie (1973) *War and Politics* (London: Cassell), p.452.

<sup>35</sup> John Garnett (1987) ‘Strategic Studies and its Assumptions’ in Baylis, John, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I*, pp. 16-20.

<sup>36</sup> U.S. Department of Defense (1995) *Dictionary of Military Terms* (London: Greenhill Books), pp. 257-258.

<sup>37</sup> Beatrice Heuser (2002) *Reading Clausewitz* (London: Pimlico), pp.72-73.

own forces by appealing either to their very personal goals of survival/comfort/honour or to their broader values.<sup>38</sup> In the face of the frictions which agitate the realm of the ends-means relationship, the process of reconciling ends and means presents a self-restraint in that strategic actors' decisions necessarily reflect the need to make choices in a way which keeps in balance their unchecked wills and their limited strategic capabilities. This is examined in the next section.

### **C.2.2 Strategic Capabilities: The Ideational-Material Duality**

The duality of ideational and material factors constructs strategic capabilities, which here mainly refer to resources of power.<sup>39</sup> The importance of both material and ideational factors is generally obvious, since they coexist and converge in the strategic realm. In any strategic calculation, it is unduly restrictive and misleading to deliberately confine oneself to either of them without the other. Strategy must therefore be conceptualized as a way of acknowledging the material-ideational duality and then going beyond ideational and material monism, whose one-sided perspective, such as the determinism of the material or the ideational factor, would affirm the isolation of its substance in the context of strategy. Juxtaposing the ideational and material factors presents a possibility and a starting-point for integrating these parallel lines of strategic analysis, even as it demonstrates some of the unavoidable conflicts stemming from their different methodologies and levels of analysis. The contending lines of analysis between the ideational and material approaches well reflect the complexity of strategy, in Edward N. Luttwak's phrase:

---

<sup>38</sup> Lawrence Freedman, Paul Hayes and Robert O'Neill (1992) *War, Strategy and International Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), p.290.

<sup>39</sup> As Lawrence Freedman puts it, the idea of power here refers to 'the capacity to produce effects that are more advantageous than would otherwise have been the case.' See Freedman (1998) 'Strategic Studies and the Problem of Power', Lawrence Freedman (ed.) (1998) *Strategic Coercion – Concept and Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.290-293. For the competing perspectives of the constitution of power between the realist and the idealist, see Alexander Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 92-113. J. Nye focuses on the idea of 'soft power', which he defines as 'the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments.' See Joseph S. Nye Jr (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: PublicAffairs). For the classical realist perspective of power, see in Hans J. Morgenthau (1952) *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

‘strategy does not merely entail this or that paradoxical proposition, blatantly contradictory and yet thought valid, but rather that the entire realm of strategy is pervaded by a paradoxical logic of its own, standing against the ordinary “linear” logic by which we live in all other spheres of life.’<sup>40</sup> In other words, the seemingly competitive perspectives between materialism and idealism in the realm of strategy never exclude each other and both need to be taken account of, although in different strategic circumstances, either ideational or material factors may be supported to strategic actors.

In fact, the ideational-material duality in the context of strategy is already noted in the literature of strategic studies. Sun Tzu, considered to have written ‘the best work on war ever written’<sup>41</sup>, indicates that there are five fundamental factors of war in strategic calculations, namely ‘moral influence, weather, terrain, command and doctrine’.<sup>42</sup> He argues that the acme of skill in strategy is ‘to subdue the enemy without fighting’, thus the object of supreme importance is ‘to attack the enemy’s strategy (*mou*)’ and the ‘next best is to disrupt his alliance, the next best is to attack his army and the worst policy is to attack cities.’<sup>43</sup> Carl von Clausewitz proposes that strategic elements can be classified into five distinct types in the context of war: moral, physical, mathematical, geographical and statistical.<sup>44</sup> In modern terminology, according to the American *Dictionary of Military Terms*, strategy is composed of political, economic, psychological and military forces.<sup>45</sup> All of these varied divisions of strategy not only demonstrate the context of strategy as constituted by ideational and material factors, but also suggest the need for understanding strategy by appreciating the influence of these ideational-material duality as a whole rather than in isolation. To understand the content of strategic capabilities in the context of strategy, it is necessary to specify more precisely the meaning of the

---

<sup>40</sup> Edward N. Luttwak (2001) *Strategy – The Logic of War and Peace* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), p.2.

<sup>41</sup> Martin Van Creveld (1991) *The Transformation of War* (New York: The Free Press), pp.231, 241.

<sup>42</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, (tr Samuel B. Griffith) (Oxford: Oxford University), p.63.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 77-78.

<sup>44</sup> Carl von Clausewitz (1993) *On War* (tr. Michael Howard and Peter Paret) (London: Everyman’s Library), p.215.

<sup>45</sup> U.S. Department of Defense (1995) *Dictionary of Military Terms* (London: Greenhill Books), p.362.

ideational and the material factors and then to explore how these two dimensions can both be applied to strategic analysis.

First, the realm of ideas comprises various intellectual and psychological qualities and influences, which are manifest in reasoning, perception, belief, morale, conceptualization, memory, emotion, intention and imagination.<sup>46</sup> The present study treats these collective mental processes as a single variable, the “ideational”. It also treats the manifestations of these ideational influences under the term “ideational” as a potential instrument for strategic analysis. In the analysis of decision-making, for instance, as Robert Jervis suggests, perceptions and misperceptions of the world and of other actors are fundamentally decisive in the choice by decision-makers of actions and reactions in the international arena.<sup>47</sup> Alexander Wendt highlights the importance of ideas in making sense of “power” and “national interest”, vital analytical terms in security and strategy.<sup>48</sup> Alan Macmilliam and Ken Booth explore the ideational sector, using the term “strategic culture”, to identify and explain lasting features of thought and behaviour patterns in states to make sense of their particular ways of ‘adapting to the environment and solving problems with respect to the threat and use of force.’<sup>49</sup> Clausewitz believes that ‘[T]he moral elements are among the most important in war.’<sup>50</sup> ‘The cause of war’, Liddell Hart contends, ‘is fundamentally psychological rather than political or economic.’<sup>51</sup> Accordingly, the ideational sector emerges as an indispensable component in the strategic realm.

As it refers to a feature of human activity, strategy has to be put into action and implemented by human beings who cannot help being ideational in part by their nature. Reasoning, perception, belief and morale are the four key dimensions of

---

<sup>46</sup> See “philosophy of mind” in Robert Audi (1999) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 684-692.

<sup>47</sup> Robert Jervis (1976) *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp.3-10.

<sup>48</sup> Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*, pp.92-138.

<sup>49</sup> Alan Macmilliam and Ken Booth (1999) ‘Strategic Culture – Framework for Analysis’ in Ken Booth and Russell Trood (eds.) (1999) *Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region* (London: Macmillan), p.363.

<sup>50</sup> Clausewitz (1993) *On War*, p.216.

<sup>51</sup> Basil H. Liddell Hart (1999) *Thoughts on War* (Staplehurst: Spellmount), p.15.

the ideational in terms of strategic capability. Reasoning is a quality of intellectual power. It involves calculation, planning and resolving problems in accordance with rationality in the assessment of cause and effect, win and lose, advantage and disadvantage, risk and opportunity, cost and effectiveness, etc. Perception is the capacity to experience, acquire, interpret, select and systemize sensory information to understand given referent objects and contexts. Although the strategic actors' subjective and insufficient information may also cause misperception, perception is also the main source of creation and imagination, generally regarded as intellectual virtues, which may not be logical or obtained through the objective use of logical reasoning. Belief here refers to the content of a particular assertion in which strategic actors are convinced of the truth of a moral proposition. Ideology, as it relates to a distinctive way of looking at political, social, or economic issues, for instance, is a typical example of belief. Morale refers to the quality of the strategic actors' psychological condition in maintaining their enthusiasm and determination in the pursuit of beliefs or assigned missions. From the ideational dimension, as Andre Beaufre explains, strategy may be understood as 'a method of thought' rather than 'a single defined doctrine' and he maintains that it is 'the art of the dialectic of two opposing wills using forces to resolve their dispute'.<sup>52</sup>

For the scientific approaches of those positivists who endeavour to treat strategic analysis as a predictive science, the ideational poses considerable problems. Nevertheless, the ideational framework, such as constructivism, stressing the importance of ideas and the interaction between the way we describe the world and how we act within it, represents a real advance over the realist tradition, whose simplistic thinking of power as a set of measurable resources leads to a view of strategy as no more than a mechanical matter of expending material resources in the pursuit of clearly defined objectives.<sup>53</sup> Clausewitz rightly argues, 'In formulating any [theory] concerning physical factors, the theorist must bear in mind the part moral factors may play in it; otherwise he may be misled into making categorical statements that will be too

---

<sup>52</sup> Andre Beaufre (1965) *An introduction to strategy* (tr. R.H. Barry) (London: Faber & Faber), p.13, 22.

<sup>53</sup> Lawrence Freedman (2002) 'The Future of Strategic Studies' in John Baylis, James Wirtz, Eliot Cohen and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, p.338.

timid and restricted, or else too sweeping and dogmatic.<sup>54</sup> It is worth keeping in mind that it is the ideational factors which expose human frailties and irrationality when strategic actors encounter danger, stress and uncertainty, these being common though crucial phenomena in strategic context.

Second, having established that the nature of strategic capability is composed of a distinctive ideational and material substance, it is now the turn of the content and role of the material substance to be defined. In contrast to unquantifiable ideational substance, the concept of material substance illustrates a unique characteristic, the quantifiable, visible and touchable properties of power resources. The material dimension of strategy has always sought to capture the objective features of strategic capabilities – to see strategy and its components as they are, rather than as they might be. The material elements of strategic capabilities include: armed force, technology, economics and geography.<sup>55</sup>

Armed force denotes an aggregation of military personnel, weaponry, organization, logistics, or any combination thereof.<sup>56</sup> Armed force, a member of Clausewitz's often-quoted "the remarkable trinity", occupies a central place among the material factors making up the strategic capabilities. It is an inevitable, wicked and darker part of strategy that makes strategy "a deadly business" such as John Garnett describes.<sup>57</sup> Lacking this material force, ideational factors alone cannot make a sensible strategy. The importance of overwhelming brutal material force is shown, as Raymond Aron notes, in the case of machine-gunners easily mowing down the waves of assault on open ground, whatever the morale of the soldiers.<sup>58</sup> It is armed force that gives one side the essential capability to compel others to do its will and creates chances through applying threats. Without armed force, strategic doctrines, such as those

---

<sup>54</sup> Clausewitz (1993) *On War*, pp.216-217.

<sup>55</sup> Murray and Grimsley, for instance, identify five strategic factors for the making of strategy: namely geography, history, culture, economics, and governmental systems. See Williamson Murray, MacGregor Knox and Aalvin Bernstein (eds.) (1994) *The Making of Strategy*, p.23.

<sup>56</sup> U.S. Department of Defense (1995) *Dictionary of Military Terms*, p.156.

<sup>57</sup> John Garnett (1987) 'Strategic Studies and its Assumptions' in John Baylis, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I: Theories and Concept* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (London: Croom Helm), p.3.

<sup>58</sup> Raymond Aron (1976) *Clausewitz – Philosopher of War* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul), p. 117.

on deterrence, coercion, flexible response, etc., are simply abstract intellectual concepts and cannot be applied in practice. Clausewitz praises the factor of the armed force, ‘If one side uses force without compunction, undeterred by the bloodshed it involves, while the other side refrains, the first will gain the upper hand.’<sup>59</sup> It is not surprising that as “the ultimate arbiter of political disputes”, the threat, use and control of armed force remain the central subject of strategic studies, despite its attempts to widen the concern by other factors, e.g. diplomacy and economics.<sup>60</sup> Technology, which Michael Howard regards as one of four indispensable dimensions in the conduct of war,<sup>61</sup> is the other unique part of the material capabilities on strategy. Technology involves all forms of the practical application of knowledge to material objects of use to humanity. In most popular accounts, it refers to applied science and machinery. From a historical review, the invention of gunpowder, the steam engine, breech-loading rifles, railroads, electricity, the telegraph, tanks, aircraft, submarines, missiles, the atomic bomb, computers, satellites, etc., provide substantial evidences to suggest that the form, conduct and sometimes the outcome of war have been intrinsically linked with the nature of the technology available. From John Garnett’s standpoint, ‘technological innovation is probably the most significant driving force behind contemporary strategic thought. No strategist can afford to ignore the application of science to warfare.’<sup>62</sup> In fact, technology not only impacts on military affairs, but also relates to decisive ways to improve a state’s comprehensive power, which also bring in the role of economics, the third power factor in the material dimension of strategic capabilities.

Economics comprises human activities related to ‘the production and distribution of goods and services and the development of wealth’.<sup>63</sup> In spite of different interpretations and emphases on the role of economics in strategic literature, it is commonly agreed that economic capability is an indispensable

---

<sup>59</sup> Clausewitz (1993) *On War*, p.84.

<sup>60</sup> Freedman (2002) ‘*The Future of Strategic Studies*’, pp.339-340.

<sup>61</sup> The other three are the operational, the logistical and the social. See Michael Howard (1983) *The Causes of Wars and Other Essays* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (London: Maurice Temple Smith), p.105.

<sup>62</sup> John Garnett (1987) ‘*Technology and Strategy*’ in Baylis, John, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I*, p.91.

<sup>63</sup> Mautner (2000) *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy*, p.159.

part of national strength to produce and practise in the context of strategy.<sup>64</sup> The relationship between economics and strategy may be indirect, but it is obvious with respect to a nation's influence and international interaction. According to Chinese traditional strategic wisdom from the Legalist School (*Fa Jia*),<sup>65</sup> to become wealthy first is a premise for a state to establish a strong military (in Chinese terms "*Fu-quo Qiang-bing*"). To explore how the interaction of economic and military forces involves the progress of nations, Paul Kennedy in his famous book, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, concludes that wealth and power are always relative.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, in the era of globalization, the linkages between economics and strategy in the international context are increasingly relevant, while longstanding military concerns still abound. Finally, as a visible and influential element of the material strategic factors, geography stands out as a constant and objective dimension in a country's strategic resources. Geography provides a natural obstacle to, as well as advantages for, strategic actors in formulating a particular strategy to deal with their own unique material circumstances. Strategy can be analysed as a concern for the geographical conditions to which it is intentionally applied in the spheres of land, sea, air and space. As Williamson Murray and Mark Grimsley observe, the way of policy-makers conceptualising strategy is crucially permeated, stimulated and structured by a concern with "the size and location" of a nation.<sup>67</sup> The influence of geography on strategy in practice can be classified in two ways: in geopolitical terms and on the battlefield. Halford Mackinder's "heartland" theory, Alfred T. Mahan's "sea power" theory and Giulio Douhet's "air power" theory all indicates the vital impact of the geographical setting on strategy.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Williamson Murray, MacGregor Knox and Aalvin Bernstein (1994) *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp17-19.

<sup>65</sup> For key thinking in Chinese Legalist statecraft see, for instance, Ching Ping and Dennis Bloodworth (1976) *The Chinese Machiavelli: 3000 Years of Chinese Statecraft* (London: Secker & Warburg), pp. 72-84.

<sup>66</sup> Paul Kennedy (1987) *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economics Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (New York: Random House), p. XXII.

<sup>67</sup> Williamson Murray, MacGregor Knox and Aalvin Bernstein (1994) *The Making of Strategy*, pp.7-9. The relation between geography and international politics see Jeremy Black (2009) *Geopolitics* (London: Social Affairs Unit).

<sup>68</sup> Halford John Mackinder (2009) *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics and Reconstruction* (London: Faber and Faber); Brian W. Blouet (2001) *Geopolitics and Globalization in the Twentieth Century* (London: Reaktion Books); A. T. Mahan (1889) *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783* (5<sup>th</sup> edn.) (London: Sampson Low, Marston &

In conclusion, assessing strategic capabilities involves an understanding in which both the ideational and material realities are juxtaposed, interplaying and complementing each other. The understanding derives from a realization of the limitations of treating the ideational and material monistically and in doing so has generated apprehension that strategic capabilities may be constituted by ideational-material duality. As regards the relationship between the ideational and the material dimensions in strategy, a constructive view is necessary in order to apprehend the important dynamic relationships between the ideational and material factors, since neither of the two alone can in itself capture the reality of strategic capability. A sensible strategy is unlikely to result if ideational and material factors are absent. As Clausewitz describes this indispensability, ‘[T]he effects of physical and psychological factors form an organic whole which, unlike a metal alloy, is inseparable by chemical process.’<sup>69</sup> Michael Howard well notes in Clausewitz that ‘the dialectic [between moral and physical forces] was not Hegelian: it led no synthesis which itself conjured up its antithesis. Rather it was a continuous interaction between opposite poles, each fully comprehensible only in terms of the other.’<sup>70</sup> This dialectical understanding indicates the nature of strategic capabilities, dually constituted by ideational and material factors, which penetrates and acts on one another in the realm of strategy.

### C.2.3 Strategic Environment: Interplay of Agent and Structure

The interplay in the agency-structure relationship makes for the third dimension in the realm of strategy. The context of the interplay relationship is used to identify the referent strategic environments, or circumstances, where strategic actors practise and are situated. In the broadest usage of the term “strategic environment”, the analysis of this relationship is derived from scholars’ debates

---

Company); Giulio Douhet (2002) *The Command of the Air* (North Stratford, NH: Aayer Company Publishers); Zalmay M. Khalilzad and Jeremy Shapiro (ed.) (2002) *United States Air and Space Power in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Santa Monica: RAND).

<sup>69</sup> Clausewitz (1993) *On War*, p.216.

<sup>70</sup> Michael Howard (1983) *Clausewitz* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.34.

on international relations, which involve how far actors are free “agents” who can make their own fate and how far their choices are dictated and constrained by the “structure”.<sup>71</sup> In other words, there are two different analytical levels on which to examine the strategic environment, depending on whether it is the agent or the structure that accounts for and influences more in the realm of strategy. A structurally oriented perspective emphasises the significance of circumstances and context rather than the actor’s own ability to shape strategy. This perspective is visible in works by the neo-realist school of International Relations.<sup>72</sup> It has also, for instance, given rise to a theory of the strategic behaviour of small and weak states in the international system.<sup>73</sup> By contrast, agent-centred approaches can provide an account of the way in which changes in circumstances and international structures are initiated and shaped by agents, great powers in particular.<sup>74</sup> In Strategic Studies such approaches account for why an asymmetric strategy is pursued by weak states against their much stronger foes.<sup>75</sup> Both structure-centred and agent-centred analyses have their merits and limitations, but, as Colin Hay observes, there is a “strategic-

---

<sup>71</sup> Anthony Giddens (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press); Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); D. Dessler (1989) ‘What at Stake in the Agency-Structure’, *International Organization*, Vol.43, No.3, pp.441-73.

<sup>72</sup> Kenneth Waltz (1959) *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press); Stephen M. Walt (1987) *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Avery Goldstein (1991) *From Bandwagon to Balance-of-Power Politics: Structural Constraints and Politics in China, 1949-1978* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

<sup>73</sup> Michael I. Handel (1981) *Weak States in the International System* (London: Frank Cass); Christine Ingebritsen, Iver B. Neumann, Sieglinde Gstohl and Jessica Beyer (eds.) (2006) *Small States in International Relations* (Seattle: University of Washington Press); Andrew F. Cooper and Timothy M. Shaw (eds.) (2009) *The Diplomacies of Small States: Between Vulnerability and Resilience* (London: Palgrave Macmillan); Efraim Inbar and Gabriel Sheffer (eds.) (1997) *The National Security of Small States in a Changing World* (London: Frank Cass); David Vital (1967) *The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press); Robert Lewis (1968) *Alliances and Small Powers* Rothstein (New York: Columbia University Press).

<sup>74</sup> Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*; Friedrich Kratochwil and John Gerard Ruggie (1986) ‘International Organization: A State of the Art on an Art of the State’, *International Organization*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Autumn), pp. 753-775; Jervis (1976) *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press); Alastair Iain Johnston (1995) *Cultural Realism – Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press); Robert J. Art (2009) *America’s Grand Strategy and World Politics* (London: Routledge); Robert Jervis and Jack Snyder (eds.) (1991) *Dominoes and Bandwagons – Strategic Beliefs and Great Power Competition in the Eurasian Rimland* (New York: Oxford University Press); Richard Rosecrance and Arthur A. Stein (eds.) (1993) *The Domestic Bases of Grand Strategy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

<sup>75</sup> T. V. Paul (1994) *Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiation by Weaker Powers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Ivan Arreguin-Toft (2005) *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

relationship” between structure and agency such that the structure-agency relation is interdependent and dynamic.<sup>76</sup> Accordingly, it would be a serious mistake in the realm of strategy to treat them separately rather than as a whole. “Agency” refers to the decisions and practices of a cognitive strategic actor, whether individual or collective, and includes political and military elites, domestic and international institutions, peoples, states, etc., who act intentionally for their desired ends. All actors are embedded in a host of structures. For instance, in the case of political elites, both domestic and international institutions are part of the structure; however, in the case of a state, its domestic institutions themselves provide actors with the possibility for agency while the international institutions are part of structure. A sensible strategy needs to be understood in where strategic actors make their choices and adopt their actions to confront, and utilize as well, a given and created structure, no matter whether the structure is subjectively perceived or exists objectively, to pursue their desired ends. As a result, to understand the strategic environment one has to consider the notion of structure, of agency and of their interactions simultaneously.

The strategic environment can be seen as a correlated realm of actors, referent structures and their interactions. To appreciate the strategic environment is decisive to strategic actors in the realm of strategy, since this refers to actors’ understanding of the strategic environment where the actors can identify themselves and other referent objects, so as to make sense of their situations, to shape the structures if the structural change is possible, to adjust their actions if structural change is unlikely and to pursue their desired ends accordingly. Nevertheless, the strategic environment is dynamic rather than static, since actors and structures interplay upon one another. The purpose of agency-structure interaction is a strategic agenda-setting process in which strategic actors frame themselves and the referent structures in a specific issue within which actors act. Colin Hay has proposed a “strategic-relational approach” to overcome the boundary between structure and agency and suggests that the interplay of structure-agency needs to be understood as it results in practical

---

<sup>76</sup> Colin Hay (2002) *Political Analysis – A Critical Introduction* (New York: Palgrave), pp.126-134.

actions in contexts of social and political interaction.<sup>77</sup> ‘The key [structure-agency] relationship in the strategic-relational approach is not that between structure and agency’, as Hay argues, ‘but rather the more immediate interaction of strategic actors and the strategic context in which they find themselves.’<sup>78</sup> Colin Hay comments, ‘They [agency and structure] do not exist as themselves but through their relational interaction. Structure and actor, though analytically separable, are in practice completely interwoven.’<sup>79</sup> As regards Hay’s analysis, the notion of the structure-agency relationship not only demonstrates the conduct of strategy as a process rather than only an outcome dictated by structure or agent alone, but also indicates the crucial interdependent relationships between agents and structure which mutually construct the strategic environment. Without agency or structural sectors, the constitution of the strategic environment would not exist from the first; without their interplay, there can be no implementation in the realm of strategy. As strategy is to do with actors’ practical actions in an environment where agents and structures interplay, as Hay’s strategic-relational approach suggests, it is not feasible for any strategic calculations to ignore either agency or structure and assume that one of them alone can provide an exclusive and persuasive vision of the strategic environment.

A key lesson of strategy from history is that one cannot mainly expect to take or depend on taking advantage of strategic environment whose nature is dynamic and arguably always beyond one’s control and expectation. One of the most enduring patterns of strategic history, as Brian Holden Reid observes, is “to expect the unexpected” in the uncertainty of strategic environment.<sup>80</sup> In other words, one can do anything that depends on oneself; but what depends on the external context, e.g. the enemy, cannot be certain. Therefore, a strategic actor is bound to try to be strong enough in the first place to control the variables and secure his position from hostile acts or influences, so as to wait for the

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, p.128.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, p.127.

<sup>80</sup> Brian Holden Reid (1998) ‘Enduring Patterns in Modern Warfare’, in Brian Holden Reid and Mungo Melvin (eds.) (1998) *The Nature of Future Conflict: Implications for Force Development* (London: The Strategic and Combat Studies Institute), p.29.

emergence, if any, of favourable circumstances. As Sun Tzu suggests: '[T]he skillful warriors first made themselves invincible and awaited the enemy's moment of vulnerability. The invincibility depends on oneself; the enemy's vulnerability on him[self]. It follows that those skilled in war can make themselves invincible but cannot cause an enemy to be certainly vulnerable.'<sup>81</sup> Sun Tzu's original analysis was in the context of war, but it provides insightful advice for strategic actors, to be strong first in their own right, in order to deal with the dynamic interaction among the contending parties. In the agency-structure dimension of the strategic environment, a self-help mind-set to make themselves strong first leads most strategic actors to take domestic factors into consideration.

While the structured context constrains actors, it also provides freedom for action and unleashes, or at least provides, opportunities. The core of exploiting the structured context against an enemy involves strategic actors bringing about confrontation only under the most advantageous circumstances and the preference to fulfill their goal without serious fighting. The more advantageous the circumstances, the more freedom of action the actor possesses, the less resistance there is likely to be on the part of the enemy and the greater the possibility that favourable victory will be secured. As Sun Tzu mentions: 'Those skilled at making the enemy move do so by creating a situation to which he must conform; they entice him with something he is certain to take and with lures of ostensible profit they await him in strength. Therefore, a skilled commander seeks victory from situation and does not demand it of his subordinates.'<sup>82</sup> Accordingly, the impact of the structured context on strategy is similar as the power of the tide for a boat. To push the boat along with the tide is much easier than to go upstream or push against the tide. The actor has to know how to exploit the advantage, if any, of the structured context and create a favourable situation as best he can. In operational terms, with self-help and diplomatic arrangements, the agency-structure dimension in the realm of strategy refers to one fundamental consideration: in what ways and to what

---

<sup>81</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, p.85.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid, p.93.

extent can both of them contribute to improving the structured strategic environment on the actor's preferred terms.

#### C.2.4 Strategic Posture: Synthesis of Defence and Offence

Strategic debates have always centred on competing perspectives between offence and defence in settling whether defensive or offensive postures are more relevant in the realm of strategic actions.<sup>83</sup> The fourth dimension of strategy, accordingly, is about the relationship between offence and defence and, as such, the action-reaction process of integrating initiatory and reactive postures in the conduct of strategy. On the one hand, an offensive posture here is understood as a coercive stance in pursuit of initiatory actions under the belief in a first-strike advantage and the intention to revise the status quo.<sup>84</sup> On the other, a defensive posture amounts to a stance of deterrence, which centres on a passive reaction to preserve the status quo, to discourage any possible attack first and to wait for favourable circumstances to launch a counterattack if necessary.<sup>85</sup> Nevertheless, there is unlikely to be a pure posture of offence or

---

<sup>83</sup> Bjorn Moller (1992) *Common Security and Non-offensive Defense: A Neorealist Perspective* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner); Stephen J. Cimbala (1994) *Military Persuasion – Deterrence and Provocation in Crisis and War* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press); David Gates (1991) *Non-Offensive Defensive: An Alternative Strategy for NATO* (London: Macmillan); Jack Snyder (1984) *The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Barry R. Posen (1984) *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain and Germany between the World Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press). The concepts of defence and offence are applied not only to military strategy but also to strategic studies, security studies and international relations studies. For instance, there are “offensive realists” and “defensive realists”. See Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (eds.) (2004) *Offense, Defense and War* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press).

<sup>84</sup> For the strategic concepts of coercion, see Freedman (ed.) (1998) *Strategic Coercion – Concepts and Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Robert A. Pape (1996) *Bombing to Win – Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Keith A. Dunn (ed.) (1987) *Conflict Termination and Military Strategy: Coercion, Persuasion and War* (Boulder: Westview Press); Kenneth A. Schultz (2001) *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Robert J. Art and Patrick M. Cronin (2003) *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press).

<sup>85</sup> For ideas of deterrence in strategy, see Andre Beaufre (1965) *Deterrence and Strategy* (tr. R.H. Barry) (London: Faber & Faber); Barry Buzan (ed.) (1987) *The International Politics of Deterrence* (London: Frances Pinter); Alexander L. George and Richard Smoke (1974) *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Columbia University Press); Michael Charlton (1987) *From Deterrence to Defense: The Insight Story of Strategic Policy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press); James DeNardo (1995) *The Amateur Strategist: Initiative Deterrence Theories and the Politics of the Nuclear Arms Race* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Patrick M. Morgan (2003) *Deterrence Now*

defence in practice, since offence and defence are normally intertwined and transformed to fit dynamic strategic circumstances in relation to particular strategic choices. Clausewitz, for instance, argues that the concept of defence is only relative, compared with offence, since defence is ‘not a simple shield, but a shield made up of well-directed blows.’<sup>86</sup> Equally, Sun Tzu describes the complexity of the offence-defence relationship by arguing that ‘in battle there are only the normal [defensive] and extraordinary [offensive] forces, but their combinations are limitless; none can comprehend them all. For these two forces are mutually reproductive; their interactions as endless as that of interlocked rings. Who can determine where one ends and the other begins?’<sup>87</sup> The transformation between defence and offence indicates that, when circumstances change, in practice, a defender can become an attacker and an attacker can turn into a defender. There is, as a result, a synthetic process of strategic posture in the dialectical relationship between defence and offence.

In the context of war, for instance, it is believed that the offensive concept plays a decisive role in starting the confrontation because of a belief that offence is generally regarded as the best defence.<sup>88</sup> In spite of negative views on offence, there is also ample historical evidence, e.g. Israeli offensive doctrine in the Arab-Israel wars, to demonstrate why many strategic decision-makers are so fond of the offensive perspective.<sup>89</sup> In fact, the very virtue of offence derives from the concept of initiative, which is about freedom of action, hence flexibility.<sup>90</sup> Those strategic actors who possess freedom of action enjoy the great advantage of choosing their own favourite times, places and other related elements to engage their adversaries. In contrast, strategic actors lacking freedom of action will be forced to react rather than pro-actively engage at their

---

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Robert Jervis, Richard Ned Lebow and Janice Gross Stein (1985) *Psychology and Deterrence* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press); Bradley S. Klein (1994) *Strategic Studies and World Order: The Global Politics of Deterrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

<sup>86</sup> Clausewitz (1993) *On War*, p.427.

<sup>87</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, p.92.

<sup>88</sup> Snyder (1984) *The Ideology of the Offensive*, p.9.

<sup>89</sup> T. V. Paul (1994) *Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiation by Weaker Powers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

<sup>90</sup> The term ‘freedom of action’ is from the French Marshal Ferdinand Foch. See in Ferdinand Foch (2002) *Principles of War* (tr. Hilaire Belloc) (New Delhi, India: Reliance Publishing House)

own discretion. Sun Tzu explains the advantage of initiative that if the enemy ‘does not know where I intend to give battle he must prepare in great many places. And ... those I have to fight in any one place will be [relatively] few. For if he prepares to the front his rear will be weak and if to the rear his front will be fragile ... when he prepares everywhere he will be weak everywhere.’<sup>91</sup>. Nevertheless, the concept of freedom of action is relative rather than absolute, since there is a dilemma in freedom of action in relations to strategic competitors. Similarly as in the notion of the security dilemma,<sup>92</sup> the freedom dilemma occurs when two or more strategic actors each feel unfree vis-à-vis other actors, since one’s own freedom of action always comes at the cost of the opponents’ freedom. What one gains, the other loses in the competition for freedom among strategic actors. In the conduct of strategy, especially for weaker powers against their stronger foes, appreciating the value of freedom of action, strategic actors look for the initiative and seek to maximize freedom in their own terms, even though the available freedom of action is significantly constrained by insufficient resources, the reconciliation of ends and means, and the structured contexts. The very notion of offence lies in the idea that it is having the initiative that mainly ensures freedom of action. The more freedom one enjoys, the more options one can choose from, and the more opportunities are open to be exploited. This is why Sun Tzu said that ‘those skilled in war bring the enemy to the field of battle and are not brought there by him.’<sup>93</sup> For him, to move as an attacker in the end is the decisive way to achieve victory.<sup>94</sup> In short, the notion of offence is an overall posture, which dictates that strategic actors prefer to act first rather than to react to their adversaries’ initiative for the possible change of status quo between them. According to Sun Tzu, the idea of initiative is linked in offensive strategy to three operational concepts: to disturb, to probe and to surprise. In practice, a coercive-rooted strategy trying to initiate

---

<sup>91</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, p.98.

<sup>92</sup> For a discussion of the “security dilemma” see Ken Booth (1992) ‘What is the security dilemma?’ in John Baylis and N.J. Rengger (eds.) (1992) *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Alan Collins (1997) *The Security Dilemma and the End of the Cold War* (Edinburgh: Keele University Press); Michael Howard (1989) *The Continental Commitment: The Dilemma of British Defence Policy in the Era of the Two World War* (London: The Ashfield Press)

<sup>93</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, p.96.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, p.85.

behavior by fear of the consequence,<sup>95</sup> for instance, can be regarded as one of the typical forms of offensive strategy.

In contrast to the offensive posture, the notion of defence is associated with a distinct passive posture, which emphasizes reaction rather than acting first. The idea of defence, nevertheless, does not mean only sitting still, although the defence declines the initiative in the first place. In fact, defence itself may also contain aspects of offence. Proclaiming that defence was a stronger form than offence in the context of war, Clausewitz described the concept of defence as ‘a shield with blows’, insisting that ‘defensive warfare … does not consist of waiting idly for things to happen. We must wait only if it [defence] brings us visible and decisive advantages.’<sup>96</sup> ‘The natural course of war’, he concludes, ‘is to begin defensively and end by attacking.’<sup>97</sup> Sun Tzu also observes, ‘Invincibility lies in the defence; the possibility of victory in the attack.’<sup>98</sup> The upper hand of defence is achieved by preventing any direct challenge to strategic competitors in a well-prepared position in which the defender possesses a comparative advantage in terrain and in moral terms. Sun Tzu describes defensive physical advantages as follows: ‘Close to the field of battle, they [defenders] await the enemy coming from afar; at rest [against], an exhausted enemy; with well-fed troops [against], hungry ones.’<sup>99</sup> Moreover, it is more effective for a defensive actor that he can focus on the controllable variables by himself in the first place, rather than fighting his opponent under uncontrollable variables, since strategic actors can never be sure of the opponent’s moves, counter-moves, or mistakes. The defender eventually will have enough advantage to launch his own counterattack on the enemy’s vulnerable points, since, after successfully parrying the enemy’s attack, all forms of weakness and mistakes by the offender will emerge and can be exploited by the defender. Accordingly, under the notion of defence, there are

---

<sup>95</sup> For a useful summary of coercive-rooted strategy, in the diplomatic term sees Paul Gordon Lauren, Gordon A. Craig, and Alexander L. George (2006) *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Challenges of Our Time*. (4th ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press), chapter 10; in the military term sees Pape (1996) *Bombing to Win – Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

<sup>96</sup> Beatrice Heuser (2002) *Reading Clausewitz* (London: Pimlico), p.91.

<sup>97</sup> Clausewitz (1993) *On War*, pp.428-429.

<sup>98</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, p.85.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid, p.109.

four operational concepts in defensive strategy: to discourage, to wait, to preserve and to counterattack. In practice, a deterrent-rooted strategy trying to inhibiting behaviour by fear of the consequence,<sup>100</sup> either in conventional or nuclear war for instance, is a topic much discussed in the realm of defensive strategy.

The conduct of strategy can generally be defined on two different operational levels: the strategic (which relates to purpose) and the tactical (which relates to the necessary measures for the purpose). Accordingly, the offence-defence posture here can be classified according to its four types: first, strategic offence with offensive tactics; second, strategic offence with defensive tactics; third, strategic defence with offensive tactics; and, fourth, strategic defence with defensive tactics. The first and second types amount to an offensively-oriented strategic posture, whereas the third and fourth types are defensively-oriented. The four types of offence-defence posture not only provide an illustrative classification of strategic postures, but also, more importantly, demonstrate an intertwining relationship between the concepts of offence and defence. In short, strategic actors need the synthetic assessment and application of the two strategic concepts between offence and defence, because of their dialectical relationships. Strategic actors may comprehensively apply mixes of these four types to deal with the dynamic and uncertain strategic context. The intertwining offence-defence postures reflect again the need of a constructive process to juxtapose, integrate and complement the two contrasting alternatives in specific situations of strategic decision-making.

### **Conclusion: Toward a Convergent Understanding of Grand Strategy**

To understand the realm of grand strategy needs a systematic way to explore its meanings and components. Many of the strategic literature choose exclusive dimensions, e.g. military, diplomacy, economics or culture, as their analytical lenses in the historical context by examining the grand strategy, which is

---

<sup>100</sup> Paul Gordon Lauren, Gordon A. Craig, and Alexander L. George (2006) *Force and Statecraft*, p.200, pp.175-197.

adopted by the state agent in the contexts of war or peace. To provide an alternative approach, the aim of this theoretical chapter has been to establish a conceptual framework of strategic analysis to understand the idea of grand strategy in general and to be applied to the case of exploring Taiwan's grand strategy in particular. This chapter proposes a theoretical analysis of grand strategy in terms of a convergent understanding. It focuses on a description of strategic actions – relating to strategic actors' decisions, power, situation and pose – which are applied across the periods of war and peace. That is not to say that it covers all the scholarship in Strategic Studies. Instead, this convergent understanding of grand strategy here intends to offer a relative broader but fundamental map of essential insights derived from Strategic Studies.

The primary task of strategic analysis is not only to help us understand what strategy is, but also to enable us to know how to use it effectively, for the realm of strategy simply cannot be separated from policy as Bernard Brodie suggested. To explain and find how strategy works effectively, one needs in advance a conceptual framework to explore what it is and how it is constructed. The concept of grand strategy can only be substantialized by a conscious agent through the practice of it. The preceding four sections of this chapter are designed to provide a constructive process by which to understand the theoretical context of grand strategy. It begins by defining the meaning of grand strategy, which refers to the process of power practice by a cognitive strategic state actor. The central body is designed to establish a conceptual framework for understanding the concept and conduct of grand strategy. It highlights four distinct analytical dimensions: the elementary pairs of ends-means, ideational and material factors, structure-agency, as well as defence and offence. Associating with these four dimensions, the central terms of the typology here are in fact common, but many take them much for granted and fail to consider them in a systematic way: strategic choice, strategic capabilities, strategic environment and strategic posture reasoned together in the realm of strategy.

In the first section, the chapter explores the linkages between ends and means in the decision-making process and shows that the strategic decision is determined above all by the reconciliation process between the desired ends and the

available means. Section two emphasizes the duality of ideational and material factors constituting the content of strategic capabilities. Section three suggests that the strategic environment is constructed by interplay in the relationship between structure and agency. Section four proposes that the point of the defence-offence synthesis is to let us know how strategic actors adopt a posture to answer challenges leading to the proposed strategic choice. Accordingly, the analysis of strategy refer to a constructive process of integrating the ways of strategic actors how to create power, to reconcile desired ends, to manipulate the environment and to react to challenges.

The concept of grand strategy thus refers to a practical activity that is fundamentally policy relevant in a dynamic environment. The overall context within which the strategic analysis framework has developed must be seen as intimately tied up with all of the four dimensions (ends-means, ideational-material, structure-agency and defence-offence) into a mutually constructive process. In the interrelated convergent strategic perspective, the line between the advantages and disadvantages of the four interdependent pairs is mutable and impermanent. This is because the convergent strategic perspective builds on a logical process of establishing a systematic and interrelated analysis between the four intertwining pairs together rather than in isolation from each other, so as to overcome the narrowness, partiality and one-sidedness of one particular view. After establishing the theoretical analytical framework of the concept of grand strategy, the defined terms of the typology, namely, strategic choice, strategic capability, strategic environment and strategic posture, will be applied to the following empirical chapters to understand the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy.

## Chapter 3

### The First and Second Taiwan Strait Crises, 1954-55 and 1958

#### Introduction

The Chinese nationalist Chiang Kai-shek retired officially from the presidency of the Republic of China (ROC) in early 1949 when his force in Mainland China was doomed and he tried to negotiate peace with the Chinese Communists. At the same time, however, he had already started to prepare to turn Taiwan into “the base of operations for national restoration” against the Chinese Communists, because the island was geographically separated from the mainland and was less susceptible to Communist infiltration.<sup>1</sup> When the ROC government retreated to Taiwan in December 1949 and Chiang Kai-shek (CKS) resumed the ROC Presidency on 1 March 1950, the Chinese civil war between the Chinese Nationalists (the Kuomintang, or KMT) and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) entered a new phase: cross-Straits confrontation. Instructing the KMT soon after he resumed power in Taiwan, CKS pledged that the overall goal and mission of his government for the island would be, as he encapsulated them: ‘to restore the ROC, to eliminate the international communists’.<sup>2</sup> He never relinquished that national goal and mission for the rest of his life.

The outbreak of the 1954-55 first Taiwan Strait crisis and the 1958 second Strait crisis reflected the intensity of cross-Straits political-military confrontation. Both crises centred on the little-known groups of offshore islands near the Chinese

---

<sup>1</sup> Steve Tsang (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT’s Policy to Reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, Steve Tsang (ed.) (1993) in *the Shadow of China: Political Developments in Taiwan since 1949* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press), p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) “Mission and Goal of My Return”, at <http://zh.wikisource.org/zh/復職的目的與使命> (accessed on 5 August, 2010)

mainland – Jinmen, Mazu and Dachen<sup>3</sup>, but brought the US and the PRC to the brink of direct military confrontation. The 1954-55 crisis emerged as negotiations aiming at a US-ROC defence treaty became public in late July 1954. The PRC responded immediately with a mass propaganda campaign, which called for “the liberation of Taiwan” (*jiefang taiwan*). Subsequently, the Central Military Commission (CMC) established a Zhedong (East Zhejiang) Front Command in late July 1954 to prepare an attack on the Dachen islands. The crisis started on 3 September 1954 when the PLA artillery in Fujian shelled Jinmen<sup>4</sup>, on the same day that the first meeting of members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) convened.<sup>5</sup> The crisis escalated on 8 December 1954, when the Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai verbally attacked the US for signing the Mutual Defence Treaty (MDT) with the ROC on 2 December 1954. The Strait crisis culminated on 5 February 1955 as the ROC evacuated its forces and civilians from Dachen and eased when, on 23 April 1955, Zhou Enlai announced at the Bandung Conference that China did not want war with the US and was willing to relax the tensions in the Taiwan Strait.<sup>6</sup> US President Dwight D. Eisenhower recalled that the effect of the first Strait crisis was to ‘threaten a split between the United States and nearly all its allies and carry the country to the edge of war, thus constituting one of the most serious problems of the first eighteen months of my administration.’<sup>7</sup>

The second Taiwan Strait crisis erupted on 23 August 1958 and centred on the PLA’s massive bombardment of Jinmen. To renew America’s problem of its involvement on the offshore island and test Washington’s commitment on the ROC-US MDT accordingly, Mao Zedong instructed the Fujian Military

---

<sup>3</sup> From north to south respectively, the Dachen Islands are just off the Zhejiang coast in the East China Sea, the Matsu Islands are 10 miles off Fuzhou and the Jinmen Islands lie two miles off Xiamen (Amoy).

<sup>4</sup> Well before 3 September 1954, during March 1954, PLA guns had shelled Jinmen for the first time, though in a small way. See Chao Ching, “A General Review of the Chinese Communist Artillery Shellings on Kinmen and Matsu During the Past Decade,” *Issues and Studies* (Taipei), Vol.II, No.10 (July 1966), p.20.

<sup>5</sup> Segal argued that most of the tensions in the first Strait crisis seemed to result from the US establishing a containment wall against the Sino-Soviet bloc, for example, the SEATO pact, even though the ROC was deliberately excluded from the treaty. See Gerald Segal (1985) *Defending China* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.115.

<sup>6</sup> George McTurnan Kahin (1956) *The Asian-African Conference: Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press), pp. 28-29.

<sup>7</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower (1963) *The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953-1956* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday), p.459.

Command to ‘attack the KMT troops on Jinmen [not Matsu] with a concentrated, surprising and extensive artillery shellfire and at same time, blockade [the strait surrounding Jinmen and Mazu]...Whether we attack these islands will depend on how the military situation changes. One step at a time.’<sup>8</sup> Except for Mao’s diplomatic calculations, it is believed that preparations for the bombardment began early in the summer of 1958; the aim of the operation was to resume the 1954-55 battle plan for the offshore islands to recover, if possible, Jinmen and Mazu.<sup>9</sup> The bombardment intensified over the following days and weeks into a full-scale military campaign because of Beijing’s attempts to cut off the supplies of the defending forces and undermine their will to fight. On the first day of the bombardment, the PLA fired around 20,000 shells and caused serious casualties in the headquarters of the ROC Jinmen Defence Command. Those included General Ghao Chia-hsiang and General Chi Hsing-wen, who were killed, and the ROC Defence Minister, Yu Ta-wei, who was wounded. Having experienced the 1954-55 Strait crisis, the US this time responded swiftly and vigorously to the PRC attack on Jinmen since Washington had anticipated and prepared for a crisis to erupt across the Strait and had determined that Jinmen should be defended.<sup>10</sup> Three days after the PLA’s initial bombardment, Eisenhower instructed the US military to prepare to escort ROC supply ships and to be ready to attack PRC coastal military bases if necessary. This included the possibility of pursuing nuclear options.<sup>11</sup> In the event, the Chinese blockade was breached by a joint US-ROC convoy. By 21 September the PLA had lost its advantage of local control and begun to suffer heavy casualties, to its air forces in particular.<sup>12</sup> Generally, the garrisons’ morale on the offshore islands remained good throughout, as it had been during the August shelling and there was never a serious supply problem throughout the crisis.<sup>13</sup> To escape from the deadlock, the PRC officially announced a unilateral ceasefire on 6 October.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Mao’s instruction to the CMC, 20 August 1958. See in Zhang (1992:237).

<sup>9</sup> He Di (1990), “The Evolution of the People’s Republic of China’s Policy toward the Offshore Islands”, in Warren I. Cohen and Akira Iriye (eds.) (1990) *The Great Powers in the East Asia: 1953-1960* (New York: Columbia University Press), p.234.

<sup>10</sup> Morton H. Halperin (1966) *The 1958 Taiwan Strait Crisis: A Document History* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Memorandum RM-4900-ISA, December 1966), p.99.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, pp.112-114.

<sup>12</sup> Segal (1985) *Defending China*, pp.124-125.

<sup>13</sup> Stolper (1985) *China, Taiwan and the Offshore Islands*, p.118.

<sup>14</sup> *Collected Documents of Sino-American Relations* (1960), p.2838.

On 25 October, the PRC further announced that it would resume shelling but only on odd-numbered days and the ROC, on the same day, decided in response to bombard the coastal provinces on alternate days.<sup>15</sup> The state of exchanging fire in this regular way in the Jinmen and Matsu area was maintained until 1979.

Beijing's strategy for the offshore islands in the two Strait crises had similar rationales: first, to remind the world of China's continuing civil war and claim to Taiwan; second, to probe America's real intention regarding its security commitment to Taiwan; and third, to make the Taiwan issue enough of a problem for the US to persuade Washington to disengage from it eventually.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, it is worth noting that there is a debate about whether Mao really intended to seize the offshore islands. For instance, Michael Szonyi argues that Mao did not intend to capture them because this would have denoted the first step in the permanent separation of the two regimes into "Two Chinas" across the Strait.<sup>17</sup> Eric Herring, however, argues that 'China would have invaded the offshore islands if the US had not made its extended deterrence commitment.'<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Gerald Segal observed that while military force was not used in the same way in both crises, by the very nature of its probe, Beijing kept its

---

<sup>15</sup> Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival: The Foreign Policy and External Relations of the Republic of China on Taiwan* (London: Sherwood Press), p.114.

<sup>16</sup> Stolper (1985) *China, Taiwan and the offshore islands*, p.128; Segal (1985) *Defending China*, pp.135-136. For a discussion of the Soviet Union's involvement during the two crises, see Zhang Shu Guang (1992) *Deterrence and Strategic Culture*, pp. 216-218, 254-256; and Segal (1985) *Defending China*, pp. 130-136.

<sup>17</sup> Michael Szonyi (2008) *Cold War Island: Quemoy on the Front Line* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.66-71. Stolper and Zhang similarly maintain that there was no indication that Beijing had planned to seize Jinmen and Matsu during the crisis. For details see in Zhang Shu Guang (1992) *Deterrence and Strategic Culture: Chinese-American Confrontations, 1949-1958* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 235-237 and Thomas E. Stolper (1985) *China, Taiwan and the Offshore Islands* (New York: M.E.Sharpe), pp. 125-126. Szonyi's argument however raises further important questions: If Mao intended to leave these offshore islands to CKS as the vital link between the two Chinese regimes, why did Beijing launch an all-out military invasion to take Jinmen during the Battle of Guningtou on 24 October 1949? How is this compatible with Mao's overarching strategy to liberate Taiwan so as to put an end to the Chinese civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists? If Mao intended to invade Taiwan to finish the KMT, could he in military terms accomplish it without taking the offshore islands? Could this have been a rationalization by Beijing in that the government failed to take the offshore islands and break the US-ROC security link at the first attempt and then expediently decided to change its strategy to make the most of the role of these offshore islands?

<sup>18</sup> Eric Herring (1995) *Danger and Opportunity: Explaining International Crisis Outcomes* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), p.123. See also in He Di (1990), "The Evolution of the People's Republic of China's Policy toward the Offshore Islands", Warren I. Cohen and Akira Iriye (eds.) (1990) *The Great Powers in the East Asia: 1953-1960* (New York: Columbia University Press).

objectives and strategy flexible in order to react to the US response.<sup>19</sup> From Taipei's strategic point of view, the Nationalist government adopted the stance that there was a continuing Chinese civil war across the Strait but intended to link the civil war with Washington's global containment strategy against the Communists in its own favour. In Chiang Kai-shek's national address soon after the end of the 1958 crisis, he pointed out three major strategic implications of the defence of the offshore islands: first, its strategic importance for the promising future of the ROC and the Chinese people; second, its crucial relationship with the stability of the Asia Pacific region and its people; and, third, its significant contribution to the peace and security of the free world.<sup>20</sup> Chiang then concluded by saying that the success in safeguarding the offshore islands represented the total failure of Beijing's attempt to "liberate Taiwan". While appreciating war as a necessary means to advance revolution, Chiang proclaimed that it would be an excellent strategic opportunity for Taipei to retake the Chinese mainland if Beijing dared to escalate a full-scale military confrontation across the Strait.<sup>21</sup>

Despite the fact that CKS did not explicitly express Taiwan's grand strategy in any comprehensive manner, his national address in 1958 reflected his overall national strategic perspective. The latter had four distinct characteristics. First, there was no option of peaceful coexistence in the context of the Chinese civil war across the Strait. A primary concern of this zero-sum competitive strategic perspective was to restore the ROC on the Chinese mainland rather than on Taiwan. This perspective on the part of CKS's resulted in what I call an outward-looking strategic choice, whereby Taipei's strategic concern focused fundamentally on the Chinese mainland. The outward-looking strategic choice prioritized the restoration of political control on the mainland as the most important aim of securing the further existence and development of the ROC, in terms of pursuing its sovereignty and territorial integrity. To serve this aim, CKS initiated domestic political reform starting from rebuilding the KMT as a

---

<sup>19</sup> Segal (1985) *Defending China*, p.136.

<sup>20</sup> Chiang Kai-shek's state address on the ROC's National Birthday, 10 October 1958. See You, Zixiang (2006) *Leaders' Rhetoric: Important Speech Collections of Cross-Straits Leaders, 1906-2006* (Taipei City, Taiwan: Wu Nan Publishers), pp.343-346.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

Leninist-style party, as a means by which to compete with the CCP across the Strait.<sup>22</sup> This mission by CKS's to re-conquer the mainland also justified in his eyes him the imposition in May 1949 of martial law, which in turn legitimized the KMT dictatorship in Taiwan.<sup>23</sup> Second, to implement the outward-looking strategic choice, CKS deliberately championed ideational factors, i.e., ideology, by means of what might be called national spiritual mobilization, to cope with Taiwan's obvious material disadvantage in terms of competing for power against its much bigger foe. Third, to compensate for its material inferiority Taipei sought to secure on its side support by an external power. America's global anti-communist containment strategy in the 1950s created a favorable strategic environment for the Nationalist government. CKS's management of the ROC's strategic environment, associated also with upholding Taiwan's domestic security, was designed to link Taipei's national strategy with Washington's containment strategy and to exploit this linkage. Fourth, Taipei's strategic posture associated with its outward-looking strategy in the 1950s was offensive rather than defensive in nature. While regarding war as a necessary means for his national mission of Chinese restoration, CKS's emphasis on the strategic importance of these remote offshore islands demonstrated his relentless ambition to launch a military counter-attack in the Chinese mainland, if necessary over a period of many years. Accordingly, this chapter will examine the above four factors so as to understand Taiwan's grand strategy under Chiang Kai-shek's rule in the 1950s.

### **C.3.1 CKS's Outward-Looking Strategic Choice**

Following the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) on 1 October 1949, the national grand strategy of the Republic of China was

---

<sup>22</sup> For a further discussion, see Chapter 3.3 'Upholding Domestic Security' in this thesis. For a discussion of CKS's domestic political reform to consolidate the KMT's control in Taiwan, see also Steve Tsang (1993) 'Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT's Policy to Reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958', pp. 64-68; Steve Tsang (1999) 'Transforming a Party State into a Democracy', Steve Tsang and Hung-mao Tien (eds.) (1999) *Democratization in Taiwan*, pp. 1-10; Shelley Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (London: Routledge), pp.55-80.

<sup>23</sup> Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan*, pp. 16-19.

fundamentally designed to impose and secure the ROC's sovereignty claim, not constrained in space to Taiwan but territorially extended to the Chinese mainland. From CKS's point of view, the ROC was "China" and represented the only legitimate government of China as a whole. The intensive military conflicts in the 1950s reflected the lasting hostility of the unfinished Chinese civil war. For both the Chinese Nationalists and the Communists, the nature of the confrontation across the Taiwan Strait had by then focused on the struggle for the control of China as a whole, rather than maintaining the status quo. The options of two Chinas or one China and one Taiwan across the Strait were at this time not contemplated by either side. As a result, President Chiang Kai-shek's rigid belief in the pursuit of the cross-Straits unification against the PRC without any compromise had fundamentally shaped Taiwan's national grand strategy, which centred on his outward-looking strategic choice. And the outward-looking strategic choice could be understood with reference to the unfinished Chinese civil war, his determination to defend the legitimacy of the ROC, and his statecraft of risk taking.

### ***The Unfinished Chinese Civil War***

While CKS resumed the ROC presidency in Taiwan, the island of Hainan, China's second largest island, was not seized by the PRC, nor would it be until April 1950; many of the offshore islands, however, such as Chusan, Dachen, Jinmen (Quemoy) and Mazu (Matsu), remained under the ROC's control. However, the security of the ROC on Taiwan was fragile though rather stable. The PRC possessed overwhelming superiority in most aspects of strategic capability, e.g. men, weapons, logistics and morale, since the People's Liberation Army (PLA) was massing for an invasion of Taiwan to fulfill its unfinished task of unifying China. In fact, CKS did in fact expect the PRC to invade Taiwan between July and late September 1950.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Waichiapu telegram to Washington Embassy 357, 19 July 1950, File B.13(1)b, Box 145, Paper of Wellington Koo, Butler Library, New York.

By then, the defeated Nationalist regime on Taiwan seemed an easy prey for the victorious PRC. In early 1950, Chiang's forces in Taiwan experienced a shortage of military equipment and, recently defeated, demonstrated low poor morale and a low degree of general preparedness. The American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the State Department intelligence section concluded that the Kuomintang could not 'effect political and military adjustments sufficiently realistic to make possible a successful defense of Taiwan'.<sup>25</sup> General Chen Cheng, the new Governor of Taiwan Province appointed in 1949 and later vice president of the ROC, described the dangerous situation: 'At that juncture the general situation on the mainland was deteriorating fast, the morale of the people on Taiwan was low, economic confusion and social unrest were rampant and it looked as though anything might happen'.<sup>26</sup> General Chen also admitted that Taiwan's defence was 'barely adequate' and that there was 'no prospect for counterattack on the mainland in the foreseeable future'.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, the outbreak of the Korean War on 25 June 1950 relieved Taiwan's dangerous situation and reversed the entire strategic outlook and military balance across the Strait, because Washington changed its China policy and decided to secure the ROC on Taiwan. From this point, with Washington's security commitment in hand, the CKS administration was able to adopt an offensive outward-looking strategic choice for the so-called "sacred mission" of national restoration in the Chinese mainland.

Given Taipei's threat perceptions, the Chinese Communist regime was an irreconcilable and aggressive foe. CKS asserted that a continuation of the war against the Communists was inevitable because to eliminate the Chinese Communist regime was "my life-long responsibility" as well as "the key to the existence of the Chinese nation and the success of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles".<sup>28</sup> Chiang's perception of China's future and the

---

<sup>25</sup> CIA Report ORE 7-50, 20 March 50, in Steve Tsang(1993) 'Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT's Policy to Reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958', p.50.

<sup>26</sup> Chen Cheng (1961) *Land Reform in Taiwan* (Taipei: China Publishing Company), p.X.

<sup>27</sup> Taipei to Secretary of State, telegram 249, 14 August 1950, "Neutralisation of Formosa", Records relating to the Korea War, Box 6, Papers of Harry S. Truman, Truman Library, Independence, Missouri.

<sup>28</sup> Chiang Kai-Shek (1952), *Selected Speeches and Messages of President Chiang Kai-Shek, 1949-52* (Taipei: Office of the Government Spokesman), p.8

Communist threat caused him to fight the PRC ruthlessly and without compromise. Since “the loyal and the treacherous cannot co-exist” (*han zei bu liang li*)<sup>29</sup>, as he put it, there was no possibility of peaceful coexistence between the two regimes, as expressed in the proposal of “two Chinas” or “one China and one Taiwan” to resolve the Chinese civil war. From CKS’s strategic perspective, to safeguard Jinmen and Mazu was decisive for concluding the Chinese civil war. Accordingly, Chiang maintained that those islands were indispensable to the defence of Taiwan, in that in the short term they ensured the regime’s survival and control and in the long term they helped to retain his claim to sovereignty on the mainland.

Beijing obviously possessed a similar perception of threat in the context of the cross-Strait Chinese civil war, as Taipei’s existence, with Washington’s support, imposed a constant threat to the newly established Communist regime. Accordingly, Beijing’s primary national strategic choice was either the “liberation” of Taiwan, or unification with Taiwan on its terms. Its strategic choice of liberation explains why Beijing began offensive operations on the offshore islands during the two Strait crises and sought to seize those offshore islands, if at all possible, as a first step in the unification mission. From Beijing’s point of view, to liberate Taiwan was a matter of principle for the unfinished Chinese Communist revolution and, more importantly, for its national sovereignty and territorial integrity. The military operations against the offshore islands served the long-term political goal of resolving the Taiwan issue. As Beijing had already successfully occupied the Hainan and Chusan islands in April and May, respectively, of 1950, the PRC hailed both operations as harbingers of victory in the struggle against Taiwan as “the last battle in completing the liberation and unification of our country.”<sup>30</sup> It was believed that well before the 1954-55 crisis, presumably in late 1952, Mao had approved a plan to occupy all the offshore islands, but suspended this offensive in response to the 1953 Korean armistice.<sup>31</sup> Accordingly, the PRC was strongly motivated

---

<sup>29</sup> After the evacuation of the Dachen Island, Chiang replied to the proposal for “two Chinas” in a press conference on 14 Feb., 1955. See Chiu (ed.) (1973) *Documents and Analysis*, p.261.

<sup>30</sup> Allen S. Whiting (1960) *China Cross the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War* (Stanford: RAND/Stanford University Press), p.21.

<sup>31</sup> Eric Herring (1995) *Danger and Opportunity: Explaining International Crisis Outcomes*

to invade the offshore islands as a stepping-stone to the eventual liberation of Taiwan; in practice, however, doubts persisted whether the PRC had the capacity to do so given the signing in late 1954 of the Mutual Defense Treaty between Taipei and Washington.

Washington's security commitment notwithstanding, Taipei's relentless military preparations against Beijing in these offshore islands bore witness to its outward-looking strategic choice. In line with its position concerning the Korean armistice, for instance, CKS's nationalist government constantly refused to accept any UN-sponsored cease-fire proposal to settle the cross-Strait issue during those two Taiwan Strait crises. Taipei's strategy of declining the idea of an armistice to stabilize cross-Strait relations clearly expressed CKS's preference to continue the unfinished Chinese civil war. This stance would not only justify all his military and political struggles against the Chinese Communist regime, but also enable Taipei to launch a counterattack against the Chinese mainland when the time came. Thus, CKS's determination to conclude the Chinese civil war resulted in his outward-looking strategic choice "to restore the ROC, to eliminate the international communists", which stood at the heart of Taipei's national grand strategy. His determination was by no means what most people in international society summed up as a simple rhetorical claim.

### *Defending the Legitimacy of the ROC*

The origins of Taipei's outward-looking strategy can be traced to CKS's perception of a relationship between the political ends of war and the military means to attain it. Taiwan's grand strategy, shaped by China's attempt at "liberation" in the two Strait crises, reflected Chiang Kai-shek's political beliefs and his view of the merits of military means. Chiang defined strategy as follows: 'Strategy is the art of creating and utilizing advantageous situations to achieve the goals of war, campaigns, or decisive battles, of a nation or of a group of nations in order to increase the probability of success and the final

---

(Manchester: Manchester University Press), p.123. Herring argues that 'China would have invaded the offshore islands [as part of its overarching strategy to liberate Taiwan] if the US had not made its extended deterrence commitment.'

victory.<sup>32</sup> To avoid possible contradiction between political ends and military means, Chiang established guidelines whereby military strategy should accord with the national political goals. In his view, military leaders were not permitted to decide strategies by themselves and it was the political leaders who were in charge of directing war and responsible for dealing with the strategic problems, although they should not intervene in military operations.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, from Chiang's vantage point, national strategy served political objectives and war was a legitimate instrument in the pursuit of political victory. The primary objective in CKS's outward-looking national strategy was to uphold the legitimacy of the ROC on Taiwan as well as on the Chinese mainland.

Since his retreat to Taiwan in 1949, Chiang had formulated his government's fundamental national strategy against the PRC as follows: 'First, concentrate all armed strength; second, safeguard Taiwan; third, rescue our compatriots on the mainland and fourth, rejuvenate the Chinese Republic.'<sup>34</sup> This strategy was informed by his belief and experience acquired over 25 years of dealing with the CCP; Communism was the biggest threat to him, to the survival of the ROC and to the Chinese nation as a whole.<sup>35</sup> He regarded the war against the Communists as a 'life and death struggle'; thus 'to fight the Communists to the bitter end' was, as he put it, 'the only way by which our compatriots can save themselves as well as their country'.<sup>36</sup> He saw nothing wrong with using force for political purposes and he had already demonstrated his relentless willingness to do so for a variety of specific objectives during the Chinese civil war.

In the 1954-55 crisis, because of US pressure and the militarily indefensible position of Dachen Island, Chiang traded this offshore island for the US security commitment regarding Jinmen and Mazu. Part of his purpose was also to concentrate his forces on these islands. However, in the case of the 1958 crisis,

---

<sup>32</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), *The Collection of Military Speeches of President Chiang* (Taipei: the Editorial Committee of the Zhongxing Speeches Collections of President Jiang), Vol.3, p1206.

<sup>33</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), *Military Speeches of Chiang*, Vol.3, p1315.

<sup>34</sup> Chiang Kai-Shek (1952), *Selected Speeches and Messages of President Chiang Kai-Shek, 1949-52* (Taipei: Office of the Government Spokesman), p.36.

<sup>35</sup> For Chiang's most inclusive discussion of Communism, see in Chung-cheng (Kai-shek) Chiang (1957), *Soviet Russia in China: A Summing-up at Seventy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy).

<sup>36</sup> Chiang Kai-Shek (1952), *Selected Speeches, 1949-52*, p.6.

Chiang firmly resisted the US political pressure and PRC military coercion to retreat from these offshore islands and deliberately linked the defence of the offshore islands to the defence of Taiwan and the survival of the ROC. After the 1958 crisis, in a joint communiqué with the US, Chiang did half-heartedly promise not to use force to achieve his “sacred mission” – “the restoration of freedom to [China’s] its people on the mainland”.<sup>37</sup> However, in view of Chiang’s active military preparations later in June 1962 in an attempt to take advantage of China in the chaos of the Cultural Revolution<sup>38</sup>, Chiang never deviated from his outward-looking strategy to seek, if possible, the reestablishment of political control over the mainland and he firmly believed war was an appropriate and necessary means in the pursuit of the ROC’s legitimate existence. Following the two Strait crises of the 1950s, the main difference in the outward-looking strategy would have been the added emphasis on “political warfare”, a concept that CKS understood as “all operations except those directly using force against the enemy.”<sup>39</sup>

Although it had become more and more illusory, CKS’s insistence on pursuing a policy of returning to the mainland, the core of his outward-looking strategic choice, had its own reasons. As demonstrated already, the Nationalist government could not abandon its political goal of achieving national restoration by re-occupying the Chinese mainland, no matter how illusory and unfeasible this objective was, because, in terms of its concern for sovereignty, the government’s political agenda also included securing the legitimate existence of the ROC on Taiwan. After all, Taipei declined to end the formal state of civil war and proclaimed itself to be the only legitimate Chinese government across the Strait. From CKS’s perspective, the abandonment of the policy of returning to the mainland would have meant not only legitimizing the existence of the PRC but also accepting the permanent political division of China across the Strait. Moreover, for personal reasons, such division would

---

<sup>37</sup> ROC-US Joint Communiqué October 23, 1958 in Chiu (ed.) *Documents and Analysis* (1973: 288).

<sup>38</sup> Chiang’s military action was called off by Washington. See Bernard D. Cole (2006). *Taiwan’s Security: History and Prospects*. (London: Routledge), p.25.

<sup>39</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1957), “The Major Points of Political Warfare”, in *The Digest of the Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare* (Taipei: General Department of Political Warfare of Military of National Defense, 1957), p.25.

eventually have affirmed CKS's failure and responsibility for the Nationalist defeat in the Chinese civil war. All of these three effects were utterly unacceptable to the former ruler of China. The potential dilemma for his government was that Taipei felt obligated to adopt what ultimately might be a futile outward-looking strategy against the Chinese Communists, coming at the cost of Taiwan's domestic development and more stable cross-Strait relations. For instance, the basis for the KMT government's legitimacy was the 1947 Constitution, rooted in a liberal and democratic political system, which was severely limited by a set of constitutional amendments, namely, the "*Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion*", in May 1948. Given the declared state of emergency because of the worsening civil war against the CCP, the Constitution was further restricted after the proclamation of martial law in May 1949. In the end, these constitutional arrangements helped to legitimize the prolonging of the KMT authoritarian rule and the unchecked power of Chiang Kai-shek.<sup>40</sup>

### ***A Statecraft of Risk Taking***

Personality is important in politicians' choices between ends and means. In a study of the relations between personality and politics, Fred I. Greenstein argues that political consequences significantly result from the personal characteristics of political actors, or their "personality", which refers to 'a construct that is introduced to account for the regularities in an individual's behavior as he responds to diverse stimuli.'<sup>41</sup> As Chinese historian Huang Ren-yu observed, CKS was the ultimate adventurer, who used to say famously that 'life (*ren sheng*) is adventure (*mao xian*), without adventure there is no life. ... If we don't take real action and try, we will never know whether it is right or wrong.'<sup>42</sup> While Beijing boldly launched military operations to test Washington

---

<sup>40</sup> Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, pp. 26-30. Wu Jaushieh Joseph (1995) *Taiwan's Democratization: Forces behind the New Momentum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 24-32; Denny Roy (2003) *Taiwan: A Political History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 81-93. A detailed discussion of the Constitutional arrangements, see Hungdah Chiu (1993) 'Constitutional Development in the Republic of China in Taiwan', in Tsang (ed.) (1993) *In the Shadow of China*, pp. 17-47.

<sup>41</sup> Fred I. Greenstein (1969) *Personality and Politics* (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company), pp. 1-3.

<sup>42</sup> Huang, Ren-yu (1994) *A Macro Historical Perspective on Interpreting Chiang Kai-shek's*

and Taipei planned to engage in military confrontation against Beijing for the restoration of nationalist rule in the 1950s, in the two Strait crises both sides adopted an offensive strategy to challenge their much stronger opponents. One of the most distinct features of Taiwan's grand strategy under CKS leadership was Taipei's willingness to take a calculated risk in opting for its outward-looking strategic choice to revise the cross-Strait status quo.

In the two Taiwan Strait crises, neither Taipei nor Beijing assumed that war across the Strait could be avoided. On the contrary, each was not only not afraid of war, but also relentlessly and deliberately applied military power to pursue its respective political objectives, i.e. "recovering the mainland" and "liberating Taiwan". However, war was a matter of life or death given the challenge of a much stronger foe. From CKS's point of view, "[n]ational regeneration can follow closely upon a national crisis".<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, Mao applied his experience of guerrilla warfare which emphasized "the solution of problems by war", while retaining "the ability to run away" if necessary.<sup>44</sup> Their respective strategy of pursuing political ends by deliberate risk-taking during the two Strait crises demonstrated that these crises were characterised by two contradictory elements—opportunity and danger.<sup>45</sup> Which one would predominate in the crises would depend on the skill of leaders to address and exploit the risks.

From Chiang Kai-shek's perspective, the nature of war was total rather than limited and the whole country would have directly or indirectly to be involved in war, in particular because for him it was a war of the weak against the strong.<sup>46</sup> In assessing why the PRC abandoned its attempt in 1955 to attack Jinmen and Mazu after successfully capturing Dachen Island, Chiang and his subordinates indeed stressed the value of waging total war against Mao's war of calculated limits. As the ROC Vice President General Chen Cheng claimed in

---

*Diary* (Taipei: China Times Publishers), p. 434.

<sup>43</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1974) *Aphorisms of President Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: Government Information Office), p.5.

<sup>44</sup> Tien Hung-mao (ed.) (1996) *Taiwan's Electoral Politics and Democratic Transition: Riding the Third Wave* (Armonk: M.E. Shape), pp. 219-220.

<sup>45</sup> Eric Herring (1995) *Danger and Opportunity: Explaining International Crisis Outcomes* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), pp.1-4.

<sup>46</sup> Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory*, pp.190-191.

1957: ‘the [Communist] bandits attempted to use limited war to sunder apart our battle line in the Taiwan Strait. We nevertheless used total war to defend the security of the Taiwan Strait. The [favourable] result was that, because of our determination and our ability to support our determination with our power, the scheme of the enemy was frustrated.’<sup>47</sup> Although this was a rhetorical claim in praise of Taipei’s victory, there was in fact no difference between the front and rear lines, given that Taiwan’s grand strategy was designed to fight a total war against the PRC. After the 1954-55 crisis CKS took the serious risk of firmly holding on to the easy targets (for the PRC) of Jinmen and Mazu as both offshore islands were the last territory connecting the mainland province with a vital operational front base. He clearly did this in order to defend Taiwan and pursue his political goal of “recovering the mainland”. The key to holding Jinmen and Mazu was to deploy his main forces on these vulnerable offshore islands so as to intensify the possible cross-Strait confrontation and prepare to launch a decisive battle on the Chinese mainland whenever the opportunity arose. This strategy, which amounted to confronting the adversary with the prospect of death so that both would launch an all-out fight for survival, was a life and death battle for CKS’s regime. Accordingly, the US faced a strategic dilemma: to help him on his own terms or to risk the loss of the ROC. It was in fact a kind of brinkmanship strategy on the part of CKS, meant to test Washington as well as Beijing. The maximum payoff for Chiang’s bold gamble would be four-fold: first to retain the offshore islands as the bridgehead for implementing plans for national restoration; second, to reinforce the American security commitment to the ROC; third, “to embroil the US with his enemies, the [Chinese] Communists”<sup>48</sup> in the cross-Strait confrontation; and, fourth, to demonstrate his determination to fight the Chinese civil war to the bitter end. Consequently, for CKS, to hold Jinmen and Mazu at all costs, though very dangerous, was a decisive strategic decision that had significant political overtones concomitant with his outward-looking strategy.

Meanwhile, Mao Zedong, who had initiated the two Strait crises of the 1950s,

---

<sup>47</sup> The Political Report of Chen Cheng to the Eighth Congress of the Kuomintang [in Chinese]. Reprinted in *Reconstruction in China* [Taiwan], October, 1957, pp.3-6.

<sup>48</sup> Text of the Secretary of State Dean Acheson’s Statement on United States Policy Regarding China, *New York Times*, September 7, 1958, p.3.

had long believed in using war to achieve political objectives. His most famous dictum whereby “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun” demonstrated his perspective on the relationship between military means and political ends. In order to gain experience in amphibious warfare for a future operation across the Taiwan Strait and to remove Chiang’s increasing threat on the eastern Chinese coast, the PRC in the early 1950s mainly focused its attention on the Chiang-occupied offshore islands<sup>49</sup> By then, Mao’s military strategy to recover these offshore islands was to move ‘from small to large, one island at a time, from north to south and from weak to strong.’<sup>50</sup> However, as Eisenhower was entering into closer military relations with Chiang and giving him increasing support, Mao had to find an available means to clarify and test – and if possible to undermine – the US security commitment to Taiwan before he could launch a further large-scale military attack against Chiang. The Nationalist-occupied small offshore islands were the proper place at the right time for Mao to employ his limited war strategy. While Chiang regarded physical control of the offshore islands as a possible stepping-stone to “recovering the mainland”, these vulnerable offshore islands also provided a valuable chance for Mao to reactivate the physical and psychological confrontation at any time; this favoured his forces, since Mao possessed a decisive geographic advantage.<sup>51</sup>

Mao’s strategy of limited war paid off in the 1954-55 crisis even though he could not prevent the proposed US-ROC Mutual Defense Treaty from being signed. Mao not only succeeded in occupying the Dachen islands in early 1955, but also used the occasion, just after the signing of the MDT in late 1954, to demonstrate his will and capacity to challenge the US, which he referred to as a “paper tiger”. In the beginning of the 1958 crisis, the Chinese leaders believed that relying only on artillery fire<sup>52</sup> they would be able to impose against a blockade the offshore islands that would in turn make America exert pressure on CKS to abandon the indefensible offshore islands as the US had done in the

---

<sup>49</sup> He Di (1990), “The Evolution of the People’s Republic of China’s Policy toward the Offshore Islands”, p.223.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Oran Young (1968) *The Politics of Force* (Princeton: Princeton University). pp. 292-93.

<sup>52</sup> George and Smoke (1974) *Deterrence in American foreign Policy*, p.375.

case of Dachen in 1955.<sup>53</sup> However, this scenario did not recur in the 1958 crisis; on the contrary, it backfired seriously because the US assured the world of its commitment to defending Jinmen and Mazu. To prevent a direct military clash with the US, Mao then demonstrated his flexibility and appealed for negotiations to end the 1958 crisis by agreeing on a ceasefire. This kind of strategy, which was combining limited bold acts of war with calculated acts of political initiative (the so-called “*da da, tan tan*” strategy), was precisely the same as the one Mao had used in the Chinese civil war against the Nationalists. He Di, a Chinese scholar, concluded that the experience of the two Strait crises demonstrates that ‘confrontation (“*da da*”) would prove more fruitful than conciliation (“*tan tan*”), as a means of achieving the ultimate goal of national reunification.<sup>54</sup> As a result, both sides’ distinctive risk-taking strategy to fulfill their own political objectives by deliberately applying military means initiated a turbulent cross-Strait context and imposed a zero-sum type of political competition across the Strait throughout the 1950s and 1960s.

### C.3.2 National Spiritual Mobilization

With an inescapable cross-Strait military conflict seemingly in sight, President Chiang Kai-shek unshakably regarded the spiritual (*jing shen*) factor as decisive in war.<sup>55</sup> He believed that ‘the magic effect of the spirit could be attained by the noble mind, supreme courage and talent’.<sup>56</sup> Chiang himself had come to know “the spiritual magic” during his military career when he won the revolutionary war in the late 1920s with less than 100,000 men against the Chinese warlords, whose forces numbered more than one million. Equally, however, he lost the civil war to the Chinese Communists in the late 1940s despite the Nationalists’

---

<sup>53</sup> He Di (1990), “The Evolution of the People’s Republic China’s Policy toward the Offshore Islands”, p.234.

<sup>54</sup> He Di (1990), “The Evolution of the People’s Republic China’s Policy toward the Offshore Islands”, pp.232-233.

<sup>55</sup> Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory: Ancient and Modern* (Oakville: Mosaic Press), p.180.

<sup>56</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), “The Aim and Purposes of Military Education”, in *The Collected Military Speeches of President Chiang*, Vol.3 (Taipei: the Editorial Committee of the Zhongxing Speeches Collections of President Chiang), p.1263. (Hereafter referred to as *Military Speeches of Jiang*).

numerical and material advantage. He concluded from his experience of victory and defeat that ‘the most serious problem in war was not necessarily the [material] strength of the enemy, but the lack of adequate spirit, knowledge and ideas of one’s own forces.’<sup>57</sup>

It was generally believed that without US assistance Chiang’s defeated regime in Taiwan was doomed to fall sooner or later, in view of the PLA’s overwhelming material advantage following Mao’s victory on the Chinese mainland. It may thus be difficult to understand why during the 1954-54 and 1958 Strait crises Chiang repeatedly objected to an American plan whereby Taiwan’s status quo would be maintained under a UN ceasefire resolution, unless one takes account of the fact that Chiang appreciated “the magic effect of the spirit” associated with his outward-looking grand strategy of waging revolutionary warfare against the PRC. The significance of ideational factors, particularly the “Five Beliefs” doctrine, a strong dose of anti-communism as well as an optimist outlook can help to understand why CKS was confident that his regime could overcome Taiwan’s material disadvantage in the fierce and prolonged cross-Strait competition. The following will outline what I call here a strategy of national spiritual mobilization.

### ***“Five Beliefs” of ‘Ideology, Leader, State, Duty, Honour’***

By early 1949, CKS acknowledged that the mainland phase of the civil war was lost and concluded that the main reason for the KMT’s failure was the lack of both revolutionary commitment and integrity, which showed itself in myriad ways, not least corruption and factionalism.<sup>58</sup> CKS had earlier made a similar point about the spiritual failure of the Nationalists in his famous 1932 utterance. As he put it then, ‘[t]he Revolution has failed. My only desire today is to restore the revolutionary spirit that the Chinese Kuomintang (KMT) had in 1924’.<sup>59</sup>

Given the threat of imminent invasion by Beijing in 1949 and early 1950, one of

---

<sup>57</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), “The Importance of Military Philosophy to the Military Commanders”, in *Military Speeches of Chiang*, Vol.3, p.1341.

<sup>58</sup> Thomas A. Marks (1998) *Counterrevolution in China: Wang Sheng and the Kuomintang* (London: Frank Cass), p.130.

<sup>59</sup> Lloyd E. Eastman (1974) *The Abortive Revolution: China under Nationalist Rule, 1927-1937* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), p.1.

the fundamental challenges to Taiwan's national security was the low morale and defeatism rampant among his forces by then. CKS indeed described the ROC on Taiwan as a “subjugated state” (*wang guo*) and demanded that his KMT government should restore the revolutionary spirit against the CCP.<sup>60</sup> It was clear in CKS's mind that the revolutionary spirit was vital for his overall national strategy since before he could gain any foreign assistance he would need to instil among his supporters a fresh revolutionary spirit and advance the reform of the KMT as well as the armed forces so that all would subscribe to the notion of virtuous revolution in the pursuit of national restoration.

The “Five Beliefs” doctrine was derived from this need to revive the revolutionary spirit. It was constituted by “ideology”, “leader”, “country”, “duty” and “honour” (*zhuyi, lingxiu, quojia, zeren, rongyu*), which had in the past been mainly invoked to underpin military education by building up invisible spiritual power (*wuxing zhanli*) of the ROC revolutionary armed forces to pit against tangible material power (*youxing zhanli*).<sup>61</sup> Addressing his generals in March 1953, CKS set out the “Five Beliefs” doctrine by referring to the motto of the US Military Academy (duty, honour, country) but he added “ideology” and “leader” to fit the revolutionary purpose of the ROC armed forces in the particular context of cross-Strait confrontation.<sup>62</sup> Ever since then, the “Five Beliefs” doctrine has underpinned the training and preparations of Taiwan's armed forces under the Nationalist governments.<sup>63</sup>

First, regarding itself as a revolutionary government, the CKS administration instilled “ideology” as the leading ideational foundation for Taiwan's armed forces. According to CKS, this was because this ideology, the Three Principles of the People (*San Min Zhu Yi*), represented the fundamental guideline for

---

<sup>60</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) “Mission and Goal of My Return”, at <http://zh.wikisource.org/zh/復職的目的與使命>

<sup>61</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1953) ‘Spirit of American Armed Forces and the Necessary Belief of Chinese Revolutionary Soldiers’, in Zhang Qi-yun (ed.) (1984) *Complete Collections of President Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: Chinese Culture University Press), Vol.2, pp.2271-2276.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> On 1 July 2007, the DPP government officially removed the ‘ideology’ and ‘leader’ but kept the other three of the ‘Five Beliefs’ doctrine, in terms of nationalizing the ROC armed forces.

‘national reinvigoration and state construction’.<sup>64</sup> As CKS put it, ‘[b]eing a revolutionary, despite the hardship and the seemingly unbearable risks, we should devote ourselves sincerely to implementing the ideology with our heart and soul by sacrificing personal interests, affairs, sentiments and even our life for the purpose of national restoration which will eventually see the Three Principles of the People win over communism.’<sup>65</sup> Second, the idea of “leader” was related to the relationship between the President of the ROC and the loyalty of the ROC armed forces. The demand for the armed forces’ loyalty was made because the ‘leader’, or the President, was the agent who alone represented the state and gave meaning to the ‘ideology’.<sup>66</sup> In this regard, CKS had obviously learned a hard lesson in the Chinese civil war, in which he blamed his forces for their treason to the leader, namely himself.<sup>67</sup> Thirdly, the concept of “country” involved a sentiment of patriotism. The core of patriotism, according to CKS, was to be able to sacrifice a small ego (*xiao wo*), the individual, for a big ego (*da wo*), the state, since the existence and value of the individual would fundamentally rest on the survival and development of the state.<sup>68</sup> Fourth, the belief in “duty” was about the obligations of a professional soldier. As CKS explained, the duty involved, from a micro perspective, a sense of moral commitment to the soldier himself and his job and from a macro perspective, it was related to carrying out whatever task was demanded by the country and the revolution.<sup>69</sup> Finally, the belief in “honour” was a sense of honesty, self-respect and integrity. As CKS bitterly pointed out, the Nationalist military failure on the mainland was closely related to the disgrace, dishonesty and defeatism of his armed forces themselves.<sup>70</sup>

In short, the purpose of the “Five Beliefs” doctrine was to equip Taiwan’s armed forces with revolutionary spiritual zeal and power. CKS had witnessed

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) “Mission and Goal of My Return” (my own translation).

<sup>66</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1953) ‘Spirit of American Armed Forces and the Necessary Belief of Chinese Revolutionary Soldiers’.

<sup>67</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) “Mission and Goal of My Return”.

<sup>68</sup> Xu Cheng-xi (ed.) (1995) *Beliefs of The ROC Armed Forces* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Li-ming Wen-hua Publisher), p. 94.

<sup>69</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1953) ‘Spirit of American Armed Forces and the Necessary Belief of Chinese Revolutionary Soldiers’

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, p.88.

the ideational influence as an energizing factor for establishing a powerful and effective force when his Whampao cadets were vanquishing the warlords in their early combat (1926-1927). Analyzing the Nationalist military failure against the CCP in the late 1940s, CKS admitted that he had not put sufficient efforts into ideational education for his armed forces and as a result they lacked the discipline and spirit that a revolutionary force should have.<sup>71</sup> It was with this understanding that he decided to devote great effort to restoring the revolutionary spirit of his armed forces on the basis of the “Five Beliefs” doctrine so as to prevail against the hitherto victorious PLA.

### ***Anti-communism***

To understand CKS’s national grand strategy, it is important to appreciate his revolutionary-centred perspective on national reconstruction and his embrace of the political ideology of the Three Principles of the People, which is associated with hard-line anti-communism. CKS started his career as a revolutionary officer in Sun Yat-sen’s Nationalist revolution. Soon after Sun’s death, he assumed the Nationalist leadership and, against heavy odds, defeated the warlords with his revolutionary forces to unite China. Despite experiencing numerous rebellions and much social conflict, economic depression and foreign invasions, CKS had been a political-military strong man who managed to dominate China for 25 years until 1949, when the Nationalists were driven off the mainland by the CCP, leading him to take refuge in Taiwan. His career had its highs and lows, but one thing is certain, as Steve Tsang observes: that CKS genuinely believed in the revolution and behaved as a revolutionary whose commitment to unify and establish China as a powerful modern state along the lines of the Three Principles of the People never wavered.<sup>72</sup> CKS’s devotion to the cause of the Chinese revolution can be seen from a statement made by himself:

---

<sup>71</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1953) ‘Spirit of the American Armed Forces and the Necessary Belief of Chinese Revolutionary Soldiers’.

<sup>72</sup> Steve Tsang (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang’s Policy to Reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, Steve Tsang (ed.) (1993) *The Shadow of China: Political Developments in Taiwan since 1949* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press), pp.49-50.

‘The only purpose in my revolutionary career is the realization of the teaching of the *Tsung-li* [Sun Yat-sen]. That is to say, we must make our party a revolutionary and democratic party, our government a modern constitutional government based on the exercise of the five powers and the principle of efficiency and integrity and our country into a country where the Three Principles of the People prevail.’<sup>73</sup>

Taking refuge in Taiwan to continue the Chinese civil war, CKS defined the situation as “the third phase of the Nationalist revolutionary” whose central mission was to eliminate the Chinese Communists in the pursuit of Chinese unification under the Three Principles of the People.<sup>74</sup>

Every revolution needs the guideline of an ideology to make sense of the complex world, for which revolutionaries strive, and take action in response. The core values of CKS’s so-called third phase of the Chinese national revolutionary mission rested on the ideology of the Three Principles of the People (nationalism, democracy and social well-being), or collectively the San-min Doctrine, which also appears in the national anthem of the ROC. The San-min Doctrine is a set of interrelated ideas developed by Sun Yat-sen to make China an independent, free and prosperous nation.<sup>75</sup> In 1947, it was the state ideology, officially incorporated into the Constitution by the government of the ROC. According to Article 1 of the ROC Constitution, ‘The Republic of China, founded on the Three Principles of the People, shall be a democratic republic of the people, to be governed by the people and for the people.’<sup>76</sup> The San-min Doctrine, as CKS put it, should be upheld as the highest guiding principle for the Chinese revolution, as well as the blueprint for the KMT in the missions of national reconstruction and regeneration during the third phase of the Chinese

---

<sup>73</sup> Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival: The Foreign Policy and External Relations of the Republic of China on Taiwan* (London: Sherwood Press), p. 70.

<sup>74</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) “The Mission and Goal of My Return”.

<sup>75</sup> Sun’s political thoughts can also be found in his various writings, e.g. “The Five-Power Constitution” (wu-quan xian-fa), “The Programme of National Reconstruction” (jian-quo fang-lo) and “The Theory of Sun Yat-sen” (sun-wen xue-shou). Most of Sun’s writings and speeches can be found in the ‘Complete Works of the President’, 12 vols, by the Central Committee of the Kuomintang, Taipei, 1956. For a useful brief discussion of the Sam-min Doctrine, see in Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival*, chapter 2, pp.56-77

<sup>76</sup> Constitution of the Republic of China, from <http://www.gio.gov.tw/info/news/constitution.htm> (accessed on 19 August 2010)

revolution.<sup>77</sup> It was clear to CKS that the task of the Chinese revolution had not been completed, as the state ideology of the San-min Doctrine could not be implemented on the Chinese mainland. Moreover, from CKS's point of view in Taipei, the ROC Nationalist government, founded by Sun Yat-sen as the legitimate successor of the Qing Dynasty, represented the Chinese orthodox tradition whereas the PRC's communism-rooted regime was a "heresy" which, given the later Cultural Revolution, not only destroyed China's cultural heritage but also amounted to "immorality". CKS obviously intended to define the cross-Strait confrontation as a sign of the revolutionary ideological competition between Sun's Three Principles and communism, rather than as a personal or party level power struggle.

Because he saw himself as the political heir of Sun Yat-sen, CKS's determination to put his heart and soul into implementing the San-min Doctrine should never be ignored – in fact it was what made him adopt the anti-communist perspective which decisively shaped Taipei's grand strategy. CKS's ideological perspective on the ongoing Chinese revolution was straightforward and consistent. From his point of view, the Chinese Communist government was not only the "puppet" regime of the USSR but also a disaster for the Chinese people and their culture; accordingly, Taipei's anti-communist policy was the key to ensuring Chinese national survival and development.<sup>78</sup> For him, the very meaning of the existence of the ROC and Taiwan lay in concluding successfully the cross-Strait political-military confrontation with reference to the San-min Doctrine. Moreover, the doctrine was vital in justifying his war against the Communists, and was meant to build up a strong spiritual force to underpin the political and social mobilization of his people. He disagreed profoundly with most rational observers, including American government representatives, who believed that Taiwan's national material capacity was too limited to carry out his ambitious national restoration to overthrow the Chinese Communist regime. That CKS relentlessly pursued the unlikely national restoration mission and rejected any idea of abandoning his revolution as a trade-off for assurances regarding

---

<sup>77</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) "The Mission and Goal of My Return".

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

Taiwan's security can be best understood by his ideological faith in the San-min Doctrine. Accordingly, Taipei's national grand strategy could be understood by the grounds of the San-min Doctrine, CSK's views on state identity, his revolutionary experience and his personality.

### ***Optimism***

To understand CKS's perspective on Taiwan's grand strategy, it is also important to take into account his distinctive optimism as regards the revolutionary war against the PRC. A conviction that his forces could hold on to the offshore islands, for instance, was the most obvious display of this optimism, which was understood in Taiwan as building on confidence, imagination and courage. When the Chinese Communists established the PRC in Beijing, CKS declared that 'we should not be discouraged by our past military failure. I would not admit that the war against the Communists has been lost. The whole war is not finished until the last shot is fire.'<sup>79</sup> CKS's confidence was derived not only from his belief in the supremacy of the San-min Doctrine but also his calculation that the developing strategic situation was turning in his favour. Well before the two Strait crises, the ROC secured a victory in the Jinmen campaign in October 1949 and annihilated the Chinese invasion force of 15,000 men in October 1949. This was the first significant military defeat of the PLA since the mid-1930s.<sup>80</sup> After the outbreak of the Korean War led the US to re-involve itself in the Chinese civil war, Chiang became more confident over not only the offshore islands but also the security of Taiwan. In an interview, he revealed that the US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles 'promised us that, after our [US-ROC] evacuation of the Dachen Islands, the US would jointly defend Jinmen and Mazu.'<sup>81</sup> In the 1958 Strait crisis, it was believed that 'the overriding reasons for defending the islands

---

<sup>79</sup> Chiang Kai-Shek "Double Tenth Message, October 10, 1949", in You Zi-xiang (2006) *Leaders' Rhetoric*, pp.334-339.

<sup>80</sup> Bernard D. Cole (2006). *Taiwan's Security: History and Prospects*. (London: Routledge), pp.18-19.

<sup>81</sup> For Spencer Davis's interview with Chiang Kai-shek on 24 September 1964, see Jonathan Howe (1971) *Multicrises: Seapower and Global Politics in the Missile Age* (Cambridge: MIT Press), p.170.

[Jinmen and Mazu] were psychological'.<sup>82</sup> Chiang convinced the US, including Eisenhower, that if the ROC lost Jinmen its main forces on Taiwan would "lose their will to fight" and such a loss of morale, Eisenhower thought, would lead to the disaster of having to defend Taiwan and Penghu.<sup>83</sup> Obviously, then, the concerns with respect to morale were a vital factor in US-ROC considerations about playing their strategic hand in the context of the cross-Strait political-military confrontation.

In the words of Edward N. Luttwak: 'the entire realm of strategy is pervaded by a paradoxical logic of its own, standing against the ordinary linear logic by which we live in all other spheres of life.'<sup>84</sup> In other words, in strategy, the ideational factor of imagination is no less important than rational calculation when it comes to dealing with uncertain and illogical phenomena. Without imagination, one would have failed to foresee the outbreak of the Korean War, which drew the US again into the Chinese civil war and helped the ROC to survive even after its disastrous defeat on the mainland. During the 1958 Strait crisis, America found it difficult to understand why CKS insisted on taking an unaffordable risk by concentrating one-third of all his troops on the islands, numbers which seemed to exceed the needs of an efficient defense.<sup>85</sup> However, the perspective of imagination helps indeed to understand that Chiang's bold military and political gamble in this deployment derived in fact from his imagination, which led him to push the US into combat against China. His effort did in the end bring the USA and the PRC to the point of war during the two Strait crises. Some have argued that CKS even imagined that the outbreak of the third World War and rebellion within Mainland China would help him to retake the Chinese mainland.<sup>86</sup> Such thoughts were never borne out in fact, but he eventually pushed the reluctant Americans into the defense of Jinmen and Mazu and enabled his forces to use these offshore islands uninterruptedly as

---

<sup>82</sup> Howe (1971) *Multicrises*, p.172.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>84</sup> Edward N. Luttwak (1987) *Strategy –The Logic of War and Peace* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), p.4.

<sup>85</sup> Tang Tsou, "The Quemoy Imbroglio: Chiang Kai-Shek and the United States", *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol.12, No.4 (Dec., 1959), pp.1077-1078.

<sup>86</sup> Zhang (1992) *Deterrence and Strategic Culture*, p.200.

political-military counterattack bridgeheads for his aggressive outward-looking strategy.

As Jay Taylor observes, CKS was “the ultimate survivor”, as he was always in a weak position in dealing with his allies and enemies.<sup>87</sup> Having fought with the Chinese warlords, the Chinese Communists and the Japanese from the early 1920s, Chiang was well enough able to understand the importance of the morale factor in national strategy. Given his unique personal experiences and his reading of military history, CKS, a professional soldier, firmly believed that superiority of numbers was not always decisive in war. Rather, it was morale that was always vital. Having been victorious over the Chinese warlords and the Japanese but defeated by Mao, CKS was more convinced that superior spirit in war could overcome material disadvantage, e.g. of numbers and equipment, and one should never trust one’s enemy, in particular the Chinese Communists. Courage in facing risks was an optimistic assertion of the superior spirit. As he argued, ‘if one does not dare to take risks, there is no other way to show one’s own spirit. Only when one dares to fight to death against the enemy can one expect to win the battle.’<sup>88</sup> He explained the psychological effect of courage: that ‘if one does not fear the enemy, the enemy will begin to fear him; if one feels scared by the enemy, the enemy will gain courage.’<sup>89</sup> During the two Strait crises, the assertion of courage manifested itself in the strategy of deploying his main forces on the offshore islands in greater numbers than were necessary, which might have been dangerous for the defence of Taiwan. When the US suggested an internationally sponsored ceasefire resolution across the Strait, CKS did not believe at all that it would last and that Beijing would also renounce the use of force. Nor did he accept Zhou Enlai’s “peaceful liberation” announcement in 1956; to him this showed the “art of deception” which the ROC ‘[should] not even consider’.<sup>90</sup> Chiang’s optimistic attitude regarding his Chinese revolutionary mission can be understood in the light of his early personal experiences in China, which had profoundly influenced his perspective

---

<sup>87</sup> Taylor (2009) *The Generalissimo*, p.590.

<sup>88</sup> Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory: Ancient and Modern* (Oakville: Mosaic Press), p.170.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid*, p.443.

<sup>90</sup> Chiang Kai-shek’s state address in the ROC National Birthday, 10 October 1958.

on Taiwan's national strategy. In the end, the endeavour of CKS to impose his optimism on the island became a vital part of his war against the Chinese Communists.

### **C.3.3 Taipei's Management of the Strategic Environment**

It would be impossible to discuss the confrontation across the Taiwan Strait without reference to the ROC's persistent efforts to maintain its legitimacy on the mainland and the PRC's resolute attempts to pursue the integrity of Chinese sovereignty and territory in the international context. Moreover, it turned out to be difficult for both sides to adopt a proper national strategy without paying attention to domestic considerations. During the two Strait crises in 1950s, Mao's intention to seize the offshore islands and Chiang's risky decision to retain these vulnerable possessions hardly follow from "structural" stimuli alone. Both sides rejected categorically the UN intervention and were resolute in regarding the confrontation across the Strait as an internal affair. However, without the structured context of the Cold War background, it would also be difficult to explain why the US became re-involved in the Chinese civil war and went to the brink of war with the PRC for these small Nationalist-held offshore islands. Furthermore, the involvement of foreign states, the US in particular, constructed a regional structured context, which constrained the behaviour of the ROC and the PRC throughout the two Strait crises and fundamentally shaped the ROC's national strategy. Accordingly, further analysis is needed of the way in which the ROC grand strategy was influenced by factors of structure as well as Taiwan's own, so as to fully understand the mutually constructed structure-agent strategic environment. The core of CKS's management of Taiwan's strategic environment can be encapsulated in two themes: the upholding of domestic security and situating Taiwan within the US-led global containment strategy against international communism.

#### ***Upholding Domestic Security***

As Taiwan was the only base of the third phase of his revolutionary mission, CKS's management of Taiwan's domestic security in the 1950s had four strands: the reconstruction of the KMT, political militarization, the military buildup and modernization, and social stability. As regards the reconstruction of the Nationalist Party, Chiang reviewed the weaknesses of the KMT and the strength of the CCP during the Chinese civil war. He believed that the collapse on the mainland 'had resulted from the weakness and mistakes of the Nationalists themselves, rather than from foreign [American] influences'.<sup>91</sup> As he saw it, 'To tell the truth, never, in China or abroad, has there been a revolutionary party as decrepit [*tuitang*] and degenerate [*fubai*] as we [the KMT] are today; nor one as lacking in spirit, lacking in discipline and even more, lacking in standards of right and wrong as we are today. This kind of party should long ago have been destroyed and swept away!'<sup>92</sup> Accordingly, the first objectives in consolidating the KMT's power in Taiwan were to reform the party and to restore its revolutionary character so that it could become an effective instrument to control the country and serve his revolutionary purposes in opposing the Communists. To reform the KMT in Taiwan then, Chiang had first to eliminate such ills as corruption, factionalism, empty talk, lack of revolutionary spirit, selfishness, laziness and bureaucracy, all of which had undermined the strength of the KMT on the mainland.<sup>93</sup> Then, in 1952 Chiang reorganized the KMT as a quasi-Leninist party, which emphasized the important role of ideology, the principle of democratic centralism, the necessity of strict party discipline, the establishment of a party-state and the pervasive presence of party cells throughout society.<sup>94</sup> Consequently, the KMT took over the state and Chiang took over the party.

Second, CKS pursued a unique form of political militarization to consolidate his domestic control in the interests of security. Chiang described it as a move 'to militarize domestic politics and to manage all domestic political programmes by

---

<sup>91</sup> Lloyd E. Eastman (1981) 'Who Lost China? Chiang Kai-shek Testifies', *China Quarterly*, No.88 (Dec., 1981), p.664.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid. It was originally quoted from Chiang Kai-shek (1966) *Collection of the Thoughts and Speeches of President Chiang* (Taipei, 1966), Vol.19, p.291.

<sup>93</sup> Steve Tsang 'Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang's policy to Reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958', p.66.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*

military command.<sup>95</sup> As Monte R. Bullard observes, CKS's methods of political militarization included a combination of authoritarian, elitist/paternalistic and benevolent values. Accordingly, Chiang hoped to accomplish his intended national goals by placing most emphasis on three work areas: education, developing the economy and building a strong national army and police force.<sup>96</sup> In order to legitimize the political militarization, Chiang promulgated early in May 1948 a set of constitutional amendments called *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion* and imposed martial law in May 1949. In this political militarization, the ROC on Taiwan was not only a party-state under the leadership of the KMT but also a military regime under the military command of Generalissimo Chiang. The efforts of Chiang's political militarization in Taiwan reflected his strategic aim of safeguarding the island as a revolutionary base. An intense fear of the communist threats led to this extensive militarization of the political system and social life as well.

Thirdly, similar to Mao's dictum about power flowing from the barrel of a gun, Chiang believed that military strategy was the most important pillar in national grand strategy, which, in CKS's point of view, was generally constituted by politics, economics, society, culture, psychology and military affairs.<sup>97</sup> Chiang knew that the ROC had to build up and modernize its armed forces to cope with its serious numerical disadvantage against the PRC. He was also aware that military excellence could not depend on modernizing his military hardware alone. It needed to be linked to the reinstatement of military software – relating to organization, discipline and morality.<sup>98</sup> It was believed that in the early 1950s Chiang's troops were poorly trained and badly equipped, with low morale as well as a serious shortage of ammunition and spare parts.<sup>99</sup> However, since April 1951, the American military aid programme under Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) had been helping with the reorganization and re-

---

<sup>95</sup> Monte R. Bullard (1997) *The Soldier and the Citizen*, p.58.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> Tien (1992) *Chinese Military Theory*, p.183.

<sup>98</sup> Eastman (1981) 'Who Lost China?' pp.659-661.

<sup>99</sup> Joyce Kallgren (1963), 'Nationalist China's Armed Forces', *China Quarterly*, No.15 (Jul.-Sep., 1963), p.37.

equipment of the ROC's armed forces.<sup>100</sup> Chiang himself formulated three principal areas of reform: (1) the restoration of the national spirit, (2) organizational restructuring and (3) consolidating military units throughout the areas controlled by Taiwan.<sup>101</sup> One of his most important decisions, learning from the Communists, was the re-establishment and reform of the political work system in the military.<sup>102</sup> According to the *Guidelines for the Political Work of the National Revolutionary Army*, the main task of the political work was 'to conduct political education and ideological leadership of the military to build a spiritual armament in order to guarantee the success of the military combat missions.'<sup>103</sup> That Chiang put such huge efforts into the political education of the armed forces reflects his belief in the supremacy of 'the spiritual factor over material ones in war'.<sup>104</sup>

Finally, a state could not have a feasible national security strategy against its enemy without domestic social stability and support. Sun Zi suggested that the most important element of strategic planning was to 'cause the people to be in harmony with their leaders, so that they will accompany them in life and unto death without fear of mortal peril'.<sup>105</sup> After the 28 February 1947 incident, which involved a bloody clash between the Chinese Nationalist regime and local Taiwanese, Chiang's Nationalist government made itself an alien regime on Taiwan.<sup>106</sup> To regain domestic support, Chiang later executed General Chen Yi, then the first Governor of Taiwan, and blamed the Communist conspiracy

---

<sup>100</sup> From April 1951 to December 1978, the US Military Advisory Assistance Group in Taiwan, formally the 8678th American Advisory Unit, was to assess, advise, and assist Taiwan's military, and assigned advisors down to the division level. The first Commander of MAAG in Taiwan was Major General William C. Chase. Further details see Bernard D. Cole (2006). *Taiwan's Security: History and Prospects*. (London: Routledge), pp. 26-27. Chiang Kai-shek also recruited Japanese and German veterans to advise and train his armed forces. See Lin Zhao-zhen (2007) *The Shadow Troop: Japanese White Unite in Taiwan* (Taipei: China Times Press); Lai Ming-tang (1994) *The Reminiscences of General Ming-Tang Lai, Vol. I and II* (Taipei: Academia Historica).

<sup>101</sup> Bullard (1997) *The Soldier and the Citizen*, p.80.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.* This system, under his son Chiang Ching-kuo's control, was first established in 1950 and was named the Political Work Department, later renamed the General Political Warfare Department (GPWD) in 1963. See in Thomas A. Marks (1998) *Counterrevolution in China*, Chapter 4, pp. 124-181.

<sup>103</sup> Bullard (1997) *The Soldier and the Citizen*, pp.80-81.

<sup>104</sup> Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory*, pp. 179.

<sup>105</sup> Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, p. 64.

<sup>106</sup> Detail of the Incident see in Lai Tse-Han, Ramon H. Myers and Wei Wou (1991) *The Tragic Beginning: The Taiwan Uprising of February 29, 1947* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

and “ambitious” Taiwanese for the government’s action. However, with the so-called 228 Incident, the Nationalist government had allowed a serious gap to open up between the Taiwanese and Mainlanders and had lost the support of many local Taiwanese. The incident became ‘the most significant formative experience in preventing the consolidation of a Chinese national identity for the island [Taiwan] over the following decades.’<sup>107</sup> To ensure that Taiwan would be a solid operational base for the restoration of his rule on the Chinese mainland, Chiang knew he needed not only to build up military defence forces and a powerful effective party-state government but also to pursue social stability and support from the Taiwanese society.

The first step in this was the land reform in the early 1950s. At this time, the social and economic conditions of Taiwan still rested on an agricultural basis. Farmers constituted more than three-fifths of the population and more than two-thirds of all farm families were tenants.<sup>108</sup> General Chen Cheng, the Governor at the time, believed that ‘social stability, improvements in people’s livelihood and economic development could take place only through land reform.’<sup>109</sup> Furthermore, to create domestic unity Chiang in the early 1950s applied five interrelated sets of guidelines in Taiwan to secure political socialization: ‘(1) a clear rationale for the requirement of national and party unity, (2) resolute and decisive leadership, (3) persuasive belief in the Communist threat, (4) a powerful belief in the role of ideology [the Three Principles of the People] and (5) an optimistic and determined vision of the role that Taiwan would play in the recovery of the Mainland.’<sup>110</sup> By then, although there were two important domestic incidents, the dismissal of Wu Kuo-cheng (as Governor of Taiwan) in 1954 and of General Sun Li-jen, (the Army Commander) in 1955, the political and military elite remained loyal to Chiang. As Steve Tsang argues, ‘politics in the ROC in Taiwan during the 1950s was conditioned by [the] official policy of recovering the mainland.’<sup>111</sup> Generally speaking, by the time of the two Straits

---

<sup>107</sup> Christopher Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism- National Identity and Status in International Society* (London: Routledge), p.26.

<sup>108</sup> Cheng Chen (1961) *Land Reform in Taiwan*, p.x.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>110</sup> Bullard (1997) *The Soldier and the Citizen*, pp.54-55.

<sup>111</sup> Tsang, ‘Chiang Kai-shek and Kuomintang’s policy to Reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, p.72.

crises in the 1950s, CKS had secured the political and social stability in Taiwan that enabled him to concentrate on dealing with the factors of a structured external context for the practice of his national strategy.

### ***Linking up with America's Global Containment Strategy***

The ROC on Taiwan, compared with the PRC, is a small, weak and vulnerable state.<sup>112</sup> The most obvious fact about small powers is that their security strategy, in terms of foreign policy above all, is governed by the policy of other, major powers and the international system.<sup>113</sup> Therefore, M. I. Handel argues that the most important condition for the security of the weak state is its ability to appeal to other states for support and the most dangerous condition for the weak state is isolation from the international system, or inclusion in the sphere of influence of adversarial great powers.<sup>114</sup> From the structural perspective of formulating a national security strategy, Steven M. Walt suggests: 'When confronted by a significant external threat, states may either balance or bandwagon. Balancing is defined as allying with others against the prevailing threat; bandwagoning refers to alignment with the source of danger.'<sup>115</sup> As the cross-Strait political-military confrontation was zero-sum and ideological in nature, Chiang Kai-shek's strategic preference was obviously "balancing" over "bandwagoning". Three structural factors were fundamentally shaping Taiwan's grand strategy in the 1950s: first, the PRC's relentless threat, second, conditional US assistance and, third, the structured context of the Cold War. All these three structural factors were interrelated and shaped Taipei's decision to link its national security strategy with the American global strategy of containment.<sup>116</sup>

Indeed, Beijing's overall strategy was to push the US forces away from the Taiwan Strait so as to create a favourable environment for either coercing

---

<sup>112</sup> For a theoretical discussion of "weak" states see Michael I. Handel (1981) *Weak States in the International System* (London: Frank Cass).

<sup>113</sup> Jack E. Spence (1967) *Republic Under Pressure: A Study of South African Foreign Policy* (London: Oxford University Press), p.6.

<sup>114</sup> Michael I. Handel (1981) *Weak States in the International System*, pp. 257-258.

<sup>115</sup> Stephen M. Walt (1987) *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), p.17.

<sup>116</sup> For a classic and useful discussion of American containment strategy, see John Lewis Gaddis (1982) *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Taiwan on its terms or “liberating” it, if at all possible. By then, the CCP leadership deemed it a feasible strategy to focus on exploiting differences between CKS and the US about Taiwan’s vulnerable offshore islands in order to undermine their strategic alliance. Mao reasoned then that in view of Beijing’s military threat, the US would eventually force Chiang to withdraw his forces from Jinmen and Mazu since the US would be unwilling to risk a direct war with the PRC.<sup>117</sup> Furthermore, since war with the US was unlikely to break out for what were essentially insignificant offshore islands, it was further believed that Mao’s attack on the offshore islands would also demonstrate his determination to unify Taiwan and boldness in overcoming his country’s fear of the US. As Mao argued, ‘Do not be afraid of ghosts [the US]. The more you are afraid of ghosts, the more likely you are not to survive, to be eaten up by them. We are not afraid of ghosts; that is why we bombard Jinmen and Matsu.’<sup>118</sup> And Mao asserted that the US was trapped on Jinmen and Mazu.<sup>119</sup> As such, the two Strait crises in the 1950s demonstrated that Mao applied military force on the offshore islands to express Chinese anger about the intervention of foreign powers in Taiwan’s affairs, to remind everyone, the US in particular, of the danger of engaging with the PRC, to test and clarify the US commitment, to erode American willingness to intervene and to strengthen his bargaining position.

Chiang’s preference for managing Taiwan’s strategic environment centred on Taipei’s alliance with the US. This was because CKS believed that there was a mutual national interest against the Communists between Taipei and Washington. In CKS’s view, grand strategy referred to “the strategy of allied nations” (*tongmengguo jian di jiti zhanlie*), or alliance politics.<sup>120</sup> The foundation of grand strategy, in terms of his perspective of alliance politics, was based on ‘their mutual interest to promote cooperation in order to take unified

---

<sup>117</sup> He Di (1990), “The Evolution of the People’s Republic China’s Policy toward the Offshore Islands”, p.236.

<sup>118</sup> Mao Zedong, “Talk at the Sixteenth Supreme State Conference”, April 15, 1959, in Stolper (1985), Appendix E, p.154.

<sup>119</sup> Thomas E. Stolper (1985) *China, Taiwan and the offshore islands*, p.128.

<sup>120</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), “The Importance of Studying Strategies in Military Education”, in *Military Speeches of Chiang*, Vol.3, pp.1201-02.

steps and achieve their common goal with their joint efforts.<sup>121</sup> In practice, the primary strategic concerns of the alliance politics involved the confirmation of the common enemy, the methods of dealing with the enemy, and the priority of targets and possible actions.<sup>122</sup> When the Truman administration abandoned the KMT in the late 1940s, Chiang was confident that sooner or later the US would reinvoke itself in the Chinese civil war. As Chiang asserted, ‘[t]ime is the creator of history... Rapprochement and estrangement, gain and loss in diplomatic relations cannot be everlasting and without change. Today’s loss may be the foundation of future gain... Given a prolonged period of time and with power in one’s grasp, international development can all be in one’s hands.’<sup>123</sup> Later, the structured context of the Cold War, the PRC’s hostility against the US, Mao’s policy of “leaning to one [the Soviet] side” (*yi mian dao*) and the outbreak of the Korean War did move the international context in Taiwan’s strategic favour and provided the ROC with the great opportunity to foster its alliance with the US against their common enemy, the Communists. The US had since the early 1950s adopted a hard-line policy to contain, isolate and undermine the PRC. Notably, the US then assisted Taiwan in establishing the second largest military force in the Far East; and the \$ 260 million annual American aid contribution provided two-thirds of the ROC budget.<sup>124</sup> That the US-ROC security alliance was took the form of the ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty in 1954 represented a major strategic triumph for Taipei. The alliance thus became the cornerstone of Taiwan’s grand strategy. Given the evidence of the two Strait crises, as long as the US-ROC security alliance existed, the PRC was unlikely to successfully use military means to coerce or “liberate” Taiwan. However, Chiang was blinded by his confidence in the permanent nature of US-PRC hostility, which derived from shared ideological confrontation and the context of the Cold War. By the late 1960s, the US had started to normalize its relations with the PRC and this eventually posed a serious security challenge (analyzed in Chapter 4) for the ROC.

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Tang Tsou, “The Quemoy Imbroglio: Chiang Kai-Shek and the United States”, *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol.12, No.4 (Dec., 1959), p.1076.

<sup>124</sup> Jonathan Howe (1971) *Multicrises: Seapower and Global Politics in the Missile Age*, p.167.

Chiang's perspective of strategic environment was built on an assumption of Sino-American permanent hostility. This assumption not only failed to grasp the reality of the dynamic nature of international politics, but also led him not to maximize Taiwan's advantage in the two Strait crises of the 1950s, in the light of establishing a practical and stable relationship across the Strait under UN's intervention. Because of recent bitter experience of World War II and fear of a possible nuclear catastrophe, international society became worried that the conflict across the Strait under Taipei's hard-line policy against Beijing might trigger another world war. In September 1958, Dulles implied that America would defend Jinmen with nuclear weapons, while Khrushchev warned that an attack on China would be regarded as "an attack on the Soviet Union". The British Prime Minister Harold MacMillan protested that these small islands did not justify taking the world to "the brink of World War III."<sup>125</sup> Other Western major powers like the UK opposed America's Taiwan policy and would have preferred to see a UN ceasefire arrangement across the Strait. However, under the protection of the US-ROC Mutual Defense Treaty, Chiang took bolder and more aggressive measures to proceed with his die-hard mainland restoration policy, which involved deploying his main forces in Jinmen and Mazu.

Failing to appreciate the advantages of normative constraints on the prevailing use of force in the international system of the Cold War,<sup>126</sup> Chiang firmly rejected the idea of a UN supervised ceasefire which would have internationalized the Taiwan issue and led to de facto separation across the Strait, as in the cases of Germany and Korea. During the two Strait crises in the 1950s, Taiwan had the best opportunity to exploit a favourable international context, not only in relation to the US but also the UN, to enhance its strategic position against the PRC's relentless threat. In dealing with its external threats, a weak state such as the ROC on Taiwan could not afford international isolation. However, Chiang's unrealistic mainland policy and ideological-rooted perspective of international politics ultimately made the ROC government commit itself to a wretched and much less favourable situation in the world: that

---

<sup>125</sup> Wesley M. Bagby (1999) *America's International Relations since World War I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.184.

<sup>126</sup> Handel (1981) *Weak States in the International System*, pp. 258-259.

of an isolated small country continually challenged a much stronger great power.

### **C.3.4 Strategic Offensive Posture for Military Counterattack**

In the 1950s, Taiwan's strategic posture, in military terms in particular, was offensive in nature. The offensive strategic posture was fundamentally derived from CKS's outward-looking strategic choice, as well as his perception of threats. Meanwhile, Beijing's security concerns focused mainly on the threat emanating from the ROC-US anti-Communist alliance, which sought to constrain, isolate and undermine the PRC regime. To enhance the security of the PRC, it was natural for Beijing to apply the mainland's geographic advantage to manipulate the issue of the offshore islands for its political purposes. Beijing's conduct at the very beginning of the 1958 Strait crisis, for instance, was characterized by an active, or offensive, opportunism. As Mao himself explained, his original aim of applying the initial bombardment was to bring about the withdrawal of Chiang's troops from Jinmen and Matsu as a stepping-stone for his ultimate liberation of Taiwan.<sup>127</sup> Mao's offensive strategy was thus designed to test the determination and political will of the ROC and US before irrevocably committing his forces against them. However, when the US and the ROC demonstrated unity and a willingness to hold Jinmen and Mazu in early September 1958, Mao immediately adopted a different strategy whereby he sought to confront the ROC and the US separately. On the one hand, vis-à-vis Mao adopted an offensive strategy that would allow him to reactivate the armed conflict over the offshore islands at any time and in any place, with options of his own choosing; however, because of his concerns about American intervention he tactically left the offshore islands to Chiang and continually exerted military pressure on them, e.g. by bombarding them on odd dates. On the other hand, he confronted the US by engaging in rhetorical assaults. Mao seriously criticized US imperialism and tried to push the US to revise its Taiwan policy, but at the same time, to prevent any direct military clash with the US, he

---

<sup>127</sup> Allen S. Whiting (1975), 'New Light on Mao: 3. Quemoy 1958: Mao's Miscalculation', *China Quarterly*, No.62 (June, 1975), pp.264-265.

appealed for peace and negotiations. In view of the US position, Mao applied a protracted strategy to unify Taiwan, but it was never his intention to allow a rival Nationalist regime to exist on the island.

Given Mao's strategy, Taiwan's grand strategy in the 1950s unsurprisingly was informed by Taipei's perspective on the overt military threat from Communist China.<sup>128</sup> Many people, today more than ever, would argue that Chiang's perception of the Communist threat was exaggerated, since the PRC had neither the capacity nor the intention to invade Taiwan.<sup>129</sup> However, this argument misses the point that at the time the Communist threat to "liberate Taiwan" was real rather than a mere figment of Chiang's imagination.<sup>130</sup> From Taipei's point of view the offshore islands were symbols of its determination to recover the mainland and were a base for initiating raids and blockade operations. In the case of the two Strait crises, Taipei's deep commitment to the offshore islands was designed to create opportunities and to make use of the islands to achieve its ultimate political end – the restoration of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity under the banner of the ROC. Taipei's offensive strategic posture could be better understood more fully by its relentless military preparations and the presumed strategic role of the offshore islands associated with Eisenhower's calculated "Unleash" Policy to check Beijing's offensive posture.

### ***Relentless Military Preparation***

Ever since the Nationalist forces retreated to Taiwan in late 1949, CKS firmly believed that a military clash across the Strait was inevitable. In terms of strategy, he combined defensive and offensive postures in the early 1950s. On 16 June 1950, after the evacuation of Hainan and Chusan, CKS announced that: "our first step is to concentrate all of our military strength. Our second step is to fortify Taiwan and its adjacent islands. Our third step is to launch a counter-

---

<sup>128</sup> Bullard (1997) *The Soldier and the Citizen*, p.27.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>130</sup> Zhang Shu Guang (1992) *Deterrence and Strategic Culture: Chinese-American Confrontations, 1949-1958* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 64-66, 269-270. Bullard (1997) *The Soldier and the Citizen*, pp.27-30;

offensive on the mainland. Our fourth step is to restore the ROC and to establish a free and independent New China.”<sup>131</sup> Even though he rhetorically asserted his commitment to retaking the mainland, Chiang argued that based on ‘the objective circumstances at the time and the strength of our government, we have to realize that unless we concentrate our strength [to defend Taiwan] we could find it difficult to win the final victory.’<sup>132</sup> Chiang even predicted that the Communists would invade Taiwan between July and late September 1950.<sup>133</sup>

By then, Chiang’s major strategic concern was to defend Taiwan rather than the offshore islands - Dachen, Jinmen and Matsu. And there is no evidence in the early 1950s that CKS intended or prepared to fight a decisive war with all his military resources against the PRC on these small offshore islands. In fact, Chiang did not deploy his main forces on the offshore islands until the aftermath of the 1954-55 Strait crisis. General Chen Cheng, Chiang’s most important military and political ally, admitted in the early 1950s that Taiwan’s defense was “barely adequate”. This assessment took account of the manpower strength of the PLA of an estimated 3.7 million, as well as the PRC’s capability to transport 200,000 troops by sea for an assault on Taiwan.<sup>134</sup> Given its numerical disadvantage against the PLA, Taipei’s posture of strategic offence with tactical defence aimed not only to defend Taiwan but also to recover the territory lost against the Communists. As Yang Chih-heng put it, ‘before the signing of the Taiwan-US Defense Cooperation Treaty, Chiang Kai-shek’s military strategy was still predominantly offensive.’<sup>135</sup> Against the advice of the US, CKS insisted on continuing to enlarge his military, maintaining 600,000 personnel in his regular forces during the 1950s. Accordingly, perhaps he

---

<sup>131</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1950) ‘The Evacuation of Hinan and Chusan’, in Chiang Kai-Shek (1952), *Selected Speeches and Messages of President Chiang Kai-Shek, 1949-52* (Taipei: Office of the Government Spokesman), p.35.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>133</sup> Steve Tsang (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT’s policy to reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, p.51.

<sup>134</sup> Tsang (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT’s policy to reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, p.51.

<sup>135</sup> Yang Chih-heng (2003) ‘The Evolution and Adaptation of Taiwan’s Military Strategy’, in Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (ed.) (2003) *Defending Taiwan: The Future Vision of Taiwan’s Defence Policy and Military Strategy* (London: RoutledgeCurzon).

committed 15 percent of Taiwan's GNP and around 85 percent of total government expenditure to the military.<sup>136</sup>

The ROC strategic situation and posture changed dramatically after the US again became involved in the Chinese civil war following the outbreak of the Korean War. Before the US Seventh Fleet began to patrol the Taiwan Strait in June 1950, Taiwan's security situation was precarious; it had adopted a military posture of mixed defence and offence in view of its weak defensive capacity to ensure its survival. On March 1, 1950, the day that Chiang resumed the Presidency, Zhu De, Mao's Commander-in-Chief, announced that the 'elimination of the Chiang Kai-shek regime from Taiwan has become the most pressing task of the whole country.'<sup>137</sup> However, the PRC's imminent invasion was stopped by the outbreak of the Korean War. With US intervention and assistance, the safety of Taiwan and Penghu were basically secured while the more vulnerable offshore islands were still in danger, given their geographical disadvantage and the deliberate ambiguity of US strategy with respect to them. By then, as Robert A. Scalapino says, 'it [the Nationalist military force] is much more than adequate to defend Taiwan at present and much less than adequate to engage the Communists on the continent.... If Taiwan has to be defended militarily, the ultimate burden will surely fall upon the United States in company with the Taiwanese.'<sup>138</sup>

From June 1950 (when the Seventh Fleet began to patrol the Strait) to December 1954 (when the MDT was signed), Taipei's tactical defence posture was also adjusted, with greater emphasis put on offence. After the Communist threat to Taiwan was gradually neutralized on the back of US intervention, Chiang concentrated on improving the quality and quantity of his military forces, shifting towards a more overall offensive strategy that would eventually allow him to recover the mainland. At the same time, Chiang adopted embraced offensive tactics by treating the offshore islands as operational bases from

---

<sup>136</sup> Cole (2006). *Taiwan's Security*, p.24.

<sup>137</sup> Crozier, Brian (1976) *The Man Who Lost China: The First Full Biography of Chiang Kai-Shek* (London: Angus & Robertson), p.354.

<sup>138</sup> Robert A. Scalapino (1960), 'Communist China and Taiwan', in Schurmann, Franz and Orville Schell (ed.) (1967) *Communist China: Revolutionary, Reconstruction and International Confrontation, 1949 to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books), pp.568-569.

which to launch guerrilla activities and harass China's eastern coast. In August 1950, it was reported that the underground guerrillas had fought 1,800 pitched battles, both large and small, with the Communists, inflicting 300,000 casualties.<sup>139</sup> In November of the same year, Beijing reported that it had repulsed a landing attempt by Taipei on the Zhejiang Coast.<sup>140</sup> As Chiang at the time still lacked the military capacity to wage major war on the mainland, small and limited guerrilla activities were the only option that could relieve frustration, boost morale, affirm the existence of the ROC and strengthen the claim to sovereignty over the mainland.

Mao captured the evacuated Dachen islands at the end of the 1954-55 Strait crisis. However, in the event Chiang skillfully relied on what constituted a defensive tactical retreat to win a clear US security commitment regarding Jinmen and Matsu, whose status had deliberately been left ambiguous in the ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty. This was CKS's strategic achievement. Building on US support, Chiang was able to improve Taiwan's overall strategic position, especially offshore islands. Indeed, according to the MDT, the US was not formally committed to defending these offshore islands unless Taiwan or Penghu was threatened. From a military standpoint, in Washington's estimation, Jinmen and Mazu were 'important but not essential to the defense of Formosa'.<sup>141</sup> However, soon after the first Strait crisis, Chiang gradually deployed 100,000 of his best forces, roughly one third of the entire ROC army, on these small offshore islands. As we saw, before the 1958 Strait crisis, he successfully linked the defence of Jinmen and Mazu to the defence of Taiwan. Eisenhower recalled that the US did not have much choice but to help Chiang to defend Jinmen and Mazu in the second Strait crisis, since their loss would "probably" threaten not merely KMT's control of Taiwan but also the American position in the whole of Asia.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Hollington K. Tong (1953) *Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: China Publishing Company), p.522; Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival*, pp.91-92.

<sup>140</sup> New York Times, 17 November 1950, p.5 and 3 December 1950, p.4.

<sup>141</sup> Leonard H.D. Gordon (1985) "United States Opposition to Use of Force in the Taiwan Strait, 1954-1962", *The Journal of American History*, Vol.72, No.3 (Dec., 1985), p 645.

<sup>142</sup> Alexander L. George and Richard Smoke (1974) *Deterrence in American foreign Policy*, p.385.

When Mao Zedong had the PLA attack Jinmen and Mazu during the 1958 Strait crisis, he could not muster more than a wasteful military campaign, since Mao failed to seize any of Chiang's islands. Similarly, the PLA failed to break down the ROC-US determination to defend these islands, or to create a favourable strategic situation. Indeed, Chiang eventually succeeded in extending the US commitment to securing Jinmen and Mazu and retained his offensive posture with reference to his continued military threat to the Chinese coast. Obviously, the offensive military advantage of the offshore islands was conditional on Washington's allowing Taipei to exploit it. As his intention was to remove the PRC threat permanently, however, Chiang seemed to deliberately ignore the fundamental geographic advantage that the PRC enjoyed vis-à-vis these offshore islands and this allowed for the possibility that the PLA might launch an attack whenever it chose.

### ***The Offshore Islands and Eisenhower's "Unleashing" Policy***

Chiang's persistence in holding on to these exposed islands after the 1954-55 Strait crisis derived from his belief in the supremacy of offence and his assumption that, with Washington's military alliance in hand, Taiwan itself was secured from the PLA attack. For Chiang, a defensive posture alone could perhaps have mitigated the Communist threat to the existence of the ROC temporarily but it would not have removed the danger permanently and attain his goal of national restoration eventually. The explicit US security commitment to Taiwan and Penghu under the MDT more or less removed Chiang's fear of an insecure rearguard. Moreover, Chiang was informed that the US would jointly defend Jinmen and Mazu after the first Strait crisis, although the promise was still informal and ambiguous.<sup>143</sup> It seemed that Taipei could keep all that it already possessed. Nevertheless, would Chiang then be satisfied with the status quo across the Taiwan Strait? The answer was no, since for Chiang at this time war against the Communists was not only inevitable but also desirable. Seeking to exploit the US security commitment, CKS's offensive stance against the Communist threat became more pronounced after the 1954-55 Strait Crisis.

---

<sup>143</sup> Howe (1971) *Multicrises*, p.170.

Giving a speech to the KMT's political and military elite in October 1954, Chiang comprehensively outlined his strategy vis-à-vis the PRC. In view of its importance for understanding CKS's offensive strategic posture in the 1950s, it deserves to be quoted in full:<sup>144</sup>

- (1) In terms of the goals of counter-attacking Mainland China and protecting Taiwan within the constraints of the international situation and other factors, Taiwan and the PRC are in competition. Both are looking for the opportunity to defeat the other. War will break out at any time, but no one knows precisely when.
- (2) Taiwan's military preparation[s] will make no distinction between war and peace. Taiwan has to maintain all-out defence readiness in order to deal with a war at all times.
- (3) The recovery of Mainland China means that the Communist Party has to be eliminated. The war may become a long-term affair, certainly if [the] Soviet Russia supports the PRC.
- (4) Public opinion in Mainland China is on the side of the KMT. Once the ROC's armed forces have landed, thousands of thousands of Mainland Chinese will begin to overthrow the Communist regime everywhere.
- (5) The international situation is increasingly favourable to the ROC. Once war with China has broken out, international friends and allies will support Taiwan, not only in protecting the islands themselves, but also in [offering] assistance in the air and at sea near the offshore islands.

Combined, the front forces on the offshore islands and the guerrilla forces on the mainland constituted the two pillars of Chiang's military offensive strategy in the 1950s. On the one hand, deploying his main forces on Jinmen and Mazu was a measure to attain two objectives with a single move. The first objective was to ensure that the reluctant US would become involved in the defence of the offshore islands; the second was to consolidate his defensive as well as

---

<sup>144</sup> Revolution Practice Research Institute (*Ge-Min ShiJian Yanjiu Yuan*) (ed.) (1954) *Party, Administration, Military Cadres, Co-operation: Seminar Conclusions* (Taipei: October 1954), pp.17-18; the translation is quoted from Yang Chih-heng (2003) 'The Evolution and Adaptation of Taiwan's Military Strategy', pp.52-53.

offensive position against the Communists. On the other hand, the ROC claimed that in June 1950 there were some 400,000 guerrillas, due to increase to 1,600,000 in August, who were operating against the PRC on the mainland.<sup>145</sup> These potential guerrillas were either previous ROC supporters or the remnants of ROC forces. They had been either too slow to escape from the troubled mainland, or they had merely not been convinced of the need to do so.<sup>146</sup> While retaining the offshore islands and waging guerrilla warfare, Chiang could hope to wait for a favourable opportunity to launch a counter-attack in Mainland China, either in the event of the Communists making a move that would provoke America or with the onset of a Hungarian-type uprising against the PRC. Mao's calculated but provocative bombardment of Jinmen and Mazu provided Chiang with the opportunity to put his offensive strategy into action. It was reported that Chiang was sensitive to this opportunity and repeatedly said "Good, good, good" when he was informed of Mao's bombardment of Jinmen on 23 August 1958.<sup>147</sup>

Summarizing the insights derived from his own experiences of Chinese civil war, Chinese traditional strategic wisdom and foreign strategic thinking, Chiang formulated his ten principles of war, which had a profound influence on the ROC's military academy and its military doctrines. These ten principles were as follows: (1) target and major point (*mubiao yuanze yu zhongdian*), (2) initiative and flexibility (*zhudong yuanze yu tanxing*), (3) offence and preparation (*gongshi yuanze yu zhunbei*), (4) organization and duty (*zuzhi yuanze yu zhize*), (5) unity and cooperation (*tongyi yuanze yu hezuo*), (6) concentration and thrift (*jizhong yuanze yu jieyue*), (7) manoeuvring and speed (*jidong yuanze yu sudu*), (8) raids and deception (*qixi yuanze yu qidi*), (9) safety and information (*anquan yuanze yu qingbao*) and (10) morale and discipline (*shiqi yuanze yu jilV*).<sup>148</sup> Among these ten principles, Chiang particularly emphasized the principle of

---

<sup>145</sup> Hsieh (1985) *Strategy for Survival*, pp.91-92.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Kao Wen-ke (1991) *Taiwan Yu Dalu Fengyun Sishi Nian* (Forty Years Ever-changing between Taiwan and China) (ChangChun, Kirin: Kirin Wen Shi Publisher), p.70.

<sup>148</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1963) 'Directive on the Decision of the Principles of War', in Chiang Kai-shek (1963) *The Works of President Chiang*, Vol.2 (Taipei: Institute of National Defence Study), p.2612. Quote and translation in Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory*, p.184.

offence for the proposed operations against the Mainland.<sup>149</sup> As Chiang saw it, the ROC was at a manpower disadvantage but could compensate for this by taking the initiative. Accordingly, Chiang asked his officers to take an offensive-oriented perspective on the future war. He said: ‘All in all, in the operation of the counter-offensive against the Communists, we have to emphasize the spirit of initiative, manoeuvre and mobility...in every campaign. Attacks from the front and flank, outflanking attack, [and] unstoppable attacks... [we must] continuously attack with a lightning surprise force, like a rolling stone down a ten-thousand-foot mountain.’<sup>150</sup> This reasoning could have come from Mao. Indeed, Mao also provided a plausible interpretation of the dialectical relationship between defence and offence, saying: ‘A revolution or revolutionary war is an offensive yet also has its defensive phase and retreat. To defend in order to attack, to retreat in order to advance, to take a flanking action in order to take a frontal action, to be devious in order to direct – these are inevitable occurrences in the process of development of many things and military movements cannot be otherwise.’<sup>151</sup>

Before the 1958 Strait crisis, Chiang’s offensive strategy was also encouraged by what amounted to little more than half-hearted efforts by Washington to persuade Chiang to give up the idea of attacking the mainland. Early on 2 February 1953, Eisenhower announced his famous policy of “unleashing” Chiang, which ‘created the impression that Eisenhower’s administration was prepared to rely on a more vigorous strategy to “roll back” communism.’<sup>152</sup> Furthermore, at the time it was argued that ‘important members of his administration favor a policy of improving the offensive as well as the defensive capacity of the Nationalist forces in order to pose a threat to the mainland and keep open the possibility, should favorable circumstance develop, of permitting and assisting the Nationalist to return the mainland.’<sup>153</sup> In December 1954, the

---

<sup>149</sup> Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory*, p.185.

<sup>150</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1965), ‘Carrying Out the Determination and Action of the Counter-attack for National Restoration’, Military Speech of Chiang, Vol.4, p.1647; the translation is quoted from Tien Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory*, p.186.

<sup>151</sup> Tang Tsou and Morton H. Halperin (1965), ‘Mao Tse-Tung’s Revolutionary Strategy and Peking’s International Behavior’, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol.59, No. 1 (Mar., 1965), p.89.

<sup>152</sup> George and Smoke (1974) *Deterrence in American foreign Policy*, p.270.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid*, p.274.

MDT and the Exchange of Notes, signed eight days later, clearly encouraged Chiang to take bolder measures against the Communists, despite the defensive character of the pact and his military weakness vis-à-vis the PLA.<sup>154</sup> When Chiang asked Eisenhower to support his counter-attack policy in April 1956, Eisenhower wrote back, ‘we do not consider that to involve military force is an appropriate means of freeing Communist-dominated peoples and we are opposed to initiating action which might expose the world to a conflagration which could spread beyond control’. He agreed, however, that ‘we must be prepared to take advantage of any such developments [Hungarian-type uprisings] in an appropriate manner when the time arrives.’<sup>155</sup> Understandably, Chiang would interpret this US policy in accordance with his mainland recovery policy and assume that “the international situation was increasingly favorable to the ROC”.

However, in practice, Chiang’s desire during the two Strait crises to apply an offensive strategy, to wage counter-offensive actions and to escalate the Strait crisis, was consistently discouraged by the US, although Eisenhower was half-hearted support CKS’s initiation to check Beijing. The US was obviously aware that the escalation of the Strait crisis was likely to trigger a major war in the Asia-Pacific that would serve Chiang’s interests but damage those of the US. As John Foster Dulles mentioned, the Nationalists would be very likely to ‘view this [Washington’s military retaliatory action] as a golden opportunity for recovering the mainland as the outcome of a war between the US and Red China.’<sup>156</sup> O. Edmund Clubb concluded that ‘the Nationalists were far too weak to engage the Communist armies in open warfare and could only hope that the US would fight the war on their behalf.’<sup>157</sup> Despite CKS’s declaration that ‘he only needs America’s logistic support and does not want America to fight on his behalf’<sup>158</sup>, it became obvious that American assistance was an indispensable

---

<sup>154</sup> Leonard H.D. Gordon (1985) “United States Opposition to Use of Force in the Taiwan Strait, 1954-1962”, p.638.

<sup>155</sup> Gordon (1985) “United States Opposition to Use of Force in the Taiwan Strait, 1954-1962”, pp. 642-643.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid, p.648.

<sup>157</sup> O. Edmund Clubb (1959) “Formosa and the Offshore Islands in American Foreign Policy, 1950-55,” *Political Science Quarterly*, LXXIV, No.4 (December 1959), p.531.

<sup>158</sup> Qi Mao-ji (1991) *Chiang Kai-shek and Taiwan’s Security* (Taipei: Li-Ming Culture Publisher), pp.9-10.

part of Taipei's offensive strategy. Chiang's extensive military and economic dependence on the US eventually allowed the US to constantly constrain CKS's offensive strategy to a reasonable extent. In the ROC-US Communiqué of 23 October 1958, under US pressure at the end of the second Strait crisis, Chiang first publicly renounced the use of force to bring about the restoration of freedom to the people on the mainland. However, this renunciation soon proved a half-hearted statement rather than a significant change of his offensive strategy.<sup>159</sup> In June 1962, for instance, Chiang again actively prepared to launch a military attack on the mainland while the PRC was experiencing the domestic chaos in the aftermath of the Great Leap Forward. Although 'no one seriously expects Chiang Kai-shek to return to the mainland'<sup>160</sup>, Chiang was always looking for ways to push forward his offensive strategy to return the mainland at the first obvious opportunity.

### **C.3.5 Conclusions: Taiwan's Grand Strategy under Chiang Kai-shek in the 1950s**

The 1954-55 and 1958 Taiwan Strait crises highlight the strategic role for Taipei of the offshore islands, mainly Jinmen and Mazu, and this provides valuable empirical evidence to examine Taiwan's grand strategy under Chiang Kai-shek's administration in the 1950s. In reviewing the legacy of the two Strait crises and why these small offshore islands were of such vital strategic concern to the ROC, four important features of CKS's national grand strategy have been distinguished, as follows: an outward-looking strategic choice, his belief in spiritual supremacy, jumping on the coattail of America's global containment strategy, and his perspective regarding the value of a strategic offensive posture.

First, Taiwan's grand strategy was in the 1950s fundamentally characterized by CKS's preference for an outward-looking strategy which was designed to

---

<sup>159</sup> Chiang's interpretation of the communiqué was contrary to that of the US. See Gordon, Leonard H.D. (1985) 'United States Opposition to the Use of Force in the Taiwan Strait, 1954-1962', pp. 652-653.

<sup>160</sup> O. Edmund Clubb (1959) "Formosa and the Offshore Islands in American Foreign Policy, 1950-55," p.531

restore the ROC on the Chinese mainland, not only on Taiwan. From CKS's point of view, the offshore islands and Taiwan were both only a springboard to his ultimate goal of achieving the cross-Straits national restoration of China. To understand Chiang's outward-looking strategy in the 1950s requires a clear sense of the deadlock brought by the incompatible political ambitions of Chiang and Mao: Chiang's objective of "recovering" the mainland as opposed to Mao's goal of "liberating" Taiwan. Chiang emphasized the importance of waging total war, whereas Mao manipulated a strategy of limited war in the offshore islands. Both sides intended to proclaim to international society that the Chinese civil war was still unfinished. Chiang's perspective embracing total war associated with his outward-looking strategy made him willing to take the serious risk of deploying his major forces on Jinmen and Matsu, so as to secure these small and vulnerable offshore islands as a means to claiming the ROC's legitimate sovereignty over Mainland China.

Second, in the cross-Straits zero-sum competition, it is difficult to understand how Taipei could have been so determined and convinced of its final victory against the PRC, unless one can appreciate CKS's belief in spiritual supremacy. In reviewing CKS's public speeches about his national restoration plans, one can see that he particularly emphasized the power of ideational factors, which were designed to allow Taipei to overcome the inferior material capabilities. CKS's endeavor to equip Taiwan with the presumed ideational powers for his revolutionary war can be understood by what I have called his strategy of national spiritual mobilization, whose contents are constituted by three main themes: the "Five Beliefs" doctrine for his armed forces, Sun Yat-sen's San-min doctrine that is strongly associated with anti-communism, and his distinctive optimism for his so-called third phase of the mission to further China's national revolution. However, it would be naïve to claim that these ideational forces alone could capture the big picture of CKS's national grand strategy against the PRC. Other factors, e.g. military preparations, domestic security and the international structure, also proved important influences on CKS's grand strategy.

Third, CKS's ways of upholding domestic security and abiding by Washington's global containment strategy are also important for understanding Taiwan's grand strategy in the 1950s. To engage the external communist threat, Chiang had in the first place to consolidate his fragile regime on Taiwan, since the domestic situation at the time could be described as politically and socially fragmented and economically chaotic. Chiang did learn the lesson of his defeat on the mainland and focused on four strategies to establish domestic security: KMT reconstruction, political militarization, a military buildup and modernization, and social stability. The state of war and the state of emergency against the PRC justified the need for martial law and the restriction of civil liberties, and accordingly legitimized the dictatorship of the KMT and CKS in Taiwan. However, a small state such as the ROC on Taiwan was still unlikely to fight alone against a strong power such as the PRC. Accordingly, three interrelated structural factors fundamentally shaped Taiwan's grand strategy in the 1950s: namely, the PRC's relentless threat, the US-ROC Mutual Defense Treaty and Cold War dynamics. And Taipei's way of managing these three structural factors was encapsulated in CKS's strategy of supporting Washington's global containment strategy.

Fourth, the predominant factor in Taiwan's decision making in the 1950s was the overt military threat from the Mainland. Taipei's strategic posture to deal with the Communist threat was in general oriented towards offense. Before the US Seventh Fleet patrolled the Taiwan Strait, the priority in Taipei's national strategy was to ensure Taiwan's continued survival. Soon after the first Strait crisis, however, the US explicit security commitment to Taiwan, Penghu, Jinmen and Mazu, enabled CKS to take a more offensive posture in dealing with the Communist military threat. Furthermore, during the intervening period between the two Strait crises, Chiang's offensive strategy was also encouraged by the half-hearted efforts of the US to persuade Chiang to give up the use of force as a means to constrain Beijing's international activity for Washington's interests. Only at the end of the 1958 Strait crisis, when he was under pressure from the US, did Chiang publicly renounce the use of force in the confrontation across the Taiwan Strait, albeit not wholeheartedly. By contrast, the PRC has never renounced the use of force and this has given the PRC a vital strategic

advantage – the flexibility to apply defensive as well as offensive measures to deal with dynamic strategic challenges.

In short, Taiwan's grand strategy in the 1950s is distinguished by CKS's outward-looking strategic choice, an emphasis on spiritual supremacy, the dominating structural factor of the US global containment strategy, and the rigid belief in the usefulness and importance of pursuing an offence-oriented strategy. All these four factors are reflected in CKS's perspective on sovereignty that the ROC was to be seen as "China" and represented the only legitimate government of China as a whole against the newly established PRC. While the ROC managed to withstand Mainland pressure in the two Strait crises, Taipei failed to discover, or to admit, to a strategic reality – that Taiwan alone was too small and lacked the available capabilities to recover the Mainland in the long term. The two military confrontations across the Strait in the 1950s were crises, but also provided a precious opportunity for the ROC to internationalize the Taiwan issue in order to secure its de facto sovereign status in the international context. However, already at the time Chiang's perspective against the PRC was isolating the ROC from the mainstream of international society, which tended more and more to accept the legitimacy of the PRC's existence. Taipei's rigid stance in relation to the lack of international legitimacy of the PRC was thus soon counter-productive. This would later impact on Taiwan's national strategy when the US started to normalize its relations with the PRC.

## Chapter 4

### The Beginning of Taiwan's International Isolation: The Nixon Shock

#### Introduction

The relations between the Republic of China (ROC), the United States, and the People's Republic of China (PRC) were an unusual phenomenon of international politics during the 1950s and 1960s. Although the ROC controlled only a very small part of China and was no longer in control of the mainland after October 1949, the US supported diplomatically Chiang Kai-shek's unrealistic claim that the ROC on Taiwan represented the only legitimate government for the whole of China. Accordingly, the US declined at this time to formally recognize the PRC, even though America's major allies, such as the UK and France, did so in 1950 and 1964 respectively<sup>1</sup>. It is obviously ironic that the PRC, covering a territory of 3,690,500 square miles and boasting the world's most populous nation, should not have been recognized by the United States while a small polity, the ROC on Taiwan, was. In the name of China, it even continued to hold a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. By the 1970s, however, many held that Taipei's insistence on its sovereignty claim over all of China turned the ROC leadership into something of a laughing-stock in international society.<sup>2</sup>

This unusual situation can be regarded as a result of Chiang Kai-shek's skilful manipulation of the hostility between China and the US. For decades, Taipei

---

<sup>1</sup> Britain was the first Western power to recognize the PRC on 6 January 1950, but it did not establish full diplomatic relations with the PRC until the two countries had exchanged ambassadors on 13 March 1973. For details, see Feng Zhong-ping (1994) *The British Government's China Policy, 1945-50* (Keele: Ryburn Publishing), p.134.

<sup>2</sup> Shelley Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (London: Routledge), p. 106.

had effectively obstructed Sino-American relations, aiming to isolate the PRC, so much so that Taipei in fact wielded a vastly greater influence than most countries of its size could do.<sup>3</sup> This success came about generally because Taiwan took advantage of the Cold War context and ideological tensions between the PRC and US. It is also due to Taipei's detailed understanding of the American political system and its ability to make use of a well-organized group in the US Congress and government, as well as deploying a wealth of skills to influence American public opinion. For decades Taiwan successfully dissuaded the US from seeking an accommodation with Beijing and persuaded Washington to mount massive diplomatic campaigns on Taiwan's behalf against the PRC, in the UN in particular. As Nancy B. Tucker observes, 'the manipulation of the United States, a skill developed early by Chinese Nationalist leaders, became fundamental to Taiwan's foreign policy ... No government learned to manipulate the system more expertly than Chiang Kai-shek's regime.'<sup>4</sup>

However, unusual feats often come to a sudden end. In this case, the unusual situation of Sino-American mutual non-recognition ceased due to the dynamic nature of international politics. In effect, Chiang had only limited power to manipulate the US in order to prolong the latter's containment, isolation and weakening of the PRC. The main weakness of CKS's manipulation rested on his assumption that the PRC was America's permanent strategic rival, a rival itself allied irreversibly to Moscow in the bipolar Cold War context. In the event, change in the structure of global alignment was beyond Taiwan's capability to shape; it was Taiwan that lacked the strategic influence to keep the PRC in opposition to the US. The significance of this structural factor had already manifested itself in the fact that the Truman administration would arguably have abandoned the ROC and recognized the PRC as far back as the early 1950s if the PRC had not joined the Korean War against America.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the ROC's unrealistic and uncompromising policy of claiming that

---

<sup>3</sup> Robert A. Madsen (1999), *Chinese Chess: US China Policy and Taiwan, 1969-1979* (PhD thesis, International Relations at Oxford University), p.7.

<sup>4</sup> Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (1993), *Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the United States, 1945-1992: Uncertain Friendship* (New York: Twayne Publishers), pp. 335.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas J. Christensen (1996) *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 106-122.

it represented the whole of China pushed the US into a difficult diplomatic situation, which was to undermine its strategic flexibility in the global context.

For the US, the emergence of Sino-Soviet split in the early 1960s was unexpected, as was the case earlier with the outbreak of the Korean War, which led Washington to reconsider the state of Sino-American relations. The far-reaching international significance of the Sino-Soviet confrontation, escalating greatly in the late 1960s, induced US leaders to rethink the ‘unthinkable’ possibility of Sino-American “rapprochement”, or “normalization”, so as to take advantage of the Sino-Soviet split and to enhance America’s strategic position. Early in 1959, *the Colon Report* suggested that the US should recognize the existence of the PRC, adjust its policy of containing and isolating China and adopt a policy of engagement to split apart the Sino-Soviet partnership, and to replace the ROC in the UN by the PRC.<sup>6</sup> Although these reconsiderations still did little to change America’s concrete policy across the Strait in Taipei’s favour during the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, the idea of “normalizing” US-China relations was always mentioned as a feasible option for enhancing America’s global strategic situation.

In the event, surprising many, Sino-American “rapprochement” materialized under President Richard M. Nixon, well regarded as a strongly anti-communist politician who even had backed General MacArthur’s efforts to extend the War in Korea to Communist China. Soon after assuming the Presidency, Nixon initiated new contacts by high officials on both sides in 1969. He also assigned Henry Kissinger to undertake a secret trip to Beijing in 1971, and himself became the first American President to visit Communist China on 21 February 1972. These developments took Taiwan by surprise; the Nixon shock provoked a crisis that virtually challenged all the major elements of Chiang Kai-shek’s national grand strategy, which was still centred on his outward-looking strategic choice. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on examining the causes and implications of this decisive change in Taipei’s strategic environment for

---

<sup>6</sup> US Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations (1 November, 1959), *United States Foreign Policy: Asia*, a research report to the Committee, by Colon Associated, Ltd. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), pp. 145-155.

Taiwan's grand strategy, the way in which Taipei responded to the US-China diplomatic rapprochement and its major impact: Taiwan's international isolation.

#### **C.4.1 Unfavourable Changes in the Strategic Environment – Détente in Sight**

One of the principal tasks of managing the strategic environment is to exploit or, if possible, create an advantageous structural context, which can more feasibly and efficiently produce the outcome most preferred for an agent's proposed strategic objectives. From the 1960s to the early 1970s, Taiwan's major concern was centred on transformation of the strategic environment. The key challenge was to respond to Sino-American rapprochement in the late 1960s, which in many ways was the consequence of Nixon's strategy of global détente. Motivated by the desire both to extricate the US from the Vietnam War and to quash any possibility of superpower nuclear confrontation, the Nixon administration sought to rely on Sino-American and Soviet-American détente in the context of these states' triangular relations to achieve the said twin aims: to extricate US forces from Vietnam and to build a stable structure of peace.

However, Nixon's strategy of détente and Sino-American rapprochement were a decisive shock for Chiang Kai-shek's regime, which still regarded the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) as an irreconcilable ideological enemy; not only as a threat to the existence of the ROC and the "free world" but also as a wholly illegitimate regime. While Nixon's détente policy opened the door to integration into international society to the PRC, America's subordination of the ROC's international status to ensure that Sino-American détente was the starting point for the ROC's more pronounced international isolation. Facing this challenge, Taipei's response rested on two major beliefs: (1) that Washington's security commitment to Taipei would not change, and (2) that international politics was still bipolar in nature deriving from an irreconcilable ideological competition between the communist and anti-communist camps. These beliefs, associated

with CKS's continuing zero-sum competition over sovereignty with the PRC, which allowed for no flexibility to the arrangement of possible co-existence across the Strait, eventually reinforced the ROC's international isolation. In order to understand the impact on Taiwan's grand strategy, this section will examine Nixon's détente strategy, the Nixon Doctrine and his Sino-American rapprochement in greater detail.

### *The Origin of Détente*

The primary motivation of the Nixon-Kissinger strategy of détente was to reduce the risk of nuclear war.<sup>7</sup> As President Nixon asserted 'the two superpowers cannot afford to go to war against each other at any time or under any circumstances'.<sup>8</sup> In Kissinger's words, '[w]e are in favour of détente because we want to limit the risks of major nuclear conflict'.<sup>9</sup> The horrifically destructive power of nuclear weapons, above all the hydrogen bomb, made it unacceptable for the nuclear powers to apply military means on their own terms in pursuing political ends. Obviously, if one cannot either annihilate one's enemy or compel him to act in accordance with one's will to enhance one's own security, eventually both sides may come to believe that the pragmatic strategy in this security dilemma is to learn to live with one's adversary as peacefully as possible. Rejecting Clausewitz's view of war as "the continuation of political activity by other means", Nixon in the era of nuclear warfare believed that 'there can be no real peace in the world unless a new relationship is established between the United States and the Soviet Union ... War is an option whose time

---

<sup>7</sup> In its literal sense the term détente means a "relaxation of tension"; in the diplomatic sense, it represents an easing of strained or tense relations between states. As early as 1963, J. F. Kennedy had already used détente to describe the process of relaxing tensions with the Soviet Union. For discussions on the meanings and uses of détente, see Raymond L. Carthoff (1994) *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Regan* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution); Robert S Litwak (1984) *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); and Richard C. Thornton (1989) *The Nixon-Kissinger Years: Reshaping America's Foreign Policy* (New York: Paragon House).

<sup>8</sup> Richard Nixon(1983) *Real Peace* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson), p.1.

<sup>9</sup> Henry Kissinger (1973) "Interview at Peking, November 12", *Department of State Bulletin*, Vol.69 (December 10, 1973), p.716.

has passed. Peace is the only option for the future'.<sup>10</sup> At the high tide of the Cold War with the decline of American global power in the late 1960s, it was this perspective of emphasizing the theme of peace, rather than war that underpinned the new relationship of the superpowers which prompted the Nixon-Kissinger focus on détente.

However, the pursuit of peace was not the only objective of Nixon's détente strategy; the content of this peace was an equally vital matter. As Nixon insisted, 'The peace we seek must be coupled with justice' and 'the West must adapt its policies to the realities of the world today'.<sup>11</sup> Nixon's conditions for peace, corresponding to American justice and recognizing international conditions, explain why Nixon asserted there were always intractable differences and inevitable competition between the two superpowers. Nixon later referred to his détente as a 'hard-headed détente' which '... does not mean that the United States and the Soviet Union *agree* [on some crucial matters, e.g. ideology]. Rather it means that we profoundly *disagree*. It [détente] however provides a means of peacefully resolving those disagreements that can be resolved, and of living with those that cannot'.<sup>12</sup> Even though there were stubborn differences between the US and the Soviet Union, Nixon believed that, from the American standpoint, détente was about 'breaking the ice, where that is possible, and trying to approach our differences rationally'.<sup>13</sup> The rational negotiation of differences came from a common ground of national interests – avoiding nuclear war and pursuing national prosperity. Nixon explained, 'Our differences make a perfect, ideal peace impossible, but our common interests make a pragmatic, real peace achievable'.<sup>14</sup>

Accordingly, Nixon's détente involved reconciling the goal of national interests with the means of rational negotiation, which can be regarded as the peace-centred neo-classical strategic perspective. From Nixon's perspective, 'Peace is

---

<sup>10</sup> Nixon (1983) *Real Peace*, pp.1-2.

<sup>11</sup> Nixon (1983) *Real Peace*, p.96.

<sup>12</sup> Nixon (1983) *Real Peace*, p.26.

<sup>13</sup> Richard Nixon (1980) *The Real War* (New York: Warner Books), p.288.

<sup>14</sup> Nixon (1983) *Real Peace*, p.17.

not an end to conflict but rather a means of living with conflict.<sup>15</sup> The concept of détente gave rise to profoundly paradoxical relations between egoism and altruism, disagreement and agreement, competition and cooperation and reality and idealism. It was also reflected in Nixon's policy towards China and Taiwan – to normalize relations with the PRC- but concurrently to maintain America's security commitment vis-à-vis Taiwan. Notably, these aspects of détente were designed to negotiate a new mutually accommodating international order, so as to establish a 'stable structure of peace', albeit a conditional and imperfect peace. As such, Nixon's peace-centred strategic perspective of détente for mutual accommodation fundamentally contended with Chiang Kai-shek's classical strategic perspective of insisting on a zero-sum competition between the ROC and the PRC. The difference in the end not only isolated Taipei from the mainstream of international society but also brought about the beginning of the end as regards diplomatic relations between Taipei and Washington.

### ***The Nixon Doctrine***

When in Guam in July 1969, Nixon enunciated a new overall principle of American foreign involvement, later known as the Nixon Doctrine, which was a logical complement to the notion of détente. Most closely relevant to crises in the peripheral areas of American allies and friends, the Doctrine consisted of three guidelines for American intervention: first, keeping the assurance of American treaty commitments; second, providing a shield for American allies or countries vital to American security against nuclear threats; and third, in cases of non-nuclear aggression, looking 'to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for defense'.<sup>16</sup> The third guideline, in fact, was the core of the Doctrine, which put a precondition on American interventions and distinguished Nixon from his predecessors who had Americanized their foreign interventions, in particular in the Vietnam War. 'At the heart of the Nixon Doctrine', in Nixon's own word,

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, p.4.

<sup>16</sup> For full details of Nixon's remarks in Guam, see US President, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, 1969* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1971), pp.544-56.

‘is the premise that countries threatened by communist aggression must take the primary responsibility for their own defense.’<sup>17</sup>

The emphasis on winning public support through minimizing American casualties was a unique character of the Nixon Doctrine. The major goal of the Doctrine was not designed ultimately to win wars such as the Vietnam War. In the latter case the goal was instead to “negotiate an honorable extrication” of American combat forces from the War by all possible means.<sup>18</sup> Emphasizing the “primary” role of indigenous forces, no matter how inadequate they were, the doctrine, in effect, was a solution to minimize American casualties sustained in US military intervention. This political sensitivity to casualties resulted from the characteristic of modern liberal democratic politics, in which government policies were fundamentally influenced by domestic public opinion. The impact of “the bodybags effect”, revealing the bloody character of the Vietnam War, devastated American public support for its government’s foreign policy. Understandably, the Nixon doctrine was thus designed to make war less painful, in terms of reducing the risk to US forces, so as to better manage domestic public opinion. As a result, arms transfers and financial aid, instead of military manpower, became the major instruments for Nixon’s administration in continuing American foreign intervention, in Vietnam in particular.

America’s political-military commitments were, however, ambiguous. Even though the first guideline of the Nixon Doctrine pledged that the US would stick to its commitments, ‘the key issue in the Nuclear Age’, as Kissinger argued, ‘was not whether commitments would be kept, but how they would be defined and interpreted.’<sup>19</sup> Litwak observes that Nixon and Kissinger were determined to exploit the Nixon Doctrine’s underlying ambiguity so that Washington’s manoeuvring and ability to discriminate among cases would lead it to not become a prisoner of its declaratory stance.<sup>20</sup> The purpose of the strategic

---

<sup>17</sup> Nixon (1980) *The Real War*, pp.106-7.

<sup>18</sup> Kissinger later recalled and reflected on the lesson that ‘when American commits itself to military action, there can be no alternative to victory’. For the lessons of the Vietnam War, see Henry A. Kissinger (1994) *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone Book), pp. 674-702.

<sup>19</sup> Kissinger (1994), *Diplomacy*, p.708.

<sup>20</sup> Litwak (1984) *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p.124.

ambiguity was to create space for freedom of action so as to both maintain flexibility and regain the initiative in the dynamic domestic and international contexts. Indeed, since the nature of the strategic context was to be full of uncertainty, the doctrine deliberately declined to provide technical details and tangible criteria for American intervention.

In short, the Nixon Doctrine was intended to enable Washington to disengage from painful and unpopular foreign interventions. Nixon asserted, ‘Our objective, in the first instance, is to support our interests over the long run with a sound foreign policy … We are not involved in the world because we have commitments; we have commitments because we are involved. Our interests must shape our commitments, rather than the other way around.’<sup>21</sup> However, the tension between commitment and possible disengagement called into question of American global containment against Soviet expansionism<sup>22</sup>: how then did the Nixon Doctrine help to reconcile the continuous “consolidation” of American commitments with the requisite “retrenchment” of American intervention? Nixon’s solution to this tension rested on the pursuit of an overall Sino-American-Soviet détente, which served as an end to justify Washington’s pursuit of the status quo and as a means to create stable conditions in the peripheral areas to which America was committed. The Sino-Soviet split provided a timely opportunity for America to normalize Sino-American relations, which would provide a new structural context favourable to the US. In the event, Sino-American rapprochement fundamentally reshaped Taiwan’s strategic environment, affecting not only Taipei-Washington-Beijing relations but also Taipei’s overall international status in every respect. This structural change put a final end to CKS’s intention of drawing on Sino-American hostility in order to exploit a possible Sino-American military clash for the purpose of pursuing his ultimate mission of national restoration. Nevertheless,

---

<sup>21</sup> US President (1970), *US Foreign Policy for the 1970s: A New Strategy for Peace*. A Report to the Congress by Richard M. Nixon, 18 February 1970 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 119.

<sup>22</sup> Nixon asserted that ‘there can be no détente without containment’. John L. Gaddis observes that there were “striking similarities in the approaches to containment” advocated by George Kennan and Henry Kissinger, in relation to the aspects of threats, interests, response, and public justifications. For details, see Nixon, *Real War*, pp.281-286, and John Lewis Gaddis (1982) *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.307-8.

his priority of restoring the ROC on the mainland, rooted in the question of sovereignty associated with his anti-communism, which still dominated every aspect of Taipei's grand strategy, never wavered throughout the development of the unfavourable structural change.

### ***Nixon's Sino-American Rapprochement***

The Nixon Sino-American rapprochement of the late 1960s already signaled the eventual Sino-American normalization of 1979.<sup>23</sup> The rapprochement not only improved America's global strategic position to contain Soviet expansionism, but also created more favourable regional circumstances in the Asia-Pacific, which eventually allowed the US to disengage from the Vietnam War. The starting point of the rapprochement involved reassessing relations with China, its *de facto* existence of the PRC, and the escalation of Sino-Soviet confrontation.

Nixon's rapprochement served to revise America's hard-line China policy, which was at odds with international developments in the late 1960s. Assuming a monolithic communist world and still suffering from the bitter experiences of the Korean and Vietnam Wars, Washington regarded Communist China as more implacably hostile toward the West than the Soviet Union had been in the 1950s and 1960s.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, the US was very reluctant to recognize the *de facto* existence of Communist China, adopting instead a policy of "containment and isolation" against the PRC which involved supporting the ROC on Taiwan as the only legitimate government of China. However, the escalation of Sino-Soviet confrontation in the late 1960s called into question the policy of the US to "contain and isolate" China. Indeed, neither the PRC's strategic significance nor the increasing Soviet threat could be ignored if Washington wanted to improve its global strategic position, which had been significantly undermined by the Vietnam War. In his article, *Asia After Viet Nam*, Nixon signaled the

---

<sup>23</sup> To deal with the Watergate crisis, Nixon increasingly depended on the support of conservative Congressmen, who firmly supported Chiang Kai-shek's regime, and he ultimately failed to accomplish Sino-American normalization, the recognition of the PRC, during his presidency.

<sup>24</sup> Nixon (1980) *The Real War*, pp.134-35.

possibility of Sino-American normalization in the following words: ‘Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China ... Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations ... There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation.’<sup>25</sup> Nixon’s pragmatic perspective of accepting the existence of the PRC eventually was incompatible with Washington’s long-standing “containment and isolation” policy towards China, which Taipei took too much for granted because it assumed an ideological hostility between China and the US.

The US-PRC détente served as a key element of Washington’s strategy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. Nixon recalled that the Sino-Soviet split was “the most significant geopolitical event since World War II”, which made Sino-American rapprochement possible.<sup>26</sup> The strategic importance of China for Nixon’s détente strategy derived not only from the China’s immense material resources and its vital geographical position, but also from the new Chinese perception of Moscow as Beijing’s primary security threat. In view of this structural change, Nixon stated in September 1968: ‘We must not forget China. We must always seek opportunities to talk with her, as with the USSR ... We must not only watch for changes. We must seek to make changes.’<sup>27</sup> The Nixon Sino-US rapprochement culminated in the Shanghai Communiqué of 28 February 1972, which has provided, in Kissinger’s words, “a road map” for Sino-American relations since then. Indeed, Sino-American rapprochement well reflected Nixon’s sense of seizing a strategic initiative and his determination to exploit the rapprochement as an available means to pursue his overall strategic objective – a “stable structure of peace”.

In order to clarify matters, amid the rumours surrounding US-ROC relations at the time, President Nixon on many occasions publicly promised Taipei that his administration would not abrogate US-ROC diplomatic relations and the US-

---

<sup>25</sup> Richard M. Nixon (1967), ‘Asia After Viet Nam’, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.46, No.1 (October, 1967), p.121.

<sup>26</sup> Nixon (1980) *The Real War*, pp. 133-4.

<sup>27</sup> “Nixon’s View of the World – from Informal Talk”, an interview in *US News & World Report*, no. 12 (September 16, 1968), p.48.

ROC Mutual Defense Treaty (MDT) as a trade-off for Sino-American rapprochement.<sup>28</sup> In Nixon's own words, "I will never sell you [the ROC] down the river."<sup>29</sup> From Washington's perspective on the cross-Strait relationship, following the Nixon-Kissinger logic of détente, Sino-American rapprochement would not in fact harm Taiwan; on the contrary, it could be a win-win game for the US, the ROC and the PRC. It would enable Washington to moderate Beijing's hostility toward Taipei; accordingly, the likelihood of China attacking Taiwan would diminish. Washington already had Mao Zedong's private assurance that China would not use force against Taiwan.<sup>30</sup> As a result, despite the Sino-American rapprochement, Nixon could still hold firm to his proclamation that the US 'could not and should not abandon the Taiwanese' because America was 'committed to Taiwan's right to exist as an independent nation'.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, Nixon's alignment with Beijing signified that the ROC on Taiwan, a peripheral small state, would henceforth play only a marginal role in pursuing US national interests in the global context. In fact, the Nixon administration always worried that Washington's commitment to Taiwan might become a substantial obstacle to the newly prioritized objective – Sino-American rapprochement. In the end, Taiwan's strategic role for the US dramatically shifted from that of being a valuable anti-communist fortress to essentially becoming a strategic burden in the context of America's strategy of global détente.

#### **C.4.2 Continuity in Taipei's Outward-Looking Strategic Choice**

The fundamental changes in Beijing's favour of Washington's cross-Strait policy associated with Taipei's eviction from the UN resulted in a crisis for Taipei that saw Taiwan slip into deeper international isolation. Nevertheless, CKS's particular pursuit of his outward-looking strategy in the context of the

---

<sup>28</sup> Shen James C. H. (1983), *The US & Free China: How the US Sold Out its Ally* (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books Ltd), p.51. Shen was the last ROC ambassador to Washington, where he served for eight years.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> Kissinger (1994) *Diplomacy*, pp.726-9.

<sup>31</sup> Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (2007) *Foreign Policy Making in Taiwan: From Principle to Pragmatism* (Oxon: Routledge), p. 32.

cross-Strait political-military confrontation never wavered. Although he felt obliged to accept Sino-US rapprochement not least in order to continue his country's diplomatic and military alliance with Washington and decided on the ROC's 'honorable withdrawal' from UN to maintain the ROC's national dignity, he never formally compromised Taipei's sovereignty claim over the Chinese mainland. Instead, he always vowed that 'the ROC and the treasonous bandits [the PRC] would never coexist.'<sup>32</sup> There were three domestic determinants of Taiwan's grand strategy at the beginning of Taiwan's intensifying international isolation, namely, Taipei's perception of threat, nationalist sinocentrism and the primacy of Taipei's sovereignty claim<sup>33</sup>, which, when combined, can help to explain CKS's insistence on maintaining his outward-looking strategic choice, despite his awareness of the unfavourable structural change.

### ***Taipei's Threat Perception***

Because of the unfinished civil war between the two rival governments across the Strait, Taipei's perception of national security threat was derived from its understanding of the unlikelihood of peaceful co-existence and Beijing's changing approach to Taiwan: from military liberation to a strategy of diplomatic isolation. As the Sino-American rapprochement drew nearer, one of the most significant characteristics of Mao's cross-Strait strategy was his demonstration of confidence and calculated patience to resolve the Taiwan issue. This characteristic stemmed from the favourable change in the strategic environment and the need to make the most of the change in the international system. In the 1950s, facing the threat of isolation and containment from the US-Taiwanese security alliance, Mao had constantly probed America's real intentions toward China to ascertain whether opportunities existed to "liberate" Taiwan, once and for all. However, the US had demonstrated its determination to defend Taiwan during both the first and second Strait crises and the US-ROC

---

<sup>32</sup> Chiang Kai-shek's 1972 New Year Address, in You Zi-xiang (2006) *Leaders' Rhetoric: Important Speech Collections of Cross-Strait Leaders, 1906-2006* (Taipei City, Taiwan: Wu Nan Publishers), p. 356.

<sup>33</sup> For the point regarding 'the primacy of Taipei's sovereignty claim', see the later analysis in this chapter on the back-firing of Taipei's 'one China' policy.

MDT compelled Beijing to reassess how it could draw on its limited military means to accomplish its ambitious goal of “liberation”. Subsequently in the 1960s, the PRC had suffered the devastating effects of “the Great Leap Forward” and the chaos of “the Cultural Revolution” on the domestic front. Furthermore, under Mao’s “two line” doctrine aimed at both American and Soviet ‘imperialists’ simultaneously, Beijing’s strategic environment was indeed severe and unfavourable by then. Finding it difficult to manage such domestic and international conditions, Beijing desisted from exploring how to “liberate” Taiwan. However, Nixon’s enthusiasm to proceed with Sino-American rapprochement after the late 1960s not only helped Beijing to overcome the dilemma of “opposing two sides [the Soviet Union and the United States]”, but also enabled it to change the nature of the ROC’s relations with the US.

From Taipei’s point of view, this strategy of “killing two birds with one stone” was designed to exploit the current developments in international politics so as to gain Beijing’s objective over Taiwan. There were two substantial steps implementing what amounted to Beijing’s strategy to achieve Taiwan’s isolation. The first was to separate the Sino-American issues from the Sino-Taiwan ones so as to sidestep the Sino-American differences on Taiwan, which might damage the establishment of the Sino-American overall strategic partnership. Mao made this point clearly to the US when he said that, “[T]he question of the US relations with us should be separate from that of our relations with Taiwan.”<sup>34</sup> Second, according to a united-front strategy, Mao was to put forward a doctrine of “one horizontal line” doctrine, which replaced his former “two lines” doctrine, to unite the US, Japan, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey and Europe against Soviet imperialism.<sup>35</sup> Attaining this united front within the international context, in which the US would take the most important role, would create a favourable strategic environment for the PRC against the Soviet threat, as well as isolating Taiwan.

---

<sup>34</sup> William Burr (ed.) (1998) *The Kissinger Transcripts: The Top-Secret Talks with Beijing & Moscow* (New York: The New Press), p.186.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, p.94.

It became obvious that, when Taiwan was isolated from the US and international society, time would be on China's side, giving Beijing the confidence to expect an inevitable victory in the Strait competition. Kissinger, for example, believed that, without American intervention, Taiwan would eventually be absorbed by the PRC.<sup>36</sup> Beijing's confidence may explain why Mao displayed calculated patience on the Taiwan issue in the course of the Sino-American rapprochement. Mao told Kissinger, 'I say that we can do without Taiwan for the time being and let it come after one hundred years. Do not take matters on this world so rapidly. Why is there a need to be in such a great haste?'<sup>37</sup> Kissinger obviously interpreted Mao's calculated patience as a positive signal for peace. He highly appreciated Mao's consideration and patience on the Taiwan issue, since 'Mao asked for no reciprocity for the assurance [renouncing force on Taiwan] America had been seeking for twenty years.'<sup>38</sup> However, Mao's declared patience, claimed to last "one hundred years", was merely an exercise in political expediency and did not signal genuine goodwill in accepting the existence of the ROC. In fact, one should focus on Mao's very next phrases in the above conversation with Kissinger, which revealed his real intention on Taiwan. Mao said, 'It [Taiwan] is only ... an island with a dozen or more millions. As for your [American] relations with us, I think they [ issues of Taiwan] need not take a hundred years.'<sup>39</sup> Ironically, although Washington was still Taipei's ally at this stage, Kissinger applauded Mao's optimism about the disappearance of the ROC and said, 'I would count on that. I think they [issues of Taiwan] should come much faster.'<sup>40</sup>

Mao's isolating strategy was clearly a continuation of "liberating" Taiwan by a peaceful means. Mao's calculated patience was based on two fundamental strategic considerations: (1) as regards the strategic environment – isolating Taiwan from the US and international society; and (2) as regards strategic

---

<sup>36</sup> Van Vranken Hickey (2007) *Foreign Policy Making in Taiwan*, p. 33.

<sup>37</sup> Burr (ed.) (1998) *The Kissinger Transcripts*, p.186.

<sup>38</sup> According to Kissinger, Mao assured Nixon that China would not use force against Taiwan. Kissinger (1994), *Diplomacy*, p.727. However, except for Kissinger's own interpretation of Mao's patience, there would not appear to be relevant other empirical evidence nor public pronouncements on China's part that would serve to underpin Mao's apparent assurances.

<sup>39</sup> Burr (ed.) (1998) *The Kissinger Transcripts*, p.186.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

capability – taking advantage of Taiwan’s limited comprehensive national resources. Mao’s isolating strategy explains why he insisted on separating Sino-American rapprochement from Sino-Taiwanese competition. Mao’s patience was a kind of “indirect approach” in the face of Taiwan’s global anti-communist strategy that aimed to undermine Taiwan’s fighting will. Mao’s strategy of isolating Taiwan also echoes Sun Tzu’s famous doctrine: ‘What is of supreme importance in war is to attack the enemy’s strategy; next best is to disrupt his alliances; the next best is to attack his army; the worst strategy is to attack cities.’<sup>41</sup> CKS’s perception of Beijing’s threat to absorb Taiwan was undeniably correct but the coming international isolation did not shake his outward-looking strategic determination to compete with Beijing. However, CKS’s classical war-centred strategic perspective in the context of cross-Strait confrontation, which followed from his insistence on Taipei’s zero-sum sovereignty claim vis-à-vis the Chinese mainland, prevented him from adjusting to the dynamic international changes and consequently maximized the effects of Mao’s “one line” strategy to isolate Taiwan in the end.

### ***Nationalist Sinocentrism***

To understand the reason for Taipei’s continued embrace of its outward-looking strategy from the 1960s to the early 1970s, it is also important to appreciate Chiang Kai-shek’s perspective on the relationship between his country’s national strategy and traditional Sino-centrism. According to CKS’s definition, ‘National strategy is the art of building and using the national powers (*quo li*) and of developing the national powers in an integrated way (*tonghe li*) so as to achieve the national goals.’<sup>42</sup> In other words, CKS’s perspective on national strategy focuses on ways to create and apply national powers. From CKS’s point of view, the national powers were constituted by five elements, namely, political, economic, social, cultural and military forces, and that the five powers should be aligned and integrated with the basic national goals at any given

---

<sup>41</sup> Sun Tzu (1963), *The Art of War*, tr. Samuel B. Griffith (Oxford: Oxford University), pp.77-8.

<sup>42</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), “The Importance of Studying Strategy in Military Education”, in *The Collection of Military Speech of President Chiang* (Taipei: The Editorial Committee of Zhongxing Speech Collections of President Chiang), Vol.3, p.1202. (My translation)

time.<sup>43</sup> For CKS, Sun Yat-sen's "Three Principles of the People" was the ultimate guide to nation-building. These centred the primary national objectives on three components: nationalism, democracy and social well-being.<sup>44</sup> In the event, one of the above objectives dominated CKS's perspective on national strategy, namely nationalism. The Principle of Nationalism, according to Sun Yat-sen, referred to China's national freedom and independence and was the very foundation of CKS' perspective of international relations that nationalism accordingly had become a decisive part of CKS's national strategy and inspired his unique belief in Sino-centrism. In effect, Taipei's foreign policy should be subordinated to the Chinese "domestic" issue across the Strait, namely, his perspective on sovereignty, framed in terms of national restoration and unity. This underlay his continued adoption of an outward-looking strategy to counter the unfavourable changes in the strategic environment.

The so-called "Sino-centrism", or Middle Kingdom (*zhong guo*) mentality, is about the traditional Chinese perception of world order and of China's role in this order.<sup>45</sup> Sino-centrism refers to a perspective that puts China at the centre, isolated and unaware of the growth and progress being made outside its borders.<sup>46</sup> Sino-centrism reflects a nationalist mentality that nothing in the world is important except China's own concerns. This Sino-centrism was a kind of domestic bases of national grand strategy that the agent's ideational factor charted a nation's response to the dynamics of the external context. As CKS was a rigid Chinese nationalist, this mentality played a vital part, surprisingly ignored by many, in CKS's method of managing the changing strategic environment hostile to the ROC. From Chiang's point of view, the primary state mission for the ROC on Taiwan was still focused on China rather than Taiwan, the island being evidently designed as a stronghold for Chiang's national restoration. Accordingly, CKS constantly paid more attention to China's affairs

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Sun Yat-sen (1983) *The Three Principles of the People* (Taipei: China Publishing Company), pp.5-6.

<sup>45</sup> For more information on the traditional Chinese view, see Norton Ginsburg (1968) 'On the Chinese Perception of a World Order', in Tang Tsou (ed.) (1968) *Chinese in Crisis*, Vol.2 (Chicago: Chicago University Press), pp.73-91 and C. P. Fitzgerald (1964) *The Chinese View of Their Place in the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

than to those of Taiwan or international affairs more generally. Chiang's Sino-centrism suggested that Taiwan's fate would depend fundamentally on China's future. As Taiwan should appreciate China's efforts to liberate it from Japanese colonial rule, CKS believed that Taiwan, as a part of China, should in return devote itself at all costs to the future development of China. Thus even when retreating to Taiwan as a 'political refugee', Chiang was somewhat arrogant toward local Taiwanese people, just as he was toward the so-called 'bandit regime' in Beijing. As Hsieh Chiao Chiao rightly observes, 'his mentality was still that of supreme leader of China, a big country with an enormous reservoir of natural resources and the strategic potential to play a role in balancing East-West relations.'<sup>47</sup> As a result, CKS was determined to believe that, as long as cross-Straits affairs were resolved, external matters could run their proper course. Accordingly, the cross-Straits issue, an affair assumed to be purely domestic, was prioritized at the cost of Taipei's wider diplomatic relations.

As the dominant feature of CKS's management of external relations, the mode of Sino-centrism resulted in Taipei's insistence on the "one China" principle across the Strait despite of its growing international isolation. Taipei's obsessive one-China policy was in fact a synthesis of CKS's sinocentrism, anti-communism and optimism, which yielded a desire to achieve a united China and to turn it into the great power that it had formerly been. Regardless of Taiwan's limited material resources and the unfavourable changes in the international system, Chiang was determined to fulfill his sacred task to recover the mainland and destroy the Communist Chinese regime at all costs, a typical instance of his outward-looking strategy associated with the war-centred classical strategic perspective. To justify this strategy internationally and domestically, Chiang Kai-shek firmly maintained that the rule of the Chinese Communist regime was ephemeral and illegitimate. After Taipei's withdrawal from the UN, CKS still vigorously claimed that the government of the ROC on Taiwan 'is the true representative of the seven hundred million Chinese, expressing their common will, heeding their anguished outcries and inculcating within them a maximum of courage and hope with which to struggle against the

---

<sup>47</sup> Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival*, p.285.

violence of the Mao regime and win back their human rights and freedom.<sup>48</sup> From Chiang's perspective, the struggle against the regime of Communist China was a war between 'evil and justice' and it was vital to rescue the whole Chinese race from "tragedy".<sup>49</sup> The final points of his UN withdrawal statement so clearly demonstrates Taipei's cross-Strait policy that is worth quoting in full: '1) The restoration of human rights and freedom to our 700 million compatriots on the mainland is the common will of the whole Chinese race and is our unalterable national purpose and the holy task which we must accomplish. 2) The Republic of China, an independent sovereign state, will tolerate no external interference. 3) Regardless of the changing international situation, we shall unhesitatingly make whatever sacrifices may be required and persevere in our struggle. We shall never waver. We shall never compromise.'<sup>50</sup> To compete with Communist China in the name of safeguarding the Chinese people under Sun Yat-sen's Chinese nationalism, Chiang's continued outward-looking strategy (associated mostly with the one-China principle opposing any diplomatic arrangement for co-existence, such as the "two Chinas" option) can be also understood with particular reference to his ignored nationalist perspective of sinocentrism.

#### C.4.3 Backfiring of Taipei's "One-China" Policy

Despite the structural change so unfavourable to Taipei, one of the most distinct characteristics of Taipei's grand strategy under CKS's administration was to insist on the "one China" policy perpetually challenging Beijing's legitimacy. Taipei's one-China policy was derived from CKS's unaltered political goal: China's national restoration, so as to securing the integrity of the ROC's sovereignty. However, in pursuing Taipei's fundamental political goal Chiang deliberately ignored the significance of material factors. Taipei never possessed sufficient material and substantial means to attain its primary political ambition

---

<sup>48</sup> President Chiang Kai-shek's statement on the withdrawal of the ROC from UN, October 26, 1971. In Chiu Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, pp.344-5.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> President Chiang Kai-shek's statement on the withdrawal of the ROC from UN, October 26, 1971. In Chiu Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, pp.344-5.

unaided. Facing the coming of international détente, Taipei continued its strategic stance of rejecting political co-existence with Beijing, while it also took too much for granted its diplomatic and security relations with Washington. CKS for years had assumed that the ideological struggle at the heart of the bipolar international system would always serve Taipei's interests and that the Cold War's structural context would be immune to change. Taipei's relentless pursuit of its one-China principle was however inconsistent with the emerging international consensus for compromise and failed to appropriately contemplate the option of more moderate policies toward the PRC. The rigidity of Taipei's one-China principle in the end made for a serious dilemma when the Nixon administration decided to proceed with the Sino-American rapprochement so as to improve its global strategic position.

Taipei's "one China" principle, which had become an accepted norm in international society, indeed backfired seriously. Taipei was forced to isolate itself from its former allies and the UN system when a majority of members in international society favoured Beijing's representation rather than Taiwan's. Also, the one-China principle soon became perhaps the most powerful tool for the PRC to claim Taiwan as part of its sovereign jurisdiction. CKS's single-minded focus on the one-China policy thus became a major failure in terms of Taiwan's leadership not being able to adjust the ROC's national strategy to the complexity of international politics and, in particular, the structural change of the emerging US-PRC-Soviet strategic triangle. The backfiring of Taipei's "one China" principle associated with CKS's interpretation of international affairs resulted in the loss of the ROC's UN seat and inevitably led to Taipei's international isolation.

### *Origins of Taipei's "One China" Policy*

After the Nationalist regime retreated to Taiwan, three basic interrelated positions informed the content and practice of Taipei's "one China" policy: 1) there was only one China; 2) the ROC was the only legitimate Chinese government; and 3) Taiwan was a part of China. Accordingly, the ROC government on Taiwan was the only sovereign authority in the whole of China.

On the other side of the Strait, the PRC also insisted on a “one China” policy whose basic position was the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as that of the ROC. In essence, then, the difference between Taipei and Beijing lay in who should be the only legitimate Chinese authority. Because both Chinese governments totally rejected the legitimacy of the other side, ROC-PRC sovereignty competition in relation to the “one China” policy became a zero-sum competition in international society. Owing to American support, Taipei’s one-China policy was generally accepted by international society during the 1950s and 1960s. However, after the Nixon administration decided to proceed with Sino-American rapprochement, the end to widespread international acceptance of Taipei’s one-China claim was obviously only a matter of time.

Four calculated political aims underpinned Taipei’s “one China” policy: first, to justify the legitimacy of the ROC regime; second, to prevent the international recognition of the PRC; third, to preserve the right to recover the Chinese mainland; and fourth, to oppose any possible international support for the Taiwanese independence movement. The synthesis of the four presumed objectives rested on CKS’s relentless pursuit of Chinese national restoration in his grand strategy. Because of the Sino-American antagonism in the 1950s and 1960s, Washington basically felt obliged in the United Nations in particular to support Taipei’s claim that its sovereignty extended to the whole of China. At the same time, the US government also tried to persuade the ROC to adjust its uncompromising one-China policy for the purpose of promoting peaceful co-existence and maintaining regional stability.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, taking into account Chiang’s insistence and the complexity of PRC-US-ROC relations, the US had not exerted much pressure on the ROC to adjust its “one China” policy. As a result, the continuity of Taipei’s “one China” policy in the 1950s and 1960s built on a mixture of the ROC’s political ambitions, Chiang’s ideological insistence and American strategic support.

Since the early 1960s, however, some in international society quietly explored scenarios other than that based on Taipei’s one-China principle, whereby both

---

<sup>51</sup> Richard Nixon, for instance, said he preferred the “two-Chinas” solution. See Lasater, Martin L. (2000) *The Taiwan Conundrum in U.S. China Policy* (Boulder: Westview Press), pp. 116-118.

the PRC and the ROC could be diplomatically accommodated together and thus participate together in the UN.<sup>52</sup> From CKS's point of view, this was a scenario that derived from the notion of "two Chinas", which he persistently rejected. Under Chiang's one-China principle, Taipei simply severed diplomatic ties with any country that recognized the legitimacy of the PRC. In answering questions about the implications for Taiwan of France's recognition of the PRC in 1964, Chiang famously made the following comment: 'this [Taipei's termination of the ROC-France diplomatic relations] was done on the basis of the traditional Chinese principle that a legitimate government and a regime of traitors do not exist side by side, just as there is no room for coexistence between justice and evil.'<sup>53</sup> Asked what he thought of the likelihood of moving toward the "two Chinas" approach, Chiang replied, 'I myself and the Chinese people are resolutely opposed to the "two Chinas" concept. The Republic of China will never consent to any "two Chinas" arrangement.'<sup>54</sup> Although France would have preferred to retain its diplomatic relations with Taipei, the ROC government refused to comply, denouncing the proposal as a "most unfriendly act" and "a plot to create two Chinas" and demanding that all French people should leave Taipei.<sup>55</sup> After this, Chiang confidently claimed that the Sino-French case could 'produce only a negligible effect on the free world as a whole. It can in no way affect the international position of the ROC.'<sup>56</sup> In fact, contrary to Chiang's calculation, there was evidence that Taipei's uncompromising position with respect to its "one China" policy would be profoundly counter-productive for Taipei's later struggle to defend its UN membership and prevent its international isolation. This rigid policy, challenging Beijing and putting international society in a dilemma of having to choose between Taipei and Beijing, reflected his lack of a response to the changes in international politics which required Taipei to adopt a more flexible

---

<sup>52</sup> Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (2007) *Foreign Policy Making in Taiwan: From Principles to Pragmatism* (London: Routledge), pp.11-12.

<sup>53</sup> For "President Chiang Kai-shek's reply to the questions of Armando Rivas Torres on March 26, 1964", see Chiu Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, p. 321.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival: The Foreign Policy and External Relations of the Republic of China on Taiwan* (London: Sherwood Press), pp.151-2.

<sup>56</sup> "President Chiang Kai-shek on March 26, 1964", Chiu (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions on Taiwan*, P.321.

and pragmatic strategy to deal with the pair of de facto Chinese governments across the Strait.

As both the ROC and the PRC consistently believed in and implemented the “one China” formula, this principle gradually became accepted as a norm in international society. For the ROC, it had the unfortunate consequence that once a majority of UN member states wanted the PRC to take up the China seat in 1971, the ROC had no option but to leave. Then, in the 1972 Sino-US Shanghai Communiqué, the ROC’s sovereignty position in international society was further undermined when the US ‘acknowledged’ that ‘all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain that there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China. The United States Government does not challenge that position.<sup>57</sup> Losing the authority to represent China internationally, Taipei was forced to accept that its own rigid “one China” principle had seriously backfired, not least because it allowed the PRC to justify its sovereignty claim over Taiwan, which fundamentally undermined in international society the statehood of the ROC on Taiwan. Ever since then, because of its unfavourable “one China” approach, Taipei has lost the diplomatic flexibility to defend itself as an independently sovereign state, which has evidently constrained Taipei’s international space and resulted in its international isolation.

### ***CKS’s Perspective on International Reality***

In facing the dramatic changes in the Sino-American-Soviet triangular relations, CKS’s lack of flexibility in responding to structural change could also be attributed to his rigid ideological perspective on the outside world. Chiang’s international perspective was a value-oriented worldview centring on political beliefs of anti-communism and Chinese nationalism. His longstanding anti-communist worldview had been reinforced by the Kuomintang’s humiliating defeat in the late stages of the Chinese civil war. Chiang’s former experiences of victory against Chinese warlords and Japanese invaders also convinced him that the importance of nationalism, as a moral strength and inspiration, was a

---

<sup>57</sup> “The Nixon-Chou Communiqué, February 28, 1972”, in Chiu (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions on Taiwan*, p.346

vital component of national strategy, irrespective of any overwhelming material advantage that an enemy might possess. Consistent with his worldview, Chiang's notion of national grand strategy thus constantly emphasized the decisive importance of spiritual strength.<sup>58</sup>

But in the late 1960s Chiang's ideologically rooted worldview proved outdated. The first and, in a way, the most fundamental of Chiang Kai-shek's misjudgments of the changes within the international system was his assertion of the continuity of bipolarity at a time when the emerging Sino-American-Soviet strategic triangle was already imminent. Unlike both Nixon and Mao, Chiang failed to adequately perceive the significance of international developments, given his concentration on ideological priorities.<sup>59</sup> As a result, Chiang lacked the kind of imagination that Nixon and Mao had, and was thus unable to adjust appropriately to the practical context of détente. Moreover, Chiang's assertion, which was based on ideological grounds, reflected the fact that his regime on Taiwan had been the biggest beneficiary from Sino-American confrontation.

According to Brian Crozier, one of Chiang's important intellectual characteristics was that he tended to over-simplify the complexity of the world.<sup>60</sup> In his world-view, for instance, there was a dichotomy in international politics between the communist and anti-communist camps. His rigid anti-communism formulated a way to differentiate between friend and enemy in international society. This could be useful for constructing political propaganda to justify his rule on Taiwan, but was seriously counter-productive to the extent that the over-simplification endorsed his strategic decisions. Even after the international situation had dramatically changed as the result of Sino-American rapprochement, for instance, CKS thus persisted in de-recognizing those who

---

<sup>58</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "An instruction on Military Education and Its System", in Chiang Kai-shek (1971), *The Collection of Military Speeches of President Chiang* (Taipei: the Editorial Committee of the Zhongxing Speeches Collections of President Chiang), Vol.3, pp.1438-9.

<sup>59</sup> During the Chinese civil war of the 1920s and 1930s, Chiang was a master of realism who was famous for his flexible strategy of cooperating with other competing warlords, keeping one jump ahead of his rivals and out-maneuvring them. See Brian Crozier (1976) *The Man Who Lost China: The First Full Biography of Chiang Kai-Shek* (London: Angus & Robertson), Chapters 7 and 10.

<sup>60</sup> Crozier (1976) *The Man Who Lost China*, p.391.

recognized the PRC. It seemed that he wanted without compromise to defend everything, everywhere, all the time and by every possible means, against Beijing. Regardless of Taiwan's limited overall strength in terms of economic resources, military capability and diplomatic instruments, Chiang over-extended his struggle against Communist China and eventually lost control over Taipei's foreign relations, as he found diplomatic space cut by country after country and organization after organization. Sino-American rapprochement in the end signified the beginning of Taipei's loss of recognition and support in international society.

Chiang's concern with the zero-sum sovereignty competition against the PRC in many ways reflected his personality and ideology rather than realistic strategic considerations. So strong was Chiang's subjective vision of the incompatibility between communism and anti-communism that, after Nixon on 15 July 1971 announced his visit to China to seek Sino-American normalization, he accused the US leadership of having "lost their courage" and of actually becoming China's stooges in the vain hope that this would obviate the need to fight international communism with armed force.<sup>61</sup> From Chiang's perspective, the Chinese Communists for a long time had prepared for an ultimate and unavoidable confrontation against not only Taiwan but also the "free world". Accordingly, he believed that if the "free world" countries sincerely wanted to prevent a third world war, they should attack and defeat the PRC immediately, before it grew more powerful.<sup>62</sup> His preference for an offensive strategy vis-à-vis Communist China, however, was by then far removed from the consensus of international society. Therefore, Chiang's worldview of the communist threat associated with his rigid "one China" claim led him to fail to put forward a creative and relevant strategy under which Taiwan's grand strategy should have more flexibility to respond to unfavourable structural change and prevent itself from being internationally isolated.

### ***The Loss of the ROC's UN Seat***

---

<sup>61</sup> *China Yearbook*, 1971-2 (Taipei: China Publishing Co., annual), pp.1-4.

<sup>62</sup> Robert A. Madsen (1999), *Chinese Chess: US China Policy and Taiwan, 1969-1979*, p.52.

From CKS's perspective in the 1950s and 1960s, the strategic role of the United Nations was rather limited, in terms of serving his outward-looking strategy. UN representation was important mainly because it provided Taipei with the best possible international stage to present the legitimacy of the ROC and to interact with other countries on key international issues, within both the UN Security Council and other UN bodies. However, these functions of the UN were not decisive for Taipei's pursuit of its primary strategic goal - national restoration, while for many years, the United Nations possessed neither the military means nor political consensus to intervene against the status quo across the Strait in Taipei's favour. In contrast, the UN now became an international platform for the PRC to constantly challenge the ROC's illusory claims of sovereignty over the Chinese mainland. From 1949 until October 1971, the ROC was for years always on the defensive when the General Assembly voted on the question of which government should be the "rightful" representative of China.<sup>63</sup> This was an exhaustive mission for Taipei to challenge the de facto existence of the PRC. The frustrated Chiang Kai-shek accused the world body in 1960 of having '... failed to discharge its obligations toward its member states in defending international justice and in asserting the power of moral principles.'<sup>64</sup> When the ROC was forced to withdraw from the United Nations in October 1971, Chiang furiously blamed the UN for 'ignoring and completely disregarding law and justice, shamelessly bowing to the forces of evil and timorously yielding to violence. Thus the United Nations, which this country [the ROC] helped to establish after so many years, has finally degraded itself and become a den of iniquity.'<sup>65</sup>

By publicly voicing these accusations, CKS revealed his true feelings about the limitation of the UN's role in his grand strategy against Beijing. It would appear that he calculated that, if the PRC had lived as a viable political entity without UN recognition for decades, why could the ROC not do the same? Therefore,

---

<sup>63</sup> See the 'China issue' at the United Nations in Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival*, pp.174-179.

<sup>64</sup> "ROC President Chiang Kai-shek's Address at the Opening of the Third Session of the First National Assembly, February 20, 1960", in ROC-US Joint Communiqué, October 1958", in Chiu Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions on Taiwan*, p. 299.

<sup>65</sup> "President Chiang Kai-shek's statement on the Withdrawal of the ROC from UN, 1971", Chiu (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions on Taiwan*, p.345.

UN representation was not indispensable for the state's survival, not least because the US continued to honour its security commitment vis-à-vis the ROC. In fact, during Taipei's series of international setbacks in the early 1970s, its primary strategic concern in dealing with the crisis of international isolation was to secure the ROC-US diplomatic relations and their mutual defence security treaty.<sup>66</sup> That the ROC wanted to remain in the UN was certain. However, this position could not be allowed to upset the prospect of the absolute political goal of the ROC's sovereign integrity, since UN representation was a means rather than an end in its strategic calculation. Accordingly, by the 1970s it became obvious that Chiang Kai-shek despised the role of the UN and regarded it as an expendable means for his national strategy. Hence, there was no need for him to relinquish the ROC's sovereign integrity if staying in the UN was the alternative.

Mao's guerrilla diplomacy of mass mobilization of the developing countries during the 1960s played a key role in Beijing's UN triumph. The core of Mao's guerrilla diplomacy was to win over the 'masses' of international society. In other words, the goal was to target most of the developing countries, rather than the two superpowers. The idea was to locate itself on the side of the masses and then, to get their sympathy, apply an independent foreign policy focused on anti-hegemonism. Consequently, Mao's strategic perspective on the international system was multi-polar rather than bipolar. This strategy rested on his theory of the "Three Worlds",<sup>67</sup> whereby he divided international society into three worlds to define the part which China should play in the multi-polar system.<sup>68</sup> Assuming that the major contradiction of international politics was between "the first world" and "the third world", Mao appealed to the developing states to cooperate as "a united front" against the two imperialist superpowers. In fact, the application of Mao's guerrilla diplomacy in the 1960s had its own purpose of supporting his "two line" doctrine, which was designed

---

<sup>66</sup> Shen (1983) *The US & Free China*, p.129; Taylor (2009) *The Generalissimo*, p. 548.

<sup>67</sup> For Mao's "Three Worlds" doctrine, see Melvin Gurtov and Byong-Moo Huang (1980) *China under Threat*, pp.250-9.

<sup>68</sup> "The first world" (two superpowers) consists of the big capitalists; "the third world" (the developing countries) represents the oppressed peasant masses, and "the developed world" (other developed states) is the national bourgeoisie, a class which both exploits and is exploited. See Melvin Gurtov and Byong-Moo Huang (1980) *China under Threat*, p.251.

to contend against the US and the Soviet Union simultaneously. The “two line” doctrine did entail the risk that China might have to fight a diplomatic war on two fronts. However, in this way he also created an opportunity to promote China’s independent foreign policy, which won the moral support of international society, primarily in the developing countries. The independent policy eventually enabled China to succeed in crafting the Sino-American-Soviet strategic triangle in the early 1970s. These achievements created a favourable strategic context for Beijing’s later UN success in replacing Taipei as the representative of China. In contrast, the core of Taipei’s foreign policy and its anti-communist strategy was centred on drawing on the support of only one country, the United States, rather than the other way around. Given Sino-American rapprochement and other international setbacks, Taipei’s US-centred policy not only constrained its freedom of action but also increased its psychological and security dependence on the US. This put Taipei in a very vulnerable diplomatic situation.

As John W. Garver observes, instead of condemning its allies’ betrayal or blaming the unfavourable international situation, Taipei itself, if it could have reacted differently from its adamant policy of non co-existence with the PRC, should have assumed the primary responsibility for the loss of its UN membership in 1971.<sup>69</sup> In the event of the UN’s vote on the decisive day on 25 October 1971, for instance, many of Taipei’s allies in the UN did not even know what Taipei really wanted them to do when the US publicly endorsed a proposal of dual representation.<sup>70</sup> The main reasons for Taipei’s defeat at the UN thus relate to Chiang Kai-shek’s single-minded pursuit of the ROC’s sovereign integrity associated with the “one-China” principle and his nonchalant attitude toward the world body. Both made him reluctant to adopt a new and more flexible policy with the objective of remaining in the UN. Almost as important for this outcome was that, during the 1960s, Taipei had ignored the signs of structural change. Mao’s “guerrilla” diplomacy won the sympathy of a great many new and developing states in Africa and Asia, which began to be admitted

---

<sup>69</sup> John W. Garver (1997) *The Sino-American Alliance: Nationalist China and American Cold War Strategy in Asia* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe), pp.248-262.

<sup>70</sup> Madsen (1999), *Chinese Chess*, p.83.

into the UN after 1960 and gradually dominated the UN General Assembly. Taipei was poorly prepared to accept and adapt to these international changes and shocked by Washington's shift in favour of Beijing. As a result, Taipei's shortcomings, as well as the unfavourable international context, eventually played a key part in Beijing's UN triumph.

#### **C.4.4 The Offensive Posture of “70 per cent Political Work and 30 per cent Military Effort ”**

Chiang Kai-shek always believed that he would be able to recover the mainland eventually, even after he publicly renounced the use of force in the 1958 ROC-US Joint Communiqué. His determination to pursue the ROC's sovereignty, along with the “one China” principle, resulted in his “70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort” strategy of national restoration. The said restoration strategy was grounded in his sino-centrism, anti-communism and revolutionist idealism. Chiang had adopted this recovery strategy since the late 1950s as a reaction to Taiwan's limited capabilities and its international position, which did not permit him to initiate military campaigns against the PRC without agreement from his American ally. Nixon's Sino-American rapprochement and the loss of the UN seat in the early 1970s constituted a decisive setback to his grand strategy, which, according to CKS, was centred on the management of Taipei's foreign relations, in particular to its allies.<sup>71</sup> It represented the end of Chiang's strategy of drawing on the ROC-US alliance in his revolutionary plan to recover the mainland. As a result, CKS's former military-centred national strategy to retake the mainland was in the first instance gradually transformed into an offensive strategy for national restoration based on non-violent political warfare.

#### ***Retaking the Mainland by Political Means***

---

<sup>71</sup> Chiang Kai-shek (1971), “The Importance of Studying of Strategies in Military Education”, in The Collection of *Military Speeches of President Chiang* (Taipei: The Editorial Committee of Zhongxing Speech Collections of President Chiang), Vol.3, pp.1201-1202.

While encountering numerous international setbacks after the late 1960s, CKS did not waver in his pursuit of national restoration across the Strait. By this stage, as mentioned, his cross-Straits strategy had, however, turned to emphasizing political, instead of military warfare, encapsulated in the political phrase of “70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort”. The origin of the underlying politically-centred strategy can be traced back to CKS’s private talk about the task of retaking the mainland in 1949-1950.<sup>72</sup> It took until 1958 and the ROC-US Joint Communiqué however for this politically-centred strategy to be publicly espoused. CKS’s strategy of national restoration maintained that while the ROC considered ‘the restoration of freedom for its people on the mainland as its sacred mission’, it regarded ‘the implementation of Dr Sun Yat-sen’s Three People’s Principles and not the use of force’ as ‘the principal means of successfully achieving its mission’.<sup>73</sup> In his 1959 New Year’s Speech, Chiang Kai-shek explicitly then endorsed his mainland recovery strategy as “70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort”.<sup>74</sup> From this point it was adopted as Taipei’s blueprint to compete with Beijing until the end of CKS’s regime. Notably, the US Department of State soon interpreted Chiang as saying that two Chinese nation-states would be a permanent arrangement.<sup>75</sup> Many others similarly understood CKS as making a U-turn with respect to Taipei’s mainland policy, which in essence implied the abandonment by Chiang of his goal of recovering the mainland.<sup>76</sup> Steve Tsang, for instance, argues that CKS’s “re-conquer the mainland” claim was rhetorical in nature and its true intention was mainly to establish Taiwan as a quasi-Leninist party state

---

<sup>72</sup> Steve Tsang (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang’s Policy to Recovery the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, in Steve Tsang (ed.) (1993) *The Shadow of China*, p.71.

<sup>73</sup> “ROC-US Joint Communiqué, October 1958”, in Chiu, Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions on Taiwan*, p.288.

<sup>74</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, “A New Year Message to the Public in 1959”, quoted from *The Digest of Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare* (Taipei: General Department of Political Warfare of Ministry of National Defence, 1975), p.171.

<sup>75</sup> John F. Cooper (1996) *Taiwan: Nation-State or Province* (Boulder: Westview Press), p.148.

<sup>76</sup> Cooper (1996) *Taiwan*, pp.147-8. Steve Tsang (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT’s policy to reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, Steve Tsang (ed.) (1993) *The Shadow of China: Political Developments in Taiwan since 1949* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press), pp.48-72.

so as to maintain the Nationalist rule and put down challenges to the government's legitimacy and Taiwanese independence.<sup>77</sup>

However, upon closer examination, it is difficult to uphold this assessment of CKS's claim of national restoration as 'rhetorical'. First, it fails to appreciate Chiang's mentality as a revolutionary whose ideology, passion and optimism were the distinctive drivers of his actions. Second, the assessment mentioned above rests on the assumption of a rational, materially-oriented strategic evaluation of Chiang's chances of retaking the mainland. This rational evaluation, assuming that material capability matters more than ideas in strategy, is obviously different from Chiang's ideationally-centred strategic perspective. Third, it ignores other empirical evidence, principally Chiang's statements and plans to accomplish the recovery mission. For instance, in the winter of 1960, Chiang secretly organized a special military meeting at which all his generals were asked to pledge to retake the mainland and ordered the General Staff Headquarters to establish a so-called *Guo-Guang Operation Office* which carried out a substantial amphibious operation and a national mobilization schedule, called the *Wu Han Plan*, to prepare a possible invasion.<sup>78</sup> In the Easter of 1962, Chiang explicitly threatened to invade the mainland and followed up the threat with a gradual military buildup.<sup>79</sup> Fourth, the assumption that Chiang sincerely renounced his recovery mission also cannot explain why, if his strategy was for sake of domestic control associated with maintaining the cross-Straits status quo only, he later insisted on a rigid "one China" foreign policy, which eventually cost Taipei's membership in the UN. As is suggested below, Chiang's cross-Straits strategy of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort", far from discarding this strategic goal, was meant to emphasize a different approach designed to accomplish the mainland's recovery.

---

<sup>77</sup> Tsang (1993) 'Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT's policy of reconquering the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958', pp.71-72.

<sup>78</sup> *The Reminiscences of Mr. Ming-Tang Lai, Vol. I and II* (Taipei: Academia Historica, 1994). General Lai Ming-tang was the Chief of the General Staff during the Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Ching-kuo eras.

<sup>79</sup> Lin Cheng-yi (1989) *A Triangle Lesson of Taiwan's Security Triangle: The Influence of Communist China and the United States* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Laureate Publishers), pp.129-130.

The Chiang's political-centred strategy in the counter-offensive war against the PRC can be examined in its nature and operation. First, the core of this strategy was centred on political rather than military warfare. In Chiang's words, 'its strategic principle ...would be primarily a political one; the military would only play an assisting role.'<sup>80</sup> There were subjective and objective reasons for Chiang to fight the Mainland Chinese politically instead of militarily. Chiang believed that 'faith [was] the foundation of our national restoration' and his counter-offensive war was 'for righteousness, freedom, justice, against tyranny and in answer to the unanimous wish of a people for survival.'<sup>81</sup> At the same time, Chiang could not obtain the necessary international support, in particular that of the US, to compensate for his inferior military capability in launching a military invasion on the Chinese mainland. Second, from the operational aspect, Chiang insisted that any war for the purpose of the recovery of the mainland would be conducted from within enemy territory. Indeed, the strategy of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort" was linked to Chiang's notion that he needed to concentrate 70 percent of his effort on enemy-occupied areas in where he intended to win over the Chinese popular support for a likelihood of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, whereas 30 percent would be required for the front military campaigns if the opportunity did emerge.<sup>82</sup> Thus, as CKS put it, 'The major battlefield would be on mainland China, not in the Taiwan Strait which would only be a field in supporting the campaigns on the mainland.'<sup>83</sup>

### ***From Interdependence to Dependence***

Chiang's politically-centred strategy of retaking the Mainland was linked to his optimistic perspective on Taiwan's overall security situation as long as the ROC-US Mutual Defence Treaty existed. During the early 1950s, the periodical

---

<sup>80</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "A New Year Message to the Public in 1959", in *The Digest of Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare*, p.171.

<sup>81</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "Double Ten Messages, October 10, 1960", *China Yearbook*, 1963-64 (Taipei: China Publishing Company, 1964), pp.911-5.

<sup>82</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "The Major Point of the Counter-Offensive War Direction", in *The Digest of Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare*, p.272.

<sup>83</sup> Chiang Kai-shek, "A New Year Message to the Public in 1959", in *The Digest of Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare*, p.171.

mass campaigns undertaken in the PRC to “liberate” Taiwan represented a severe security threat to the ROC. Not many years after the ROC-US Mutual Defence Treaty came into effect in 1954, the outbreak of the second Taiwan Strait crisis in 1958 became the first test of the ROC-US Mutual Defence Treaty. In the event, the US demonstrated its determination to defend Taiwan as well as other offshore islands by every possible means. In the 1958 ROC-US Joint Communiqué, President Eisenhower particularly emphasized that ‘opposing aggression by force is the only position consistent with the peace of the world.’<sup>84</sup> Ever since then, Washington’s seemingly resolute security commitment associated with the ROC-US MDT had significantly attenuated Beijing’s military threat from Taipei. Working on the assumption that Taiwan was safe, given the US commitment to its security, Chiang believed that he could try to pursue any initiative, except those mainly involving military options, to create a more favourable strategic situation in the hope of prevailing in the cross Strait competition. Chiang’s political warfare strategy against the PRC was the product of this context.

Despite of Taipei’s security being decisively relying on Washington by then, the ROC-US security alliance was interdependent, or mutually-needed, in character in the 1950s and 1960s. The alliance basically rested on mutual rather than unilateral interests in the context of America’s global containment strategy. Taiwan’s strategic value for America by then was real and specific. As the 1955 American Congressional “Formosa Resolution” stated, ‘the secure possession by a friendly government of the Western Pacific Island chain, of which Formosa [Taiwan] is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States.’<sup>85</sup> Meanwhile, Taipei could easily link itself with American vital interests, sharing the same anti-communist outlook as the US. Their common interests and values put the ROC-US alliance into an interdependent relationship, which provided a favourable strategic environment for Chiang’s political warfare in Mainland China. And Chiang’s strategy of political-military warfare against the enemy

---

<sup>84</sup> “ROC-US Joint Communiqué, October 1958”, in Chiu Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, p.287.

<sup>85</sup> “US Congressional Authorization for the President to Employ the Armed Forces of the United States to Protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and Related Positions and Territories of the Area”, in Chiu (ed.) (1973) *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, p.257.

rear did impose a partial threat over the PRC's southeastern provinces and made a contribution to the US containment of China.

However, Nixon's Sino-American rapprochement signified the imminent end of ROC-US interdependence, which was replaced by Taipei's unilateral dependence on Washington, in terms of military security in particular. This change had a profound impact on Chiang's formula of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort". First, as Chiang Kai-shek did not give up his goal of retaking the mainland, the politically-centred strategy of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort" had become the only available and workable option for his national restoration. Second, after Taipei was evicted from the UN, CKS retuned the politically-centred strategy by changing its tone to one which emphasized the construction of Taiwan's status as a model province rather than launch-pad for further political warfare to the enemy rear, as before. The "battlefield" between the ROC and the PRC shifted from Mainland China to the Taiwan Strait, both politically and militarily. It was only then that Taiwan's grand strategy under the Nationalist regime started to concentrate its attention and efforts on Taiwan rather than the mainland. Equally, since this time, US government concern over Taiwan's future gradually shifted from Taiwan's international status to Taiwan's domestic affairs, particularly the political democratization of Taiwan. These domestic and international changes significantly paved the way for Chiang Ching-kuo's "inward-looking" national strategy (discussed in the next chapter), which resulted in Taiwan's successful political and economic reform after the mid-1970s. CKS's politically-centred strategy of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort" to compete with the PRC thus underlies Taiwan's later domestic political and economic achievements, even though the result was not what Chiang originally intended.

### ***Combining Political Offensive with Military Defence***

The practice of Chiang Kai-shek's recovery strategy focused on a major effort of offensive political warfare targeting the mainland and a limited effort of the defensive military posture across the Taiwan Strait. The underlying strategy was

that the ROC could leave to the US the major responsibility of defending Taiwan by force. As a result, one of the most counterproductive consequences of this strategy is Taiwan's failure to develop a proper composition of its armed forces, in accordance with the nature of the demands associated with the island's defensive warfare, which should give priority to the air forces and navy. Instead, to prepare for the invasion of the mainland, the ROC invested its major military resources in the army. In the 1960s, Taiwan's military forces consisted of 600,000 troops, but 400,000 of them were in the army and only 50,000 in the navy (including marines), while 100,000 were air force personnel.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, one-fourth of the army was deployed in the offshore islands of Jinmen (85,000) and Matsu (15,000). It is estimated that the total military expenditure consumed 80 per cent of the Taiwanese government's total budget per year during CKS's regime.<sup>87</sup> This army-centred military structure, huge military expenditure and the significant force deployment in the offshore island indicate that Chiang's practice of the "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort" was still an offensive strategic posture, despite the existence of America's security commitment.

In Chiang's view, Washington's security commitment to the ROC represented both opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, with the advantage of Washington's security commitment, Taipei seemed assured that time would be on its side and it could wait for a favourable change on the mainland in this cross-Strait competition. On the other hand, with the cost of Washington's security commitment, Taipei now faced the dilemma of not being able to pursue its ultimate strategic goal, which was to retake the mainland, largely because the US preferred to maintain the status quo across the Strait. For Chiang, the preferred solution was the politically-centred strategy of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort" which was designed to make the most of Washington's security commitment, while Taipei could still pursue its strategic goal of retaking the mainland. This was because the core of the politically-

---

<sup>86</sup> Joyce Kallgren (1963), 'Nationalist China's Armed Forces', *China Quarterly*, No.15 (Jul.-Sep., 1963), p.37.

<sup>87</sup> Su Chin-ch'iang (1996) 'Taiwan Strait Defense Warfare and ROC's Armed Forces Structure', in Su Chin-ch'iang (ed.) (1996) *ROC's Armed Forces Structure and Taiwan Strait Security* (Taipei: Institute for National Policy Research).

centred strategy was not only to wait, but also to initiate a possible change of strategic environment, mainly in the cross-Straits context, which would enable Taipei to maintain the offensive and progress towards its strategic goal when an opportunity did emerge.

In practice, three different phases can be discerned during which Taipei's politically-centred strategy was applied in relation to different contexts. From the early to the mid-1960s, the "first phase", the ROC pursued opportunities to invade the mainland. However, the ROC mainly waged political warfare against the PRC by looking for a favourable moment to plunge into possible military action in the event of unsuspected errors made by Beijing. In the spring of 1961, three years after he renounced the use of force, Chiang emphasized Taiwan's strategic priority as focusing on 'raising operational capabilities, enlarging military bases, supporting the population of mainland Chinese in opposing tyranny and counter-attacking in time.'<sup>88</sup> From a strategic perspective, this was an offensive strategic posture, which did not correspond with his renunciation of the use of force, causing some concern in Washington. However, in January 1966, Chiang revised his strategic priority, aiming to 'consolidate recovery bases [including the offshore islands], guide the mainland Chinese people to oppose tyranny, control the Taiwan Strait, enhance military readiness and, in due course, counter-attack mainland China.'<sup>89</sup> It is believed that this change in Chiang's recovery strategy was mainly derived from the PRC's first nuclear test in October 1964.<sup>90</sup> From this point onward until the Sino-American rapprochement in the early 1970s, the practice of Chiang's "70% political and 30% military" recovery strategy went into a "second phase" in which Chiang's major strategic posture shifted from offence by preparing an invasion to defence by waiting for a chance to return to the mainland.

The "third phase" of Taipei's politically-centred strategy followed the Sino-American rapprochement in the early 1970s and lasted until 1975, when CKS

---

<sup>88</sup> Ministry of National Defense, ROC (ed.) (1970) 'Defense Military Construct', in *The ROC Sixtieth Commemoration, October 1970* (Taipei: Ministry History & Translation Bureau), p. 251.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid. p. 251-2.

<sup>90</sup> Yang Chih-heng, 'The Evolution and Adaptation of Taiwan's Military Strategy', in Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (ed.) (2003) *Defending Taiwan: The Future Vision of Taiwan's Defence Policy and Military Strategy* (London: RoutledgeCurzon), p. 57.

died. For CKS, this period denoted the end of the interdependent, or mutually-needed, security relationship with Washington and should have marked the moment to develop a more defensively oriented and self-reliant national strategy to deal with China's threat at a time when America might be absent. However, despite the loss of the ROC's seat at the UN, Chiang was still unwilling to adopt a more flexible stance and to revise his longstanding outward-looking strategy. Rather, in line with its gradually increasing international isolation, Taipei became more dependent on the security assurances from Washington to cope with its external threats and uncertainties. In fact, to deal with this unfavourable structural change, Taipei's strategic measures were exclusively focused on securing its diplomatic and military relations with Washington.<sup>91</sup> As enshrined in the Mutual Defence Treaty, Washington, concerned about domestic public opinion, was about to honour its security commitment on Taiwan for the time being. However, Washington started to withdraw troops from Taiwan in the early 1970s in keeping with the implementation of Nixon's Guam doctrine and the necessity of a Sino-American rapprochement. As a result, Chiang's recovery strategy in effect underwent further change, in so far as during the "third phase" Taipei's strategic priority shifted mainly to defending and building up Taiwan even though it retained the hope of recovering the mainland. Ever since then, Taipei's sense of China's threat has increased enormously, accompanied by the realization that retaking the mainland should not be the priority of its national strategy.

### **Conclusions: Taiwan's Grand Strategy under Chiang Kai-shek in the 1960s and the early 1970s**

In the 1960s, the general strategic environment seemed to favour Taipei. The PRC was suffering increased chaos under Mao's endless and ruthless domestic political struggles, from the Great Leap Forward to the Cultural Revolution. In its foreign relations, Beijing fought a border war with India and its radical foreign policy of spreading communist revolution in Vietnam, Laos and

---

<sup>91</sup> Taylor (2009) *The Generalissimo*, pp. 577-578.

Cambodia increased the enmity between itself and the US. The Sino-Soviet split intensified Beijing's strategic difficulties and compelled the PRC to confront both superpowers simultaneously. Accordingly, the ROC had good reason to be confident about its status, both in the cross Strait competition and the international arena. Indeed, at the time Taipei's leaders were allowing themselves to believe that time was on their side, that Taiwan's strategic importance was decisive for the free world and that the US might still support their efforts to return to the mainland. As a result, CKS generally did not waver in his outward-looking strategic choice, designed to change the status quo across the Strait, in terms of extending the ROC's claim of sovereignty to the Chinese Mainland.

However, crisis and opportunity always come together. Chiang Kai-shek's overconfidence backfired when Nixon subordinated the Taiwan issue to his pursuit of Sino-American rapprochement in the early 1970s. Chiang Kai-shek's single-minded outward-looking strategy was not significantly adjusted to respond to the dramatic changes occurring in international politics. Indeed, Chiang's revolutionary perspective, associated with his nationalist sinocentrism, had led him to ignore, deliberately or not, the signals of change in Washington's China policy. In 1970, American Vice President Spiro T. Agnew unusually visited Taipei twice within a half year to probe Chiang's attitude in relation to the changes in US-ROC-PRC relations. Chiang adamantly resisted any proposal of reconciliation from his most important ally to live with Beijing. Agnew recalled that 'Chiang and his subordinate gave no indication that they were willing to alter their traditional ideology, exercise flexibility in their relations with the PRC, or do anything to reconcile themselves to developments within the US.'<sup>92</sup> As this chapter has shown, Chiang's conceptualization of ROC-PRC relations as a zero-sum sovereignty competition may be attributed to his personality and idealist vision and his failure to appreciate the importance of international politics for a small country such as his. In fact, during his twenty-five years in power in Taiwan, CKS made only one foreign visit, in 1949, although Taipei before its eviction was a prestigious permanent member of the

---

<sup>92</sup> Madsen (1999) *Chinese Chess*, p.57.

Security Council of the UN.<sup>93</sup> Chiang's single-mindedness and insistence on continuing to espouse his perspective of the ROC's sovereign status as the only legitimate state for China as a whole can be better understood with reference to his revolutionist mentality rather than his naïve take on international affairs. As a result, even though he had renounced the use of force across the Strait under American pressure in 1958, he continued to aspire to ultimately retake the mainland. He merely adapted Taipei's outward-looking strategy, primarily by emphasizing political over military warfare encapsulated in the formula of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort". Nixon's Sino-American rapprochement and the loss of the UN seat resulted in increasing Taipei's international isolation that put an end to Chiang's outward-looking strategy of manipulating the ROC-US alliance for the sake of retaking the mainland, which was his goal.

Chiang Kai-shek died on April 5, 1975. During his rule on Taiwan, the pursuit of the ROC's sovereignty along with his "one China" principle was the single and important perspective that involved his insistence on the ROC as the sole representative of China in international society. The sovereignty-centred doctrine, namely, the identity of the ROC as "China", fundamentally informed all his choices and actions relating to Taiwan's grand strategy. Chiang's consistent practice and insistence on the sovereignty-centred doctrine had profound implications in both the domestic and international contexts. As a result, the US recognized Taiwan as part of China and in the 1972 US-PRC Shanghai Communiqué acknowledged that there is only one China on both sides of the Strait, even though the US government still honoured its security commitment vis-à-vis the ROC government on Taiwan. Ever since, the "one China" principle has been fully accepted as a norm in international society. On the one hand, the norm of "one China" across the Strait essentially justifies the PRC claim of sovereignty over Taiwan. On the other, this claim fundamentally challenges the very existence and international status of the ROC as an independent sovereign state, although the ROC has had full control of Taiwan

---

<sup>93</sup> In 1949, CKS visited the Philippines and South Korea to form an anti-communist military alliance, but failed because Washington did not support his idea. See Hsieh (1985) *Strategy for Survival*, pp. 144-145.

as a de facto political entity beyond the PRC's authority since 1949. This influential impact of the one-China principle not only caused the diversity of Taiwan's domestic national identity later but also still constrains the ROC's international status as a sovereign state. Both of them have undermined the efforts of the later leaders of Taipei to formulate an effective national grand strategy, e.g. to internationalize the Taiwan issue, as a better position from which to safeguard the existence of the ROC on Taiwan.

In short, Chiang Kai-shek's regime on Taiwan was both the beneficiary and victim of the structural contexts of Sino-American relations in particular and the Cold War in general. Sino-American rapprochement gave rise to a new decisive strategic environment in which triangular US-ROC-PRC relations developed. Although this new strategic environment obviously favoured the PRC and caused the ROC's international isolation, CKS's national grand strategy to deal with its unfavourable aspects focused exclusively on upholding its existing diplomatic and security relations with Washington. Taipei did succeed to some extent in doing this for a time. However, the end of the ROC-US strategic alliance indicated Taiwan's need to develop a more self-reliant national security strategy against the PRC's sovereignty claim, which threatened whether the ROC could still survive as an independent sovereign state in the long term. As CKS famously put it, the way to confront this unfavourable situation was 'Not to be upset in time of adversity but remain firm with dignity and strive to be self-reliant with vigour' (*chubian bujing, zhaungjing ziqiang*).<sup>94</sup> However, Chiang insisted on maintaining the ROC's sovereignty claim over the whole of China, which isolated the ROC from the mainstream of international society and by doing so, he threw away what may have been the last opportunity available to internationalize the ROC-PRC issue that would provide a better strategic position for Taipei against Beijing's sovereignty threat. While the ROC continuously strove for its primary strategic goal - to secure its independence as a sovereign state, its international isolation became one of the most unfavourable strategic consequences to be locked into, creating a deadlock on the issue of sovereignty competition with a great power such as the PRC. As a

---

<sup>94</sup> Shen (1983), *The US & Free China*, p.9.

result, the ROC had no choice but to continue to increase its dependence on America's ostensibly fragile security assurances.

## Chapter 5

### The Challenge of Taiwan's Self-Defence: The Uncertainty of Washington's Security Commitment

#### Introduction

On December 15, 1978, President Jimmy Carter unilaterally announced the abrogation of diplomatic relations between the ROC and the US, the termination of the ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty (MDT) and the withdrawal of all American military personnel from Taiwan.<sup>1</sup> Before this announcement, there was barely seven hours' advance notice given to its long-standing ally, the ROC, when President Chiang Ching-kuo (CCK) was roused at approximately two o'clock in the morning by American Ambassador Leonard Unger to receive the news of Carter's announcement. It is regarded that in diplomatic terms this rudely disconcerted the ROC.<sup>2</sup> As Chiang Ching-kuo (CCK) put it to Leonard Unger, 'this [notice] is a serious personal insult to me. I had thought over the possible changes of ROC-US relations already. However, I was still surprised by America's perfidious and abrupt announcement, which did not even allow my country an opportunity to express its opinion. This will have very serious consequences.'<sup>3</sup> While CCK felt humiliated and frustrated by Washington's high-handedness, the abrogation of the US-ROC diplomatic-military relations also revealed "serious consequences" for Taiwan's defence policy, which since 1950 had mainly relied on America's security commitment in the face of the Chinese threat. However, there was no room for Taipei to accuse America of being "insulting" and "perfidious", since the U.S. still remained the most important provider of such security as the ROC could have as a member of international society. Nevertheless, while aiming to keep its security ties with

<sup>1</sup> 'President Carter's Address to the Nation' (1978), in Hsiao, Gene T. and Michael Witunski (eds.) (1983) *Sino-American Normalization and its Policy Implications* (New York: Praeger Publishers), p.243.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas J. Bellows (1979) "Normalization: A Taiwan Perspective", *Asian Affairs*, 6:6 (July/August), p. 339.

<sup>3</sup> Fredrick F. Chien, former Foreign Minister of the ROC, (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 1: Diplomatic Dynamics* (Qian Fu hui yi lu: wai jiao feng yun dong) (Chinese Edition) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing Group), p. 391. My translation.

the US as close as possible, probably the most important and difficult issue in constructing Taiwan's grand strategy during CCK's regime was whether Taiwan could establish an effective self-defence capability to guard against the PRC once the US shifted its diplomatic recognition from the ROC to the PRC.

In the event, Sino-American normalization was hardly a surprise for the ROC government in Taiwan in the early 1970s, as Nixon had already begun to seek Sino-American rapprochement, which signaled a fundamental change in Washington's policy toward Taipei. In effect, the ROC leadership realized that the US, the ROC's most important ally and security provider, would no longer show enthusiasm for maintaining the diplomatic and military relations with the ROC at the cost of Sino-American rapprochement and normalization.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, Sino-American normalization caused the abrogation of the ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty (MDT), bringing an unprecedented security challenge to Taipei.

Faced with this challenge of the withdrawal of American diplomatic recognition and defence commitment posed by the growing Sino-American normalization in the late 1970s, the ROC had on the one hand to adjust its grand strategy and on the other to propose a new form of comprehensive relationship with the US, in particular in the diplomatic and military areas, which would mitigate the security impact. As Carter's administration did not provide a proper substitute framework for maintaining the political, economic and cultural exchanges between the ROC and US after the de-recognition, the US Congress overwhelmingly passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), which provided considerably more solid legislative support to Taiwan than the White House had expected.<sup>5</sup> The legislation of the TRA significantly redeemed the termination of the formal Taipei-Washington diplomatic and military relations and provided a valuable but rather unusual way to maintain Taiwan's ties to the US. Ever since then, the unique TRA has become the cornerstone of American policy vis-à-vis Taiwan. It played a decisive role for CCK's administration as the latter built its national strategy against the backdrop of continuing ROC-PRC struggle over sovereignty.

---

<sup>4</sup> For discussions of the Sino-American rapprochement and normalization, see for example Robert S. Ross (1995) *Negotiating Cooperation: United States and China, 1969-89* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).

<sup>5</sup> Nancy Bernkopf Tuckner (2001) *China Confidential: American Diplomats and Sino-American Relations, 1945-1996* (New York: Columbia University Press), p.331.

Since the US security involvement in the cross-Straits issue under the TRA is implicit and ambiguous rather than explicit and unequivocal, CCK's administration needed to adjust itself to establish a flexible and workable national strategy in order to deal with this change and uncertainty. To pursue such a national strategy without American security assurances, Taipei's national strategy during CCK's regime had three distinct features. First, CCK's administration downgraded the importance of the cross Strait issue within its national agenda. Instead of relentlessly preparing military readiness to exploit any opportunity to return to the mainland as his father Chiang Kai-shek had done, CCK transferred the nation's strategic priority from the cross-Straits issue to domestic reforms, notably economic growth and political democratization, as the most important means of maintaining and justifying a continued Kuomintang (KMT) regime on Taiwan which was still confronted with the PRC's sovereignty claim. Second, faced with Beijing's political strategy of "One Country, Two Systems" as an attempt to impose its own terms in relation to any future cross-Straits reunification. CCK formulated his famous doctrine of the "Three Noes Policy" (*sanbu zhengce*) (no negotiation, no compromise and no contact) in the face of Beijing's strategy of peaceful reunification. His "Three Noes" doctrine, a peace-centred strategy but one entailing no search for reconciliation with the Chinese communist regime, remained at the heart of Taiwan's national grand strategy until the end of his rule in 1988. Third, while facing the cessation of ROC-US diplomatic relations and the MDT, CCK's administration had little choice but to continue to preserve the closest possible Taipei-Washington relations. The passage of the TRA, amidst Taipei's strong lobbying, can be regarded as one of the most important strategic arrangements of CCK's administration in its continued competition against the PRC. Nevertheless, for the first time since 1950, the ROC was by 1980 forced to encounter the PRC security threat alone without an explicit defence commitment from America, which at the same time hastened Taipei's build-up of an autonomous defence capacity of its own.

To understand how Chiang Ching-Kuo's administration fought for the political survival of the ROC as an independent sovereign state, this chapter examines four key developments, which encapsulated Taiwan's grand strategy in the CCK era. The first part examines the implications of Washington's passing of the TRA, which imposed a new strategic environment on Taipei, and shows how CCK managed this decisive new development. The second part explores CCK's strategic choice, which saw him shift from the outward-looking strategy

for the cross-Straits competition to an “inward-looking” strategy concentrating on domestic construction. The third part focuses on Taipei’s counter-measures, which derived from CCK’s Chinese nationalist perspective on Taiwan’s grand strategy, against Beijing’s “United Front” strategy. The fourth part discusses Taiwan’s strategic posture, which was designed to establish defensive-oriented military deterrence measures against Beijing’s military threat.

### C.5.1 Washington’s Taiwan Relations Act

Since the beginning of Nixon’s rapprochement policy, Taipei had been aware that full Sino-American normalization was only a matter of time and the right conditions. In fact, early in 1976, Taipei had begun to work out a contingency plan, which built on ten scenarios about relations to deal with the possible rupture of diplomatic relations with the US<sup>6</sup>. After the 1972 Shanghai Communiqué, whereby the US and the PRC let Sino-American normalization go forward, Washington had guaranteed Taipei at least forty times that the US would continue its diplomatic recognition of the ROC and remain committed to the ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, the worst scenario that seemed likely to Taipei was Carter’s acceptance of the PRC’s three main normalization conditions: 1) diplomatic de-recognition with the ROC; 2) termination of the MDT; and 3) withdrawal of American forces on Taiwan, although the US did not fully comply with Beijing’s conditions, e.g. that the US should end its arms sales to Taiwan.<sup>8</sup> As the White House almost totally excluded the involvement of the US Congress from the final chapter of the Sino-American normalization process, the US Congress responded by a strong involvement in the drafting of the Taiwan Relations Act so as to provide a substantial framework for maintaining the long-standing relations between Taipei and Washington, even after the end of their formal diplomatic and alliance relations. Exploiting the competition between the US Congress and the White House, CCK’s administration seized the opportunity and lobbied the US Congress to the utmost, a move which was designed to associate the TRA with Taipei’s “Five Principles” so as to establish a new framework for relations between these two countries after Sino-American normalization. In the end, the core of CCK’s

---

<sup>6</sup> Fredrick F. Chien (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 1: Diplomatic Dynamics*, pp. 334-336. By this time, Chien, a Deputy Foreign Minister in charge of relations between Taipei and Washington, had finalized the plan.

<sup>7</sup> Fredrick F. Chien (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 1: Diplomatic Dynamics*, p. 394.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p.335. Robert S. Ross (1995) *Negotiating Cooperation*, pp.133-141.

method of improving Taiwan's strategic environment was managing Taipei-Washington relations under the new TRA.

### ***Taipei's "Five Principles"***

The primary goal of Taipei's strategy for handling America's abrogation of its diplomatic recognition of Taiwan and its security commitment was to establish an alternative framework which would tie it as closely as possible to the US to maintain its security ties. Two weeks after its de-recognition by the Carter administration, CCK's government proposed the "Five Principles" as a new guideline in building a comprehensive new relationship with the US. The "Five Principles" are: "continuity" (*chixu xing*), "reality" (*xianshi xing*), "security" (*anquan*), "legality" (*fali*) and "governmentality" (*zhengfu quanxi*).<sup>9</sup>

Fredrick F. Chien, Taipei's main negotiator, recalls the background to the design of these five principles<sup>10</sup>. According to him, in the aftermath of Carter's announcement, Taipei's initial concern was a functional one: that a "continuity" principle should secure the many non-political dimensions of treaties and executive agreements which seamlessly bond two countries to each other. Second, the "reality" principle was a political consideration, which called on America to accept, realistically and pragmatically, the fact that the ROC retained its sovereign status over Taiwan. Third, in the context of China's immense threat, the "security" principle was at the heart of Taipei's concern to manage the Taipei-Washington strategic relationship, on which depended the ROC's very political survival and its ability to make a credible response to China's threats in the continuing but dynamic cross-Strait sovereignty competition. To accomplish both goals, namely political survival and a credible response, Taipei desperately required Washington's assurance and support for its national defence after the termination of the MDT. Fourth, following de-recognition, Taipei's "legality" principle was a practical concern that was meant, despite its informal political status, to guide the non-political bilateral relationships in multifaceted forms of cooperation on the basis of solid law. Finally, the most problematic principle among the five was "governmentality"

---

<sup>9</sup> Document 31: 'President Chiang Ching-kuo's Five Principles on US-ROC Relations in the Postnormalization Period, December 29, 1978', in Chiu Hungdah (Ed.) (1979) *China and the Taiwan Issue* (New York: Prager), p.262.

<sup>10</sup> Fredrick F. Chien (1999) 'The Taiwan Relations Act and ROC-US Relations: A Review After Twenty Years', in The Central Agency (Ed.) (1999) *TRA: The First 20 Years, A Critical Review of the Taiwan Relations Act* (Taipei: The Central News Agency), pp. 18-23.

in the sense that, after Washington's de-recognition, the ROC still expected a more durable and formal inter-governmental relationship with the US in the future.

Put into practice the aim of the "Five Principles" was designed to preserve the existing Taipei-Washington relations by a unique arrangement. The "governmentality" principle, for instance, well demonstrated that Taipei wanted to maintain its inter-governmental relations with Washington, despite Sino-American normalization. Compared with Chiang Kai-shek's previous rigid foreign policy vis-à-vis the PRC, CCK demonstrated a more flexible and pragmatic approach toward this most serious international setback to its national security. However, due to Beijing's conditions for the normalization, Carter's administration showed no interest in Taipei's demands or in extending greater flexibility. During the Taipei-Washington negotiations, the White House refused altogether to consider the "Five Principles".<sup>11</sup> On 29 January 1979, without any advance discussion with Taipei, the Carter administration instead submitted the Taiwan Omnibus Bill, which sought 'to promote the foreign policy of the United States through the maintenance of commercial, cultural and other relations with the people on Taiwan on an unofficial basis and for other purposes.'<sup>12</sup>

Carter's "unofficial basis" principle for constructing the new Taipei-Washington relations has ever since had profound negative impacts on Taiwan. However, CCK's five principles were, one way or another, incorporated into the TRA, which eventually replaced Carter's Taiwan Omnibus Bill.<sup>13</sup> Many factors, in particular the clash between Congress and the White House, allowed the Act to pass.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, its legislation should not be attributed to American domestic factors alone. Had it not been for CCK's vigorous lobbying of Congress and the pragmatic stance and clear purposes of the "Five Principles", the TRA might not have been formulated so much in Taipei's favour, much to China's consternation, as evidenced by the fact that Beijing has never ceased to oppose it strongly. As a result, the distinct pragmatism of the CCK's approach to the new Taipei-Washington relationship comprised the following elements: first, to limit but still accept the complications in ROC-US-PRC relations and,

---

<sup>11</sup> Fredrick F. Chien (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 1: Diplomatic Dynamics*, p. 412.

<sup>12</sup> Lee David Tawei (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act: Twenty Years in Retrospect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.48-49.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, pp.48-51.

<sup>14</sup> See Chapter 1, in Lee David Tawei (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act*.

second, to isolate rather than combine the key difficulties within Taipei's "Five Principles" by resolving any problems one by one through practical measures. Accordingly, the five principles were separately treated as individual goals to be pursued during the negotiations in the process of passing the TRA, but in the end they would be assembled as a comprehensive means to tie the ROC to America.

### *America's Formula of "Peaceful Resolution"*

For the US, the pursuit of peace and stability across the Taiwan Strait has been a consistent strategic goal ever since it sides with Taipei in the ROC-PRC political-military competition in 1950. The cross-Strait situation has affected various American interests over time. During the Sino-American confrontation in the 1950s and 1960s, peace and stability across the Strait served as an indispensable goal in preserving the status quo in East Asia in favour of the American strategy of global containment. In terms of international commitments, maintaining peace in the Taiwan Strait has always represented America's credibility as a leader in international society. From the geopolitical point of view, the Taiwan issue relates to regional stability and prosperity. In the domestic context, to prevent Taiwan from attack by China is a matter of moral responsibility for the US as Taiwan has been its long-standing and loyal ally for decades, causing the American Senator Richard Stone to call the TRA an "emotional legislation"<sup>15</sup>. As a result, even in the de-recognition announcement on 15 December, 1978, President Carter unilaterally stated, 'The US 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.'<sup>16</sup>

However, putting into practice Carter's proposal, with its contradictory goals of both preserving peace and preventing interference across the Strait, highlighted the dilemma of how the US could maintain peace without actually being seen to interfere. This dilemma, later, brought about the further strategic debate whether America should adopt an ambiguous or clear policy to prevent the possibility of China's invading Taiwan.<sup>17</sup> In fact, throughout the Sino-American

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p.183.

<sup>16</sup> President Jimmy Carter (15 December, 1978), 'US Statement Accompanying the Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the US and the P.R.C.', in Chiu, Hungdah (Ed.) (1979) *China and the Taiwan Issue* (New York: Praeger), p.256.

<sup>17</sup> Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (1994) *United States-Taiwan Security Ties: From Cold War to Beyond Containment* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger), pp.30-32.

normalization negotiations, none of the officials in Carter's administration pressed specifically for a formal guarantee by China that it would not use force against Taiwan.<sup>18</sup>

Unable and apparently unwilling to win China's unequivocal commitment to renounce the use of force and declining to intervene in a possible military clash across the Strait, the Carter administration unilaterally proclaimed the need for a "peaceful resolution" across the Strait, but this was wishful thinking rather than a practical policy. Nevertheless, Carter's statement that the US wanted "the peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue" provided Taipei with a starting point to construct a new security arrangement with the US. The sound endorsement of the "peaceful solution" formula was embodied later in the TRA, even though in a 'lengthy and convoluted form'.<sup>19</sup> The content of this endorsement is in sections 2 and 3 of the TRA. Here the US commits itself:

S.2. (b).2 "to declare that peace and security in the [Western Pacific] area are in the political, security and economic interests of the United States and are matters of international concern";

S.2. (b).3 "to make clear that the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the PRC rests on the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means;

S.2. (b).4 "to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including boycotts or embargoes [would be considered] a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States";

S.2. (b).5 "to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character; and

S.2. (b).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 of Taiwan".

Also, in accordance with S.3. (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

---

<sup>18</sup> Martin Schram, 'China Policy: A Born-Again Brzezinski', *Washington Post*, 8 February 1979.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, p. 149.

processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger.”<sup>20</sup>

Since China persistently refused to renounce the use of force, Washington’s endorsement of achieving the peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue within the TRA can be regarded as a vigorous expression of American concern for Taiwan’s security following the formal abrogation of the MDT. Considering that there were no diplomatic relations between Taipei and Washington, this strategic arrangement was not as good as the MDT but it nevertheless enabled Taipei to link its national security with the core of America’s cross-Strait policy, i.e. the interest in a peaceful resolution of the conflict between Taiwan and China. In the end, the American formula of cross-Strait peaceful resolution helped not only to alleviate Taiwan’s security concerns about China’s military threat (e.g. Washington’s interference in the 1995-96 Strait crisis see in next chapter), but also to justify US arms sales as a way of enhancing Taiwan’s self-defence capability in the post-MDT era.

### ***Problems of Taipei’s Arms Acquisitions***

The nature of Taiwan’s arms acquisitions is naturally linked to a desirable military balance across the Strait in terms of Taiwan’s power to defend its own sovereignty against the military threat from China. Without available and adequate arms, Taiwan’s grand strategy is seriously undermined by this disadvantage, not only physically but also psychologically. The view in Taipei has been that any ongoing military imbalance would eventually increase Beijing’s determination to invade, given the prospect of an easy military victory. Accordingly, the military balance across the Strait has raised a serious strategic challenge for Taipei: how would it be possible to secure Washington’s commitment to continuing arms sales to Taiwan in the absence of diplomatic relations between the two countries? Not surprisingly, one of CCK’s preferred solutions to deal with this predicament was to embed the arms sale issue within the TRA.

Being committed to bringing about “the peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue”, Washington has also been keen to prevent a military clash with Beijing over the cross-Strait confrontation. A feasible way of attaining these two goals was for

---

<sup>20</sup> *Taiwan Relations Act, 1979*, in Chiu Hungdah (Ed.) (1979) *China and the Taiwan Issue*, p.267.

the US to equip Taiwan with sufficient arms to defend itself without risking its own direct involvement in war. This was an echo of Nixon's Guam Doctrine. In accepting China's three normalization conditions, namely, severing its diplomatic relations with Taipei, withdrawing its armed forces from Taiwan and terminating the MDT, President Carter had presented America's own conditions on the Taiwan issue: the continuity of its arms sales to Taiwan and a commitment to the peaceful resolution of the conflict across the Strait. However, both American conditions were indignantly rejected by China.<sup>21</sup> China's opposition to American arms sales on Taiwan was built on the rationale that the arms sales would not only challenge Beijing's sovereignty claim, but also maintain Taipei's defence capacity and symbolize America's continued defence commitment to Taiwan. This in turn would undermine 'the PRC's ability to isolate Taiwan and ... pressure it to acquiesce to Beijing's demands.'<sup>22</sup>

Despite Beijing's persistent opposition, however, Washington continued to supply Taiwan with weapons to maintain a more or less favourable military balance across the Strait as a means of securing the "peaceful solution" formula in practice. To substantiate this formula with respect to Taiwan, Washington pledges, in sections 2 and 3 of the TRA, to "provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character" and to "make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quality as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capacity."<sup>23</sup> In fact, at the time Taiwan had not signed any new contracts for US weapons since the early years of the Ford administration.<sup>24</sup> To complete the normalization, President Carter during the negotiations made a last-minute concession to Beijing – he agreed to a moratorium on arms sales to Taiwan for one year.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, the US arms sales to Taiwan in fact increased after the passage of the TRA; the US sold to Taiwan weapons worth approximately \$ 1.4 billion during the first four years following the passage of the Act.<sup>26</sup> However, because of the ambiguous terms (e.g. "security", "defensive" and "sufficient") in the TRA and the President's executive power under the American Constitution, the interpretation and

---

<sup>21</sup> Lee David Tawei (1996) *The Legitimizing Process of the Taiwan Relations Act: The Balance of Power between American President and Congress* (Taipei: Feng-Yun Forum Press), p.19.

<sup>22</sup> Ross (1995) *Negotiating Cooperation*, p.134.

<sup>23</sup> *Taiwan Relations Act, 1979*, in Chiu, Hungdah (Ed.) (1979) *China and the Taiwan Issue*, p.267.

<sup>24</sup> Ross (1995) *Negotiating Cooperation*, p.133.

<sup>25</sup> Jay Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo's Son: Chiang Ching-kuo and the Revolutions in China and Taiwan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 335-336.

<sup>26</sup> Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (1994) *United States-Taiwan Security Ties: From Cold War to Beyond Containment* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger), p. 31.

implementation of the arms sales provision in the TRA ultimately depended on the White House. One of the clearest examples of the possibilities available to the White House to potentially undermine the TRA was the Sino-American Joint Communiqué on Arms Sales to Taiwan of 17 August 1982.

Disregarding the TRA, which committed the US to provide Taiwan with arms, the Joint Communiqué of August 17 proclaimed a new formula under which the Reagan administration agreed to gradually bring to an end American arms sales to Taiwan. While “understanding and appreciating” Beijing’s efforts for the promotion of peaceful cross-Strait reunification, Washington in the Communiqué, stated that ‘it [the American government] does not seek to carry out a long-term policy of arms sales to Taiwan... and it intends to reduce gradually its sales to Taiwan, leading over a period of time to a final resolution.<sup>27</sup> This statement obviously diluted the TRA’s commitment to sell American arms to Taiwan and raised a groundswell of criticism that the Reagan administration had compromised Taiwan’s security.<sup>28</sup> To balance the impact of the Communiqué on the arms sales issue, the Regan administration then gave Taiwan what it called the “Six Assurances”, as follows:

1. The US has not agreed to set a date for ending arms sales to the ROC.
2. The US has not agreed to hold prior consultations with the Chinese Communists on arms sales to the ROC.
3. The US will not play any mediation role between Taipei and Beijing.
4. The US has not agreed to revise the TRA.
5. The US has not altered its position regarding sovereignty over Taiwan.
6. The US will not exert pressure on the ROC to enter into negotiations with the PRC.<sup>29</sup>

To deflect these criticisms of the Communiqué and the fear which it aroused, President Reagan, confirmed in this regard that ‘Our Taiwanese friends are going to continue to get everything they need for their own self-defence.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, a serious lesson could be drawn from the changes in the American

---

<sup>27</sup> *The United States-China Joint Communiqué of August 17*, in Chang, Jaw-ling Joanne (1986) *United States- China Normalization: An Evaluation of Foreign Policy Decision Making* (Baltimore: University of Maryland School of Law), pp.202-203.

<sup>28</sup> Hickey (1994) *United States-Taiwan Security Ties*, p. 35.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. Discussion of the “Six Assurances” for example see Martin L. Laster (1992) ‘US Arms Sales to Taiwan’, in Steven W. Mosher (Ed) (1992) *The United States and the Republic of China: Democratic Friends, Strategic Allies and Economic Partners* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Periodicals), p.107.

<sup>30</sup> Hickey (1994) *United States-Taiwan Security Ties*, p.36.

position on this issue in the 1982 Communiqué, namely that America's arms sales policy would change from time to time and was not influenced by the terms of the TRA in terms of the willingness to maintain Taiwan's "sufficient self-defense capacity". Rather, the policy would substantially depend on the global context of Sino-American strategic relation and the current American perspective on whether China would resolve the Taiwan issue peacefully. All of these strategic issues were and still are beyond Taiwan's control.

### ***Taipei's Triumph? The Passing of the TRA***

The passage of the Taiwan Relations Act was a considerable strategic achievement for CCK's administration. In effect, the TRA generally embodied CCK's "Five Principles", although many of them were worded vaguely. During its legislative process, the American government did not consult with Taiwan over the Act since the TRA was a piece of domestic legislation, despite the fundamentally foreign scope of its content. Taiwan could hardly expect to be granted more of an American security guarantee when Carter's administration was overwhelmingly anxious to placate Chinese interests, concerns and sensitivities in the context of the prioritized Sino-American strategic alignment against the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, the Taiwan Omnibus Bill did not mention any of the peace preservation across the Strait or its security concerns over Taiwan. The administration insisted that any further explicit language in the TRA assuring Taiwan's security was unnecessary and unacceptable, since America had already made a clear declaration when calling for the "peaceful resolution" of the cross-Strait conflict.<sup>31</sup> When the Congress overwhelmingly passed the TRA as a replacement for the Omnibus Bill, President Carter, in order to express his reluctant approval, sat on the Act and waited to sign it until the last day of the statutory ten-day period.<sup>32</sup>

Given the lack of diplomatic recognition and a security assurance from the US, the most immediate problem for CCK's administration in the wake of the Sino-American post-normalization agreement was how to construct a comprehensive new relationship with Washington as a means of perpetually shielding the ROC's de facto sovereignty and security on Taiwan from the risk of forced reunification with Communist China. By then, the TRA had become a

---

<sup>31</sup> Steven M. Goldstein and Randall Schriver (2001) 'An Uncertain Relationship: the United States, Taiwan and the Taiwan Relations Act', *The China Quarterly*, Vol. 165, (March 2001), p. 148.

<sup>32</sup> Lee David Tawei (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act*, p. 175.

favourable alternative to grant Taipei an acceptable relationship with Washington, after the initial rejection by Carter's administration of Taipei's proposal of the "Five Principles" framework. The verdict on the passage of the TRA is that 'perhaps for the first time in the history of modern foreign affairs, a state had broken relations with another only to create a new legal arrangement so as to maintain virtually most relationships that had existed before.'<sup>33</sup> Beijing immediately expressed its protest at Washington's part concerning the passage of the TRA and this became the first serious complaint made by the PRC after the setting up of full diplomatic relations.<sup>34</sup> Beijing objected to three "unacceptable" aspects of the TRA: America's continued security commitment, albeit diminished, towards Taiwan, Taipei's retention of its diplomatic properties, and the fact that the Taiwanese authorities were still considered a "foreign government".<sup>35</sup> However, regardless of Beijing's protest, as Senator Frank Church said, the passage of the TRA proved that the United States had not "walked away from an old ally."<sup>36</sup>

After the legislation, in a press conference in June 1979 when CCK asserted Taiwan's continuing cooperation with the US leadership in international society, Chiang Ching-kuo commented that while the ROC had a 'deep sense of appreciation' for America's friendship as shown in the TRA, the actual effect of the Act would still rely on whether the American government could faithfully implement it.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, the key benefits of the TRA, which Taiwan associated with its grand strategy, were not whether words and commitments would be uttered but how the White House would define, interpret and implement them. The main cause of this derived from the distinctive character of the TRA, which incorporated "masterful ambiguities" deliberately created by its constructors.<sup>38</sup> These masterful ambiguities reflected the complexity of ROC-US-PRC relations. The ambiguity was designed not only to accommodate the competition between the Congress and the White House, but also more importantly to allow Washington flexibility in its Taiwan policy, in accord with the dynamic international situation and in line with America's interests. According to Prof. Parris H. Chang, a former American Taiwanese who participated in the making of the TRA, its provisions have never been fully and faithfully implemented

---

<sup>33</sup> Romon H. Myers (ed.) (1989) *A Unique Relationship: The United States and the Republic of China under the Taiwan Relations Act* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press), p.13.

<sup>34</sup> Lee David Tawei (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act*, p. 172.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> Washington Post, 14 March 1979.

<sup>37</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1992) *Collected Speeches of Chiang Ching-Kuo* (chiang ching-kuo xiang-sheng quan-ji), Vol.14 (Taipei: Government Information Office), p.427.

<sup>38</sup> Lee David Tawei (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act*, p. 180.

since its enactment in 1979.<sup>39</sup> The varying attitudes to its implementation from time to time have been caused by the different perspectives on its provisions taken by successive US administrations. As a result, these various interpretations have inevitably increased the uncertainty and difficulty felt by Taipei's leaders in associating the American enactment with its national grand strategy.

### **C.5.2 Toward an Inward-Looking Strategic Choice**

Soon after the US severed its diplomatic ties with Taiwan in 1979, thus plunging Taiwan into its most unfavourable strategic environment since 1950, a serious strategic challenge arose for Chiang Ching-kuo's administration: how might the government revalue and adjust the country's grand strategy to deal with this crisis in the context of cross-Strait confrontation? The most distinct characteristic of Taiwan's grand strategy under CCK's leadership can be described by then as its strategic choice to look inward, giving priority in its mission to domestic construction rather than the cross-Strait competition. The changed priority revised Taiwan's grand strategy fundamentally. The content of CCK's inward-looking strategic choice was determined by his ways of pursuing economic development, striving for Taipei's political survival, maintaining domestic order and implementing constitutional democracy. Of the four ways of domestic construction, CCK's national strategy appeared to be overwhelmingly economic in its scope. The major reason for such a national grand strategy was quite straightforward and pragmatic. Taiwan's increasing international isolation gave the island little choice but to rely mainly on its own efforts. And the way to improve the island's chances against China's threat would rest on its national comprehensive power, in which economic factors were decisive.

#### ***Economic Development***

It is believed that economic failure, in particular the financial crisis, was one of the main factors that had caused the defeat of the KMT in Mainland China.<sup>40</sup> In a self-examination after the defeat, Chiang Kai-shek confessed in his journal,

---

<sup>39</sup> Parris H. Chang (1999) 'Lessons from Twenty Years of the Taiwan Relations Act', in The Central Agency (Ed.) (1999) *TRA: The First 20 Years, A Critical Review of the Taiwan Relations Act* (Taipei: the Central News Agency), p. 33.

<sup>40</sup> Edward L. Dreyer (1995) *China at War, 1901-1949* (London: Longman), conclusion chapter.

‘in the past twenty years in power [in mainland China], I made no effort to pursue social reform and people’s welfare. The staff in our party, the military and the government were concerned only with their own official status; they ignored the implementation of the Three Principles of the People. In future all our efforts in education [in the KMT reforms] will begin with a concern for people’s livelihood.’<sup>41</sup> CCK learned his father’s lesson and commented, ‘this is a thoughtful assessment of our defeat and will be a permanent guideline for our revolutionary policy.’<sup>42</sup> In 1986, after creating a so-called “Taiwanese miracle” under his administration, CCK proudly ended his account of the course of his successful experience, ‘We have grasped a very salient point: the people’s well-being is the core factor of history.’<sup>43</sup>

As Taiwan was a developing country, the people’s well-being depended on economic development. The guideline for Taiwan’s economic policy associated with CCK’s inward-looking strategy, following Sun Yat-sen’s Principle of the People’s Livelihood, was that ‘[its] economic development should get started with land reform and the promotion of industries that provide for the basic needs of life – food, clothing, housing and transportation.’<sup>44</sup> CCK’s first major economic initiative was “The Ten Major Development Projects” (*shi da jianshe*) in the early 1970s, which laid a solid foundation for Taiwan’s economic development. Responding to critics of the difficulties of the Projects in the beginning, his determination took shape in a dictum, “If we don’t do it today, tomorrow we will regret it!”

The character of Taiwan’s economic policies under CCK was ‘more problem-oriented than ideology oriented’.<sup>45</sup> “I learned a serious lesson on the mainland”, CCK said as Premier to the Legislative Yuan in 1972: “namely, the economic issue must be resolved by economic means and principles, not by political means.”<sup>46</sup> In fact, ever since the early 1970s when CCK took control of the government, the nature of his administration was economy-centred. The main reason for saying this is that CCK, in contrast to his father, focused the

---

<sup>41</sup> *The Collection of President Chiang Ching-kuo’s Speech and Articles*, Vol. II, (Taipei: Li Ming Culture Publishing, 1983), pp.557-8.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1986) *China’s Reunification and World Peace*, p.5.

<sup>44</sup> Li Kuo-ting (1988) *The Evolution of Policy Behind Taiwan’s Development Success* (New Haven: Yale University Press), pp.150-151. Li was the key author of CCK’s economic policy, and the Minister of Economics, Finance, and State in the 1960s and 1970s. He was also known as “the creator of Taiwan’s economic miracle”.

<sup>45</sup> Li Kuo-ting (1988) *The Evolution of Policy Behind Taiwan’s Development Success*, p.150.

<sup>46</sup> Liu Pao-chieh (2005) *Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Ching-kuo: Archives Decoded* (Taipei: E.T. Publishers), p.168.

country's major effort on domestic economic development rather than other issues. In the 1980s, facing increasing calls for domestic democratization and a more flexible policy across the Strait, CCK still insisted that economic development take precedence.<sup>47</sup> It was the first time in the KMT's history that economics, instead of politics, together with the mainland issue, enjoyed a higher place in government policy.

The pursuit of economic development stood at the very heart of CCK's inward-looking national strategy. It was not only an end in itself to attain prosperity and spread social welfare by improving the living standards of the Taiwanese people and thus winning their support as the KMT had failed to do when in power on the mainland. It was also an indispensable means to enhance Taiwan's overall national capabilities, to put the government in a better position to defend itself despite its state of relative international isolation. Furthermore, according to the modernization theory of the developing state, the more a country's economy develops, the easier it is for it to implement political democracy.<sup>48</sup> Accordingly, the government's claim that Taiwan was developing into a model which would appeal to the people of Mainland China would be substantiated only when Taiwan made considerable improvement in relation to its citizens' economic and political well-being.

### ***Political Survival***

In late January 1979, the month of America's de-recognition of Taipei, Hedley Donovan of *Time* magazine asked Deng Xiaoping about the meaning of Beijing's initiation of the peaceful reunification approach and its effect on cross-Strait relations. He replied, 'Ten years is too long a time [to wait for reunification]'.<sup>49</sup> No doubt, when the ROC lost America's diplomatic recognition and its commitment to the island's security, Deng was optimistic that Taipei would lose its morale and come to accept Beijing's terms for reunification. Deng's confidence well reflected the view that Taipei's political survival, defined in terms of political independence and the preservation of sovereignty, was in imminent and palpable danger.

To pursue political survival is "the bottom line" and "a minimum requirement",

---

<sup>47</sup> Jay Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo's Son*, pp.369-370.

<sup>48</sup> Wu Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait: Taiwan, China, and the Prospects for Reunification* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.99-100.

<sup>49</sup> *Washington Star*, January 29, 1979, p.1.

according to Muthiah Alagappa's observation, for any discourse about a state's security.<sup>50</sup> The meaning of the ROC's political survival, however, might have changed if the ROC's leaders had looked at the country's sovereign status across the Strait from a different perspective. Ever since 1949, when Chiang Kai-shek (CKS) had retreated from the communist forces to Taiwan, the ROC in Taiwan had struggled for political survival as a sovereign entity. However, Chiang Ching-kuo and Chiang Kai-shek gave different meanings to preserving the ROC government in Taiwan. For CKS, the political survival of the ROC in Taiwan was undeniably vital, but it was more important for him that this survival was applied to fulfilling Taipei's ultimate political mission: the restoration of Mainland China under the KMT rule. In the end, the nature of the ROC's political survival under CKS was characterized by his outward-looking strategic choice to pursue cross-Straits unification. From CKS's perspective on national survival, therefore, any approach that disconnected the ROC's political survival from the task of reunifying with the mainland was not only unsound but also immoral.<sup>51</sup>

Chiang Ching-kuo had a somewhat different perspective on Taipei's political survival, even though in many ways he shared his father's vision of the relationship between Taiwan and China in the matter of cross-Straits unification. In other words, for CCK, the ROC's political survival during his regime was more of an end than a means. The reason for this adjustment reflected not only Taiwan's apparent material disadvantages but also the unfavourable international political structure as perceived by Taipei in the context of cross-Straits competition. Since Taiwan's favourable strategic environment – in the form of Sino-American hostility – had already disappeared, Taipei could not afford any longer to take for granted its political survival as it had formerly done. According to Ray S. Cline, CCK's close personal friend and a former CIA Station Chief in Taipei, CCK often said, 'Small nations have to adjust to international geopolitical circumstances and protect themselves the best way they can.'<sup>52</sup> CCK's awareness of the limitations of a "small state" such as Taiwan reflected his realism, which revised his father's outward-looking strategic choice of a national grand strategy for Taiwan in this dynamic strategic

---

<sup>50</sup> Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) (1998) *Asian Security Practice- Material and ideational Influences* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), pp.63-4.

<sup>51</sup> 'President Chiang Kai-shek's 1975 New Year Message', in You Zixiang (2006) *Leaders' Rhetoric: Collection of Important Speeches by Cross-Straits Leaders, 1906-2006* (Taipei: Wu Nan Publishers), pp.359-361. In fact, Chiang Kai-shek's determination and devotion to pursue the mission of cross-Straits unification mission lasted to his dying day.

<sup>52</sup> Ray S. Cline (1989) *Chiang Ching-kuo Remembered: The Man and His Political Legacy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Global Strategic Council), p.124.

context.

CCK's pursuit of the ROC's political survival was, then, closely associated with his inward-looking strategic choice. When Washington opted for strategic alignment with Beijing and severed its military-diplomatic relations with Taipei, CCK's administration had little choice but to turn its strategic attention to the domestic context, choosing first to look inwards for its political survival rather than outwards to the Mainland China. In the negotiations to establish new overall relations with the US following de-recognition, CCK's administration called sternly for Washington to recognize that Taiwan had never been part of the PRC's sovereign domain.<sup>53</sup> For CCK, the predominant strategic concern was not so much to recover the lost mainland as to secure Taiwan as the last foothold of the Nationalists.<sup>54</sup> At the very least, Taiwan had to be sustained as a free China, beyond the dominion of the Chinese Communists, for the sake of CCK's vision of sovereignty, of establishing a "liberal, democratic and prosperous" China across the Strait. Accordingly, the ROC's political survival was a matter of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, which was derived from its efforts to preserve and implement the Constitution of the ROC.<sup>55</sup>

### ***Domestic Order***

Domestic order requires a political authority to maintain its effective control to ensure political and social stability. The increasing external threats of international isolation and China's challenge led to CCK's concern with securing Taiwan's domestic order. Domestic disorder of any kind, political instability in particular, represented a serious internal threat to the authority of the government, as well as the KMT. CCK's concern for domestic order could be traced back to the painful experience of the Chinese civil war. Then the KMT lost control domestically before suffering its military defeat at the hands of the Chinese Communists.<sup>56</sup> The loss of domestic order meant the failure of government authority and credibility. For CCK's authoritarian government, securing domestic order was an indispensable part of its inward-looking

---

<sup>53</sup> Fredrick F. Chien (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu*, Vol. 1, p.404.

<sup>54</sup> Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival: The Foreign Policy and External Relations of the Republic of China on Taiwan* (London: Sherwood Press), p.292.

<sup>55</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1986) *China's Reunification and World Peace* (Taipei: Kuomintang), pp.11-12.

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion of the Chinese civil war from 1945-49, see Edward L. Dreyer (1995) *China at War, 1901-1949* (London: Longman), chapter 8 and conclusion.

national strategy because Taiwan was the last and only place where the Nationalist regime held sway and there was nowhere else to go.

In fact, ever since the 228 Incident in 1947, the KMT leaders constantly feared that local Taiwanese would challenge the authority of the Nationalist authoritarian government.<sup>57</sup> In the 1977 elections for magistrates, mayors and the Taiwan Provincial Assembly, the anti-KMT Taiwanese organization, also called *Tangwai*, which later became the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), won an unprecedented victory in a fiercely-fought election contest with the KMT. However, KMT's election fraud in Tao-yuan County soon triggered the Chungli Incident of November 1977, which was regarded as the worst instance of mass violence since the 228 Incident.<sup>58</sup> Facing increased internal political challenges, when the US derecognized the ROC in December 1978, CCK immediately decided to suspend the National Assembly and the supplementary election of the Legislative Yuan to reduce the impact of this diplomatic disaster on the domestic situation. When the Tangwai fiercely protested against this suspension, political strong man CCK responded by suppressing its opposition activities and detaining its leading members.<sup>59</sup> The confrontation between the KMT and Tangwai gradually escalated. It culminated in the Kaohsiung Incident (the *Meilidao* Incident) of 10 December 1979, in which a violent encounter erupted between police and the supporters of the *Formosa* magazine. No one was killed in this fracas, but the incident led to the arrest of more than forty dissidents and eight members of staff on the *Formosa* were court-martialled for treason, while others faced trial in civilian courts.<sup>60</sup> This serial confrontation and suppression of the anti-government party revealed CCK's intention to first and foremost preserve national security by addressing threats from within the state rather than from outside it.

CCK's views on domestic order had two principal components: control and stability. The implementation of efficient control was a necessary means to the pursuit of stability; in return, stability as a property of order would sustain control. One of the most important measures of control was then to maintain the supremacy of the one-party authoritarian rule of the KMT. Not surprisingly,

---

<sup>57</sup> Details of the 228 Incident see Tse-Han Lai, Ramon H. Myers and Wei Wou (1991) *The Tragic Beginning: The Taiwan Uprising of February 28, 1947* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

<sup>58</sup> Lin Cheng-Yi (1989) *Triangle Lessons of Taiwan's Security: Influence of China and the US* (Taipei: Qui Quan Publisher), PP.103-105; Shelley Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (London: Routledge), pp.114-116.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy*, pp.116-8.

Samuel P. Huntington's book, *Political Order in a Changing Society*, which emphasizes the advantages of a one-party authoritarian rule as a necessary evil in developing countries by which to maintain political stability for the sake of achieving national modernization,<sup>61</sup> was well received by the government to justify its authoritarian rule and became a textbook at many universities in Taiwan. In 1982, Minister of the Interior Lin Yang-kan remarked in the Legislative Yuan that a multiparty system would damage the government's efforts to withstand Beijing's threats and warned of the dangers associated with such a system, not least with reference to China's political turmoil between 1911 and 1923.<sup>62</sup> In terms of seeking domestic order, the continuing threat from Communist China also justified CCK's endorsement of the one-party system, in terms of seeking domestic order. Accordingly, Taipei's leaders were convinced that the implications of multiparty competition in Taiwan would very likely undermine the government's efforts to maintain domestic stability in order to pursue economic development.

### ***Constitutional Democracy***

The pursuit of constitutional democracy was related to the very existence of the KMT government on Taiwan, in terms of its legitimacy and legality, as part of CCK's inward-looking strategy. For nearly two decades as an authoritarian ruler in Taiwan, CCK was in fact the one person who possessed the power to interpret and implement the Constitution. This enabled him to manipulate the Constitution so as to associate it with his national strategy. Ching-fen Hu puts it well: that Taiwan's democratization in the 1980s 'ultimately belonged to Chiang Ching-kuo', for Taiwan's experience clearly illustrates that democracy can be achieved through political leadership.<sup>63</sup> Motivated to construct the ROC as a political model which would successfully compete with the PRC in political terms, CCK had decided in the 1970s that Taiwan would gradually move towards constitutional democracy.<sup>64</sup> However, it was not until the late 1980s

---

<sup>61</sup> See Samuel P. Huntington (1986) *Political Order in a Changing Society* (New Haven: Yale University Press) and Samuel P. Huntington and Clement H. Moore (ed.) (1970) *Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society: The Dynamics of the Established One-Party Systems* (New York: Basic Books).

<sup>62</sup> Lin Cheng-Yi (1987), *China, the US, and the Security of Taiwan*, p.156.

<sup>63</sup> Ching-fen Hu (2005) 'Taiwan's Geopolitics and Chiang Ching-kuo's Decision to Democratize Taiwan', *Stanford Journal of East Asia Affairs*, Vol.5, No.1 (Winter 2005), p.26.

<sup>64</sup> For CCK's perspective on constitutional democracy, see Chen Peng-ren (1990) *The Life of Chiang Ching-kuo* (Taipei: Central Daily News Publishers), pp.281-291; Zhang Zhu-yi (2009) *The Late Years of Chiang Ching-kuo* (Taipei: Tian-xia Yuan-jian Publishers), pp. 121-123. Zhang Zhu-yi was one of CCK's close members of staff from 1972 to 1988 and deputy general secretary to the Office of President Office.

that CCK actually took the first few steps to implement democracy. One of the most important steps at the time was to lift martial law in July 1987, although CCK insisted on retaining the “Temporary Provisions Effective During the Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion” (*dongyuan kanluan shiqi linshi tiaokuan*) because Taiwan’s national security was still tenuous and special arrangements were necessary.<sup>65</sup> In doing so, the move of the democratization in Taiwan would be a positive response both to the PRC’s threat and to the possibility of weakening moral at home while facing international isolation.<sup>66</sup> As John F. Copper has pointed out, ‘Taiwan had to democratize quickly to tell the world that it was no longer an authoritarian dictatorship and consequently, that it deserved to be consulted about its own future’.<sup>67</sup>

After decades of political socialization in Taiwan under the KMT, it became a deeply rooted ambition to implement popular sovereignty or democracy in accordance with Dr Sun Yat-sen’s fundamental doctrine. The people held this desire, as did the political leaders generally, and especially CCK himself. However, as mentioned, the democracy proclaimed by the ROC Constitution was not fully put into practice for some time because the government felt it had to focus on the need for stability and control in the interests of political survival and another, albeit less immediate national goal: reunification. The turning point of Taiwan’s democratic development came in 1979 with the Kaohsiung Incident, when Tangwai clashed with the KMT government. Indeed, 1979 was described by CCK as “the most difficult and dangerous year in the history” of the KMT in Taiwan.<sup>68</sup> To transform the crisis into an opportunity, CCK decided to take a further step in implementing constitutional democracy, not only to maintain domestic order, but also, equally importantly, as an instrument of anti-communism which would distinguish the democratic China on Taiwan from the communist China on the mainland. Moreover, democratic reform could lessen Washington’s increasing demands on Taiwan to democratize. In the event, CCK’s implementation of constitutional democracy was incremental rather than unconditional.

This conditional democracy sought to ensure domestic stability without violence.

---

<sup>65</sup> CCK insisted on Taiwan’s conditional democracy because of China’s threats. See Chen Peng-ren (1990) *The Life of Chiang Ching-kuo*, p.290.

<sup>66</sup> Editorial, ‘Promising Changes in Taiwan’, New York Times, 9 December 1986, p. A34.

<sup>67</sup> Wu Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait*, p.100.

<sup>68</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo’s speech in the fourth plenum of the KMT’s Eleventh Central Committee. See in Taylor, Jay (2000) *The Generalissimo’s Son*, pp.350-1.

As CCK asserted, “the security of the nation and society” was of “greater importance” than “human rights and freedom”.<sup>69</sup> He pledged to establish “a stable democracy” in Taiwan where ‘freedom will not be transformed into permissiveness and democracy will not turn to violence.’<sup>70</sup> He took three simultaneous goals as “the basis of democracy”: to “abide by public opinion, strengthen the rule of law and enhance responsible politics.”<sup>71</sup> As a result, when the KMT hard-liners asked the president to take radical action against dissidents who had established the opposition party in 1986, CCK replied, ‘To arrest people cannot solve a problem … The government should avoid conflict and remain calm.’<sup>72</sup> Near the end of his rule, CCK’s determination and belief in implementing constitutional democracy, even though conditional, eventually built a solid foundation, which enabled his successor to take democratic reforms further still.

### **C.5.3 Taipei’s Counter-Measures against Beijing’s “United Front” Strategy**

The continuation of the cross-Straits confrontation, during CCK’s regime, came about because of the unfinished Chinese civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists in terms of the competition for Chinese sovereignty. In addition to its peaceful offensive to drive a wedge between Taipei and Washington as diplomatic and alliance partners, Beijing also initiated a “United Front” strategy which was designed to appeal to international society, and even Taiwan, by positing that sorting out the cross-Straits issue once and for all would be to the benefit of all. At the core of Beijing’s way of advancing the “United Front” strategy was Deng Xiao-ping’s proposal for cross-Straits reunification on the basis of “One Country, Two Systems”. CCK’s counter-strategy to this proposed idea focused on his famous “Three Noes Policy” (*sambu zhengce*): no contact, no negotiation and no compromise with the Chinese Communist regime.<sup>73</sup> The “Three Noes Policy” was mainly derived from the Nationalist perspective on Chinese nationalism, which proclaimed the Chinese Communist regime as a threat to Chinese society and international society as well. Because of this, Taipei’s grand strategy against Beijing comprised five major dimensions: emphasizing the importance of Taiwan for Chinese nationalism; pursuing

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo’s Son*, p.406.

<sup>73</sup> Wu Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait*, pp. 112-113.

domestic consolidation for the sake of internal unity and stability; combating the “One Country, Two System” doctrine in order to preserve a free China on Taiwan; defending Taipei’s international status by strengthening its comprehensive relations with international society; and securing the US as an arbiter for peace across the Strait.

### ***Chinese Nationalism***

CCK had a fervent belief in Chinese nationalism that, like his father’s, derived from Sun Yat-sen’s writings on Chinese nationalism, in terms to unite all Chinese into a solid single state for China’s prosperity, freedom and independence. The application of Chinese nationalism in Taiwan served, from CCK’s point of view, to substantiate a vision of the whole of China across the Strait in conditions of economic prosperity, political democracy and sovereign integrity. Within this vision, the separation between Taiwan and China, deriving from the competition between the ROC and the PRC over sovereignty, was to be regarded only as a temporary situation, by reference to the concept of the one-China principle across the Strait.<sup>74</sup> Adding the ideational consideration of a national mission, Chinese nationalism inspired the CCK government’s mainland policy, standing as the core of Taiwan’s grand strategy, which referred to the status and future of Taiwan vis-à-vis the Chinese mainland in terms of an ultimate unification across the Strait. In CCK’s words, ‘There is only one China [across the Strait]. It is a China that must be reunited, but only under a system in clear accord with the Three Principles of the People.’<sup>75</sup> ‘There is only one wish for us all’ was how CCK in 1986 summed up his government’s vision of the ROC on Taiwan in the light of Chinese nationalism: ‘that is, to rebuild a united, free and democratic China [across the Strait] so that all Chinese may live and work in peace and contentment.’<sup>76</sup>

CCK’s view of Chinese nationalism to pursue a united free China across the Strait, then, consisted of two interconnected steps: first, to develop Taiwan and then to pursue cross-Strait unification when the time was ripe. The strategy of developing Taiwan and unifying China both came under the banner of Chinese

---

<sup>74</sup> For CCK’s perspective on the one-China principle, see his speech on “the State’s Principle and Vitality” on February 1980, in You Zixiang (2006) *Leaders’ Rhetoric: Collection of Important Speeches of the Cross-Strait Leaders, 1906-2006* (Taipei City, Taiwan: Wu Nan Publishers), pp.370-377.

<sup>75</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1986) *China’s Reunification and World Peace*, p.10.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, p.14.

nationalism, which fundamentally linked CCK's focus on domestic construction with his mainland policy to resolve the cross-Strait competition. To develop Taiwan was not only an end itself, but also a means for devoting the Chinese people as a whole. CCK argued that Taiwan's development of political democracy, economic prosperity and social justice was appropriate for the Chinese culture and people and was designed to map the right road for the development of the Chinese mainland.<sup>77</sup> From this nationalist standpoint, a developed Taiwan was the very key to his national grand strategy; in turn, Taiwan's development would enable his government to proclaim its commitment to the future development of China. In the end, the auspicious development of Taiwan would still need to unify with Mainland China and this unification could not succeed unless Taiwan could develop the potential of its economy first. CCK's intention of relying on Chinese nationalism to connect the two concepts of cross-Strait unification and Taiwanese development reflected his strategic concerns to fight two ideological enemies, external Chinese communism and internal Taiwanese separatism.

On the one hand, from CCK's perspective, Chinese communism not only posed an imminent threat to the ROC's political survival but also represented disaster for the whole Chinese people.<sup>78</sup> The unfavourable strategic situation of international isolation and material disadvantage in competition with the Chinese communist regime convinced CCK that the pursuit of self-development and domestic unification in Taiwan should be the priority among the ROC's tasks, which it could and should undertake. Applying this Chinese nationalist perspective in the interests of self-development would help Taiwan to become a model for the whole of China and this accordingly would enable the ROC to compete with the PRC in a political rather than a military way in cross-Strait unification. On the other hand, CCK believed strongly that Taiwanese separatists were violating the ROC Constitutional Charter and undermining domestic security.<sup>79</sup> As a political strongman acting on his Chinese nationalist beliefs, CCK had both the means and the will to suppress the political challenge of internal Taiwanese separatism. It was also feared that Taiwanese separatism might provoke an unpredictable confrontation with Beijing's Chinese nationalism, which would lead to an unnecessary crisis threatening his regime. By the middle of 1987, the National Security Law replaced martial law, but it

---

<sup>77</sup> Chinag Ching-kuo (1980) "State's Principles and Vitality" in You Zixiang (2006) *Leaders' Rhetoric*, p.371.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

also prohibited any advocacy, spoken or in print, of “Taiwanese independence”. However, CCK seemed confident that the Nationalist government could convince the Taiwanese people of the benefits of drawing on Chinese nationalism for Taiwan’s future development. At the end of 1987, CCK believed that if Taiwan and China did not unify, Taiwan would gradually lose its advantages and find it harder and harder to continue as an independent entity.<sup>80</sup> CCK’s practice of Chinese nationalism in Taiwan was designed in its appeal to convince the people of Taiwan that Taiwanese separatism was no less serious than the threat of Chinese communism and would threaten the very survival of the ROC on its own. In adopting an inward-looking strategy and facing an increasing challenge to Taiwan’s independence, CCK’s insistence on Chinese nationalism was inevitable, and his anti-separatist measures on the domestic front, such as promulgating the National Security Law, became distinctive features within the development of Taiwan’s grand strategy during his regime.

### ***Domestic Consolidation***

Domestic consolidation entails a process of unifying and fortifying the people’s will against external threats. It involves a series of actions on the means to enhance morale, which enables the political community to respond effectively to perceived threats. In 1979, after the normalization of Sino-American ties, the first task of CCK’s national agenda was to achieve internal unity and stability.<sup>81</sup> Thomas A. Marks observes that it was principally Taipei’s efforts to achieve domestic security that saved Taiwan from the near-complete collapse of its international position.<sup>82</sup> The two vital pillars of CCK’s domestic consolidation to pursue unity and stability against Beijing’s “united front” strategy were to transfer the domestic focus from international isolation and to implement Taiwanisation to localize the KMT. Chiang Ching-kuo emphatically achieved both of these.

First, CCK’s strategy to contend against Beijing’s “united front” strategy of alienating the Taipei-Washington relations in domestic context involved shifting the focus of the Taiwanese people from international isolated frustration to self-reliant confidence. Ever since Taiwan had retreated from the UN in 1971,

---

<sup>80</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo’s Son*, p.414.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, p.345.

<sup>82</sup> Thomas A. Marks(1998) *Counterrevolution in China: Wang Sheng and the Kuomintang* (London: Frank Cass), p.239.

there had been a constant fear of international isolation. The long-dreaded but inevitable break in relations with America was Taiwan's worst international set-back, but from CCK's perspective, it also represented the worst moment of national crisis and had now passed.<sup>83</sup> By then, the key to successfully shifting the domestic focus away from the disaster of Taiwan's diplomatic setback would depend on whether CCK could convince the people in Taiwan that their destiny was in their own hands, not those of others'. During the turmoil of the Taipei-Washington's changing relations, CCK endeavoured to persuade as many as possible of the importance and value of self-reliance. The injunction "Rely on yourself and stay calm in the face of dynamic changes" (*zhuangjing ziqiang, chubian bujing*) had always been the dictum that he most liked. CCK efficiently took advantage of his party's control of the media, which was one of his most powerful means for politically socialising and mobilising his people. At the same time, CCK astutely launched extensive economic, political, military and social reforms associated with his inward-looking strategy to restore the nation's confidence. Even leading dissidents, such as Kang Ning-hsiang, also joined the national unity parade to begin with.<sup>84</sup> The achievement of Taiwan's "economic miracle", which CCK regarded as the core of his national grand strategy and the people's welfare, provided a solid basis for the government's effort to format its national confidence in self-reliance against international isolation.

The second pillar of CCK's consolidation strategy was "Taiwanisation" (*taiwan hua*), a process of political localisation designed to pursue reconciliation and consolidation in Taiwan. Taiwanisation was a function-centred process and formed efficient means of control. From a national identity point of view, Taiwanisation was designed to reduce the Taiwanese sense of alienation from the Chinese Nationalist regime.<sup>85</sup> CCK took two important steps as he proceeded with Taiwanisation: first, he recruited Taiwanese political leaders and, second, he endorsed the establishment of a democratic system. Thus, while Taiwanisation began as a tool for sustaining the minority rule of the KMT mainlanders, it gradually came to be a by-product of the KMT's preparedness to seek political reform and ultimately evolved as a means to win Taiwanese support in a liberal democratic political system. In the early 1980s, CCK told

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, p.343.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Christopher Hughes(1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism- National Identity and Status in International Society* (London: Routledge), p.51.

his American ally that he would end minority control by dint of “Taiwanisation” and would democratise Taiwan through “comprehensive elections”.<sup>86</sup> Accordingly, the strategy of Taiwanisation amounted to a combination of localization and democratization which essentially served the purpose of fashioning on Taiwan a consensus against the perceived two main security threats: Chinese communism and Taiwanese separatism. ‘After living in Taiwan for forty years’, CCK famously told the island’s residents in 1987, ‘I am a Taiwanese, of course also a Chinese.’<sup>87</sup> At the end of his regime, it was believed, according to Lucian W. Pye, that ‘the KMT had become largely native Taiwanese and that decision-making had moved to a generation that had come to political maturity on the island.’<sup>88</sup>

### ***Opposing Beijing’s “One Country Two System”***

After Beijing succeeded in bringing the Taipei-Washington diplomatic relations to an end, Deng Xiao-ping in 1982 sought to apply the “one country two systems” political solution to the cross-Strait reunification problem. Deng himself gave a simple and operational definition of his political strategy when, also with reference to the then British Crown Colony of Hong Kong he proposed that ‘the mainland practises socialism while Hong Kong and Taiwan remain capitalist.’<sup>89</sup> Thus, a distinguishing characteristic of the strategy emerged: to accept differences across the Strait so as to unify through peaceful means. Deng further explained the concept in 1983, ‘[As] peaceful reunification has been a common goal and interest between [the] CCP and KMT and [the reunification] is neither I annex you nor you annex me, we hope that both parties can cooperate in the process of national unification.’<sup>90</sup> Accordingly, the “one country, two systems” has become the guideline for Beijing’s peaceful reunification with the ROC. Standing behind Deng’s proposal by then, representatives of the pro-Beijing American policy making establishment, such as Henry Kissinger, the main architect of Sino-American rapprochement, lobbied Washington to consider Deng’s unprecedented offer, since it was ‘an

---

<sup>86</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo’s Son*, p.370

<sup>87</sup> Miao Chia-chi (2003) *Chiang Ching-kuo’s Life and the Transformation of His Ideas* (Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press), p.431.

<sup>88</sup> Lucian W. Pye (1986) “Taiwan Political Development and Its Implications for Beijing and Washington”, *Asian Survey*, June 1986, pp.618-19.

<sup>89</sup> *Beijing Review*, No.44 (October 29, 1984), p.16. Details discussion about “one country two system” see Richard C. Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot: Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press), pp.36-9.

<sup>90</sup> Deng spoke to an American Chinese scholar, Professor Winston Yang, quoted in Miao Chia-chi (2003) *Chiang Ching-kuo’s Life and the Transformation of His Ideas*, p.403.

historic opportunity' to peacefully resolve the Taiwan problem.<sup>91</sup>

To fight Beijing's peaceful reunification strategy, as we have seen, CCK proposed his famous "Three Noes Policy" (*sanbu zhengce*): no contact, no negotiation and no compromise with the CCP regime.<sup>92</sup> With regard to the possible negotiations with Beijing to justify his "Three Noes" doctrine, CCK warned, 'To talk peace with the Chinese Communists is to invite death. This is an agonizing, bloodstained lesson that we and many other Asian counties [e.g. South Vietnam] have learned.'<sup>93</sup> The main implication of CCK's warning can be understood to mean that Beijing's push for peaceful unification was seen as a strategy to downgrade the ROC's de facto sovereignty and international status, to weaken the island's domestic consolidation and to undermine Taipei-Washington relations, for instance, by hindering American arms sales. Nevertheless, while the "Three Noes Policy" lasted during the time of his regime, it is worth noting that CCK also decided to adopt a more flexible stance with which to develop working relations with China so as not to risk losing the cultural and civil connections across the Strait.<sup>94</sup> In October 1987, for instance, CCK launched a dramatic new policy, which allowed Taiwanese residents to travel to Mainland China for family visits, as a gesture of humanity.<sup>95</sup> This dramatic change can be regarded as his intention to prevent the island's being alienated from the Chinese mainland after decades of cross-Strait political confrontation. More importantly, the change also demonstrated his confidence and flexibility in taking the initiative of opening up to China. The confidence derived from the growth of Taiwan's economic prosperity and political democracy, which was in obvious contrast to conditions across the Strait. For CCK, these achievements mattered and told their own story. Indeed, he believed that they would undermine Beijing's unification strategy of "one country, two systems". In CCK's last media interview in December 1987, he asserted that '[the Chinese Communists] are changing to cope with our position, not vice versa.'<sup>96</sup>

The backbone of CCK's strategy against Beijing's approach to peaceful

---

<sup>91</sup> James Mann (1999) *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China, from Nixon to Clinton* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), pp.153-54.

<sup>92</sup> Wu Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait*, pp. 112-113.

<sup>93</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo's speech to the KMT Central Standing Committee, quoted in Tien, Hung-mao (ed.) (1983) *Mainland China, Taiwan, and United States Policy* (Cambridge, Mass: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain), p.243.

<sup>94</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo's Son*, pp.369-370.

<sup>95</sup> Wu Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait*, Chapter 11, pp.159-198.

<sup>96</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo's Son*, p.427.

reunification was to emphasize the differences across the Strait. In doing so, CCK insisted that it was because of the one-China principle across the Strait that the ROC, as the free China, should not give up its own efforts to unify China under the Three Principles of the People. CCK then urged, '[Taiwanese and Chinese] Patriotism requires anti-Communism and anti-Communist actions mean patriotism.'<sup>97</sup> 'The heart of the problem [across the Strait]', his Premier Sun Yun-suan responded to Beijing's proposals for peaceful reunification, 'is whether China should adopt a free and democratic system or a totalitarian and dictatorial one.'<sup>98</sup> From Taipei's perspective, the difference across the Strait mattered fundamentally and its political system could therefore not be compromised. 'There is no such thing as the "Taiwan problem"', CCK claimed. 'What we have is a "China problem" – a problem of how to reunify China [under Dr Sun's doctrine].'<sup>99</sup> CCK's strategy of highlighting differences across the Strait served not only to justify his efforts to preserve the existence of the ROC against the backdrop of Beijing's "one country two systems" strategy, but also to ultimately mark a way to maintain the cross-Strait competition because of his perspective of the ROC as the free China that should unite the countries on both sides of the Strait.

### ***Defending Taipei's International Status***

After losing its seat in the United Nations in 1971, the ROC suffered a series of international setbacks while Taipei continued its rigid sovereignty claim over China as a whole. The UN soon became the most formidable channel for Beijing's international united front strategy, as it has been ever since. Beijing has determinedly exploited its growing international prestige, which has enabled it to face off Taipei in a zero-sum diplomatic competition over the ROC's international status. Its strategic goal has consistently been to isolate the ROC on Taiwan. By labeling it as a province of China, Beijing has not only sought to clarify Taiwan's status in relation to Beijing, but also to undermine the morale of the Taiwanese people and to prevent international involvement in the issue.

In the face of China's international united front strategy, CCK soon adopted four approaches to counteract Beijing and to defend the ROC's international status

---

<sup>97</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1986) *China's Reunification and World Peace* (Taipei: Kuomintang), p.13.

<sup>98</sup> Lin Cheng-yi (1989) *A Triangle Lesson of Taiwan's Security: The Influence of the Communist China and the United States* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Qui Quan Publisher), p.49.

<sup>99</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1986) *China's Reunification and World Peace*, p.10.

as the sovereign and free China. First, Taipei worked hard to strengthen existing diplomatic relations with other states, such as South Korea, not least by appealing to common values of democracy and capitalism. Secondly, Taipei sought to develop new diplomatic relations with certain newly developing mini-states in Africa, the Asia-Pacific region and Latin America by offering them generous foreign aid packages.<sup>100</sup> Third, Taipei pursued comprehensive channels of communication to maintain its substantive relations with friendly countries, which had no diplomatic relations with Taipei. Fourth, Taipei made a considerable effort by adopting a more flexible stance in pursuing its desire to take part in international organizations. Taipei called these measures “total diplomacy” (*quan fangwei waijiao*). In short, it made use of several different channels – political, economic, trade, scientific, technological, culture and sport – to achieve new levels of substantive cooperation and interaction with an array of countries and organizations.<sup>101</sup> One aspect of the implementation of “total diplomacy” was the establishment of non-governmental representative offices. As CCK said, ‘[With] more than a hundred countries continuing to maintain their solid economic, trade and cultural relations with us, we shall never permit the Communists to succeed in their sinister design to isolate us.’<sup>102</sup>

CCK’s “total diplomacy” strategy makes him the pioneer of Taiwan’s pragmatic diplomacy. Reconsidering Chiang Kai-shek’s zero-sum strategy against Beijing, CCK’s “total diplomacy” saw Taipei’s full attention redirected to the question as to what could realistically be done to avoid the spectre of growing international isolation. In other words, maintaining the ROC’s international existence was certainly no less important for the government than maintaining its claim to sovereignty over the whole of China. In fact, to the extent that since the early 1980s CCK had claimed sovereignty over the mainland on the domestic front, this was done mainly for the sake of maintaining Chinese identity and pursuing in declaratory form a longstanding policy of unification. CCK’s “total diplomacy” allowed Taipei to maintain “comprehensive and substantive” relations with countries that did not officially recognize the ROC. ‘On the basis of equality and mutual benefit’, CCK pledged that, ‘[we] will carry out our international responsibilities and welcome international

---

<sup>100</sup> For Taiwan’s strategy of foreign aid, see Hsieh Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival: The Foreign Policy and External Relations of the Republic of China on Taiwan* (London: Sherwood Press), Chapter 5.

<sup>101</sup> Lin Cheng-Yi (1989) *Triangle Lessons of Taiwan’s Security*, pp.188-199.

<sup>102</sup> Thomas J. Bellows (1983) ‘Taiwan’s Foreign Policy in 1970s’, in Hsiung, James C. (Ed.) (1983) *Contemporary Republic of China: The Taiwan Experience, 1950-1980* (New York: American Association for Chinese Studies), p.409.

cooperation.<sup>103</sup> Thereafter, Taipei's energetic international activities would not only boost the ROC's international visibility, but would eventually give solid evidence of its *de facto* statehood. At the end of his regime, CCK was pleased with the ROC's overall international position, despite a lack of formal recognition of the ROC as an independent sovereign state by much of international society.<sup>104</sup>

### *America as Arbiter*

Throughout this period, Washington remained the main target of Beijing's international united front strategy to isolate the ROC. The main reason for this was that Washington's diplomatic support and security involvement were crucial and indeed decisive aspects of Taiwan's grand strategy in the context of cross-Strait confrontation, although the relationship with the US was ultimately not without ambiguity. On the one hand, Washington had remained the most important security provider that the ROC could have in international society; on the other, it was the long-standing security reliance on Washington that constituted the most vulnerable part of Taiwan's national security strategy. In the end, Washington's involvement in the cross-Strait confrontation represented a combination of opportunity and danger for Taipei. It was an opportunity if Taipei could enlist Washington's support and yet there was also a danger of abandonment to the extent that Washington sought closer relations with Beijing. Ever since Washington had strategically aligned with Beijing against Moscow in the early 1970s, Taipei lived in constant fear that Beijing would apply this advantage in the cross-Strait confrontation.

To appeal for a peaceful negotiation and solution to the cross-Strait confrontation was a key element of Beijing's calculated strategy to neutralize Washington's long-term security support for Taipei. '[Peaceful] mutual accommodation between Beijing and Taipei', in the American view, was 'not only desirable and necessary for the stability of East Asia, but also to be the only way to relieve the United States of a dilemma of future confrontation on both sides of the Taiwan Strait'.<sup>105</sup> Beijing's proposal of peaceful negotiation was understandably welcomed by Washington, which regarded the maintenance of peace as the most important goal in its cross-Strait policy. On the first day of

---

<sup>103</sup> Chiang Ching-kuo (1986) *China's Reunification and World Peace* (Taipei: Kuomintang), p.12.

<sup>104</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo's Son*, p.412.

<sup>105</sup> *New York Times*, August 30, 1976, p. A22.

Sino-American normalization, 1 January 1979, Beijing calculatedly announced that it would cease its shelling of Jimmen and Mazu, which had gone on since 1958. Then Beijing launched several offensives to promote “one country, two systems” as a route to peaceful reunification. Beijing’s peaceful proposal successfully created a positive image in international society. The Reagan administration, for instance, was impressed and appreciative of Beijing’s peace proposal vis-à-vis Taiwan.<sup>106</sup> The combination of Washington’s shift in strategic favour and Beijing’s peaceful posture placed Taipei in a very difficult strategic position. Beijing’s main goal in its united front strategy was clear: either to neutralize possible intervention from American across the Strait, or preferably to win over American support.

Responding to the trend of Sino-American normalization, CCK had already in 1973 outlined three basic principles of his foreign policy to American Ambassador Walter P. McConaugh<sup>107</sup>: first, Taipei would resolutely follow Washington’s leadership and policy; second, Taipei would never in any circumstances establish relations with the Soviets to balance the Sino-American strategic cooperation; and third, Taipei would never negotiate, talk, or make contact with Beijing. CCK placed great emphasis on the third principle in particular. As CCK explained to Washington, any negotiations with Beijing would be regarded as a sign of surrender, which would cause domestic chaos. During the tumultuous period following American de-recognition some years later, CCK’s overall strategy did not change the above three principles. To be sure, Taipei also endeavoured to maintain strong and substantive relations with Washington and emphasized its support for American arrangements for global strategy. The passage of the TRA and President Reagan’s “Six Assurances” demonstrated that CCK’s strategy was successful and considerably mitigated the impact of Beijing’s united front strategy, which was designed to isolate Taipei from Washington especially in terms of their security relations.

#### **C.5.4 The Beginning of Taiwan’s Defensive-oriented Military Strategy**

The CCK administration’s military strategic posture evolved significantly as the end of the Taipei-Washington military alliance. Taipei opted for an

---

<sup>106</sup> *New York Times*, November 16 1981, p.A1; *China-Taiwan: United States Policy, hearing*, pp.40-43.

<sup>107</sup> Wang Ching-hung (2000) *Interview History: From Washington Archive Seeing Taiwan* (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publisher), pp.413-4.

inward-looking strategic approach as the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act and Beijing's peaceful "United Front" strategy came into sharper focus. As with the Chiang Kai-shek Administration, the government of CCK had initially maintained the continuity of its strategic posture since the mid-1970s: the trend toward greater self-reliance had continued; the attempt to secure arms from America had been pursued; and recurring concerns about the survival of Taiwan's armed forces in the event of an attack by China had dictated various military modernization programmes. However, some of the strategic emphases of the CCK administration were significantly different from those of the CKS administration. Distinct was for instance CCK's defensive strategic posture, which stood in obvious contrast to CKS's offensive military preparations to retake Mainland China. Instead, the CCK Administration started to stress a defensive-oriented military strategy, which was designed to secure the island only. The defensive strategic posture adopted under CCK could be observed in Taipei's adoption of a doctrine of non-provocative defence that was designed to prevent cross-Strait military clashes, the emphasis on strategic endurance to survive at least a year under Chinese attack, the pursuit of military modernization to make strategic endurance possible, and the attempt to establish Taiwan's nuclear forces to deter China's military attack.

### ***Non-provocative Defence***

Under the protection of the ROC-US Mutual Defense Treaty (MDT) and the geographic barrier of the Taiwan Strait, Taipei, in Chiang Kai-shek's time, had intended to exaggerate Beijing's military threat to obtain American assistance for its offensive political goal, namely the reunification mission. In fact, given the history during the time from CKS to CCK, Taipei's grand strategy against a military threat from Beijing had consistently been linked to one overriding strategic assumption: Washington's intervention. Indeed, Beijing's military threat had fundamentally been mitigated as long as the MDT existed. To some extent in the post-MDT era, the passing of the TRA substantively continued Washington's security involvement, an ambiguous commitment to Taipei though it is. For some like John Taylor, for instance, the '[TRA] extending US concern over Taiwan's security interests to embargoes and boycotts seemed to go even beyond the existing treaty [MDT].'<sup>108</sup> General Hau Pei-tsung, CCK's major military adviser and Chief of the General Staff, recalls that the core of CCK national strategy was most concerned about ways to maintain and improve

---

<sup>108</sup> Taylor (2000) *The Generalissimo's Son*, p.342.

the substantive military relations with Washington, namely, the arms sales, in the turmoil during and after Sino-American normalization.<sup>109</sup>

Taipei's strategic assumption of Washington's involvement was seriously undermined by the developments in Sino-American normalization from the 1970s onwards. When Taipei lost its UN seat, CCK immediately informed General Staff Headquarters (GSH) that 'from now on, all our military preparations should be based on a defensive (*fang yu*) posture. There is no need to make much preparation for reunification from now on.'<sup>110</sup> General Lia Ming-tang, by then Chief of the General Staff, described this as a "turning point" in Taipei's overall military strategy. In 1973, CCK formally revealed this change to Washington, saying that Taipei would never threaten Beijing under any circumstances.<sup>111</sup> At this point, Taipei for the first time agreed with its security provider Washington that preserving peace across the Strait was a common interest and a strategic goal for both of them.

CCK's defensive posture to preserve peace across the Strait consisted of two fundamental concepts: non-provocation and deterrence. First, non-provocative defence insisted that Taipei should neither deliberately encourage a military attack by Beijing nor initiate a military attack on Beijing, as it had done in the 1950s and 1960s. Second, Taipei's deterrence principally involved establishing a credible military force to discourage a military attack by Beijing.<sup>112</sup> However, the core of CCK's defensive-oriented strategic posture was associated with the idea of peaceful resolution of the cross-Straits competition, as stipulated in the TRA, which CCK fully endorsed. CCK's emphasis on counter-attack instead of pre-emptive attack, for instance, derived from a belief that war was not an affordable instrument of policy for Taiwan in the cross-Straits confrontation. It was not feasible because Taipei did not possess the requisite military means to initiate war. More importantly, Taipei still needed to call for Washington's interference on Taipei's behalf. Without American support, Taipei would very likely be defeated to fight alone in a total war against Beijing given its insufficient material resources and limited capacity for conventional deterrence.

---

<sup>109</sup> Hau Pei-tsung (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years: Daily of General Hau* (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing), p.67.

<sup>110</sup> *The Reminiscences of General Ming-tang Lai* (1994) (my translation) (Taipei: Academia Historica), p.470.

<sup>111</sup> Wang (2000) *Interview History*, p.413.

<sup>112</sup> For an interview with General Hau Pei-tsung about Taiwan's strategic planning in 1980s, see Hau Pei-tsung (1995) *Fearless* (Taipei: Wu-Si Bookshop), pp. 439-443.

However, it is worth noting that CCK's insistence on the state's goal of cross-Strait reunification was not abandoned. This goal was to be pursued through a new strategy, however, which built on a defensive-oriented military strategy as a way of preserving the ROC's political survival as the free China. He instructed his generals that 'our [Taipei's] strategic goal is to ensure the security of Taiwan, Penghu, Jinmen and Matsu and then to create the opportunity to carry out our task of mainland recovery. Without securing Taiwan first, there is no the mainland recovery.'<sup>113</sup> CCK then explained how the new defensive military strategy and the unchanged political aim were related by arguing that 'our defence programme must be amended to adapt to the change in the international situation; however, the goal of anti-communism and reunification should not be adjusted to suit.'<sup>114</sup> In CCK's strategic interpretation of competing with Beijing, the military defensive posture was designed to secure Taiwan first so as to launch a 'strategic counterrevolution' through peaceful political methods rather than by offensive military means.<sup>115</sup>

### ***Strategic Endurance***

If war did occur across the Strait, according to General Hau Pei-tsung, Taipei's overall military strategic plan assumed that Beijing would apply an escalating military strategy rather than fight a swift decisive war.<sup>116</sup> Accordingly, Taipei would exercise strategic endurance, sit tight and prolong the war, until a more favourable situation transpired, conceived mainly as American intervention. CCK outlined this stance of strategic endurance: 'To survive after the enemy's first strike is the core objective of our defensive warfare; if we can sustain the first strike, then the situation will change [in our favour].'<sup>117</sup> Taipei's strategic endurance was to be supported by three major requirements: the preservation of the island's armed forces, the resort to total warfare and the likelihood of foreign intervention.

The first requirement was that, despite the PLA's advantage of material superiority and initiative, Taipei's priority would be to preserve its main forces so as to launch a decisive counter-attack later by using the geographic obstacle

---

<sup>113</sup> Hau Pei-tsung (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years: Daily of General Hau* (my translation) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing), pp.34-5.

<sup>114</sup> Hau Pei-tsung (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years*, pp.34-5.

<sup>115</sup> Thomas A. Marks (1998) *Counterrevolution in China*, pp.258-263.

<sup>116</sup> Hau Pei-tsung (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years*, p.190.

<sup>117</sup> Hau Pei-tsung (2000) *Daily of Eight Years Chief of the General Staff* (my translation) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing), p.24

advantage of the Taiwan Strait. General Hau believed that the successful preservation of Taiwan's limited armed forces, the air force and navy in particular, was based on a strategic calculation of avoiding a decisive battle at the very beginning of a cross-Strait war.<sup>118</sup> He called the strategy “preparing for war while avoiding war” (*beizhan er bizhan*). Only if Taiwan succeeded in preserving its forces, he calculated, could it defend itself in a decisive battle later when the PLA launched amphibious operations to invade the island. He believed that Taiwan's Air Force, which was vital to the pursuit of an endurance strategy in general and the tactic of a counter-attack in particular, would be neutralized within days if there were a full-scale air battle against the PLA. As a result, the most feasible strategy for preserving Taiwan's Air Force was not only to avoid a decisive engagement at the outset but also to construct strong shelters to increase its chances of survival. In 1982, Taiwan started the Chia-shan Programme to build an unprecedented underground air base in the east Taiwan mountains, which would shelter the Air Force. CCK regarded the Programme as one of the most important constructions for Taiwan's military readiness.<sup>119</sup>

According to America's military assessment, the PRC enjoyed a superiority of almost 10-to-1 over the ROC in terms of personnel and in all categories of military equipment.<sup>120</sup> Given the quantitative asymmetry across the Strait, the second dimension of the strategy of endurance would require Taiwan's determination and capacity to adopt a form of total warfare to which not only the armed forces but the whole society had to commit itself. To be able to call up the whole population in time of war involved an efficient plan of national mobilization. Furthermore, maintaining the national morale despite its material disadvantage became a major objective for Taipei's endurance strategy. To secure high morale, CCK claimed that Taiwan would be fighting a just war against the Chinese communist invader. He said, ‘Our experience against Japanese and Communists tells us that ‘it is morality and will [instead of material power] that will decide the outcome of war.’<sup>121</sup> According to General Hau, Taipei's strategic plan was designed to withstand the PLA's attack for at

---

<sup>118</sup> Hau Pei-tsun (1995) *Fearless*, pp.439-442.

<sup>119</sup> Hau Pei-tsun (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years*, p.102.

<sup>120</sup> Edwin K. Snyder, A. James Gregor and Maria Hsia Chang (1980) *The Taiwan Relations Act and the Defense of the ROC*, in Hsiung, James C. (Ed.) (1983) *Contemporary Republic of China: The Taiwan Experience, 1950-1980* (New York: American Association for Chinese Studies), p.460.

<sup>121</sup> Hau Pei-tsun (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years* (my translation), p.379.

least a year.<sup>122</sup> But he also warned that, by applying total war, Taiwan's people must have the determination to continue to fight to the death.<sup>123</sup>

The third feature of CCK's strategic endurance was that Taipei's strategic plan encompassed the aim to hold out for a year. This was designed to provide sufficient time for international society, mainly the US, to react and perhaps to intervene. CCK's expectation of international intervention was derived not only from America's commitment as expressed in the Taiwan Relations Act, but also based on his perception of Taiwan's geo-strategic importance, associated with his realist perspective on an inevitable power struggle between the US and China. Despite Sino-American normalization, CCK asked an American delegation in 1984 to brief President Reagan that Taiwan would continue to bring to bear its crucial geo-strategic role for the benefit of America's global strategy, which sought to contain the possible expansion of China and the Soviet Union.<sup>124</sup> In the event of a war across the Strait, Taipei's war plan of holding out for a year well demonstrated that securing possible American intervention was no less important than Taiwan's capacity to defend itself. This explains why CCK continued to be so concerned about America's place in Taiwan's overall national strategy. In the end, Taiwan's endurance strategy, associated with its doctrine of non-provocative defence, was designed not only to consolidate domestic morale by presenting it as a just war, but also to justify any appeal to Washington to intervene for the sake of peace.

### ***Military Modernization***

The fundamental challenge that CCK's administration faced in its plan of holding out for one year against Beijing's attack was largely the consequence of the quantitative asymmetry in Beijing's favour of the military material capabilities across the Strait. In order to cope with this material disadvantage, Taipei endeavoured to further its military modernization in order to attain qualitative superiority over Beijing. Deng Xiaoping's emphasis on "military modernization" had by then enforced CCK's sense of urgency regarding the need to match the PLA's improved capabilities. Taipei's efforts paid off and achieved a slight, but crucial, qualitative superiority that enabled Taiwan to

---

<sup>122</sup> Hau Pei-tsun (1995) *Fearless*, p.422.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> Chien Fredrick F. (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 2: the Arduous Journey to Washington* (Qian Fu hui yi lu: wai jiao feng yun dong) (Chinese Edition) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing Group), p.356.

possess air and naval superiority over the Taiwan Strait at this time.<sup>125</sup>

Under CCK in the 1970s and 1980s, Taiwan's military expenditure stood at around 8%-10% of GDP. To enhance its capability, to increase its prospects of survival and to attain greater flexibility were the three main goals of CCK's military modernization in the era of Sino-American normalization. First, to enhance Taiwan's military capability, CCK implemented a series of proposals to upgrade Taiwan's weapons systems. CCK's upgrading focused mainly on the ROC's Air Force (ROCAF) and Navy (ROCN).<sup>126</sup> The modernization programmes served three prioritized goals<sup>127</sup>: (1) to enhance the capabilities in air control, major programmes focused on upgrading Taiwan's air-superiority fighter aircraft and missile systems (surface-to-air and air-to-air); (2) to improve the capabilities of sea control, anti-blockade warfare in particular, major programmes included preparing for anti-submarine warfare (ASW), purchasing two modern *Zwaardvis*-class submarines (the *Jing-Long* programme) and developing a new generation of warships (*Chung-Yi* and *Guang-Hua* programmes); (3) to augment the capabilities of anti-landing warfare, major programmes were to upgrade the army's major tanks and establish mechanization forces as the core of the ROC's Army (ROCA). Second, to increase the prospects of survival for its armed forces, the Ministry of National Defence (MND) focused on developing the ability to preserve and operate after the PLA's first strike, as Taipei's overall military defence strategy was to maintain all available forces to fight a decisive battle on the main island of Taiwan. To do so, it sought to consolidate its military bases (e.g. by the *Chia-shan* programme) and establish a more effective early-warning radar system (e.g. by the *Chang Bai* programme) and by this means to increase the prospects of securing its major forces to launch a counter-attack in the homeland. Third, the concept of attaining flexibility was tied to its weapons procurement strategy: Taipei intended to diversify the sources of its arms acquisitions so as to mitigate the danger of relying solely on American arms supplies. The 1982 Sino-American Joint Communiqué, which proposed to reduce the quality and quantity of American arms sales to Taiwan, indicated the gravity of this possible danger. As a result, since the early 1980s, Taipei had not only started to purchase major non-American weapon systems (such as

---

<sup>125</sup> Michael Ying-mao Kau (1983) *Security and Defense Capabilities*, in Hsiung, James C. (Ed.) (1983) *Contemporary Republic of China: The Taiwan Experience, 1950-1980* (New York: American Association for Chinese Studies), p.456.

<sup>126</sup> Hau, Pei-tsung (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Late Years*, p.92.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid, p.7.

submarines from the Netherlands), but, more importantly, had intensified its efforts to establish its own military industries so as to upgrade and develop its weapon systems.

The build-up of self-reliant military industries has had a profound impact on Taipei's national strategy. It has become one of CCK's distinctive contributions to Taiwan's military modernization. Two influential achievements of Taiwan's military industries stand out: the Indigenous Defence Fighter (*IDF*) and the new missile systems: *Sky Bow* (surface-to-air), *Sky Sword* (air-to-air), *Hsiung Feng* (surface-to-surface) and *Sky Horse* (ballistic missiles). Technology obviously played a vital role in CCK's military modernization plan. However, it is worth noting that some key military leaders within the MND had a conservative attitude regarding advanced military technology. General Hau Pei-tsung, CCK's Chief of General Staff, with an army background, was the most influential representative of the conservative attitude. General Hau argued that the cross-Strait warfare would be conventional rather than high-tech in nature, mainly based on electronic warfare and missiles and neither Taiwan nor China had the capacity to apply high-tech warfare.<sup>128</sup> General Hau's passive attitude to high-tech warfare well reflected a major problem of Taiwan's military strategy and in turn of the structure of Taiwan's armed forces. At this juncture, a low-tech army was still the backbone of Taiwan's armed forces; it accounted for over 50 percent of Taiwan's total armed services and enjoyed a major share of its defence budget. This obviously was an obstacle to conducting a defensive war for the island. According to Defence Minister Soon Chang-chih who came from the Navy, the Air Force and Naval Force were considered more important than the Army for pursuing the homeland defence in the unique terrain of the Taiwan Strait.<sup>129</sup> During CCK's regime, despite the competitive strategic perspective in Taiwan's armed forces, an army-centred defence approach dominated Taiwan's military strategic plan because of the traditionally influential role of the army in Taiwan's military services.<sup>130</sup>

### ***Taipei's “Controversial” Nuclear Option***

Faced with Beijing's overwhelming conventional and nuclear forces, CCK's

---

<sup>128</sup> Hau Pei-tsung (1995) *Fearless*, p443.

<sup>129</sup> Lin Cheng-Yi (1989) *Triangle Lessons of Taiwan's Security*, pp.130-131.

<sup>130</sup> For the competitive strategic perspectives among Taiwan's armed forces, see Martin Edmonds and York W. Chen (2003) 'An Assessment of the ROCN's Modernization Program' in Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (Eds.) (2003) *Taiwan's Maritime Security* (London: RoutledgeCurzon), pp. 98-101.

pursuit of nuclear weapons was an understandable, though not a radical, strategic move. Taipei's nuclear option was mainly designed to enhance the credibility of Taiwan's deterrence after Beijing's success in ending the Taipei-Washington military alliance by the 1970s. Given the evidence of America's three successful acts of nuclear blackmail against China in the 1950s,<sup>131</sup> a state that at the time was without nuclear capability, possessing nuclear weapons was considered a likely boon to avoid political-military bullying. This was all the more necessary because Taiwan has had to contend with a nuclear-armed China since the 1960s. CCK's determination to obtain nuclear weapons reflected his concern over the vulnerability and credibility of Taiwan's military deterrence at the time and the need to construct a better capacity for self-defence in the context of the cross-Strait military confrontation.

In fact, Taiwan's actual nuclear programme first started in 1958, the same year as the second Taiwan Strait crisis.<sup>132</sup> In the name of the "peaceful use of energy", Taiwan built its first nuclear reactor in December 1961. Soon after the PRC's nuclear test in October 1964, Taiwan established the National Chung Shan Institute of Science and Technology (CSIST) whose mission was 'the development of nuclear weapons'.<sup>133</sup> Despite signing the Treaty for Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in January 1970, Taipei did not abandon its nuclear programme. On the contrary, after witnessing America's withdrawal from South Vietnam and its own serious international setback in the UN, Taipei was more determined than ever to achieve a deterrent capability via the nuclear option. By then, the Ministry of National Defence had prioritized the nuclear programme among its military projects to develop a nuclear warhead and a launching platform for it; nevertheless, Taipei's nuclear programme was constantly disturbed by Washington.<sup>134</sup> In September 1975, CCK surprisingly admitted Taiwan's nuclear capability and announced Taiwan's nuclear policy for the first time. 'After 17 years of effort,' CCK said, 'we now have both the facilities and the capability to make nuclear weapons and actually considered building up a nuclear arsenal last year [1974]; but when I broached the idea to

---

<sup>131</sup> Two occasions were in the Korean War and one was to deter Beijing's possible involvement in Vietnam. See Richard Smoke (1984) *National Security and the Nuclear Dilemma: An Introduction to the American Experience* (second edition) (New York: Random House), pp.75-76. In fact, during the two Strait crises in 1950s, Washington also threatened Beijing with nuclear blackmail.

<sup>132</sup> CCK's premier speech in Legislative Yuan in 1975. *Legislative Yuan Public News* (1976) Vol.64, No.77, (Taipei: Legislative Yuan), p.12.

<sup>133</sup> Hau Pei-tsun (1995) *Fearless*, p444.

<sup>134</sup> *The Reminiscences of Mr Ming-tang Lai* (1994) (Taipei: Academia Historica), p.474.

the late president [CKS], he rejected it flatly on the political ground that we cannot make nuclear weapons to kill our countrymen.<sup>135</sup> CCK's announcement of Taiwan's nuclear policy, which emphasized the island's capability to possess nuclear weapons even though it declined to produce and apply them itself, was a calculated psychological move serving three main purposes: to deter Beijing, since Taipei could be nuclear-armed if necessary; to allay Washington's suspicions to the extent that Taipei declined to produce them; and to strengthen domestic morale by making public that the government of Taiwan possessed the means to quickly acquire a nuclear capability to safeguard the island.

Despite risking military attack from Beijing and Washington's strong opposition, CCK never gave up his determination to obtain nuclear weapons during his regime. His relentless efforts in this sphere achieved a significant breakthrough in the early 1980s when Taipei possessed the key technology to develop ballistic missiles, which, as a platform to deliver nuclear warhead, constituted one of the most important parts of his overall nuclear programme.<sup>136</sup> In the mid- 1980s, MND not only confirmed its capability to produce nuclear weapons quickly if required but also was ready to produce medium-range ballistic missiles [of the *Sky Horse* type] to deliver these nuclear warheads.<sup>137</sup> However, in January 1988, soon after CCK's death, his nuclear efforts came under American scrutiny. This time Washington destroyed all of Taipei's clandestine nuclear facilities because of Colonel Chang Hsien-yi's treason.<sup>138</sup> Since, Taipei's nuclear capability has never fully recovered. CCK's nuclear brinkmanship strategy, which focused on announcing and preparing to have nuclear weapons while explicitly declining to manufacture them, was designed to improve Taipei's deterrence capability and to enhance its negotiating position against any hostile nuclear foe. But even if CCK, the last political and military strong man in Taiwan, could have lived long enough to complete his nuclear programme, it is an open question whether his nuclear brinkmanship strategy would have worked, since Taipei did not actually be a nuclear power. However, given his relentless nuclear efforts, CCK is no doubt the founder of Taiwan's

---

<sup>135</sup> CCK's speech as premier to the Legislative Yuan in 1975. *Legislative Yuan Public News* (1976) Vol.64, No.77, (Taipei: Legislative Yuan), p.12.

<sup>136</sup> Wang Feng (2010, 31 May) 'Taiwan's Nuclear Weapons and Missile Developer: General Tang Jun-bo', *China Times*, <http://news.chinatimes.com/world/0.5246,11050401x112010053100112.00.html> (accessed in 31 May 2010)

<sup>137</sup> Hau Pei-tsun (1995) *Fearless* (Taipei: Five-Four Bookshop), p444.

<sup>138</sup> Colonel Chang, one of four deputy directors of Taiwan's Nuclear Energy Research Institute who had been recruited by the American CIA reported Taipei's secret nuclear progress to Washington. For details, see Dennis Van Vanken Hickey (1997) *Taiwan's Security in the Changing International System* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner), pp.42-43.

nuclear strategy, a leader who dared to think the unthinkable. His thinking has not been lost on his successors, who no doubt will also have considered whether or not to have a nuclear option to maximize Taiwan's self-defence capability against the threat posed by China in the current dynamic strategic context.

### **C.5.5 Conclusions: Taiwan's Grand Strategy under Chiang Ching-kuo during 1970s-1980s**

The period from the mid-1970s to the end of the 1980s represents one of the most important periods in the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy, due to the effects of the Sino-American normalization. The rapprochement between Beijing and Washington achieved by the early 1970s developed to the point where Beijing could enter into formal diplomatic relations and foster its informal strategic alignment with Washington, while successfully insisting that the latter renounce the decades-old alliance with Taipei. Nevertheless, the passing of the Taiwan Relations Act by the US Congress was a considerable strategic achievement for Chiang Ching-kuo's administration; the TRA focused on the preservation of comprehensive relations between Taiwan and the US, in particular American arms sales to Taiwan and the insistence on a "peaceful resolution" of the conflict across the Strait. Meanwhile, the shift from an authoritarian regime to a more democratic political system, which formed part of CCKs' domestic management of Taiwan's new strategic environment, also introduced new complications into Taipei's strategic calculation. In particular, the uncertainty of Washington's security commitment to Taiwan was felt in 1979, when Taipei had to establish an adequate self-defence capability of its own against the threat from Beijing. Meanwhile, the PRC was continuing its military preparations and put forward the proposal of "One Country, Two Systems" associated with its "United Front" strategy to serve the mission of cross-Strait unification.

These developments jointly made necessary a fresh strategic perspective for Taipei. Chiang Ching-kuo, the ROC's last political-military strong-man, revised his father's outward-looking strategic stance, which had focused on the single-minded and relentless pursuit of cross-Strait unification, and above all the attempt to apply military means to this end, as this posture was becoming obviously outdated and unrealistic. When the US bowed out of its bilateral alliance with the ROC, the PRC's continued military threat acquired a new

urgency and significance, with Taiwan becoming steadily more vulnerable to the possibility of political-military attack from Beijing. The full development of these strategic concerns resulted in CCK's new inward-looking strategic choice; this became the main aspect of Taiwan's grand strategy during his regime, which focused on looking inwards at domestic developments rather than looking outwards to Mainland China for national restoration. Meanwhile, CCK stood firmly in the sovereignty competition against the PRC, in terms of securing the ROC, insisting that the ROC was legitimate because it stood for "the free China". CCK's "Three Noes Policy" well demonstrated his rigid position on sovereignty and his sense of the PRC's lack of legitimacy. To respond to the unfavourable Sino-American diplomatic normalization, from Taipei's perspective, CCK's inward-looking strategic approach not only put the ROC on the road to cross-Strait reunification on its own terms, but also exhorted to the legitimacy and continuity of the KMT's rule in Taiwan. CCK's "Three Noes Policy", as well as its "Total Diplomacy" and a defensive-oriented strategic posture were all closely related to this strategic choice.

Notwithstanding the strategic posture described above, CCK's strategic perspective on cross-Strait relations dictated competition rather than détente. This was because the ROC and the PRC were still fundamentally different, one being free and the other communist, making for a continued domestically determined clash of perspectives on sovereignty and of political ideologies despite the major change in international power politics that came at the ROC's expense. After encountering the unprecedented diplomatic challenge with Washington, CCK's national grand strategy to handle the cross-Strait competition was peaceful in character. The strategy sought: 1) to subordinate Taipei's foreign policy to Washington's global strategy so as to uphold their long-standing relations; 2) to pursue economic growth first for Taiwan's national construction and then to implement political democratization for domestic consolidation; 3) to prevent war across the Strait; 4) to adopt "Total Diplomacy" to secure Taiwan's comprehensive connections with international society; and 5) to insist on the "Three Noes Policy" vis-à-vis the Chinese Communist regime. In the event, the overall national strategy which CCK adopted to overcome Taiwan's unfavourable strategic environment was successful and created a political and economic miracle for the small island which established crucially needed national confidence and morale to compete with China. At the end of his regime, despite his semi-authoritarian rule, the ROC had benefited from CCK's achievements in decisively building on

previous foundations of economic growth, as well as fostering constitutional and legal processes, instilling a sense of strong discipline across society, promoting anti-corruption in government and exercising the provision of good leadership toward the people. All these have become aspects of the notable legacy of Chiang Ching-kuo's inward-looking grand strategy.

## Chapter 6

### The Third Taiwan Strait Crisis, 1995-1996

#### Introduction

Between July 1995 and March 1996, the People's Republic of China (PRC) conducted a series of military exercises, including missile tests and air-land-naval joint operations, against the Republic of China on Taiwan (ROCOT) in the area of the Taiwan Strait.<sup>1</sup> In the first wave manoeuvre, code-named “95 Mission Exercise”, a total of six Short Range Ballistic Missiles (SRBM) DF-15 was launched from bases in the Chinese province of Jiangxi province, targeting an area some 70 sea miles off the coast of northern Taiwan. Two per day were launched on three consecutive days, 21-23 July. In August, the second wave, code-named “Eastern Sea Live-fire Exercise”, continued for ten days, conducted by PLA naval vessels and aircraft, which carried out live-fire tests only 28 sea miles off Taiwan's Dong-yin Island near the coast of Fujian. The third wave of exercises was conducted off the coast of Shandong from 15 September to 20 October; it had the code-name “95 God's Force Exercise”, apparently designed to show off the PLA naval force. From 31 October to 23 November, the PLA conducted its fourth round, the “Success Fifth Exercise”, to practise its amphibious landing capabilities, including joint operations for the air force, army and navy off the south coast of Fujian. The fifth round of exercises, code-named “United 96”, was conducted in three parts between 8 March and 25 March 1996. The first part, from 8-15 March, involved missile tests: four SRBM DF-15 missiles altogether were aimed at the sea lanes some 15 sea miles off the northern port of Keelung and 25 sea miles off the southern port city of Kaohsiung, Taiwan's two largest commercial ports. The second part

---

<sup>1</sup> For a useful collection of China's military exercises and Taiwan's military preparations during the crisis, see, for example, Ji Le-yi (2006) *Safeguard Action: A Record of the 1996 Strait Missile Crisis* (Taipei: Li Ming Culture Enterprise).

of the exercise, from 12-22 March, focused on naval and air-force live-fire tests and war games off the south coast of Fujian in the south of the Strait. The third part of “United 96” was conducted in the middle of the coast of Fujian, near Taiwan’s military stronghold of Mazu Island, to the north of the Taiwan Strait, between 18 and 25 March. It included joint operations involving amphibious and parachute landings and mountain warfare. These five waves made for the largest-scale military exercise in the recent history of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) in this area.<sup>2</sup> Significantly, what was widely perceived as military intimidation against Taiwan unexpectedly led to the U.S. calling out the largest show of force in the Pacific since the Vietnam war, involving two battle groups of aircraft carriers which were deployed in the middle of March 1996 to deter any possible escalation of conflict across the Strait.<sup>3</sup>

The trigger for the unprecedented Chinese military exercises was the private visit of Taiwan’s President Lee Teng-hui to America in June 1995. Beijing also sought to influence Taiwan’s first ever direct presidential election in March 1996, which Lee Teng-hui, labelled the “separatist” seemed certain to win.<sup>4</sup> The more general goal of the Chinese military display was to coerce Taipei into accepting the inevitability of China’s authority in the cross-Strait sovereignty dispute.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, China also intended to issue a serious and unmistakable signal to international audiences, mainly the U.S., that, as Beijing was prepared, if necessary, to use force to unite Taiwan with China, there were tremendous risks and costs for any foreign power that meddled in Taiwan’s affairs if it

---

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Scobell (1998) ‘Taiwan as Macedonia? Strait Tensions as a Syndrome’, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 21, Issue 2, (1998), p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> Bernice Lee (1999) *The Security Implication of the New Taiwan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 331), p. 9.; Scobell (2000) ‘Show of Force: Chinese Soldiers, Statesmen, and the 1995-1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis’, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 115, No.2, (2000), pp. 238.

<sup>4</sup> For examinations of the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis, see, for example, in John W. Garver (1997) *Face Off: China, the United States, and Taiwan’s Democratization* (Seattle: University of Washington); Zaho Suisheng (ed.) (1999) *Across the Taiwan Strait - Mainland China, Taiwan, and the 1995-1996 Crisis* (London: Routledge); James R. Lilley and Chuck Downs (ed.) (1997) *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press); Greg Austin (1997) *Missile Diplomacy and Taiwan’s Future: Innovations in Politics and Military Power* (Canberra: Strategic and Defence Studies at Australian National University); Robert S. Ross (2000) ‘The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait Confrontation: Coercion, Credibility, and the Use of Force’, *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 2, (Fall 2000), pp. 87-123; The forum of “The Taiwan Crisis”, in *The China Journal*, No. 36, (July, 1996), pp. 87-134.

<sup>5</sup> Andrew J. Nathan (1996) ‘China’s goal in the Taiwan Strait’ *The China Journal*, No. 36, (July, 1996), pp. 90-91.

encouraged even the slightest advance of Taiwan's independence movement.<sup>6</sup> In the event, the 1995-96 Strait crisis ended peacefully, and all three parties, Taipei, Beijing, and Washington, claimed to have attained their goals.<sup>7</sup> While there are different opinions about who was responsible for causing what was arguably an unnecessary and avoidable crisis in the international arena,<sup>8</sup> the 1995-96 Strait crisis was in fact rooted in the complexity of the incompatible Taiwan-China sovereignty claims and the competing assessments of the status quo across the Strait in Taipei, Beijing and Washington.

The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis presented the first security trial for the newly democratized Taiwan government, although Taiwan had lived under the threat of military attack and other coercive measures from the PRC since 1949. Compared with his Chinese-nationalist predecessors, Chiang Kai-shek (CKS) and Chiang Ching-kuo (CCK), Lee Teng-hui, the first Taiwanese-born president of the ROC, had a distinct perspective of the competitive and dynamic relations between China and a self-ruled Taiwan. According to Lee, the fundamental problem for the ROC on Taiwan in confronting outside challenges has been the lack of "Taiwanese subjectivity" (*taiwan zhutixing*), by which he understands an awareness of self-preservation.<sup>9</sup> In his view, "Taiwanese subjectivity" has since 1949 always been undermined by two interrelated issues: the 'ambiguity of Taiwan's international status' and the 'uncertainty of Taiwan's national sovereignty'.<sup>10</sup> Soon after winning the 1996 presidential election, despite China's military intimidation, Lee in his inaugural speech on 20 May 1996 proclaimed the victory and importance of "popular sovereignty" and asked

---

<sup>6</sup> Ross (2000) 'The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait Confrontation', p. 89.

<sup>7</sup> Garver (1997) *Face Off*, Chapter 14, pp. 148-156.

<sup>8</sup> For example, Robert Ross criticizes Taipei's "revisionism" as the source of instability in U.S.-China-Taiwan relations. In contrast, Andrew Scobell describes Beijing's military intimidation as "hawkish" in nature and Alastair Iain Johnston argues that the Taiwan issue is "the most obvious exception" to Beijing's record as a status quo power. See Alastair Johnston (2004) 'Beijing's Security Behavior in the Asia-Pacific' in Suh, J.J., Peter J. Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson (eds.) (2004) *Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power, and Efficiency* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), p. 77; Scobell (2000) 'Show of Force', pp. 244-6; and Ross (2000) 'The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait Confrontation', pp. 122-3.

<sup>9</sup> Lee Teng-hui (2003) 'My Belief and Vision of Taiwan's Status and National Sovereignty', in Zhang Yan-xian (2008) (ed.) *An Interview with Lee Teng-hui: His Belief and Philosophy*, Vol. III (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication), pp. 215-223.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 217.

Taiwan's people to practise and consolidate "Taiwanese subjectivity".<sup>11</sup> Indeed, in the context of the cross-Strait sovereignty competition, Taiwan's grand strategy under Lee's administration can be encapsulated in his doctrine of the pursuit of "identity (*ren tong*) and existence (*cun zai*)", which is derived from Lee's perspective of popular sovereignty, or 'sovereignty in the people' (*zhuquan zai min*). As Lee defined the doctrine, the goal was 'to establish ourselves [the people of Taiwan] as the ROC on Taiwan' by substantiating popular sovereignty over the island, whereby 'the people of Taiwan can fully express their free will and build their own future.'<sup>12</sup> Accordingly, Lee's perspective of the ROC's sovereign status can best be described as 'the ROC on Taiwan'. Lee made no secret of his "existence" doctrine, arguing that '[the ROC on] Taiwan's existence is a fact, and as long as Taiwan exists, there is hope.'<sup>13</sup> In the end, Lee's advocacy of Taiwan's popular sovereignty worked as a unique approach not only to prove the legitimacy of the ROC on Taiwan but also to enable the KMT's ideological legacy of Chinese nationalism to be adjusted to fit in with a democratizing Taiwan.<sup>14</sup>

To explore the content of Taiwan's grand strategy during Lee Teng-hui's administration, from 1988-2000, the first section of this chapter examines why Taipei's strategic choice - to create a peaceful sovereign coexistence with the mainland - was formulated and to what extent it was vital to redefine cross-Strait relations as a necessary means to this choice. The second section examines to what extent the administration's pursuit of national identity - or "Taiwanese subjectivity" - involved improving the island's strategic capabilities in the face of Beijing's threats. The third section assesses in what ways Taipei's "pragmatic diplomacy" was practised in the international arena in order to ensure that the strategic environment would be in Taiwan's favour. The fourth

---

<sup>11</sup> President Lee Teng-hui's inaugural speech (20 May 1996), Chinese version in [http://newcongress.yam.org.tw/taiwan\\_sino/05201.html](http://newcongress.yam.org.tw/taiwan_sino/05201.html) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

<sup>12</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy: Taiwan's Pursuit of Identity* (English version) (Tokyo: PHP Institute), pp. 51-52 and 60-62.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 93.

<sup>14</sup> A discussion of Lee's 'popular sovereignty' and its relations with the legitimacy of the ROC and the KMT, for example, see Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism*, pp.95-100 and 153-155. A related discussion of party change on the national identity issue, see Dafydd Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan: Party Change and the Democratic Evolution of Taiwan, 1991-2004* (London: Routledge), pp. 85-128.

section examines how and to what extent Taiwan's passive defence was adopted as a strategic posture to counter China's military threats. The conclusion argues that the distinctive character of Taiwan's grand strategy during the Lee administration rested on the strategic choice to promote sovereign coexistence across the Strait by redefining its status quo. This choice was based on several factors, including the goal of self-preservation, Taiwanese nationalism, the desire for sovereign equality across the Strait, and the aspiration to terminate Taipei's international isolation. Rather than simplistically characterizing this conflict as one between Taiwan's independence movement and Chinese revisionism, the clash between Taipei and Beijing in the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis is better understood as the continuation of the Taipei-Beijing sovereignty dispute, begun in 1949, and the complexity of competing perceptions in the international society of a unified China and the status quo across the Strait.

### **C.6.1 The Choice of Peaceful Coexistence**

Lee Teng-hui took power in dramatic circumstances and, when the political strong man Chiang Ching-kuo (CCK) died suddenly in January 1988, became the first ever Taiwanese-born President of the ROC on Taiwan and the chairman of the Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang or KMT).<sup>15</sup> The most remarkable change in Taiwan's grand strategy under Lee's administration was linked to his unique vision of Taiwan which, he claimed, gave the people their right to defend Taiwan's own welfare and existence; he did not see Taiwan as an instrument or springboard for the unification of China. During the authoritarian presidencies of Chiang Kai-shek (CKS) and Chiang Ching-kuo, the strategic role of Taiwan for the ROC had been continuously informed by an unalterable commitment to the national duty to reunify with Mainland China, either in terms of CKS's "counter-attack stronghold" or CCK's "model province of China". For the first time since 1949, the Lee administration opted for a

---

<sup>15</sup> For an account of the dramatic process by which Lee took power, see the exclusive interview with Lee in Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui's Regime* (Chinese version) (Taipei: INK Publications), Chapters 1 and 2; Lin Chia-lung and Bo Tedards (2003) 'Lee Teng-hui: Transformational Leadership in Taiwan's Transition' in Lee Wei-chin and T.Y. Wang (eds.) (2003) *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui Era: Politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000* (Lanham: University Press of America), pp. 25-62.

national strategy for Taiwan which liberated it from the former mission of Chinese unification. Nevertheless, Lee did not exclude possibility of cross-Strait unification; instead, following his unilateral announcement to end the Chinese civil war, he took an initiative by proposing the National Unification Guidelines (NUG), which emphasized that both the ROC and the PRC were two equal “political entities” such that neither was subject to the other’s jurisdiction.<sup>16</sup> Compared to CCK’s inward-looking strategy of “competitive coexistence”, Taipei’s new strategic choice under Lee’s administration built on the new perspective of peaceful sovereign coexistence across the Strait. This latter thereafter resulted in Lee’s controversial claim in late 1999 of a “special state-to-state relationship” (*teshu de guoyuguo de guanxi*) between Taiwan and China.<sup>17</sup>

### ***The Nature of Lee’s Peaceful Coexistence Policy***

The most distinctive feature of Lee’s national strategy was rooted in his Taiwanese perspective of the cross-Strait relations between the ROC and the PRC. In contrast to his predecessors, Lee did not share their vision of removing the Chinese Communist government in Beijing, nor did he put the cross-Strait unification mission at the heart of Taiwan’s national interest. For Lee, Taipei’s former strategic choices of regime change in Beijing and the pursuit of a

---

<sup>16</sup> Although the NUG proclaimed cross-Strait unification as its final goal, it is worth noting that, from a strategic perspective, as Chia-lung Lin and Bo Tedards put it, ‘the function of the Guidelines was to diffuse and postpone the confrontation between independence and unification and to create a conceptual framework for the future debate after [Taiwan’s] democratization.’ See Chia-lung Lin and Bo Tedards (2003) ‘Lee Teng-hui: Transformational Leadership in Transition’, in Lee, Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America), pp. 35-36. In a later interview, Lee Teng-hui also said that the origins of the NGU had their own unique circumstances by then and he considered replacing the Unification Guideline by the ‘Cross-Strait Guideline’ (*liangan gangling*) when the situation allowed it. See Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui’s Regime (Li denghui zhizheng gaobai shilu)* (Chinese version) (Taipei: INK Publications), pp. 222-227.

<sup>17</sup> Lee’s thoughts on Taiwan’s sovereign status are best addressed in Lee Teng-hui (1999) ‘Understanding Taiwan - Bridging the Perception Gap’, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.78, No.6, (November/December, 1999), pp.9-14. Lee made his first public statement on what was called the “special state-to-state relationship” in an interview with *Deutsche Welle* in July 1999; see ‘Responses to Questions Submitted by Deutsche Welle’, *Deutsche Welle* (9 July 1999). Also see the Mainland Affairs Council (MAC, Taipei), ‘Parity, Peace, and Win-Win: The Republic of China’s Position on the “Special State-to-State Relationship”, 1 August 1999 in ([http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/2nda\\_2.htm](http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/2nda_2.htm)) (accessed on 21 April 2010) and Seth Faison, ‘Taiwan’s President Implies his Island is Sovereign State’, *New York Times* (13 July, 1999), pp. A1, A8.

unification mission were both elusive.<sup>18</sup> To break the deadlock in the cross-Strait sovereignty confrontation, Lee quickly embraced a new initiative by proposing an arrangement whereby Taipei could normalize relations with its longstanding rival. The first of his initiatives came in July 1990 when he organized the National Affairs Conference (*guoshi huiyi*) (NAC) to seek consensus on the themes of domestic political reform and a policy vis-à-vis Mainland China.<sup>19</sup> In the event, the NAC decided to abolish “the Temporary Provisions” of the Constitution and to end “the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion”, which enabled Taipei to start government-to-government talks with Beijing.<sup>20</sup> On 22 May 1991, Lee then formally terminated the “Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion”, which since 1949 had been the central operational constitutional code of the KMT-led authoritarian government against Communist China.<sup>21</sup> By removing the two pillars supporting Taiwan’s civil war against Beijing, Taipei hoped to be in a better position to construct new relations with China and to proceed with constitutional reform in order to support Taiwan’s democratization in the post-authoritarian era.

On 1 March 1991, Taipei made another decisive political move by issuing the National Unification Guidelines (NUG). These were designed to replace the constitutional provisions on “The Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion” in May 1991. The NUG was a substitute set of guidelines because Taipei needed an arrangement to outline its new Mainland China policy after unilaterally announcing the end of the Chinese civil war.<sup>22</sup> The NUG proclaimed as Taipei’s goal ‘to establish a democratic,

---

<sup>18</sup> Lee Teng-hui (2003) ‘My Belief and Vision of Taiwan’s Status and National Sovereignty’, in Zhang Yan-xian (ed.) (2008) *An Interview with Lee Teng-hui: His Belief and Philosophy*, Vol. III (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication), pp. 215-223.

<sup>19</sup> For a discussion of the NAC, see, for example, Shelley Rigger (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (London: Routledge), pp. 151-3; Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui’s Regime* (Chinese version) (Taipei: INK Publications), pp. 330-2.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1992) ‘Termination of the Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion’, in Hu Jason C. (1992) *Creating the Future: A New Era for the Chinese People* (Taipei: Government Information Office, ROC), pp. 37-62.

<sup>22</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1991) ‘The Goal and Meaning of the National Unification Guidelines’ (Chinese version), in Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), p. 371.

free, and equitably prosperous China', but stressed the following four principles as pre-conditions:<sup>23</sup>

1. Both the mainland and Taiwan areas are parts of Chinese territory. Helping to bring about national unification should be the common responsibility of all Chinese people.
2. The unification of China should be for the welfare of all its people and not be subject to partisan conflict.
3. China's unification should aim at promoting Chinese culture, safeguarding human dignity, guaranteeing fundamental human rights, and practising democracy and the rule of law.
4. The timing and manner of China's unification should first respect the rights and interests of the people in the Taiwan area, and protect their security and welfare. It should be achieved in gradual phases under the principles of reason, peace, parity and reciprocity.

It should be noted that the essence of the NUG did not simply deal with the cross-Straits unification, but, more importantly, the NUG promoted the new vision of peaceful sovereign coexistence between two equal "political entities" across the Strait. The NUG asserted above all the principles of "reason, peace, parity and reciprocity" before initiating any Taipei-Beijing consultation.<sup>24</sup> In Lee's own interpretation, '[t]he most important issue within the NUG was to emphasise the concept (*yishi*) of the ROC [on Taiwan]. There is no unification or independence within the concept of the ROC; instead the concept of the ROC is beyond the ideas (*quannian*) of unification and independence.'<sup>25</sup> 'Mao Zedong's greatest regret must be his decision to call his state the PRC,' Lee continued; 'if Mao had used the name ROC for his new China, we would have had a big problem. It is only because there is a state called the PRC that we as the ROC can still exist.'<sup>26</sup> To reshape the cross-Straits relations in the NUG, Lee obviously intended to emphasise the concept of co-existing sovereign entities across the Strait, to underline the differences between the ROC and the PRC, and accordingly to preserve the ROC's existing sovereign status by redefining Taipei-Beijing relations as existing between two "real, equal political entities".

---

<sup>23</sup> The Mainland Affairs Council (ROC) (1991) "Guidelines for National Unification", (English version) in <http://www.mac.gov.tw/english/english/macpolicy/gnueng.htm> (access on 21 April 2010)

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1991) 'The Goal and Meaning of the National Unification Guidelines' (Chinese version, my translation), in Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), pp. 376-377.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

Taipei's conciliatory gesture, unilaterally terminating the prolonged Chinese civil war and recognizing the legitimacy of the PRC, created a so-called "golden age" across the Strait in the early 1990s which enabled unprecedented cross-Strait dialogue to be held for the first time since 1949.<sup>27</sup> In January 1991, the ROC established the Mainland Affairs Council (MAC) to take charge of planning, coordinating, evaluating and implementing Taipei's mainland policy. One month later, when the government-to-government contact with Beijing had still not been established, the Strait Exchange Foundation (SEF) was formed to function as an unofficial agency, under MAC supervision, which would handle cultural, technical and economic issues across the Strait, and represent Taipei in negotiations with its PRC counterpart, the Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait (ARATS). After two years of preparation, the first ever Taipei-Beijing public meeting since 1949 was held by Koo Chen-fu (head of SEF) and Wang Daohan (head of ARATS) in Singapore in April 1993. The latter Singapore meeting is also known as the Koo-Wang Talks. To make progress and agreements in functional issues as originally proposed, it was inevitable that both sides had to find a way in advance to address the ROC-PRC disagreement over the one-China principle. Before the Singapore meeting there were thus exchanges between the SEF and the ARATS to untie deadlock. In the end, according to Su Chi, the ARATS accepted the SEF's proposal that 'although the two sides uphold the principle of one China, each side's interpretation of One China is different.'<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, this compromise did not appear in the joint public statement of the Koo-Wang Talks. This subtle and ambiguous political solution to agree to disagree on the meaning of the one-China principle later became known as the so-called "1992 consensus", or in Su Chi's term as the

---

<sup>27</sup> Christopher Hughes (2001) 'Living with "One Country, Two Systems"? - The Future of Beijing's Taiwan's Policy', in *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 14, No. 2, (April 2001), p125.

<sup>28</sup> Su Chi (2009) *Taiwan's Relations with Mainland China: A Tail Wagging Two Dogs* (London: Routledge), pp.13-14. Discussions of the so-called '92 consensus' in the Koo-Wang meeting, also see Christopher R. Hughes (2009) 'New Trend in Taiwan's China Policy', *The International Spectator*, 44: 2, pp. 60-62; Xu Shiquan (2003) 'The 1992 Consensus', in Donald Zagoria (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger), pp. 81-102; and Bush, Richard C. (2005) *Untying the Knot: Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press), pp. 44-5.

“One China, respective interpretations” (OCRI) (*yizhong gebiao*) consensus.<sup>29</sup> From Taipei’s perspective, China was divided in the form of two equal political entities across the Strait, rather than united as one, and this divided China still needed to negotiate about whether and how to reunify in the future.<sup>30</sup> Although Lee was by then vague over the one-China issue, his conciliatory gesture, unlike those of his predecessors, to pursue peaceful coexistence paved the way for the start of an uneasy peace between the ROC and the PRC, after both sides had for decades consistently declined to accept each other’s legitimate existence.

Lee Teng-hui justified the choice of peaceful coexistence with a reference to the presence of a divided China across the Strait. Instead of challenging this reference, as his predecessors had done, Lee stated that the ROCOT had to find a way to live in these difficult conditions, because fundamental differences remained between the two sides on the issue of sovereignty.<sup>31</sup> For Lee’s administration, the way forward was to choose peaceful sovereign coexistence. The implementation of Lee’s strategic choice involved two basic elements: the goal of preserving the status quo of the ROCOT’s sovereign independence and the means of redefining the Taipei-Beijing relationship across the Strait. Taipei’s choice of pursuing peaceful coexistence was a constant interaction between the goal of preserving its political independence and the means of redefining the cross-Strait relations, each fully comprehensible only in terms of the other. One could not understand the nature of Lee’s national strategy unless one appreciated his strategic choice for a cross-Strait rapprochement in the first place. But one would also have no practical explanation for Lee’s national strategy unless one understood the end and the means within the choice; in particular the pursuit of sovereignty as an end and the political move to redefine

---

<sup>29</sup> Lee Teng-hui constantly denied that the so-called “1992 consensus” ever existed. Lee claimed that the controversial term of “1992 consensus” was never used during his administration to describe the outcome of the 1993 Singapore meeting. Instead, the term was created by Su Chi, by then head of MAC, to privately summarize his own understanding of the outcome of the Singapore meeting. Su Chi later admitted that the term “1992 consensus” had been his own creation. See, for example, in Zou (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui’s Regime*, pp. 186-191; Su Chi (2004) ‘Driving Forces Behind Taiwan’s Mainland Policy’, in Steve Tsang (2004) *Peace and Security across the Taiwan Strait* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, St Antony’ series), p. 46. Su Chi’s interpretation of the “1992 consensus” see Su Chi (2009) *Taiwan’s Relations with Mainland China: A Tail Wagging Two Dogs* (London: Routledge), pp. 12-16.

<sup>30</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1991) ‘The Goal and Meaning of the National Unification Guidelines’.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

cross-Strait relations which were used to attain it. Therefore, only an examination of ends and means combined yields a full picture of Lee's strategic choice for cross-Strait rapprochement.

### ***The Necessity of Preserving “National Sovereignty”***

The strategic goal of preserving the ROCOT's sovereignty was the core of Lee's strategic stance, to be achieved by way of a policy of peaceful sovereign coexistence across the Strait. Taipei's sovereign stance was straightforward because the integrity of national sovereignty is the foundation for any independent state. The concept of national sovereignty involves an exclusive right for a state to exert control over a particular area of territory and over its people.<sup>32</sup> National sovereignty is a prerequisite for international recognition. National sovereignty moreover is a relational concept and practice: one cannot meaningfully claim that a particular state “has national sovereignty” without also specifying the role of other parties in the international society. Accordingly, state and sovereignty are mutually constructed concepts; even in the contemporary era of world politics a state depends on sovereignty for its international acceptance and legitimacy as a state.<sup>33</sup>

Taipei's goal of preserving the ROCOT's sovereign independence and integrity was also complex, given its international isolation deriving from the longstanding competition over sovereignty between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC on the mainland. The nature of this competition became more complex when it transformed itself into a competition for sovereignty between the contending visions of independence, unification and status quo across the Strait. This complexity indeed turned evidential when Lee's administration unilaterally abandoned its claim to sovereignty over Mainland China in early 1991. Moreover, the cross-Strait sovereignty confrontation became even more complex because other parties remained involved, mainly the U.S. Given that both sides had been prepared to defend their sovereignty claim by force, if

---

<sup>32</sup> The discussion of sovereign issues for statehood; for example, see Thomas J. Biersteker (2005) ‘State, Sovereignty and Territory’ in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A Simmons (eds.) (2005) *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage), pp. 157-176.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. 157.

necessary, it is believed that the military conflict across the Taiwan Strait had become one of the world's most dangerous challenges for the United States, as it potentially entailed a direct clash with another great nuclear power, China, to maintain its dominant status in East Asia in particular and global politics in general.<sup>34</sup> The events of the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis illustrate clearly that any escalation of the competition for sovereignty across the Strait could have catastrophic consequences for regional peace and stability in the post-Cold War era.

To ensure the ROC's sovereign status was crucial for the Lee administration. This sovereignty concern was particularly important for the administration because after unilaterally choosing to pursue peaceful coexistence, the ROC not only renounced the use of force to unify China but also accepted the existence of the PRC. Lee constantly pointed to the cross-Strait sovereignty division and proclaimed that 'the ROC has remained a sovereign state since 1912, although its jurisdiction now [is] extended solely to the territories of Taiwan, the Pescadores, Quemoy, and Ma-zu'.<sup>35</sup> Aspiring to democratic mechanisms, Lee championed the principle of popular sovereignty, linking it deliberately to what he regarded as the ROC on Taiwan's existing sovereign status in an attempt to consolidate a domestic consensus after encountering a mixture of phenomena between a deconstruction of Chinese nationalism and a rise of Taiwanese nationalism in the island.<sup>36</sup> 'The basic principle', he said on the cross-Strait sovereignty conflict, is that 'Taiwan's [sovereignty] belongs to the people of Taiwan'.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Nancy Bernkopf Tuckner (2005) 'Dangerous Strait: Introduction', in Nancy Bernkopf Tuckner (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), p. 1.

<sup>35</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) 'Understanding Taiwan - Bridging the Perception Gap', p. 11.

<sup>36</sup> A discussion of the deconstruction of Chinese nationalism in Taiwan, see Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, pp. 95-128 and 153-155. A discussion of the rise of Taiwanese nationalism, for example, see Dafydd Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan*, pp. 141-142.

<sup>37</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version, my translation) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), p. 469. An analysis of Lee's idea of popular sovereignty, for example see Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, pp. 96-98.

Lee's proclamation that the ROC on Taiwan enjoyed popular sovereignty was made in his Cornell speech in June 1995 and his 1996 inaugural address.<sup>38</sup> In the former, entitled "With the People Always in My Heart", Lee stressed the theme of popular sovereignty, arguing that the achievement of Taiwan's democratization deserved recognition and respect from international society.<sup>39</sup> In response to Lee's overtly popular claim, Beijing then organized a large-scale media campaign of more than 400 articles attacking Lee personally before initiating the series of military exercises from July 1995 until March 1996 mentioned above, which were supposed to intimidate Taiwan.<sup>40</sup> Despite such military intimidation, however, Lee again took up the theme of popular sovereignty which had contributed to his reelection. Although Lee did adopt a conciliatory stance on cross-Straits relations by the tone of possible reunification, he reaffirmed that democratization had ushered in an era of popular sovereignty in Taiwan.<sup>41</sup> 'From now on', he claimed, 'the people as a whole, rather than any individual or any political party, will be invested with the ruling power of the nation.'<sup>42</sup> Lee asserted that the 'legitimacy of the administration of state power can only be authorized by the Taiwanese people'.<sup>43</sup> To him, the process of Taiwan's democratization had finally consolidated the existing national sovereignty of the ROC on Taiwan.

While the focus on national sovereignty was the primary driver of Taiwan's grand strategy, in part because the ROC on Taiwan had become democratized, China's assertion of sovereignty over Taiwan clearly was equally important. In August 1993, the Taiwan Affairs and Information Office of the PRC's State Council issued a lengthy white paper on cross-Straits relations which was entitled "The Taiwan Question and the Reunification of China". Clearly, this

---

<sup>38</sup> Lee had first mentioned the theme of popular sovereignty in October 1994; see Richard Bush (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', note 31, in Tucker (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), p. 231.

<sup>39</sup> For Lee Teng-hui's speech at Cornell University (9 June 1995) (English version), see in <http://taiwanreview.nat.gov.tw/site/Tr/ct.asp?xItem=126&CtNode=119> (accessed on 21 April 2010)

<sup>40</sup> Zhao Suisheng (2002) 'Reunification Strategy: Beijing Versus Lee Teng-hui', in Bruce J. Dickson and Chien-min Chao (eds.) (2002) *Assessing the Lee Teng-hui Legacy in Taiwan's Politics: Democratic Consolidation and External Relations* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe), pp. 225-228.

<sup>41</sup> Richard Bush (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', pp. 85-86.

<sup>42</sup> Lee Teng-hui's inaugural speech as President (20 May 1996).

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

document was published in response to Taipei's pursuit of international recognition of its sovereign status, not least by making attempts to rejoin the United Nations. The White Paper stated unequivocally that there was but one China, whose central government was in Beijing, and Taiwan was a part of it. This was also to be the premise for any cross-Strait negotiations.<sup>44</sup> Rejecting Beijing's treatment of Taipei as a subordinate political unit, Lee described Beijing's sovereign claim over Taiwan as "ideological wishful thinking" since the PRC had never controlled Taiwan. Lee contended the White Paper by saying that 'the attacks that Beijing makes on the legitimacy of the democratic government [the ROC on Taiwan] affront the people of Taiwan and the prevailing values [democracy and liberty] of the international community.'<sup>45</sup> Beijing's rigid stance on sovereignty and Lee's principle of popular sovereignty became irreconcilable, opening a new dimension of the security dilemma across the Strait because of the move in Taiwan towards a post-authoritarian era.

The fragile peace between Taipei and Beijing in the early 1990s soon came under attack as a consequence of misinterpretation and revisionism. From Lee's perspective, the existing independent sovereign status of the ROC on Taiwan was a condition of the status quo across the Strait which should be beyond any controversy over independence and unification.<sup>46</sup> Lee suggested that international society should understand Taipei's one-China policy, as well as Beijing's, and that it should not misinterpret Taiwan's sovereign stance on the status quo as a policy aimed at independence.<sup>47</sup> From Beijing's perspective, however, Lee's stance on sovereignty would lead to the consequence of either "two Chinas" or "one Taiwan, one China". Both of these violated the bottom line of its One-China principle and unification policy.<sup>48</sup> Beijing also felt that Taipei was taking it for a fool. Indeed, the PRC lost patience with Lee's skillful manoeuvres on the independence-unification issue in his efforts to consolidate

---

<sup>44</sup> The Taiwan Affairs and Information Office (PRC) (1993) "The Taiwan Question and the Reunification of China", in <http://www.china.org.cn/e-white/taiwan/index.htm> (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>45</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) 'Understanding Taiwan', pp. 9-10.

<sup>46</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1991) 'The Goal and Meaning of the National Unification Guidelines'.

<sup>47</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp. 119-120.

<sup>48</sup> Zhao Suisheng (2002) 'Reunification Strategy: Beijing Verse Lee Teng-hui', in Dickson and Chao (eds.) (2002) *Assessing the Lee Teng-hui Legacy in Taiwan's Politics*, pp. 224-7.

his national sovereignty claim.<sup>49</sup> For some, the events of the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis greatly annoyed Beijing, leading the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) to reject his mainland policy and marking the failure of Lee's rapprochement strategy.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, Lee firmly believed that the sudden deterioration of cross-Straits relations in 1995-96 derived from the power struggle within the CCP. From his perspective, Beijing necessarily adopted a tough position on the Taiwan issue in order to unify the CCP.<sup>51</sup> Lee also revealed in an interview that he had privately informed Beijing in advance about his 1995 visit to the US and added that at the time there had been no indication that Beijing would respond to his American trip by initiating such a large-scale political and military protest.<sup>52</sup> Obviously, since hostile experiences had accompanied the cross-Straits sovereignty competition for decades, both Taipei and Beijing were still mutually suspicious and could not properly communicate with each other.

### ***The Four-Step Process of Redefining Cross-Straits Relations***

In order to pursue the strategic choice of peaceful coexistence while planning to ensure the ROC's independent sovereign status, Lee's administration used the method of redefining cross-Straits relations as two "equal political entities". This redefinition involved a four-step process: first, asserting the ROC's sovereignty over Taiwan; second, recognizing the PRC's sovereignty over mainland China; third, ending Taiwan's image of being identified as Beijing's so-called "renegade province" in international society; and fourth, resolving the divisions over the sovereignty issue by insisting on an equal basis from which to advance the future reunification of China. Months before the 1995-96 Strait crisis, Lee Teng-hui had put forward a "Six-Point proposal" to respond to Jiang Zemin's first major speech on policy vis-à-vis Taiwan, also known as "Jiang's

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid; Kuo Julian J. (2002) 'Cross-Straits Relations: Buying Time Without Strategy', in Dickson and Chao (eds.) (2002) *Assessing the Lee Teng-hui Legacy in Taiwan's Politics*, pp. 204-216.

<sup>51</sup> Lee Teng-hui and Nakajima Mineo (2000) *The Wisdom of Asia* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), p. 48.

<sup>52</sup> Zou (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui's Regime*, pp. 202-4.

Eight Points”.<sup>53</sup> Both Lee’s “Six Points” and Jiang’s “Eight Points” represented landmark statements of their respective cross-Strait policies. ‘In the hope of normalizing bilateral relations’, Taipei urged Beijing to be realistic and to recognize that ‘the fact that the Chinese mainland and Taiwan have been ruled by two political entities in no way subordinate to each other has led to a state of division between the two sides and separate governmental jurisdictions, hence the issue of national unification.’<sup>54</sup> From Lee’s perspective, in the pursuit of peaceful coexistence, the first step for moving forward these new cross-Strait relations for both sides was to win acceptance of the fact that the so-called ‘one China’ was divided, and let both sides enjoy their own sovereignty in relation to specific territories, people and government.

In his May 1996 inauguration speech, Lee’s proposal for “managing great Taiwan, establishing a new centre of culture” (*jingying da taiwan, jianli xing zhongyuan*) can be regarded as the synthesis of his pursuit of the four-step process of redefining cross-Strait relations. In the proposal, Lee vowed to pursue cross-Strait unification and hoped that Taiwan, as the new cultural centre, would play a leading role in fostering a new Chinese culture.<sup>55</sup> Richard Bush, a former chairman of the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT), commented that Lee’s new proposal represented ‘the most telling refutation of the idea that Lee was opposed to Taiwan’s unification with China.’<sup>56</sup> To be sure, while advocating cross-Strait unification in a timely and appropriate manner, Taiwan’s “new centre” proposal built on the emphasis given to Taiwan’s popular sovereignty and highlighted the differences between Taiwan and China after a long history of division in terms of political, economic, social and cultural facts.<sup>57</sup> Lee made it clear that there was a distinction between the “wishful thinking” of political unification and the “reality” of the divided

---

<sup>53</sup> Jiang’s “Eight Points” was stated on 30 January 1995. For Chinese and English versions of Lee’s “Six Points” and Jiang’s “Eight Points”, see in ([http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/1\\_5.htm](http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/1_5.htm)) and ([http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/1\\_5.htm](http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/1_5.htm)) respectively. (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>54</sup> Lee’s “Six Points” (English version), in ([http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/1\\_5.htm](http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/1_5.htm))

<sup>55</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), pp. 447-468; Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp. 62-63; Lee Teng-hui’s inaugural speech as President (20 May 1996).

<sup>56</sup> Bush (2005) ‘Lee Teng-hui and “Separatism”’, p. 85. Established in 1979, the AIT is the US equivalent diplomatic institution in maintaining unofficial Taipei-Washington relations.

<sup>57</sup> Lee Teng-hui’s inaugural speech as President (20 May 1996); Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp. 62-3.

situation across the Strait. Lee's redefinition of the cross-Strait division came to another climax when he overtly described the cross-Strait relations as "special state-to-state relations" in an interview with reporters from *Deutsche Welle* on 9 July 1999. In the interview, when asked for his opinion of Beijing's view that Taiwan was a renegade province of China, he replied:

The historical facts are as follows: since the PRC's establishment, the Chinese communists have never ruled Taiwan, Penghu, Jinmen and Mazu, which have been under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China. In 1991, our country amended its Constitution ... Consequently, the state organs subsequently formed will only represent the Taiwan people. The legitimacy of the administration of state power can only be authorized by the Taiwan people and has absolutely nothing to do with the people in mainland China. Since our constitutional reform in 1991, we have designed cross-Strait relations as nation-to-nation (guo-jia yu guo-jia), or at least as special state-to-state relations (te-shu guo-yu-guo de guan-xi), rather than internal relations within "one China" between a legitimate government and a rebel group, or between central and local governments.<sup>58</sup>

From the NUG's "two political entities" in 1991 to the 1999 formula of "special state-to-state relations", Lee defended his transformed tone to define the cross-Strait relations, arguing that the vague term "political entity" not only failed to accord with the evidence, but, more decisively in terms of international law, put Taiwan in an unequal position to conduct any unification negotiation with Beijing.<sup>59</sup> The overt definition of the "special state-to-state relations" also reflected Lee's prolonged frustration with Beijing's constant treatment of the ROC on Taiwan as its subordinate after Taipei initiated its "goodwill" recognition of Beijing in 1991. 'Based on the necessity of protecting national interests and dignity', Lee explained to Beijing and the international community, 'it [the described "special state-to-state relationship"] was designed to lay a foundation of parity for the two sides, to elevate the level of dialogue, to build a

---

<sup>58</sup> "VOG Interviews Li Teng-hui", *Zhongyan Ribao*, 10 July 1999, FBIS, OW12007135899, in Bush, Richard (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', p. 87.

<sup>59</sup> The Mainland Affairs Council (MAC) (1999), 'Parity, Peace, and Win-Win: The Republic of China's Position on the "Special State-to-State Relationship"', (Taipei: 1 August 1999), in ([http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/2nda\\_2.htm](http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/2nda_2.htm)) (accessed on 21 April 2010); Bush, Richard (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', pp. 87-8.

mechanism for democratic and peaceful cross-Strait interactions and to usher in a new era of cross-Strait relations.<sup>60</sup>

‘To clarify, not change the status quo and to seek peace, not to make trouble’, Lee constantly repeated his position on Taiwan’s stance: ‘there is no need to warn Taiwan about declaring independence because the ROC has been sovereign and independent since its founding in 1912.’<sup>61</sup> Then, instead of challenging the PRC’s existence as his predecessors had done, Lee proposed a mutual acknowledgement that the two Chinese governments, Taipei and Beijing, could work together from a starting point of equal sovereignty to find a solution for the cross-Strait conflict.

In the event, however, the outcome of the four-step process was acrimony, at least for Beijing and even for Washington. Against the backdrop of the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis and Lee’s 1999 statement on the “special state-to-state relations”, Beijing condemned Lee as ‘the general representative of Taiwan’s separatist forces, a saboteur of the stability of the Taiwan Straits, a stumbling-block preventing the development of relations between China and the U.S. and a troublemaker for the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region.’<sup>62</sup> While the Clinton administration worried about the risk of cross-Strait conflict erupting through accident or miscalculation after the experience of the 1995-96 Strait crisis, Lee’s “special state-to-state relations” statement caught Taiwan’s most important security provider, the US, by surprise. Washington was especially annoyed that Lee had not informed them in advance about his “state to state” formulation, which was new in that it explicitly defined the Taiwan-China relationship in terms of sovereignty status.<sup>63</sup> United States officials have also complained privately that Lee has at times been a troublemaker.<sup>64</sup> Julian J. Kuo,

---

<sup>60</sup> The Mainland Affairs Council (1999), ‘Parity, Peace, and Win-Win: The Republic of China’s Position on the “Special State-to-State Relationship”’.

<sup>61</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) ‘Understanding Taiwan’, p.10.

<sup>62</sup> “The One-China Principle and the Taiwan Issue”, *Beijing Review* (6 March, 2000), in Bush (2005) ‘Lee Teng-hui and “Separatism”’, pp. 70-71.

<sup>63</sup> Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot*, pp. 55-57.

<sup>64</sup> Richard C. Kagan (2007) *Taiwan’s Statesman: Lee Teng-Hui and democracy in Asia* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press), p. 130. Some American China experts put the label of Taiwanese independence on Lee; see W. Freeman Jr. Chas (July-August 1998) “Preventing War in the Taiwan Strait: Restraining Taiwan-and Beijing”, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, pp. 6-11; Ross,

a Taiwanese DPP scholar, has criticized Lee for proposing ‘new policies [involving the cross-Strait sovereignty issues] ... as ad hoc methods of crisis management in the face of external pressure, [which] ... ended up without an overall sense of purpose - in short, without a sense of national strategy.’<sup>65</sup>

Critics such as Kuo seem to lack a deeper historical perspective on the nature of the ROCOT-PRC competition for sovereignty and ignore Taipei’s willingness to accept the possibility of cross-Strait reunification under certain conditions. In fact, early in May 1991, Taipei’s strategic trade-off between preserving Taiwan’s sovereign status and offering a unification scheme had already taken shape when Lee proposed the National Guidelines (NUG) to normalize the cross-Strait relations. The firm stance on the “reality” of the ROCOT’s de facto sovereign independent status, combined with a vision of the possibility of cross-Strait unification, represented the very core of the national grand strategy of Lee’s administration. Most important of all, these critics of Lee’s insistence on sovereignty as the cause of the cross-Strait crises ignore the crucial point that the demand to protect national sovereignty is of fundamental interest and value for any state and government. Since Taiwan’s democratization, in particular, the sovereignty of the ROC over Taiwan has belonged to the people of Taiwan, not to any individual or political party, let alone outside regimes. Lee’s administration has opted to normalize cross-Strait relations by way of redefining cross-Strait relations - establishing mutual recognition and equality as sovereign entities. This represented a revision of the national strategic choice by Taiwan’s former authoritarian regimes. In the past, Taipei’s authoritarian rigid mainland policies were rooted in a zero-sum cross-Strait game, which not only set up an illusory strategic goal of reunification against Beijing on its own terms but also made it impossible the likelihood that any positive cross-Strait dialogue would proceed.

To make sense of Lee’s national grand strategy, one needs to understand also how Taipei’s strategic choice of pursuing peaceful coexistence was formulated

---

Robert S. (Fall 2000) ‘The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait Confrontation: Coercion, Credibility, and the Use of Force’, *International Security*, Vol. 25, pp. 87-123.

<sup>65</sup> Kuo (2002) ‘Cross-Strait Relations: Buying Time Without Strategy’, p. 205.

with reference to the four-step process of redefining cross-Strait relations in the first place. Indeed, one would seriously misinterpret Lee's way of redefining cross-Strait relations if one opted to consider any of the steps in his four-step process in isolation, such as his insistence on the sovereignty issue, and not treat the four-step process as a whole. According to Lee's vision, redefining the cross-Strait relations was vital to the very existence and integrity of the ROC on Taiwan and should go beyond the conventional ideas/debates on independence and unification, because the ROC has been an independent sovereign state since 1912.

### **C.6.2 The Power of “Taiwanese Subjectivity”**

Beijing's opposition to Taipei's strategic choice of peaceful coexistence, involving the mutual acknowledgment of sovereign equality across the Strait, presented a new strategic challenge to the ROC on Taiwan. Although freed from the burdensome national duty to reunify with Mainland China as his predecessors proposed, during Lee Teng-hui's administration, Taipei encountered a demanding but familiar task: how to increase and manage Taiwan's limited national power to guard against the threats associated with China's overwhelming comprehensive national power. The reaction to the 1995-96 Strait crisis presented an important illustration of the way in which Lee's administration managed the complex national material-ideational resources for the task. Compared to previous governments, Lee's administration had continually emphasized the vital role of drawing on material resources, such as economic power, to enhance national power. That said, the administration at the same time had also tried to build up a new national identity as a country strong on soft power to compensate for Taipei's material disadvantages in the face of Beijing's threats. However, instead of raising the banner of Chinese nationalism as his predecessors had done, Lee proposed a new concept of “Taiwanese subjectivity” (*taiwan zhuti xing*), Taiwanese awareness of self-preservation and self-mastery, as a valued innovation of Taiwanese identity (*taiwan rentong*) to unify the heart and mind of the divided Taiwan society so as

to sustain and consolidate the fighting will of Taiwan's people in the new era of a 'post-nationalist' national identity.

### ***The Nature of Lee's "Taiwanese Subjectivity"***

Lee's idea of "Taiwanese subjectivity", the foundation of his state sovereignty perspective, derives from his understanding and rethinking of Taiwan's colonial history.<sup>66</sup> Since the seventeenth century, through the Dutch and Japanese colonial masters and the different Chinese rulers (the Ming dynasty, Qing dynasty and the KMT's authoritarian regime), the very purpose of Taiwan's existence had always been to preserve and serve the prosperity of these outside masters rather than that of the people of Taiwan. According to Lee, 'for centuries the people of Taiwan were denied the opportunity to govern themselves. No matter how hard they strove, their homeland was not their own.'<sup>67</sup> Having been ruled by so many different outsiders for so long, Lee observed, the consequence of these diverse historical experiences of occupation initiated a negative state of mind within the people of Taiwan. As a result the Taiwanese not only have a very vague sense of who they are but also lack the confidence and determination to consider themselves as master and subject on the island.<sup>68</sup> In an interview with the Japanese writer Shiba Ryotaro in March 1994, Lee concluded that because of the unfortunate experiences suffered by Taiwan, the Taiwanese felt powerless in relation to their homeland, which he famously linked to "the pathos of being born a Taiwanese".<sup>69</sup> In fact, Lee also felt angry and worried about the "slavish" mind-set of the Taiwanese people who do not have the will to be their own masters.<sup>70</sup> Accordingly, Lee's "Taiwanese subjectivity" is presented as a discourse to lead the people of Taiwan out of past repression. Lee's "Taiwanese subjectivity" can be

---

<sup>66</sup> Lee Teng-hui (2003) 'My Belief and Vision of Taiwan's Status and National Sovereignty', in Zhang Yan-xian (2008) (ed.) *An Interview with Lee Teng-hui: His Belief and Philosophy*, Vol. III, pp. 215-223.

<sup>67</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p. 19.

<sup>68</sup> Lee Teng-hui (2003) 'My Belief and Vision of Taiwan's Status and National Sovereignty'.

<sup>69</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p. 19.

<sup>70</sup> Zhang Yan-xian (ed.) (2008) *An Interview and Narration of Lee Teng-hui: His Belief and Philosophy*, Vol. III (Chinese version, my translation) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication), p. 106.

conceptualized as a Taiwan-centric perception of the demand for self-mastery and the pursuit of self-preservation.

“Taiwanese subjectivity” also represents a belief in the importance of implementing popular sovereignty of the ROC over Taiwan. The concept is tied to a belief in self-mastery and self-preservation that is a matter of the greatest importance for Taiwan’s national strategy in the context of the competition for sovereignty across the Strait. For Lee, the sovereignty of the ROC over Taiwan has existed since 1949.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, the sovereignty issue was not a vague abstraction. Rather, Lee held strongly that sovereignty should be practised and reaffirmed by the people of Taiwan. Accordingly, on the one hand, the notion of “Taiwanese subjectivity” underpins Taiwanese popular sovereignty; on the other, this subjectivity also symbolises a desire to pursue self-mastery. In the end, “Taiwanese subjectivity” became not only a cause of action, but also a source of ideational power in the discourse of Lee’s Taiwan’s national grand strategy.

There is no doubt that during Lee’s twelve years in office, his last term in particular, his efforts in asserting “Taiwanese subjectivity” and his emphasis on popular sovereignty annoyed China significantly. Beijing became convinced that Lee’s claim to establish a “Taiwanese subjectivity” was at heart a conscious charade in support of Taiwanese independence. One Xinhua commentary, for example, concluded that ‘Lee was already revealed in his true colours of Taiwanese independence .... [and] Beijing could no longer show tolerance toward Lee’s visit to the US to create two Chinas.’<sup>72</sup> China’s perception that Lee was promoting the idea of the ROCOT’s sovereignty justified Beijing’s resort in 1995/6 to military exercises as a serious and unmistakable signal aimed at deterring such independence. Rejecting Beijing’s accusations, Lee charged Beijing with slander, but at the same time repeated his pledge to build a new “great Taiwan”.<sup>73</sup> From Lee’s point of view, the most important issue of his administration was ‘to listen to the voices of the people, to undertake

---

<sup>71</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) ‘Understanding Taiwan - Bridging the Perception Gap’.

<sup>72</sup> Xinhua, 27 June 1995.

<sup>73</sup> John F. Copper (1999) ‘The Origin of Conflict Across the Taiwan Strait’, in Zhao Suisheng (ed.) (1999) *Across the Taiwan Strait*, p.43.

thoroughgoing democratic reforms and to establish a new era in which sovereignty resides in the people'.<sup>74</sup> In saying this, Taipei's unprecedented promotion of the idea of "Taiwanese subjectivity" intended to articulate the ROC's sovereign independent status and, more importantly, to integrate the diversified national identities at home, split mainly between those regarding themselves as Chinese or Taiwanese, in order to create a new Taiwanese identity. However the disagreement since 1949 between Taipei and Beijing over the issue of sovereignty has continued to make for irreconcilable differences regarding the status quo across the Strait.

### ***The Innovation of "Taiwanese Identity"***

The notion of Taiwan national identity (*guojia rentong*) rooted in the state-building idea of Taiwanese subjectivity was for Lee's administration a key element in constructing Taiwan's national strategy. 'National identity', according to William Bloom, 'describes that condition in which a mass of people have had the same identification with national symbols - have internalized the symbols of the nation - so that they may act as one psychological group when there is a threat to, or the possibility of enhancement of, these symbols of national identity.'<sup>75</sup> The link between national identity and national strategy thus amounts to a fundamental hearts-and-minds issue of strategic importance within a society in the context of confrontation, in Taiwan's case over cross-Strait sovereignty. For Lee and his administration, the role of Taiwan's identity served not only to justify Taipei's primal strategic goal of preserving sovereign independence, but also to create a form of soft power, including patriotism, to integrate and mobilize Taiwan's society against China's threats. From Lee Teng-hui's point of view, forming Taiwan's national identity was the core hearts-and-minds innovation (*xinling gaige*), which was designed to adjust the longstanding China-centred paradigm of national identity into a

---

<sup>74</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p. 60.

<sup>75</sup> W. Bloom (1990). *Personal identity, national identity and international relations*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), p.52.

Taiwan-centred paradigm.<sup>76</sup> For Lee, this involved defining and living a Taiwanese national identity, which addressed the core question of ‘*who am I*’.<sup>77</sup> This identity transformation could be seen as a ‘deconstruction of Chinese nationalism’ and resulted in a ‘post-nationalist’ identity, in Christopher Hughes’s terms, which was established in Lee Teng-hui’s perspective of *Gemeinschaft*, a society as a ‘living community’ of ‘shared destiny’.<sup>78</sup> The new Taiwanese identity not only enabled Lee to carry on Taiwan’s political democratization to re-establish the KMT’s legitimacy and rule in the island but also provided a crucial context for Lee’s advocacy of popular sovereignty through securing the ROCOT’s sovereignty, although Lee had noted Taiwan’s indispensable relations with mainland China and opened the possibility for future unification across the Strait, according to *the Guidelines for National Unification*.

Lee’s discourse on establishing a new Taiwanese national identity was strategic and political in its objective. In other words, this discourse focused on more than conventional cultural considerations of self-identification. This was because Lee’s Taiwanese identity was applied mainly to overcoming the island’s divisions on grounds of national identity, in order to counter Beijing’s Chinese nationalism and also to reform the core values of his Nationalist Party (KMT) in order to compete with the DPP in domestic elections. After the 1995-1996 Taiwan Strait crisis, Lee Teng-hui showed more enthusiasm on the identity issue and asserted that ‘the pursuit of national identity will become the decisive and central issue of Taiwan’s future political development.’<sup>79</sup> To unite the four main ethnic groups (Hoklo, Hakka, Mainlanders and Aborigines) under one national identity in Taiwan, Lee proposed the idea of the “New Taiwanese”, which may be regarded as one of his most important political legacies. During the 1995 Strait crisis, Lee had first addressed the idea of a ‘New Taiwanese’

---

<sup>76</sup> Zhang Yan-xian (ed.) (2008) *An Interview and Narration of Lee Teng-hui: His Belief and Philosophy*, Vol. III (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication), p.74.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>78</sup> Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, pp. 154-155. It is worth noting that Lee described himself not only as a Taiwanese but also as a Chinese during the 1996 presidential election; see Shi Zheng-feng (2000) *Taiwanese National Identity*, (in Chinese) from <http://www.wufi.org.tw/shih/f0008.htm> (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>79</sup> Lee Teng-hui and Nakajima Mineo (2000) *The Wisdom of Asia*, p. 36.

identity, which referred to all of Taiwan's residents as Taiwanese, disregarding ethnic differences and the question of who had come to Taiwan first, as long as people identified themselves as masters of Taiwan, devoted themselves to Taiwan and shared the common goal of state *Gemeinschaft* (*guojia shengming gongtongti*) (a political community as a state).<sup>80</sup> The idea of a 'New Taiwanese' identity did not attract much public attention at the time. The term did, however, become popular after the 1998 Taipei mayoral election, when Lee was speaking at a rally on behalf of the KMT's candidate Ma Ying-jeou and called Ma, then the most popular political figure, of mainland Chinese origin, a 'New Taiwanese'. Since this time, the concept of the 'New Taiwanese' identity has become a useful rhetorical device for forging a new self-awareness on the island.

The transformation of Taiwanese national identity has been in evidence since Lee's efforts to promote a new Taiwanese national identity. Opinion polls in the early 1990s indicated that less than 20 per cent of Taiwan's population described themselves as Taiwanese (as opposed to Chinese, or "Taiwanese and Chinese"), but this figure rose to 50 per cent (more than double) in early 2000 and to 57 per cent (nearly triple) in 2004.<sup>81</sup> Those admitting to a Chinese-only identity saw their percentage drop strikingly from 24.1 per cent in 1994 to 8.3 per cent at the end of Lee's administration in 2000.<sup>82</sup> Research on Taiwan's national identity has concluded that Taiwan's people have joined the movement to a Taiwanese-only identity.<sup>83</sup> Many factors may account for this dramatic change over such a short period. While Lee's administration played a key part, Beijing also contributed significantly to it. For instance, Beijing's coercive strategy, which adopted the course of seeking to compel Taipei, as manifested in the 1995-96 missile intimidation, obviously did not endear Beijing to the

---

<sup>80</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1995) 'We Are All New Taiwanese', in Lee, Teng-hui, Zhang, Y. (1996). *Closely Reading Lee Teng-hui* (*Xi du Li Denghui*). (Taipei: Zhong Yang Ri Bao Chu Ban Bu), pp.209-212.

<sup>81</sup> Ho Szu-yui and Liu, I-chou (2003) 'The Taiwanese/Chinese Identity of the Taiwan People in 1990s', in Lee Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America), pp. 149-180; O. Bedford and Hwang, K. (2006). *Taiwanese Identity and Democracy: the Social Psychology of Taiwan's 2004 elections*. (New York, N.Y., Palgrave Macmillan), p.11; Shi Zheng-feng (2000) *Taiwanese National Identity*

<sup>82</sup> Ho Szu-yui and Liu I-chou (2003) 'The Taiwanese/Chinese Identity of the Taiwan People in 1990s', p.154.

<sup>83</sup> Ho Szu-yui and Liu I-chou (2003) 'The Taiwanese/Chinese Identity of the Taiwan People in the 1990s', pp. 177-179.

people of Taiwan. On the contrary, the threat of applying force not merely alienated many on Taiwan but in fact consolidated the very Taiwanese-only national identity that Beijing wanted to undermine, since it constituted a serious obstacle to its unification mission.<sup>84</sup> There is no evidence to show that Lee's administration deliberately adopted a strategy to create the crisis across the Strait so as to exploit it either to manipulate domestic politics or to consolidate Taiwanese identity. Nevertheless, the Strait crisis did provide an unexpected opportunity for Lee's administration to forge a new and different Taiwanese national identity, which is at the core of the island's political defiance. The absence of a shared national identity was to be avoided because it could have led to a situation in which reluctance to endorse this identity would have put Taiwan's national security strategy in serious doubt.

### ***Lee's Blueprint for “Managing Taiwan”***

The distinct strategy of building up and enhancing Taiwan's comprehensive national power by Lee Teng-hui's administration is encapsulated in the scheme of “managing great Taiwan and establishing a new centre of Chinese culture” (*jingying da taiwan, jianli xin zhongyuan*), which was deeply rooted in the notion of the new Taiwanese subjectivity.<sup>85</sup> The scheme, which provided the first blueprint of Lee's vision for managing Taiwan's development strategy, was initially proposed in 1995 for the 1996 presidential election. For “managing the great Taiwan”, the starting point was domestically to establish a common ground of solid Taiwanese identity. This involved celebrating the idea that “we are all Taiwanese”, so as to bring together Taiwan's people of different historical and ethnic backgrounds, forming a new common ethnic (*zuqun*) background distinct from that of mainland China.<sup>86</sup> In practice, the management concentrated on three elements - the political, economic and social sectors - so as to construct a democratic and efficient Taiwan, to achieve its further industrial and technological advancement and to create a comfortable and

---

<sup>84</sup> M. J. Brown (2004). *Is Taiwan Chinese? The Impact of Culture, Power, and Migration on Changing Identities*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press), p.240.

<sup>85</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.).

<sup>86</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp.62-63.

secure state.<sup>82</sup> In addition, Lee's administration wanted to "establish a new centre of Chinese culture", which in the view of the government would lead Taiwan to be 'a place where culture mixes and flourishes' and which in the end could act as 'an advanced new force' for the Chinese community.<sup>87</sup>

Lee's identity-centred vision of strategy managing Taiwan can be decoded with reference to three main issues: a new identity, liberal democracy and national well-being. First, it involved composing a new Taiwanese identity, which would precipitate a clash between those keen to embrace it and those espousing a Chinese identity. Lee's approach to reconciling the identity clash focused on the promotion of a "New Taiwanese" identity. Furthermore, to prevent Beijing from misinterpreting the emerging identification with Taiwan as the sign of a move toward independence, Lee's vision of Taiwan as a "new centre of Chinese culture" was put forward, presenting Taiwan not only as closely related to the Chinese people of the past, but also committed to being a positive force for Chinese culture in the future.<sup>88</sup> Second, the promotion of a truly liberal democratic culture was at the core of Lee's overall scheme of "Managing Great Taiwan". For his administration, the goal of strengthening political democracy was crucial, because the mechanism of liberal democracy would consolidate a form of popular sovereignty and national identity which would allow the people of Taiwan to participate in the protection of Taiwan's security and to decide the direction of Taiwan's future. 'What actually is the goal of Taiwan's democratization?', Lee was asked. His answer: 'Speaking simply, it is the "Taiwanisation of Taiwan" (*taiwan de bentuhua*).'<sup>89</sup> This well demonstrates the link between democratization and the building of a national identity within his state management scheme. Finally, as an economic expert, Lee Teng-hui firmly believed that the economy was a life and death matter for the nation's

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> In fact, before proposing Taiwan as the "new centre of Chinese culture", Lee consistently emphasized the indispensable relations with mainland China and the possible reunification across the Strait in the *Guidelines for National Unification*. See Bush, Richard (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', pp. 84-87 and Chapter 5 in Hughes,(1997) *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, pp. 95-128.

<sup>89</sup> Lee Teng-hui (2000) 'Why I raised the "Special State-to-State Relationship"', in Lee Teng-hui and Nakajima Mineo (2000) *The Wisdom of Asia*, p.35.

survival.<sup>90</sup> Lee's choice to pursue Taiwan's well-being and prosperity was to ensure that Taiwan's continuing economic growth would remain the central task of his administration. The more economic success Taiwan achieved, the more material resources would be available, which in turn would increase the chances of Taiwan's preserving its independent existence. With regard to economic relations with China in Lee's strategy of managing Taiwan, it is worth noting that Lee was constantly cautious about the issue of increasing trade and investment across the Strait if this would cause Taiwan to depend economically on China, given that economic dependence would eventually corrode loyalty to Taiwan and to Taiwan's identity. Moreover, from an economic point of view, Taiwan's economic dependence on China would raise the issue of cross-Strait economic inequality and damage to Taiwan's access to other markets. In the end, Lee believed that Beijing would gain the upper hand and exploit Taiwan's economic dependence as a means to dictate Taiwan's future. Consequently, Lee created the investment and trade mantra of "no haste, be patient" (*jieji yongren*) that put restrictions on the deepening cross-Strait economic relations in the hope of revising the trend of Taiwan's economic dependence on China.<sup>91</sup> The three elements of Lee's approach, in the end, were pragmatic and idealistic in that they involved improving Taiwan's overall national power in the shadow of China's threats. By seeking convergence between the Taiwanese and Chinese identities or blending the so-called "cocktail of identities"<sup>92</sup> into a new identity for Taiwan, the identity-centred strategic management of Lee's administration could well be captured under the banner of "Taiwan's post-nationalist identity", to use Christopher R. Hughes's term, which 'attempts to maximise the benefits of Taiwan's being a branch on this tree [the Pan-Chinese culture community] while not compromising the island's political independence from the mainland.'<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Lee Teng-hui's inaugural speech as President (20 May 1996); for an outline of Lee's economic policy, see Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp. 201-209 and Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan*, pp. 273-293.

<sup>91</sup> Richard C. Kagan (2007) *Taiwan's Statesman: Lee Teng-Hui and Democracy in Asia* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press), pp. 128-130.

<sup>92</sup> Ian Buruma (1996). "Taiwan's New Nationalists," *Foreign Affairs*, 75(4), p.84.

<sup>93</sup> Hughes (1997). *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, p.95.

Some have criticised Lee's decision to raise the national identity issue, arguing that 'an elite-orchestrated Taiwanese national-building project will inevitably run into a head-on collision with a state-orchestrated Chinese nationalism on the mainland, putting the security and well-being of the Taiwanese people at grave risk.'<sup>94</sup> Nevertheless, this criticism, while it acknowledges the existing identity division within the island, fails to provide a feasible way forward to deal with the underlying issue: the importance for Taiwan of establishing a shared national identity as an ideational force for mobilising national resources in managing Taiwan's national security strategy.<sup>95</sup> To be sure, there remain weaknesses in Taiwan's strategic capabilities, which mean that, despite all Lee's efforts to forge a new Taiwanese identity with reference to the idea of Taiwanese subjectivity, Taiwan under his administration was still struggling with two types of competing nationalism, Taiwanese and Chinese. The lack of a domestic consensus on a shared national identity significantly undermined Taiwan's overall strategic capacity to prepare for China's threats.

### **C.6.3 Pragmatic Diplomacy against International Isolation**

To make use of external resources, including the strength of others, or to deal with international political structures to secure a favourable strategic environment, constitutes an important option for any small state's strategic arrangements vis-à-vis a much stronger foe. Lacking credible power of its own to deal with Beijing, Taiwan's grand strategy has consistently relied on external powers. Like the preceding administrations, Lee Teng-hui's government wanted to heavily rely on Washington's support. Despite no longer having formal diplomatic relations with the US, Washington did offer the Lee government much needed assistance, as evidenced once more in the 1995-96 Strait crisis.

---

<sup>94</sup> Chu Yun-han and Lin Jih-wen (2001) 'Political Development in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Taiwan: State-Building, Regime Transformation and the Construction of National Identity', in S. M. Goldstein and R. L. Edmonds (2001). *Taiwan in the Twentieth Century: A Retrospective View*. (New York: Cambridge University Press), p.129.

<sup>95</sup> For further details about differences between the academic and policy worlds in the discourse of strategy, see Freedman, Lawrence (2002) 'The Future of Strategic Studies', in John Baylis, James Wirtz, Eliot Cohen, and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World- An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 333-335.

This interference by Washington was decisive and set a new context for Taiwan's grand strategy which has remained ever since. This was an unexpectedly favourable development for the Lee government which had adopted a pragmatic foreign policy and initiated a new policy of peaceful coexistence with the PRC to break through its prolonged international isolation.

The 1995-96 Strait crisis resulted in a serious setback in cross-Strait rapprochement, which - as mentioned - had started in the early 1990s. Although the crisis did not lead Taipei to abandon its efforts to seek peaceful coexistence with Beijing, it clearly reinforced Taipei's belief in and practice of its "existence" (*cunzai*) doctrine, which led the Lee administration to articulate in international society its redefined sovereign status as the ROC on Taiwan.<sup>96</sup> In effect, the emphasis on "existence" is a key aspect of Taipei's "pragmatic diplomacy" (*wushu waijiao*).<sup>97</sup> Lee's 1995 high-profile American trip represented the peak of Taipei's pragmatic diplomacy, but it also resulted in the 1995-96 Strait crisis, which saw Beijing apply military force to conduct coercive diplomacy as a counter-measure. The lessons of the 1995-96 Strait crisis then raised a fundamental question about Taipei's strategic environment: if a competing relationship existed between its mainland policy and foreign policy, which one should be given priority in terms of improving Taipei's strategic position? The dilemma is related to the management of Taiwan's overall strategic environment, the question being whether to bandwagon with China or to ally with other powers to balance China's threats. As both Taipei and Beijing have their own respective firm positions on the sovereignty issue, Taipei in the end chose the strategy of balancing instead of bandwagoning, despite pledging to adopt a balanced strategy characterized by efforts to improve cross-Strait relations and pursue pragmatic diplomacy. Lee's focus on

---

<sup>96</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp.95-98.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid; Lee, Teng-hui (1991) Chapter 12, 13, 16, 17 of *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.). For discussions of Lee's pragmatic diplomacy, for instance, see Hughes (1997). *Taiwan and Chinese nationalism*, pp. 129-152; Wang, T.Y. (2003) 'Taiwan Foreign Relations under Lee Teng-hui's Rule, 1988-2000', in Lee, Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America); Hickey, Dennis V. (2006). *Foreign policy making in Taiwan: from principle to pragmatism*. (New York: Routledge), PP.89-114; Lee, Bernice (1999) *The Security Implication of the New Taiwan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 331), pp.31-32.

Taiwan's "existence" in his foreign policy, which was rooted in the concept of Taiwanese subjectivity, may ultimately be understood as an aspect of a nationalistic foreign policy. The nationalistic nature of its foreign policy was in fact very similar as that of his predecessors, except that Lee's administration focused on a different referent when setting forth its stance - a new Taiwanese nationalism.

### ***Promoting the Idea of "Existence" in International Society***

When Lee Teng-hui explained his kind of foreign policy in the book "The Road to Democracy - Taiwan's Pursuit of Identity" in May 1999, he stressed that the foremost national mission of his administration was to find a way to secure the very existence of Taiwan and that the essence of Taiwan's foreign relations was designed to substantiate this existence in international society.<sup>98</sup> 'To manifest the fact of Taiwan's existence', he said, 'we have to establish relations with other countries.'<sup>99</sup> The notion was thus essential to understanding Lee's foreign policy as a whole and its pragmatic diplomacy in particular. Indeed, the latter would later become a distinctive feature of his foreign policy.

Lee's existence doctrine can be best understood with reference to his perceptions of the threats to Taiwan and his attempts to forge a new nationalist identity. First, although Beijing's threats were nothing new for Taipei, it appears that Taipei's perception of threat was reinforced by Beijing's efforts to constantly impose its rigid "one-China principle" to the detriment of Taipei's quest for international space and legitimacy, even though Taipei had initiated a policy of mutual co-existence in the early 1990s. Moreover, Beijing's penchant for diplomatic blockade shows that there was no sign of resolving Taipei's prolonged international isolation during Lee's administration. This international isolation would in the end deprive Taiwan's leadership of the possibility of applying external resources in its own strategic favour and thus compel the small Taiwan to face China, its much greater foe, alone. Following the 1995-96 military intimidation by Beijing, Lee's perception of the magnitude of China's

---

<sup>98</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, pp.95-96.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid. (my translation of the original Chinese text)

threat became even clearer, namely, that China would continue to conduct its zero-sum sovereignty competition against the ROC on Taiwan in the international arena until it surrendered. As a result, Taiwan had to articulate its very existence in international society and pursue foreign relations with other countries to substantiate itself. Second, the existence doctrine extends from Lee's idea of Taiwan's "subjectivity". The newly nationalistic identity of Taiwanese subjectivity led the people of Taiwan to rethink what they had in common and whether they should re-assess their own existence accordingly. When Lee was asked the "secret" of how he managed Taiwan's foreign policy, he replied, 'In fact, it is extremely plain and simple. It is only to hold firmly [to] the principle that Taiwan exists. Taiwan's existence is a fact and as long as Taiwan exists, there is hope.'<sup>100</sup>

It is in this context that Lee's "pragmatic diplomacy", or "flexible diplomacy" derived from CCK's "total diplomacy", was designed, as mentioned already, to articulate the existence of Taiwan so as to overcome the international isolation which had defined the ROC on Taiwan as a "pariah state" and fundamentally undermined its existing statehood. From the perspective of Lee's administration, international isolation not only put Taiwan's security in serious danger but also frustrated the Taiwanese people's desire for self-respect and recognition as a sovereign state within international society. Soon after Lee Teng-hui first took office, he committed himself to adopting more "flexible measures" as regards participating in international activities to enhance Taipei's international status and defend its national interests so as to break the international isolation.<sup>101</sup> The core of Taipei's pragmatic diplomacy thus focused on developing all possible "substantive" (*shizhi*) relations - political, economic, cultural, technological, civilian, academic, tourist, etc. - with anyone in international society, regardless of whether formal diplomatic recognition was granted or not. Taipei's pragmatic diplomacy at the time can be summarized as consisting of three broad strategies: (1) emphasizing the importance of economic cooperation in international society; (2) forging official and unofficial relationships with other

---

<sup>100</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p.95.

<sup>101</sup> For Lee's interview with a Japanese newspaper on 9 May 1989, see Wang, T.Y. (2003) 'Taiwan Foreign Relations under Lee Teng-hui's Rule, 1988-2000', pp.246-247.

countries; and (3) joining international organizations and activities.<sup>102</sup> The innovative measures of pragmatic diplomacy under Lee's administration included, for instance, dual recognition, informal diplomacy, economic incentives or dollar diplomacy and arms trade diplomacy.<sup>103</sup> From 1993, Taiwan also began the pursuit to resume its UN membership. In line with Lee's strategy, as long as Taiwan had better relations with others, Taiwan's existence could be consolidated and manifested in international society, even if what was involved was only a marginal improvement.

The desired effects of Taipei's pragmatic diplomacy were to balance the PRC's sovereign claim over the island and to demonstrate to the world that the ROC on Taiwan existed as a separate entity; these were both politically and economically accomplished. As Taiwan had long faced a problem of international legitimacy in the experience of enforced diplomatic isolation, Michael Leifer observed that '[Taipei's] pragmatic diplomacy is a euphemism for trying to overcome a fundamental impediment to separate international status, which is inherent in the concept of sovereignty that is the organizing principle of international society'.<sup>104</sup> The PRC meanwhile asserted that the pragmatic diplomacy to 'expand its living space internationally' was a conspiracy to pursue 'Taiwan's independence'.<sup>105</sup> However, the strong desire of the people on Taiwan to join the international community simply reflected the phenomenon of a more pluralistic society boasting a vibrant democracy. As June Teufel Dreyer has noted, 'Taiwan's democratic system makes it difficult for Lee Teng-hui or any other elected leader to compromise with mainland China on fundamental issues like sovereignty'.<sup>106</sup> The resulting ambiguity in the relationship between Taiwan's identity and sovereign status has also had a

---

<sup>102</sup> Michael Leifer: '*Taiwan and South-East Asia: The Limits to Pragmatic Diplomacy*', in Richard Louis Edmonds and Steven M. Goldstein (eds.), *Taiwan in the Twentieth Century: A Retrospective View* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp.177-182.

<sup>103</sup> Wang T.Y. (2003) 'Taiwan Foreign Relations under Lee Teng-hui's Rule, 1988-2000', in Lee Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America), pp. 249-265.

<sup>104</sup> Michael Leifer: '*Taiwan and South-East Asia: The Limits to Pragmatic Diplomacy*', p.184.

<sup>105</sup> Jiang Zemin: *The 8-Point Proposition Made by President Jiang Zemin on China's Reunification* (January 30, 1995), ([www.china-embassy.org](http://www.china-embassy.org)).

<sup>106</sup> June Teufel Dreyer (1997) '*A History of Cross-Strait Interchange*', in James R. Lilley and Chuck Downs (eds.) (1997) *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press), p.37.

decisive impact on Taiwan's domestic politics that national identity rather than a socio-economic cleavage separates political parties and has constantly been one of the most salient electoral issues in a democratized Taiwan.<sup>107</sup> Indeed, Lee regarded the issue of Taiwan's foreign relations 'as important as its democratization and in fact closely connected with that process.'<sup>108</sup> As Christopher Hughes observes, the most important implication of Taiwan's democratization is in its contribution 'to the internationalization of the Taiwan issue by making it harder for the liberal democracies to turn their backs on Taiwan.'<sup>109</sup> 'Should we fail to steer a steady course for Taiwan's foreign policy', he argued, 'not only will the success of democratization but Taiwan's very survival will be endangered.'<sup>110</sup> As a result, it can be said that, to understand the external arrangements for Taiwan's grand strategy during Lee's regime, Lee's sovereignty perspective, foreign policy and political democratization are all interrelated as a whole and cannot be treated separately. The ROCOT's sovereignty would be assured so long as there was no doubt about the ROCOT's existence in international society.

### ***Competing Interpretation of the Status Quo***

During the Lee years, Taipei's perception of cross-Strait relations was reflected in its Mainland China policy. According to Taipei's National Unification Council [NUC], the cross-Strait situation was that 'China has been temporarily divided and each side of the Taiwan Strait is administered by a separate political entity [the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC on the mainland].'<sup>111</sup> For the first time, this acknowledgement meant that the ROC officially recognized the existence of the PRC as a state separate from itself. At the same time, it meant that Taiwan conceived itself as an independent de facto state which was not under the legal jurisdiction of Beijing in any sense. While declaring two sovereign entities coexisting across the Strait as a reality, the NUC stated that, although there was only "one China" across the Strait, the "one China" referred to the

---

<sup>107</sup> Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan*: (London: Routledge), pp. 85-128

<sup>108</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p.95.

<sup>109</sup> Hughes (1999) 'Democratization and Beijing's Taiwan Policy', p. 143.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> National Unification Council (1992). *The Meaning of 'One China'*, (Taipei). See Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism*, pp.101-102.

ROC on Taiwan.<sup>112</sup> Taipei's focus on "one-China, two political entities" across the Strait was a subtle way of referring to the one-China principle, but in a way which was designed to secure its own sovereign status and actual coexistence as a state. Lee Teng-hui revealed in an interview that the foremost aim of his mainland China policy during the historical and ice-breaking cross-Straits meeting in Singapore in 1993 was to assert to international audiences the existence of two equal political entities, the ROC and the PRC, across the Strait.<sup>113</sup> The formula of "One China, two political entities" can thus be seen as serving Taipei's strategy to define the meaning of the status quo across the Strait; in the name of reality, it in effect synthesised Beijing's one-China claim and Taipei's demand for sovereignty.

Once Lee Teng-hui's administration decided to initiate its policy of rapprochement to overcome the long-standing cross-Straits antagonism, it was necessary for Taipei to find a workable way to normalize relations with China. The primary method for Taipei would involve redefining the cross-Straits relations so as to safeguard Taiwan's de facto and de jure independence. Taiwan's embrace of the redefined status quo across the Strait represented a starting point for it to engage China. Taipei's stance of the status quo was also justified by the fact that a substantial majority of Taiwanese residents supported the status quo. Indeed, according to a public opinion survey conducted by the ROC Mainland Affairs Council (MAC) during the period from 1995 to 1998, the proportion of Taiwanese people who were in favour of the broadly defined status quo (including "status quo now, decision later," "status quo now, unification later," "status quo now, independence later," and "status quo indefinitely") formed a strong majority in 1995 (80.1%, after the missile crisis), having enjoyed a steady level of around 80% in previous surveys.<sup>114</sup> It is obvious that no democratic government could afford to neglect such an overwhelming demand from its people. Despite the mass of public opinion favouring the status quo, shades of opinion within Taiwanese society coexist on

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid. The idea and development of "One China" see Academia Historica (ed.) (2000) *Documentary Collection on One China Discourse, Vol. I&II* (Taipei: Academia Historica).

<sup>113</sup> Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui's Regime*, p.184.

<sup>114</sup> "Public Opinion on Cross-Straits Relations in the Republic of China – (2)," MAC, Executive Yuan, ROC, August 1998 (<http://www.mac.gov.tw>).

the question of putting into practice the status quo in the form of ‘one China, two political entities’. In this context, suggestions include ‘one China, two areas’, ‘one China, two governments’, ‘two Chinas’, ‘one China, one Taiwan’, ‘a federal system’ and ‘Multi-system nations’.<sup>115</sup> However, according to a public opinion survey, Beijing’s ‘one country, two systems’ formula was constantly incompatible with Taiwan’s description of the status quo as ‘one China, two political entities’.<sup>116</sup>

Taipei’s adoption of its cross-Straits stance on the status quo can also be traced to two other reasons: its perceived national and international interests. First, the status quo across the Straits, from Taiwan’s point of view, went hand in hand with the preservation of the existing territorial, political, ideological and economic distribution between the ROC and the PRC. It ensured that Taiwan could not only keep what it had already but also could be enabled to apply the policy of engagement without fear of China’s annexation. Second, the stance as a status quo power would provide Taipei with much greater moral stature as a defender rather than an offender against peace, order and stability in international society, which would gain much-needed external support for Taipei’s efforts to improve its strategic position. Accordingly, it is obvious that Taiwan was in favour of the status quo stance, because necessary and decisive strategic interests depended on it.<sup>117</sup> During the 1995-96 Straits crisis, Taiwan benefited from its status quo stance when the US described China’s military intimidation as “reckless and potentially dangerous”.<sup>118</sup> For the first time since the termination of the ROC-US defence alliance in 1980, the US in response to China’s military deployments deployed two battle groups of aircraft carriers to demonstrate Washington’s security commitment vis-à-vis Taiwan. In the event, both Taipei and Beijing came to the conclusion that China’s military actions against Taiwan would lead to US intervention.<sup>119</sup> Washington’s de facto

---

<sup>115</sup> Hsu Hui-you (2004) ‘Origins of the National Identity Crisis’, in Taiwan Advocates (ed.) (2004). *Cross-Straits Exchange and National Security of Taiwan* (Taipei: Taiwan Advocates), pp.175-179.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

<sup>117</sup> For a discussion of the status quo theory and Beijing’s revisionist position on the cross-Straits issue, see Johnston, A. (2003). “Is China a status quo power?” *International Security*, Vol.27(4), pp. 5-56.

<sup>118</sup> Cole, B. D. (2006). *Taiwan’s security: history and prospects*. (London: Routledge), p.29

<sup>119</sup> Cole (2006). *Taiwan’s Security*, p.30.

assurance of America's security commitment was a favourable result for Taipei. Nevertheless, the lessons of the 1995-96 Strait crisis have also meant that there was and still is no consensus on the actual and operational meaning of the cross-Strait status quo between Taiwan, China and the US, for all three parties regard themselves as status quo powers. As a result, the lack of consensus on the cross-Strait status quo still makes for competing interpretations of the status quo by the states involved so as to propose and justify the strategic goals which they define in their own interests in the name of defending the status quo. It is in this context that the ambiguity of the cross-Strait status quo allowed Taipei to take action by defining it as 'one China, two political entities' so as to construct a propitious strategic environment.

### ***A Dilemma between Foreign Policy and Mainland Policy***

The strategic environment bearing on Taiwan's security is determined above all by the international structure and cross-Strait relations, these two being interrelated. During the era of Lee Teng-hui, Taipei's management of this strategic environment faced a fundamental challenge: namely, how to accommodate the PRC with the one-China principle, ensure the continuation of the US security commitment, and break the ROC's international isolation without undermining the latter's de facto sovereign independence. Before Lee assumed office, Taipei regarded its foreign policy only as a means of serving cross-Strait relations because there was no cross-Strait policy of engaging Beijing, in that the option of accommodating Communist China was simply not within Taipei's strategic vision. In contrast to his predecessors, Lee's mainland policy, as part of the national grand strategy, was that Taipei would discard the prolonged zero-sum antagonism policy that "the Han [ROC] and the rebel [PRC] cannot stand together" (*han zei bu liangli*) against Beijing and pursue a cross-Strait "win-win" (*shuang ying*) policy of cooperation for the future of China as a whole.<sup>120</sup> The four principles of this engagement policy were reason (*lixing*), peace (*heping*), parity (*duideng*) and reciprocity (*huhui*), to establish the kind of cross-Strait relations that had been encapsulated in the 1991 *Guidelines for*

---

<sup>120</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p.119.

*National Unification*.<sup>121</sup> The *Guidelines* also spelled out Taipei's version - the one-China across the Strait, in terms of "one China, two political entities", which promised to reconcile the one-China issue with the demands of domestic interests, China and also international society. At the same time, Taipei focused attention on promoting its pragmatic diplomacy to break its international isolation and enhance Taiwan's international status, in order to articulate and substantiate the existence of the ROC on Taiwan (ROCOT) as a fact in international society.<sup>122</sup> The peak of Taipei's pragmatic diplomacy was Lee Teng-hui's American trip in 1995 when Lee unambiguously stressed the existence of the ROCOT to international audiences. Although Taipei's pragmatic diplomacy did not at the time achieve significant progress in winning international recognition for Taiwan's statehood, it did raise Taiwan's international publicity by reminding governments around the world of Taiwan's "democratic sovereignty" and emphasised that 'Taiwan is not part of the PRC, nor it is part of the 'China' defined by the PRC and other states'.<sup>123</sup>

Nevertheless, as Taiwan's pragmatic foreign policy was intensified to manifest the existence of ROCOT's sovereignty and its participation in international society, China gradually became convinced that Taipei's international bid for recognition was an attempt to secure independence.<sup>124</sup> Beijing's accusations in the direction of Taipei escalated first with Lee Teng-hui's 1995 trip to America and then with his special state-to-state pronouncement in 1999. Beijing's threats to employ force, if necessary, put Taipei in a difficult situation, in relation to both its foreign policy and mainland policy. Moreover, Washington was also in the end disturbed and alienated by Lee's active pragmatic foreign policy associated with his explicit sovereignty claim, which sparked tensions across

---

<sup>121</sup> The Mainland Affairs Council (ROC) (1991) "The Guidelines for National Unification".

<sup>122</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy*, p.62.

<sup>123</sup> Yang Philip (2000) 'Taiwan's Legal Status: Beyond the Unification-Independence Dichotomy', in Gong, Gerrit W. (ed.) (2000) *Taiwan Strait Dilemmas: China-Taiwan-U.S. Policies in the New Century* (Washington, D.C.: The CSIS Press), p.91.

<sup>124</sup> Chu Shulong (2000) 'International Space for What? Beijing's Concerns and Position Regarding Taiwan's Participation in International Organization', in Gong, Gerrit W. (ed.) (2000) *Taiwan Strait Dilemmas: China-Taiwan-U.S. Policies in the New Century* (Washington, D.C.: The CSIS Press).

the Strait and generated problems for Sino-American relations.<sup>125</sup> Indeed, while Taiwan struggled to find international living space - by following a pragmatic foreign policy to enhance its international status and to substantiate its international existence - this foreign policy challenged Beijing's one-China principle, amplifying cross-Straits tensions. As a result, it was important for Taiwan to find a balance between the options, resulting in discussions within the government about whether foreign policy or mainland policy should take priority.<sup>126</sup>

To find a way out of the dilemma, two choices presented themselves (in theory): first, a strategy of bandwagoning with China which would involve complying on the issue of Taiwan's sovereignty or, second, a strategy of coalition with other powers, which would involve relying on the US security commitment to balance the threat from China. In the event, Lee's administration continued to apply the coalition balancing strategy adopted by previous governments, since the sovereignty issue was at the very core of Taipei's grand strategy. As Richard Bush observed, 'Whatever the case, there can be no fundamental solution to the Taiwan Strait issue while the sovereignty question is in dispute [against Taipei].'<sup>127</sup> Another important strategic consideration to opt for a balancing instead of a bandwagoning strategy was that, in terms of creating a favourable strategic environment, Taipei could not simply allow Beijing's presumption to hold that the cross-Straits issue was "China's internal affair" because this would diminish the possibility of foreign intervention and allow Beijing to take the upper hand in managing Taiwan on its own. Despite Beijing's threats and domestic concerns, Taipei hence continued to practise the pragmatic diplomacy until the end of Lee's regime, because Lee firmly regarded international isolation as "the most decisive threat" to Taiwan's national survival.<sup>128</sup> The political desire to ward off and indeed reduce international isolation can be seen

---

<sup>125</sup> Bush (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', in Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait*, pp. 89-92; Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot*, pp. 44-5 and 246-250; and Robert S. Ross (Fall 2000) 'The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait Confrontation: Coercion, Credibility and the Use of Force', *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 122-123.

<sup>126</sup> Hughes (1997). *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism*, pp. 93-94.

<sup>127</sup> Bush (2005) 'Lee Teng-hui and "Separatism"', in Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), p.92.

<sup>128</sup> Lee Teng-hui and Nakajima Mineo (2000) *The Wisdom of Asia*, pp.46-47.

as a clear attempt by the Lee administration to learn the hard lessons from its predecessor, Chiang Kai-shek, whose grand strategy had led to Taipei's international isolation and, in so doing, to an unfavorable strategic position.

Despite discarding the bandwagoning strategy, Taipei did try to reconcile its foreign policy with its mainland policy. Lee's way of avoiding a direct clash with Beijing was his unique and subtle formula, "one China, two political entities". To choose the term "political entities" was a well-calculated move. After all, there have been few attempts to come up with a clear definition of "political entities" in international law and international politics.<sup>129</sup> The ambiguous meaning of this phrase would provide Taipei with political space for manoeuvre as it sought to embrace it without sacrificing its core stance in relation to sovereignty in the cross-Strait negotiations. Nevertheless, the fundamentally different perceptions held by actors with respect to "one China", "political entity" and the status quo across the Strait resulted in the failure by Taipei to establish normal relations with Beijing. The 1995-6 Strait crisis well presented the complexity and difficulty of managing cross-Strait relations while the sovereignty issue remained. Another example was Lee's 1999 'special state-to-state tie' statement, while Lee turned to a more explicit and controversial tone to define the ROCOT's sovereignty status. As a result, Taipei had little choice but to continue the strategy of a balance of power, instead of bandwagoning, to manage its strategic environment.

#### **C.6.4 Taipei's Passive Defensive Posture**

Taipei's strategic posture of deterrence to prevent a cross-Strait war and to maintain the cross-Strait status quo during Lee Teng-hui's regime<sup>130</sup> was

---

<sup>129</sup> Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui's Regime*, pp.183-4.

<sup>130</sup> As the first Taiwanese president without a professional military background, Lee Teng-hui was struggling to establish control over the military, most of all in the early 1990s. Nevertheless, as the commander-in-chief of Taiwan's armed forces, Lee was in the end able to consolidate his authority, while relying heavily on the professional views of the defence minister and the chief of the general staff. For discussions of the way in which Lee consolidated his authority, see Luo Tain-bin (1995) *Military Strong Man - Lee Teng-hui* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Formosa Publisher).

essentially a continuation of the military strategy initiated by Chiang Ching-kuo, who, as argued earlier, pursued the prime goal of ensuring Taiwan's security, rather than retaking Mainland China. Nevertheless, in terms of putting the deterrence strategy into practice, there was a significant difference between the two governments. Taiwan's defence doctrine shifted from an emphasis on unified offensive-defensive operations (*gong shou yiti*) to a passive defensive-oriented posture (*shoushi fangyu*), which emphasized non-provocative and non-preemptive military actions against China.<sup>131</sup> The guidelines of Taiwan's passive defensive posture resulted in a new strategic doctrine of "resolute defence (*fangwei gushou*) and effective deterrence (*youxiao hezu*)" which was derived from the military lessons of the 1995-96 Strait crisis and first mentioned in the *1996 National Defence Report* (NDR).<sup>132</sup> On the one hand, the concept of "resolute defence", which was not merely a rhetorical political statement as Alexander Huang and Michael D. Swaine describe it,<sup>133</sup> can be considered to refer to an arrangement of comprehensive military countermeasures which aims to formulate appropriate military doctrines and related operational guidelines for Taiwan's armed forces when facing China's invading forces. On the other hand, the concept of "effective deterrence" served as the core of Taiwan's defence planning. Associated with its focus on robust "resolute defence" building in all other possible defensive ways, such as all-out civilian defense, it seeks to impose unacceptable costs and consequences which would punish a would-be invader as severely as possible, thereby discouraging a possible Chinese invasion. To understand Taipei's overall strategic posture during Lee's regime, one thus needs to consider how Taiwan practised the deterrent doctrine and why it pursued a missile defence system to deal with its perception of imminent military threats.

---

<sup>131</sup> Ministry of National Defense (1994) *1993-1994 National Defense Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise), p.73.

<sup>132</sup> Ji Le-yi (2006) *Safeguard Action: A Record of the 1996 Strait Missile Crisis* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Culture Enterprise), p.68; Ministry of National Defense (1996) *1996 National Defense Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise), p.63.

<sup>133</sup> Huang Alexander Chieh-cheng (1997) 'Taiwan's View of Military Balance and the Challenge It Presents', in James R. Lilley and Chuck Downs (ed.) (1997) *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press), p.284; Michael D. Swaine, J. C. Mulvenon, et al. (2001). *Taiwan's Foreign and Defense Policies: Features and Determinants*. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND), p.11.

### ***The Doctrine of Taiwan's Deterrence Defence***

The underlying assumption of Taipei's military deterrent strategy, "resolute defence, effective deterrence", can be summarized with reference to two concepts: prevention and punishment.<sup>134</sup> The implementation of the two deterrent concepts presents enormous challenges and difficulties for Taiwan and raises a fundamental strategic question: can Taiwan on its own possess and maintain a credible military capability that is sufficient to avert or punish a possible PLA invasion? The answer to this question, during the 1990s, was cautiously positive, despite all the difficulties. This was because, notwithstanding the PLA's numerical advantage, Taiwan's conventional defences by then, thanks to the geographical obstacle of the Taiwan Strait, still enjoyed a qualitative edge, the air force in particular, seemed capable of defending the island and repelling China's invasion if necessary.<sup>135</sup> In practice, the credibility of Taiwan's military deterrence is obviously closely related to the issue of how Taiwan should manage the delicate cross-Strait military balance, a dynamic process of intertwining qualitative and quantitative military capabilities. Under the design of Taiwan's deterrent doctrine, "resolute defence, effective deterrence", Taiwan's creating a fear of being punished by unacceptable cost was intended to deter China from invading. Taiwan's deterrent strategy, then, was heavily dependent on the credibility of its military countermeasures in the event of an invasion. This credibility was in the end rooted in the realities of the cross-Strait military balance. Lagging far behind China's national material resources, it is self-evident that Taiwan has constantly encountered a quantitative inferiority, in terms of both military manpower and hardware, and is unlikely to close the gap in resources, let alone match China's. The only possible way to redeem this weakness was to establish a qualitative edge over the PRC and to ensure operational excellence associated with the

---

<sup>134</sup> For discussions of deterrent concepts see, for example, Thomas C. Schelling (1966). *Arms and influence*. (New Haven: Yale University Press); G. H. Snyder (1961). *Deterrence and defense: toward a theory of national security*. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press); John J. Mearsheimer (1983). *Conventional Deterrence*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

<sup>135</sup> David Shambaugh (1996) "Taiwan's Security: Maintaining Deterrence Amid Political Accountability". *The China Quarterly*, No.148: 1303-1307; Michael O'Hanlon (2000). "Why China Cannot Conquer Taiwan?" *International Security* 25(2): 51-86.

natural geographical advantages offered by the Taiwan Strait. The core task of managing the delicate cross-Straits military balance thus depended on whether Taiwan could maintain superior quality in an age when information technology and associated systematic operational tactics and doctrines - described by some as a revolution in military affairs (RMA)<sup>136</sup> - play a decisive part in modern air and sea combats which would decide the outcome for the island country of Taiwan. However, as both sides intended to maintain the military balance in their favour, it has inevitably resulted in an unwanted cross-Straits arms race, which Taipei is unlikely to win because of its material inferiority.

Nevertheless, up to the 1990s, Taiwan did manage in cross-Straits affairs to have a military edge, albeit a diminished one, over Beijing.<sup>137</sup> During Lee Teng-hui's era, Taiwan achieved substantial military build-ups to enhance its deterrent capability in three defined key combat areas, listed in general order of priority - air defence, sea control and anti-landing warfare.<sup>138</sup> Considering the priority of defence operations, the focus of Taipei's military construction during the Lee years involved two major plans: to purchase advanced weapons systems and to reconstruct military organization. First, the acquisition of appropriate advanced weapons to fulfil the demands of its national defence planning and operational requirement has always been a challenge for Taipei because of China's heavy-handed interference in Taiwan's efforts at military procurement in international society. Coincidentally or not, when Taipei in the early 1990s adopted the stance of pursuing peaceful cross-Straits coexistence and engaging in pragmatic diplomacy, Taiwan made a significant breakthrough in international military procurement, which involved arms deals mainly with the US and France. At this

---

<sup>136</sup> For the concept of RMA, see discussions in Freedman, L. (2006). *The Transformation of Strategic Affairs*. (Abingdon, New York: Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 379), pp.12-14; Colin S. Gray (1999) *Modern strategy*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 200-2005, 243-254.

<sup>137</sup> Shambaugh (1996). "Taiwan's Security: Maintaining Deterrence Amid Political Accountability"; O'Hanlon (2000). "Why China Cannot Conquer Taiwan" *International Security* 25(2).

<sup>138</sup> Ministry of National Defense (1996) *1996 National Defense Report*, p.62. Discussions of the operational priority see in Huang, Alexander Chieh-cheng (1997) 'Taiwan's View of Military Balance and the Challenge it Presents', pp.288-9; Yang, Andrew N. (1997) 'Taiwan's Military Capability', in G. Austin (1997). *Missile diplomacy and Taiwan's Future: Innovations in Politics and Military power*. Canberra, Australia: Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University. p.148; Swaine (1999). *Taiwan's National Security, Defense Policy and Weapons Procurement Process*. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND), p.xii.

time, Taiwan completed a major up-grade of its second-generation armed forces military, which included the purchase of 150 F-16s, 60 Mirage 2000-5s, 130 indigenous developed fighters (IDFs) and 4 E-2T airborne warning and command (AWAC) planes. Similarly, Taipei also acquired 6 Lafayette (*Kang Ding*)-class frigates, 8 Perry (*Cheng Kung*)-class frigates and 8 Knox (*Chin Yang*)-class frigates for its navy; and three Patriot PAC-2 Plus Modified Air Defence Systems, 42 AH-1 attack helicopters and 120 M60-A3 tanks for its army.<sup>139</sup> Second, while pursuing better high-tech military hardware, Taiwan emphasised the manpower factor to keep the qualitative edge since the application of these high-tech weapons in modern warfare requires highly trained personnel. In 1997, to make the most of its limited resources so as to establish small but highly professional armed units, Taiwan proceeded with the “Streamlining and Consolidation Programme” (*jing-shi ji-hua*), which was introduced with the “ROC Military Ten-year Force Target Programme” in 1993, to reduce its military personnel to fewer than 400,000.<sup>140</sup> At the same time, Taiwan also reorganized the structure of its army, which comprised 51 per cent of Taiwan’s total armed forces personnel, by establishing brigades as its main battle units. Unlike the former division-centred army, the smaller brigade-centred army was intended to better fit the demands for the island’s defence programmes against a possible Chinese invasion. In the end, both Taiwan’s military procurements and re-organization under Lee marked attempts not only to determine an appropriate size for its armed forces, but also to pursue military professionalism and to establish an organization and a force structure which fitted its unique strategic context and defined missions under the “resolute defence, effective deterrence” doctrine.

It is worth noting that the *1998 National Defence Report* stands out for its focus on the concept of “effective deterrence” as “defensive deterrence” (*shoushi hezu*), which is designed ‘to apply the smallest military forces to dissuade the

---

<sup>139</sup> Details of Taiwan’s military buildup see in Yang, Andrew N. (1997) ‘Taiwan’s Military Capability’, pp.149-157; Lin, Chong-pin (1997) ‘The Military Balance in the Taiwan Strait’, in Shambaugh, D. L. and R. H. Yang (1997). *China’s Military in Transition*. (Oxford: Clarendon), pp.314-321; Shambaugh, D. (1996). “Taiwan’s Security”, pp.1293-1302.

<sup>140</sup> The 1993-94 National Defense Report, p.74; Details of the manpower and defense structure are discussed in Cole, B. D. (2006). *Taiwan’s security: history and prospects*. (London: Routledge), Chapters 4 and 5.

enemy that the costs of its use of force would outweigh its gains'.<sup>141</sup> As long as Taiwan did not consider a nuclear option, this note actually raised a serious doubt about how Taiwan's "effective deterrence" could be credible, because, in facing a determined China, Taiwan intended to devote only "the smallest" military effort to successfully deterring Beijing. This said, the intention to apply only "the smallest military forces" can help to explain why there was a steady decline in Taiwan's defence budget during the 1990s, despite the increasing military threats posed by the PRC.<sup>142</sup> Dreyer suggests that, considering the rise in Chinese military power, fuelled by its huge economic power, China would sooner or later possess the necessary military capability to invade Taiwan.<sup>143</sup> Rather than the wishful thinking of relying on "the smallest" military efforts to underpin its deterrence strategy, I would argue that the feasibility and credibility of Taiwan's military deterrence depended decisively on whether Taiwan's own military build-up could make a Chinese invasion sufficiently costly and difficult. Moreover, given the task, military measures could surely not constitute the only option for achieving successful deterrence. If the question is whether Taiwan's deterrent posture was a success under Lee Teng-hui's in the 1990s, the answer is mixed. On the one hand, Taiwan did by then possess a limited credible deterrent to prevent or punish China's invasion, but this deterrent significantly depended on foreign assistance. On the other hand, it is obvious that Taiwan had too little military capability of its own to deter, let alone punish, China's military intimidation, as seen in the 1995-96 Strait crisis. This military weakness allowed China to psychologically gain the upper hand and to threaten Taiwan without bloodshed by applying calculated military means for its political ends.

---

<sup>141</sup> Ministry of National Defense (1996) *The 1996 National Defense Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise), p.53.

<sup>142</sup> Lin, Chong-pin (1997) 'The Military Balance in the Taiwan Strait', in Shambaugh, D. L. and R. H. Yang (1997). *China's Military in Transition*. (Oxford: Clarendon), pp.319-320.

<sup>143</sup> June Teufel Dreyer (2004) 'China's Ability to Make a Military Option and Its Calculation', in Tsang, S. Y. (2004). *Peace and Security across the Taiwan Strait*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp.144-163.

### ***The Debate about Acquiring Theater Missile Defence***

During the 1995-96 Strait crisis, when the PLA posed an unprecedented missile threat vis-à-vis Taiwan, Taipei not only lacked missiles comparable to those available to the PLA but also any adequate defence against the missile threats. In the aftermath of the crisis, the *1998 National Defense Report* portrayed the ‘Chinese missile attack as the most serious threat in the course of China’s invasion [of Taiwan]’.<sup>144</sup> It is worth noting that Taiwan’s defence planners put the missile threat in the context of a Chinese invasion rather than anything else. This is because Taiwan’s national defence by then was devoted to the doctrine of “resolute defence, effective deterrence”, which was mainly designed to ensure the island’s ultimate ability to defend the homeland against invasion.<sup>145</sup> ‘The core of our national defence’, the 1998 NDR stated, ‘is to prevent Communist China’s invasion and win the war if it occurs.’<sup>146</sup> The linkage between Taiwan’s military defence doctrine and the perceived missile threat highlighted the role of the PRC missile threat as the decisive weapon in the scenarios of Chinese military invasion, although the missiles could serve as instruments of Chinese political and military intimidation, for the purpose of either deterrence or coercion.

For Taiwan, consequently, the Chinese missile threat was closely linked to calculations about a possible invasion. The idea was that China was likely to launch preemptive missile strikes against Taiwan’s command and control nodes, air bases and other key infrastructure elements, such as fuel and power stations, to create the so-called “shock and awe” effect of rapid dominance, which would precede further military actions by the PLA.<sup>147</sup> In the worst-case scenario, a preemptive strike by the PLA’s ballistic missile force could involve the launch of an attack by nuclear electromagnetic pulse (EMP). Without causing mass

---

<sup>144</sup> Ministry of National Defense (1998) *1998 National Defense Report*, p.42.

<sup>145</sup> Taipei’s military preparations during the 1995-96 crisis, see in Ji Le-yi (2006) *Safeguard Action: A Record of the 1996 Strait Missile Crisis* (Chinese version).

<sup>146</sup> Ministry of National Defense (1998) *1998 National Defense Report*, pp.42-45.

<sup>147</sup> For scenarios of China’s invasion, see Shambaugh, D. (1996). “Taiwan’s Security: Maintaining Deterrence Amid Political Accountability”, pp.1311-1317; D. Roy (2000). “Tensions in the Taiwan Strait.” *Survival* 42(1), pp. 82-85; Damon Bristow (2003) ‘Taiwan’s Defense Modernization’, in Martin Edmonds and M. M. Tsai (eds.) (2003). *Defending Taiwan*, pp.78-79.

destruction to buildings and human life, it is believed that two EMP attacks would be enough to shut down all the equipment for command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) used by Taiwan's three major armed services, so as to swiftly and effectively neutralize Taiwan's crucial defence capabilities.<sup>148</sup> Generally, the resort to missiles, like air power, serves as an offensive tool to neutralize an enemy's willpower and means of resistance. The warhead, speed, accuracy and range of modern missiles make them a powerful military instrument which can be used flexibly when launching attacks on any chosen target. The Pentagon's March 1999 Report suggested that 'Taiwan's most significant vulnerability is in its limited capacity to defend against the growing arsenal of Chinese ballistic missiles.'<sup>149</sup> As a result, from a military point of view, it seems that Taiwan would in the worst case have had to deploy the Theater Missile Defence system (TMD) against China's missile threats. In fact, only two years before the 1995-96 Strait crises, Taiwan had already ordered three PAC-2 *Patriot* Modified Air Defence Systems, which were later upgraded to one full PAC-3 missile defence system.<sup>150</sup> The principle of setting a course for Taiwan's missile defence system in the long term was formulated in the 2000 National Defense Report. It was to involve a progression from TMD to National Missile Defense (NMD), which would see a development from 'lower levels to higher ones, expansion from points to areas, the west [coast of Taiwan] to the east and equal emphasis on land and sea.'<sup>151</sup>

Nevertheless, I would argue that there is a serious flaw in regarding Lee's push for the so-called "bullet-hit-bullet" missile defence system as a decisive defence system sufficient to determine the outcome of battle and on its own create a military context in Taiwan's favour in the event of a war across the Strait. Two main reasons significantly undermine the merit of TMD/NMD: immature

---

<sup>148</sup> Chung Chien (2000) High-tech War Preparation of PLA - Taking Taiwan without Bloodshed, *Taiwan Defense Affairs*, Vol.1, pp.158-161.

<sup>149</sup> Henry L. Stimson Centre Working Group Report No.34 (2000), *Theater Missile Defenses in the Asia-Pacific Region*, from <http://www.stimson.org/japan/pdf/TMDReport.PDF> (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>150</sup> S. Kan (2002). "Taiwan: Major US Arms Sales Since 1990.", from <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL30957.pdf> (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>151</sup> Ministry of National Defense (2000) *2000 National Defense Report* (Taipei: Ministry of National Defense, ROC), p.52.

technology and extremely low cost-effectiveness. First, premature technology, inefficient performance and countermeasures from the adversary cause TMD/NMD to be unreliable in operation.<sup>152</sup> It is believed that ‘all of the TMD systems, especially the upper-tier system, still face technical challenges. TMD flight tests are likely to demonstrate effectiveness against individual targets over time, but the greatest problem for the TMD systems is the prospect of being overwhelmed by large numbers of incoming missiles in a combat situation that could include simultaneous air and naval attacks.’<sup>153</sup> In the cross-Strait context of armed conflict, it should be recalled that the Taiwan Strait is only 130 kilometers long, so even with a TMD system in place it is difficult to respond quickly and make an effective intercept.<sup>154</sup> Thus it is doubtful whether Taipei could have relied on TMD to successfully carry out a response to multi-wave and multi-directional saturation attack from China’s missiles. Second, a key question for a small state such as Taiwan is how limited military resources can be distributed most efficiently. Chen Pi-choa, Taiwan’s former Deputy Defence Minister, during the final year of Lee’s administration, stated, ‘Taiwan is defenceless against missile attacks and it is hard to find a cost-effective countermeasure. Deployment of a sea-based or land-based TMD is feasible, but that is the least cost-effective option. The estimated cost ratio of relying on Short Range Ballistic Missiles (SRBMs) against a TMD system varies tremendously, ranging from 1: 20 to 1:90.’<sup>155</sup> Whatever the actual ratio, it is simply not cost-effective at all for Taiwan to fight an exhaustive missile attrition war against China’s missiles. It is not surprising that Chiang Chung-ling, former Defence Minister and Lee Teng-hui’s most reliable military advisor, criticized TMD outright as a “money pit”.<sup>156</sup> Consequently, if ‘war would be decided

---

<sup>152</sup> Tarja Cronberg (2005) ‘US Missile Defence: Technology Primacy in Action’, in Heurlin, Bertel and Sten Rynning (eds.) (2005) *Missile Defense- International, Regional and National Implication* (New York: Routledge), pp.38-39.

<sup>153</sup> Henry L. Stimson Centre Working Group Report No.34 (2000), *Theater Missile Defenses in the Asia-Pacific Region*; George Lewis, Lisbeth Gronlund and David Wright (1999) ‘National Missile Defense: An Indefensible System’, *Foreign Policy*, No. 117 (Winter, 1999-2000), pp.120-137.

<sup>154</sup> Greg May (1999) *Thinking About TMD: Relations With China and Asia’s Stability*, from <http://www.nixoncentre.org/index.cfm?action=showpage&page=tmd> (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>155</sup> Chen Pi-choa (2000) ‘*The Military Balance across the Taiwan Strait*’, conference paper (January 2000) (Taipei: Taiwan Research Institute)

<sup>156</sup> Kuo Ming (1999) ‘Tang Fei Reviewing TMD’, *The Journalist (xin-xin-wen)*, No.651 (Taipei: 28 August 1999).

more by attrition than by decisive battle<sup>157</sup>, the low cost-effectiveness of TMD could easily waste Taiwan's limited and precious resources in China's favour.

The merit of being able to draw on TMD thus can be understood in political and psychological terms rather than military. However, I believe that even the political and psychological merits of Lee's construction of Taiwan's missile defence system are significantly limited. This is because the missile defence system may create a false sense of security, which is grounded in wishful thinking about the TMD's capability to intercept incoming missiles and about possible American military involvement associated with the build-up of the TMD system. ‘[The] Chinese missile threat to Taiwan is much exaggerated, especially considering the very limited success of the far more massive and modern NATO missile strike on Serbia’, as Gerald Segal has well pointed out; yet, ‘if [the] Taiwanese have as much will to resist as did the Serbs, China will not be able to easily cow Taiwan.’<sup>158</sup> In the event of war with the PRC, I believe that it is the resolute fighting will of Taiwan's people, rather than the expensive and low cost-effectiveness of a missile defence shield, that will create “effective deterrence” against Beijing's potential willingness to wage war. In addition, there are other ways of defence against a missile attack, such as hardening and building key underground facilities and also building redundancies into critical infrastructure and processes so that Taiwan could absorb and survive a first wave of missile strikes.<sup>159</sup> Missiles are very costly and no country during a war cans relentlessly in its strategic bombing launch salvos of hundreds and thousands of missiles as if they were normal bombs. Even during the Vietnam War, the Viet Cong withstood America's bombing, the most intensive of all time and won the war in the end. This may suggest some lessons to Taiwan's defence planners in thinking how the country could survive under China's missile bombardment.

---

<sup>157</sup> Brian Bond (1998) *The Pursuit of Victory: From Napoleon to Saddam Hussein* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.5

<sup>158</sup> Gerald Segal (1999) ‘Does China Matter?’, *Foreign Affairs* (September/October 1999), p.29.

<sup>159</sup> William S. Murray (2008) ‘Revisiting Taiwan's Defense Strategy’, *Naval War College Review* (Summer, 2008), from <https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/ae650b06-a5e4-4b64-b4fd-2bcc8665c399/Revisiting-Taiwan-s-Defense-Strategy---William-S--> (accessed on 21 April 2010)

## **Conclusion: Taiwan’s Grand Strategy under Lee Teng-hui in the 1990s**

This chapter has offered an analysis of the way in which the ROC on Taiwan’s grand strategy under Lee Teng-hui’s leadership in the 1990s was shaped by a dual struggle to improve the relationship with its Communist great-power rival across the Strait and at the same time to redefine the ROCOT’s own existing independent sovereign status. The most marked change in Taiwan’s grand strategy during this era was linked to the dramatic shift in Taipei’s strategic vision, whereby Taiwan changed from being a springboard for the unification of China into the pursuit of its own welfare and existence. The essence of Taipei’s grand strategy up to 2000 was premised on an ideational factor: that establishing the national consensus regarding Taiwan’s self-preservation, which emerged during the Lee years, would secure and consolidate the very sovereign existence of the ROC on Taiwan. The political will to ensure Taiwan’s self-preservation was encapsulated in Lee’s doctrine of “Taiwan’s existence and identity”, which became a guideline for his government in shaping Taiwan’s grand strategy. From the sovereignty perspective of Lee’s administration, Taiwan’s grand strategy had been distorted by the prolonged civil war between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC on the mainland. To end this war, Taipei unilaterally took the initiative to renounce its former sovereign claim to the mainland, in the belief that by moving beyond the hard-line competition for Chinese sovereignty across the Strait it could provide a more favourable atmosphere, which would encourage the normalization of relations across the Strait and accordingly improve the ROCOT’s international status. The resulting normalization between Taipei and Beijing would also, in the belief of Lee’s administration at the time, maintain cross-Strait stability and thereby consolidate Taiwan’s de facto independent sovereign status by preserving the status quo of cross-Strait co-existence. In 1991, Taipei defined the cross-Strait status quo as “one China, two political entities” in the pursuit of pragmatic diplomacy in international society; it also proposed the “*Guidelines for National Unification*” with a view to possible future unification across the Strait. In this way, both components of

Lee's strategy - that is, Taiwan's existence and cross-Straits rapprochement - would serve as the means of achieving each other.

The 1995-96 Strait crisis caught Taiwan by surprise and terminated the seemingly golden age of cross-Straits rapprochement associated with the early 1990s. The origins of the 1995-96 Strait crisis occurred after Beijing perceived Lee's government as pursuing "Taiwan independence" and became angry over Washington's likely departure from the one-China policy. Beijing's military coercion against Taipei in the 1995-96 crisis differed profoundly in its nature and consequences from earlier crises across the Strait and imposed new strategic challenges on Taiwan. This missile crisis not only put the spotlight once more on the influential factor of military power in the cross-Straits confrontation, but also exacerbated the competition for sovereignty between Taipei and Beijing, given its impact on Taiwan's emerging national identity. The new experience of China's threat in the Strait crisis endorsed the need to consolidate "Taiwan existence and identity", which closely relates to the ROC on Taiwan's sovereign status. In order to manage its strategic environment, Taipei, to balance China, has since focused above all on strengthening its defence cooperation with the US. Taipei has resisted the temptation to bandwagon with China across the Strait, which would cost its own sovereignty. Moreover, as the outcome of the crisis led to Beijing's actively developing its missile capabilities, Taiwan's homeland security again seemed as vulnerable to the PLA's direct threats as it had been in 1949. As a result, Taipei adopted the strategic posture of "resolute defence, effective deterrence", which was associated with the new deployment of a national missile defence system, in order to prevent or punish Beijing should the latter decide to invade.

The distinctive characteristics of Taiwan's grand strategy during the Lee Teng-hui years built on the strategic choice of pursuing cross-Straits normalization, while articulating the theme of "Taiwan's existence and identity". This choice was derived from a combination of factors: the inspiration of what was called "Taiwan subjectivity"; the pursuit of the "New Taiwanese" identity; the desire for sovereign equality across the Strait; and the demand to end Taipei's prolonged international isolation. The 1995-96 Strait crises demonstrated the

continuity of the sovereignty competition across the Strait, but located it in the post Cold War era, in the unique context of a democratic Taiwan with a divided national identity, Washington’s determination to see a “peaceful resolution” between Taiwan and China and the increasing economic interdependence across the Strait.

The fundamental challenge for Lee Teng-hui’s administration was to develop a coherent national grand strategy based on his perspective of the ROC’s sovereign status as the ROC on Taiwan and his strategic choice to normalize the ROC-PRC relations by a better balance between ends and means. Lee initially continued Chiang Ching-kuo’s balancing of foreign and mainland policies while he could focus on domestic political reform for Taiwan’s democratization. For example, as with CCK’s flexible ‘total diplomacy’, Lee’s pragmatic diplomacy was designed to raise the ROC’s international status, which was inevitably involved addressing the sovereignty issue, for instance, as a dual recognition similar to the case of the two Germanys or two Koreas. But the main differences between Lee and his Chinese nationalist predecessor rested on Lee’s unique national identity with “Taiwanese subjectivity” and his reconciling attitude toward the PRC. These differences enabled Lee to take the initiative step to advance the first ever cross-Straits rapprochement in the early 1990s. This is a great achievement but one which has been ignored by many because of his later explicit and rhetorical stance on the sovereignty issue of the ROCOT. While Lee maintained the one-China principle across the Strait and intended to circumvent the sovereignty deadlock between the ROC and the PRC, Beijing constantly declined to accept Taipei as an equal political entity and completely blockaded the ROC’s attempts to fully re-enter international society. Beijing’s antagonism toward the sovereignty issue may explain why Lee’s mainland policy later evolved into a more radical way, as he needed to define more precisely what he understood by the sovereign status of the ROC on Taiwan. Moreover, following Taiwan’s democratization, the practice of popular sovereignty by the population of Taiwan also made Lee more unlikely to concede his claims of the sovereignty of ROCOT. To be sure, Lee’s sovereign perspective on the ROCOT still left open the possibility for future cross-Straits unification and was not intended to breach the one-China principle. Whatever

the case, there is little doubt that Lee successfully transformed Taiwan into a democratized society, which earned him the name of ‘Mr Democracy’. This achievement has had a great impact on Taiwan’s grand strategy. However, the failure to circumvent the cross-Straits sovereignty deadlock associated with his tough rhetorical stance on the sovereignty issue in the end not only deteriorated the cross-Straits relations but also alienated the ROC-US relations. All these points were parts of the legacy that Lee left to his successor, Chen Shui-bian.

## Chapter 7

### More Cross-Strait Drama: The DPP's Accession to Power and the Pursuit of Self-determination

#### Introduction

In March 2000, to prevent Chen Shui-bian, the candidate of the Democratic Progress Party (DPP), from winning the Taiwan presidential election, China's premier Zhu Rongji declared in threatening tones that "Taiwan's independence means war" at a press conference only a few days before election day.<sup>1</sup> Zhu's bluster indicated the possibility of a cross-Strait war if the DPP won the election, because Beijing had already in effect identified Chen as an advocate of the Taiwanese self-determination pro-independence movement. Nevertheless, Chen still won this election and he won again in 2004. No war broke out as a result, however, due to self-restraint on both sides and American mediation. The DPP's self-restraint on Taiwan's sovereign status and future can be best seen in its 1999 '*Resolution Regarding Taiwan's Future*', which stated 'Taiwan is a sovereign and independent country. .... Taiwan, although named the Republic of China under its current constitution, is not subject to the jurisdiction of the PRC. Any change in the independent status quo must be decided by all residents of Taiwan by means of a plebiscite.'<sup>2</sup> Obviously, this new open-ended position under the principle of self-determination represented a significant reconciliation involving a climb-down from its 1991 *Taiwan Independent Clause (taidu gangling)*, in which the DPP unambiguously declared its wish to pursue

<sup>1</sup> Zhu Rongji (16 March, 2000) *People's Daily*, <http://www.peopledaily.com.cn/zgrdxw/lianghui/news/0316/031602.html> (accessed on 16 June 2010)

<sup>2</sup> Shelley Rigger (2001) *From Opposition to Power: Taiwan's Democratic Progressive Party* (Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publisher), pp. 131-132. The Resolution was passed by the DPP's National Party Congress on 9 May 1999. A detailed discussion of the Chen Shui-bian administration's perspective on the cross-Strait relations, see Wilson Tien (2003) 'The DPP's position on Cross-Strait Relations', Donald Zagoria (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger), pp. 67-73.

‘Taiwan’s independence’ and establish ‘the Republic of Taiwan’.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, the DPP government, which still declined to accept the concept of “one China” as is endorsed by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the Kuomintang (KMT), was not only consistently subjected to military threats from Beijing but also was domestically handicapped from the first day it took office by the KMT majority in the Legislative Yuan. This was the origin of the national crisis which then ensued.

It is with this context in mind that the chapter examines how the DPP government, the first ever non-KMT government of the ROC on Taiwan, re-evaluated and sought to rebuild Taiwan’s grand strategy, a question of some significance. Accordingly, it is important to establish whether Taiwan’s grand strategy was changed once it was in the hands of the DPP. Notably, this chapter finds that Taiwan’s grand strategy under the DPP principally focused on maintaining the sovereignty, security and prosperity of the territory of Taiwan and its people, in line with its perspective on the sovereignty of “the ROC as Taiwan”. Nevertheless, the government also advocated a national strategy which emphasized rapprochement with China to mitigate the tensions with Beijing in order to establish “peace and stability” in cross-Strait interactions. The strategy involved two proposals: 1) the “Five Noes” and 2) the vision of a “future one China”. Like the previous chapter, this chapter also finds that the formulation of Taiwan’s grand strategy by the DPP government was very much concentrated in the hands of the President, although its implementation was influenced by its inner-party politics and other constitutional bodies, such as the Executive Yuan and, in particular, the Legislative Yuan when the government lacked sufficient votes to pass bills for the required budgets.

The chapter is organized in four sections. The first focuses on the nature of Chen’s thinking about Taiwan’s grand strategy, which was derived from a political centrist position of the so-called “New Middle Road”. And Chen’s centrist stance can be decoded by his beliefs in anti-radicalism, pacifism and

---

<sup>3</sup> Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot*, pp. 59-60. A discussion of the DPP’s constitution of the ‘Republic of Taiwan’, see Wu, Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait: Taiwan, China and the Prospects for Reunification* (Oxford: Oxford University Pres), pp. 239-240.

progressivism. The second section explores Chen's strategic choice to consolidate Taiwan's de facto sovereignty through maintaining the "status quo" in cross-Strait relations. The third section examines how with a view to improve Taiwan's strategic environment, Chen's administration sought to embed Taipei's grand strategy in the pursuit of internationalising the Taiwan issue in the context of relations with the United States, the influences of globalization, and the rise of China. The fourth section discusses the administration's strategic posture which involved Taipei's military doctrine of "effective deterrence, resolute defence" in the light of preventing war across the Strait.

### **C.7.1 Ideational Inspiration of the "New Middle Road"**

The cross-Strait rapprochement strategy of Chen Shui-bian's administration was inspired by the centrist perspective of the "New Middle Road", which has found expression in President Chen's views on anti-radicalism, pacifism and progressivism. The "New Middle Road" inspired Chen to formulate his cross-Strait doctrine of the "Five Noes" in which the government outlined its centrist stance in order to prevent any misunderstanding about the so-called Taiwan independence issue on the part of its domestic audience, as well as Beijing and international audiences, for the sake of peaceful and stable cross-Strait relations.

#### ***Anti-Radicalism***

The failure to gain re-election as mayor of Taipei in 1998 had a profound impact on Chen Shui-bian's overall perspective and way on winning support for his political ends. In the first volume of his autobiography, *The Son of Taiwan*, Chen describes the defeat as "unbelievable" and "cruel", since he had previously enjoyed a consistently high approval rating and substantial support from citizens during his first term.<sup>4</sup> According to his analysis of the election results, Chen

---

<sup>4</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2000) *The Son of Taiwan: The Life of Chen Shui-bian and his Dreams for*

concluded that, despite the general approval of Taiwan’s “Mainlanders” in relation to his social and economic achievements in Taipei, most of them still voted for Ma Ying-jeou, the KMT’s “Mainlander” candidate, reflecting perhaps continuing ethnic tensions between “Mainlanders” (*waisheng ren*) and “local Taiwanese” (*bensheng ren*).<sup>5</sup> In fact, political parties, including the DPP itself, have always manipulated and taken advantage of the ethnic tensions during election campaigns in Taiwan. However, Chen’s bitter interpretation, which ascribed his electoral defeat to ethnic tensions compelled him, as well as the DPP, to find a way of dealing with the ethnic tensions so as to make the DPP electable as a ruling party and allow it to proceed to government. He concluded that the DPP had to discard its reputation for political radicalism, expressed in terms of a single-minded pursuit of Taiwan’s independence, in order to prevent the ethnic tensions in Taiwan from intensifying and escalating the crisis across the Strait with China.

Defending his national vision against the charge of pro-independence political radicalism, Chen Shui-bian started to call for “The New Middle Road” in July 1999. This concept, which lay at the heart of his 2000 presidential campaign, served as an important guideline for his grand strategy regarding cross-Strait relations. By endorsing “The New Middle Road” concept, Chen made clear that he wanted to be a “president of all the people [in Taiwan]”. The concept thus implied a preference for anti-radicalism, which suggested that moderate policies, which would speak neither to Taiwanese independence fundamentalists nor ardent Chinese unification advocates, would be pursued by his administration. Chen argued that there existed a middle path, which was ‘the largest common denominator among the populace’ in Taiwan. This middle path, he argued, should transcend ‘differences of historical background, ethnicity, party affiliation and opinions on whether Taiwan should unify with or remain independent from China.’<sup>6</sup> In constructing the middle path against radicalism,

---

*Taiwan* (tr. David J. Toman) (Taipei: Taiwan Publishing Co., Ltd). Chapter One, pp.13-45.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* The term “mainlanders” (*waishengren*) mainly refers to those who were part of the KMT’s retreat from China to Taiwan between 1947 and 1949, together with their descendants in Taiwan.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, p.123. In his book, Chen Shui-bian said that his idea of “The New Middle Road” was inspired by Tony Blair’s ‘*New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country*’ and Anthony Giddens’s ‘*The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*’.

Chen first identified six national policy areas: ‘national security, financial and economic policy, public policy, cultural Taiwan, intellectual Taiwan and volunteer Taiwan’.<sup>7</sup> Notably, Chen then prioritized the importance of “national security” because ““national security is the lingua franca of all the people [in Taiwan]” and the root of Taiwanese survival.<sup>8</sup> By focusing on these six areas, Chen proposed to establish common national values, which would be shared by almost everyone in Taiwan. These values were in no sense incompatible with the KMT’s political view, because their low political profile distanced them from a radical stance on Taiwanese independence.

Fostering common national values was central to the incoming administration’s grand strategy. They were seen as necessary by the administration to create a sense of collective responsibility, which could prevail over divisions of interest and identity in Taiwan. Furthermore, Chen apparently hoped that the anti-radicalism of his approach would distinguish him from the fundamentalism of those striving for Taiwanese independence at all costs. Indeed, he expected that it might lead to a rapprochement strategy, which would create a new cross-strait relationship with China. One of his significant steps was the passing of ‘*the Resolution Regarding Taiwan’s Future*’ on 8 May 1999, in which the DPP replaced its radical independent stance by embracing the idea of an open-ended self-determination as the solution to the problem Taiwan’s status and future. *The 1999 Resolution* represented a decisive turning point for the anti-one-China policy, as this self-determination doctrine was compatible with a full range of solutions for Taiwan’s future and status, either independence or unification, albeit under one fundamental principle: popular sovereignty. The self-determination principle was especially important in Taiwan’s electoral politics because it enabled the DPP to appeal to middle range voters, who were worried about the DPP’s radical outlook and played a decisive role in determining whether the DPP could take power. The party’s leaning towards Chen’s more centrist position could not be taken for granted. There was inter-party competition, associated with the ideologically oriented powerful New Tide Faction (*xin chao liu*) which still insisted on the party’s stance on

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, pp.125-6.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

Taiwanese independence.<sup>9</sup> In the end, it was Chen's determination and skillful political manoeuvre that unified the DPP and made possible *the 1999 Resolution*.<sup>10</sup>

Putting this anti-radicalism into practice at his inauguration on 20 May 2000, President Chen announced the famous “Four No’s, One Without” (*sibu yimeiyou*), or “Five Noes”. As he put it: ‘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 for 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 regard to the question of independence or unification. Furthermore, there is no question of abolishing the Guidelines for National Unification and the National Unification Council.<sup>11</sup> It is worth noting that Chen from the very beginning inserted a crucial temporal precondition at the very beginning of this ‘Five Noes’ doctrine, which was to last ‘as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force against Taiwan.’ This precondition was a subtle and manipulative arrangement because, by then, there was no sign of any kind that Beijing would renounce the use of force in the Taiwan issue, let alone the fact that it was not easy to define a term such as “intention”. As a result, Chen was still able to retain the initiative to interpret, practise and even change his stance on the “Five Noes” doctrine. In fact, Chen did change later and suspended the National Unification Council [NUC] as well as the National Unification Guidelines [NUG] in early 2006. This was because, as he argued, Beijing had passed the Anti-Secession law and deployed missile forces against Taiwan, so the precondition was not being met.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, it still could not be taken

---

<sup>9</sup> A discussion of the DDP’s inter-party politics, see for example Steven M. Goldstein and Julian Chang (eds.) (2008) *Presidential Politics in Taiwan: The Administration of Chen Shui-bian* (Norwalk, CT: EastBridge); Shelley Rigger (2001) *From Opposition to Power: Taiwan’s Democratic Progressive Party* (Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publisher) and Dafydd Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan: Party Change and the Democratic Evolution of Taiwan, 1991-2004* (London: Routledge).

<sup>10</sup> Denny Roy (2003) *Taiwan: A Political History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), p. 228.

<sup>11</sup> “President Chen’s inaugural speech, ‘Taiwan Stand Up: Advancing to Uplifting Era’”, Government Information Office, 20 May 2000 (<http://th.gio.gov.tw/pi2000/>) (accessed 21 September 2009)

<sup>12</sup> Gunter Schubert and Stefan Braig (2011) ‘How to Face Embracing China: the DPP’s Identity

for granted that the pro-independence president would commit himself to the “Five Noes” at the very beginning of his administration. In fact, if he had spelled out the “Five Noes” one by one as a sign of goodwill or as cards for the purposes of negotiation, Chen might have enjoyed a more flexible and better bargaining position. In the end, it was the Chen administration’s rapprochement strategy under which Taipei would endorse the immediate embrace of anti-radicalism, that was geared for consensus, reconciliation and cooperation in the interests of new and positive cross-strait relations. This anti-radicalism perspective may explain why the pro-independence administration committed itself to the “Five Noes”; its purpose was to prevent any misunderstanding with respect to the issue of Taipei’s seemingly possible radical moves toward independence.<sup>13</sup>

### ***Pacifism***

Once he had assumed office, President Chen explicitly opposed war, violence or any kind of coercion to settle the conflict across the Strait. This idea of pacifism was to underpin Taiwan’s national strategy, which was ultimately geared towards rapprochement. ‘War is a failure of humanity’, Chen argued, ‘Waged for whatever lofty purposes or high-sounding reasons, war is the greatest harm to freedom, democracy and human rights.’<sup>14</sup> Applying Chen’s pacifism to Taiwan’s grand strategy drew on concepts of understanding, tolerance and peaceful coexistence. These concepts stood in marked contrast to Beijing’s dual strategy, which emphasized both peace and war as indispensable ways to resolve the cross-Strait issue.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Chen put forward a proposal to promote ‘goodwill reconciliation, active cooperation and permanent peace’ as a method of achieving a mutually beneficial resolution to the cross-Strait confrontation.

---

Politics and cross-Strait Relations during and after Chen Shui-bian’, Gunter Schubert and Jens Damm (ed.) (2011) *Taiwanese Identity in the Twenty-first Century: Domestic, Regional and Global Perspectives* (London: Routledge), p. 76.

<sup>13</sup> Chen revealed that the content of his 2000 inaugural speech relating to cross-Strait relation issues was the subject of discussions with Washington, Singapore and even Beijing, in advance of the actual announcement. See Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan: President A-bian Reports to the People* (Taipei: Eurasian Press), p.27.

<sup>14</sup> “President Chen’s inaugural speech, ‘*Taiwan Stand Up: Advancing to Uplifting Era*’”

<sup>15</sup> Chen’s pacifism is a kind of pessimistic pacifism, which still believes in the necessity of defence. For a detailed discussion of a spectrum of different views of pacifism, see Cadel, Martin (1987) *Thinking about Peace and War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.135-165.

He argued that ‘war will lead to more hatred and enmity, without the least help to the development of mutual relations.’<sup>16</sup>

To persuade Beijing to renounce the use of force, Chen connected his appeal for peace to the “Five Noes”. Acutely aware of Beijing’s hostility and its fear of ‘Taiwan independence’, Chen’s strategy sought in the first place to relieve Beijing’s anxiety by reducing the anxiety that Taiwan’s new administration would opt for independence by committing itself to the “Five Noes”. Nevertheless, the administration did link its proposed commitment to one condition: ‘as long as the CCP regime has no intention to use military force.’ To put it another way, it was possible for Taipei to revise Chen’s “Five Noes” commitment if Beijing consistently refused to resolve the cross-Strait conflict by peaceful means. Unlike Beijing, which possessed suitable military means to impose its will, Chen’s administration felt that Taipei needed to rely on a political initiative, such as declaring the “Five Noes”. In the end, the “Five Noes” proved to be one of the few options by which the administration could generate the space and resources it needed to interact and negotiate in the context of cross-Strait rivalry.

Building on the ideational aspirations proclaimed in pacifism, Chen’s administration invoked the latter to achieve two goals: one moral and one pragmatic. First, the administration deliberately opted for a political approach that would strike a favourable moral note and appeal to domestic unity, as well as reinforce the international condemnation that would follow any military attack by China. Second, Taipei’s dominant strategic perspective was to prevent rather than exploit war to secure Taiwan’s de facto independence, given Chen’s pragmatic calculations about the intolerable consequences of war across the Strait, such as wastefulness, ineffectiveness and unacceptability as a means of pursuing any political end. Furthermore, it was simply unrealistic for a small state such as Taiwan to mount a military challenge when it was so unlikely to win the upper hand against Beijing’s overwhelming material power. ‘To maintain peace and stability across the Strait’, the administration was convinced,

---

<sup>16</sup> “President Chen’s inaugural speech, ‘*Taiwan Stand Up: Advancing to Uplifting Era*’”

‘was the most important duty and sacred task for the president [Chen Shui-bian].’<sup>17</sup>

President Chen’s primary measure in implementing his pacifist strategy and maintaining peace across the Strait was to establish a cross-Straits dialogue mechanism, a “peaceful and stable exchange framework”, which Chen regarded as a “decisive” step in resolving disputes.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, when Chen proposed this mechanism he received no response whatsoever from Beijing. In 2006, Chen’s administration published Taiwan’s first ever *National Security Report* (NSR), setting out the island’s national grand strategy. In the *Report*, the pro-independence government defined as one of the two “strategic pillars” for Taiwan’s national security, namely “pursuing dialogue and seeking peace”, so as to reduce cross-strait tensions.<sup>19</sup> Pledging peace first, Chen hoped that the new framework would overcome the bitter disputes over Taiwan’s sovereignty status, which had led to a hostile cold-peace relationship between the two sides. Adopting in the NSR the principle of ‘reconciliation without flinching and holding a firm stance while avoiding confrontation’, Taipei’s proposal for establishing the “peaceful and stable exchange framework” contained five components: ‘basic principles for managing bilateral relations, trade and economic exchanges, measures to prevent military conflict, consultation mechanisms and possibilities for the establishment of political relations.’<sup>20</sup> Derived from the desire to construct mutually favourable conditions for long-term peace and stability, Taipei’s proposal thus suggested that it was essential to initiate a process of dialogue in order to generate understandings and agreements. For Chen’s administration, cross-Straits dialogue could reduce miscalculations, tensions and the possibility of war at a time when the level of consensus on Taiwanese sovereignty issue remained very low on both sides. To promote the cross-Straits dialogue process, the DPP government even increased

---

<sup>17</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan: President A-bian Reports to the People* (Taipei: Eurasian Press), p.16.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 40-41.

<sup>19</sup> Another pillar was “a democratic Taiwan and sustainable development”; see “*National Security Report*”(2006), pp. iii-vi, National Security Council, Taiwan (2006) *National Security Report*, (Taipei, Taiwan: National Security Council, May 20, 2006), pp.137-147. Hereafter referred to in-text as “TNSR2006”. (<http://www.gio.gov.tw/taiwan-website/download/2006nsreport.pdf>) (accessed in 16 June 2010).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, pp.152-3.

Taiwan's military transparency in an unprecedented attempt to 'establish cross-Strait military confidence-building measures through security dialogue and exchange'.<sup>21</sup>

### ***Progressivism***

As the first president of the ROC without a KMT background, President Chen was eager to be a path-finder and ice-breaker, advocating the "New Middle Way" associated with the "Five Noes" doctrine in his leadership of the country in order to resolve the cross-Strait confrontation. He also wanted to win the confidence and support of moderate voters that his administration would not go radical on cross-Strait relations. That his "Five Noes" doctrine deliberately distanced the anti-one-China administration from the so-called Taiwan independence movements was evidence of the progress being made. Seeking to explore with Beijing his thinking on future cross-Strait unification, Chen Shui-bian also proposed alternative visions of unification, such as "cross-Strait integration" (*liangan tonghe lun*), in his New Year's Day speech of 2001, and the "European Union experience" (*oumeng jingyan*), discussed in his 2004 inaugural address, as possible models for changing his original position on Taiwan independence. The perspective of Chen's administration on such change was bound up with further reformist thinking, namely, the concept of progressivism. To be progressive implied for Chen that one had a certain vision of the possibilities inherent in a process of change, which means, by and large, a willingness to eventually break away from a past position. The pursuit of change was indeed vital to President Chen's vision of progress. This included a possible change of his position in regard to Taiwan's status and future, as long as there was a consensus among Taiwan's residents about the principle of self-determination. In the event, the DPP government put together the first ever referendum mechanism for the island, the Referendum Act, in 2004, though it must be admitted that the origins and practices of Taiwan's Referendum Act were rather complex and controversial.<sup>22</sup> According to article 17 of the

---

<sup>21</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2004), "National Defence Report", Chapter 5.VI.

<sup>22</sup> It is believed that Chen Shui-bian took advantage of the Referendum Act to manipulate domestic politics so as to resolve his political difficulties and help his 2004 presidential election.

Referendum Act, ‘when the country is under the threat of foreign force and the national sovereignty is likely to be changed, the President may, with the resolution of the meeting of the Executive Yuan, apply the matters regarding the national security to referendum.’<sup>23</sup> As the Act contains a clear definition of “national security”<sup>24</sup>, the result of the referendum regarding changes to the island’s sovereignty in the context of cross-Strait relations would be open not only to independence but also to unification in practice. Significantly, while Chen’s cross-Strait policy was to maintain the status quo, his progressivist perspective on issues such as “cross-Strait integration”, or on the independence-unification issue, were long ignored by his political opponents, not least by Beijing, where Chen was regarded as a die-hard advocate of independence.

By adopting an adjustable perspective on Taiwan’s sovereignty change with its referendum mechanism, Chen’s government, in fact, worked to move beyond the old “Chinese civil war” paradigm between the KMT and the CPP, which for decades had dominated the theme of Taiwan’s grand strategy.<sup>25</sup> Chen expected that transcending the old paradigm would generate three favourable consequences. First, there would be a win-win situation across the Strait. The war would end with two de facto sovereign states, which in any case had coexisted across the Strait since 1949. This consideration was in fact not unlike that of his predecessor Lee Teng-hui. Second, by accepting the status quo and thus overcoming their competition over sovereignty as well as the attendant cross-Strait alienation, the two de facto governments would be in a position to start negotiating a possible political solution to cross-Strait relations, including

---

Details of the origins, issues and practices of the Referendum Act, see Taiwan Foundation for Democracy (2005) *Direct Democracy Practices in Taiwan: The Taiwan Referendum Act, Reports, and Analyses* (Taipei: Taiwan Foundation for Democracy Publication); Olwen Bedford and Kwang-kuo Hwang (2006) *Taiwanese Identity and Democracy: The Social Psychology of Taiwan’s 2004 Elections* (New York: Palgrave), pp. 15-83; Chi Huang (2008) ‘Referendum and Democracy: The Experiences of Taiwan’, in Philip Paolino and James Meerink (eds.) (2008) *Democratization in Taiwan: Challenges in Transformation* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate), pp. 121-134.

<sup>23</sup> The Referendum Act, <http://law.moj.gov.tw/Eng/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?PCode=D0020050> (accessed in 17 June 2010)

<sup>24</sup> The term of “national security” refers to ‘the threat of foreign force and the national sovereignty is likely to be changed’. See Article 17 of The Referendum Act.

<sup>25</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2000) *The Son of Taiwan*, pp.133-4.

along the lines of Chen’s “cross-Strait integration” theory. Third, the end of confrontation across the Strait would eventually generate for both sides numerous mutual benefits, encapsulated in terms of progress, prosperity and stability. ‘The perspective on cross-Strait relations must be changed to respond to the domestic power transition between political parties [KMT and DPP],’ Chen argued, ‘From former President Lee’s “two-states theory” to my “cross-Strait integration theory”, I do not change my firm stance on Taiwan’s subjectivity [on sovereignty].’<sup>26</sup> Chen continued that ‘however, in terms of implementing the principle of the “New Middle Road”, I am looking forward to a change soon, under the cross-Strait rapprochement.’<sup>27</sup> In the other words, to implement his cross-Strait rapprochement and make changes accordingly, the President opted for an open end of the island’s future in term of the sovereignty issue as long as there was consensus within the island and across the Strait.

President Chen’s embrace of a kind of rapprochement to advance cross-Strait relations did not imply any intention on his part to opt for appeasement or defeatism. Instead, rapprochement was a strategic perspective, which involved being prepared to make concessions in order to gain an advantage, or, as the Chinese world puts it, “one step backward two steps forward” (*yi tui wei jin*). In a constrained unfavourable context, this strategic perspective, so Chen believed, would bring about progress through relying on three successive steps: conflict, reconciliation and progress. From his experiences in dealing with the KMT authoritarian regime in the past, Chen drew conclusions about his ways to make changes and progress. As he argued, ‘it is impossible for vested interests to concede easily. We must confront them first to impose the perspective of change, then the majority will appreciate the merits and voice of the minority ... and that will force them [the vested interests] eventually to give in.’<sup>28</sup> From Chen’s perspective, confrontation was justified when it aimed at problem-solving, while reconciliation did not necessarily entail surrender as long as there was

---

<sup>26</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century: Meditation of Political Parties Rotation, Five Hundred Days After* (Taipei: Eurasian Press), p.106, (my translation). Chen’s “cross-Strait integration theory” is analyzed in the next section.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Chen Shui-bian (1990) *Conflict, Compromise and Progress* (Taipei: Chen Shui-bian Parliament Office), p.36. (my translation)

progress.<sup>29</sup> Chen's perspective on pursuing progress on the back of a synthesis of confrontation and reconciliation was consistently applied to Taiwan's grand strategy after he took power. The approach demonstrates three characteristics of his administration. First, Chen was never afraid of confrontation even when he did not have enough power; instead, he both intended and welcomed the application of confrontation when he wanted to alter unfavourable situations. Second, unlike radicals, Chen was always willing to make political compromises with Beijing as long as they brought some progress towards meeting his aims. Third, Chen's dynamic perspective, hovering somewhere between conflict and compromise, on making what he saw as progress generated an image of him as capricious and insincere, which eventually undermined his credibility with Washington and was seriously criticised by his political opponents, e.g. the KMT and Beijing.<sup>30</sup>

Chen Shui-bian's synthetic perspective on conflict and compromise should be appreciated in order to understand Taiwan's grand strategy under his administration. Chen's progressivist perspective means not simply bringing about changes, but orchestrating such changes for what are presumed to be his political ends. It raises a vital question of its own: to what extent did Chen seek to propel Taiwan forward in the cross-Strait political-military conflict? In the *2006 National Security Report*, Taipei outlined for itself four principal values, namely "sovereignty", "democracy", "peace" and "parity" as a basis for engaging China.<sup>31</sup> Although these values may be difficult and controversial when put into practice, Chen was convinced that these values, associated with the goodwill that accompanied the ideas underlying the "New Middle Road", represented the bottom line and were not negotiable under his administration. In the context of cross-Strait conflict, 'Chen ... certainly left his mark, not all positive but certainly indelible,' according to Ralph Cossa, president of CSIS, 'Chen kept Beijing on the defensive position.'<sup>32</sup> As a result, in Cossa's

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> For some representative critical views on Chen Shui-bian, see Su Chi (2003) *Brinkmanship: From Two-State-Theory To One-Country-on-Each-Side* (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing); Sheng Lijun (2002) *China and Taiwan: Cross-Strait Relations under Chen Shui-bian* (London: Zed Books).

<sup>31</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", p.vi.

<sup>32</sup> Reuters, 18 May 2008, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTP13658920080518> (accessed in

observation, China was in effect forced to move from pushing for reunification to preventing independence.<sup>33</sup>

### **C.7.2 Preserving Sovereignty through Upholding the “Status Quo”**

In the context of the cross-Strait confrontation under the DPP government, the core aim of Taiwan’s grand strategy was not only to preserve but also to manifest the island’s sovereign independence, by means of its perspective of ‘the ROC is Taiwan’, which is associated with its endorsement of the self-determination formula and the declining to be bound by the one-China principle for Taiwan’s future. This was a distinctly different handling of Taiwan’s grand strategy from that of its domestic political counterpart, the KMT. In proposing “the New Middle Road” under the “Five Noes” doctrine to defuse the cross-Strait tension, Chen’s anti-one-China administration was extremely cautious about the prospect of China’s increasing challenge to the island’s sovereignty. This challenge at least temporarily culminated in Beijing’s Anti-Secession Law of 2005, which formalized China’s long-standing policy not to rule out the use of ‘non-peaceful means’ against the so-called ‘Taiwan independence movement’. To uphold Taiwan as an independent country, the national grand strategy of Chen’s administration emphasized national sovereignty by competing over the definition of the cross-Strait status quo. Furthermore, the pro-independence government proposed a the concept of a future “One China” as a way of reconciling the claims for independence and unification in order to establish a feasible framework of peaceful coexistence between Taiwan and China.

#### ***Sovereignty First***

While states without universal diplomatic recognition but may still boast sovereign status, any nation values its sovereignty, even though it may have

---

17 June 2010)

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

different ways of interpreting, preserving and applying it in practice.<sup>34</sup> Guarding against threats to sovereignty is universally regarded as one of the fundamental tasks of a national grand strategy. As has been argued, at the heart of the political-military confrontation between the ROC and the PRC since 1949 stand competing claims to sovereignty in the context of a divided China. However, for the ROC, the nature of this sovereignty competition across the Strait has gradually evolved from competing for sovereignty over a united China to a demand to secure de facto sovereign independence on Taiwan.

As the DPP declined to accept the one-China principle and instead advocated the idea of self-determination, China steadily put political-military pressure on Taiwan about this issue from the moment that the DPP President Chen Shui-bian took power in 2000. For instance, the timing of Beijing's passing of the Anti-Secession Law in March 2005 was such that it came immediately before the anniversary of Chen's 2004 controversial presidential victory. This was not a coincidence, but rather expressed the PRC's intention to increase the difficulties for the DPP government and create a favourable situation to help the Chinese Nationalist KMT retake power in the future.<sup>35</sup> According to the Anti-Secession Law, 'the Taiwan question is one that is left over from China's civil war of the late 1940s'; it also lays down that 'the state [PRC] shall employ non-peaceful means and other necessary measures to protect China's sovereignty and territorial integrity.'<sup>36</sup> The Chen administration perceived two major purposes behind this law. One was to justify all action against the ROC within China's domestic political context. This involved Beijing's 'attempts to establish a legal basis for the invasion of Taiwan by authorizing China's military and government to use non-peaceful means in solving cross-strait disputes.'<sup>37</sup> The second viewed as being about promoting the idea of legitimacy in relation

---

<sup>34</sup> For further discussion of Asian perspectives on sovereignty, see Chung-in Moon and Chae-aung Chun (2003) *Sovereignty: Dominance of the Westphalian Concept and Implications for Regional Security*, in Alagappa, Muthiah (ed.) (2003) *Asian Security Order – Instrumental and Normative Features* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

<sup>35</sup> The DPP's perception of the implied threat behind the Anti-secession Law, see also Chen Ming-tong and the Taiwan Security Research Group (2006) *The China Threat Across the Strait: Challenges and Strategies for Taiwan's National Strategy* (Taipei: Dong Fong Color Printing), pp. 42-55.

<sup>36</sup> For the full text of PRC *Anti-Secession Law*, at

<http://taiwansecurity.org/News/2005/CD-140305.htm> (accessed on 17 June 2010)

<sup>37</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", chapter 1, p.3.

to Beijing's position. As it was formulated, 'Beijing intends to use this law to play the role of a unilateral "arbitrator" in resolving cross-strait problems.'<sup>38</sup> Not surprisingly, Beijing unilaterally framed its threat to use force in domestic law and, since it assumed the cross-Strait confrontation to be part of an unfinished Chinese civil war. From Taipei's perspective, the competition for sovereignty intensified, however. This is not surprising, considering that the stakes concern the very existence of the ROC's survival as an independent state.

To secure the perceived sovereign status of the ROC was always the first among of the strategic concerns of Taipei's leaders and this was also true for the advocacy of self-determination by Chen's administration. Indeed, Taipei's *National Security Report* ranked "maintaining sovereignty and dignity" as the prime directive of Taiwan's national security strategy. It also asserted that 'the bottom line was to prevent encroachments upon the achievements that Taiwan's people have made in democracy, freedom and economic development over the last half century.'<sup>39</sup> Three justifications by the administration stand out. First, it was held that after Taiwan's democratization, it was the people of Taiwan who are the repository of sovereignty, rather than Beijing or the people of Mainland China. At stake thus was the principle of popular sovereignty, which is held to be an essential attribute of statehood in a liberal democratic society. Second, as a so-called "settler society" from China, Taiwan was vulnerable to problems of "ethnic relations, national identity and confidence crisis" under a discourse of the "one China" concept, which undermines the people's will to oppose Beijing's threats.<sup>40</sup> To deal with the vulnerability of Taiwan's diversified national identity as presented here, it was thus vital for the government to unify the people of Taiwan by means of the principle of popular sovereignty. Third, the government believed that to safeguard popular sovereignty was necessary if the people were to pursue and legitimize their essential freedom of choice for the future of Taiwan, e.g. the status quo, independence, unification, etc.

Chen's strategy to consolidate Taiwan's democracy and sovereign independence

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p.147.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.63-67.

was also designed to counter Beijing's United Front strategy. In the post-authoritarian era, because of Taiwan's historical experience and its unusually long-standing international isolation, the primary political cleavage has been and remains the issue of Taiwan's sovereignty status, often referred to as the “unification-independence” (*tong du*) issue. Given the deepening cross-Strait economic relations, Beijing's United Front strategy was, by then, designed to make the most of its influential economic power, associating the phenomenon of Taiwan's divided society, to advocate its one-China principle for cross-Strait unification. As Christopher Hughes puts it, the practice of the United Front is ‘to isolate pro-independence forces in Taiwan and to cultivate Chinese patriotism among interest groups in the island who wield significant economic resources, scientific knowledge and political standing.’<sup>41</sup> Beijing's United Front strategy culminated in the KMT Chairman Lien Chan's historical visit to the mainland in May 2005 and the establishment of a high-level dialogue and consultation between the anti-DPP pan-Blue and the CCP leadership.<sup>42</sup> Given Beijing's refusal to contact Taipei, the CCP-KMT united front imposed tremendous domestic pressure on the DPP government precisely because this left Chen's refusal to accept the One China principle looking ‘dangerously dogmatic’.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, by proclaiming the importance of “maintaining [Taiwan's] sovereignty and dignity”, Chen's 2006 *National Security Report* emphasized consolidating the island's democratic system and winning the loyalty of its citizens to Taiwan to counter the CCP-KMT united front.

To be sure, while prioritizing the sovereignty issue on the national strategic agenda, Chen's administration never ignored domestic economic development, in particular given the progressively deepening economic relations with mainland China. From the beginning of cross-Strait economic interactions in the early 1990s, it is estimated that ‘on a per capita basis, Taiwan has sent more

---

<sup>41</sup> Christopher R. Hughes (2001) ‘Living with “One Country, Two Systems”? The Future of Beijing's Taiwan's Policy’, in *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol.14 (2) (April 2001), p. 130.

<sup>42</sup> Christopher R. Hughes (2006) *Chinese Nationalism in the Global Era* (London: Routledge), p. 129.

<sup>43</sup> Hughes (2001) ‘Living with “One Country, Two Systems”?’, p. 131.

capital to China than any other country.<sup>44</sup> Accordingly, Chen's administration was especially wary that the cross-Strait economic relations would jeopardize Taiwan's economic development and national security. Finding a balance between Taiwan's economic development and cross-Strait relations at this point became a serious question for Chen's administration. To adjust Lee Teng-hui's "no haste, be patient" (*jieji yongren*) policy, in 2001, Chen proposed his "Vigorous Liberalization and Effective Management" (*jiji kaifang, youxiao guanli*) formula. This was associated with the four principles of "Taiwan first", "global setup", "mutually beneficial" and "risk management" for cross-Strait economic interactions.<sup>45</sup> In the 2006 *National Security Report*, Chen outlined his overall strategy for Taiwan's economic development, focusing especially on the 'promoting sustainable development and economic competitiveness' by targeting five main missions – the 'enhancement of industrial competitiveness', the 'reduction of the impact of China's magnetic effect', the 'vigorous expansion of the scope of Taiwan's economic and trade activities', 'guaranteeing of energy resources and financial security', and the 'maintenance of the nation's fiscal stability and health'.<sup>46</sup> However, at the end of Chen's regime, these economic strategies had not produced what the government expected. Instead, Chen's administration not only failed to reduce the deepening cross-Strait economic relations but also put Taiwan into its most serious economic decline.<sup>47</sup> Chen's sovereignty-centred perspective on the handling of national affairs may represent one of the major political causes of the government's poor economic performance. For Chen, however, where Taiwan's status was concerned, it was just clear that the sovereignty issue would trump the economic one.

In short, Taipei's grand strategy was clearly connected to the Chen

---

<sup>44</sup> T. J. Cheng (2005) 'China-Taiwan Economic Linkage: Between Insulation and Superconductive', Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), p. 93.

<sup>45</sup> Appendix 14, 'Excerpt from Chen Shui-bian's Address to the Economic Development Advisory Committee, August 26, 2001', Zagoria, Donald (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger).

<sup>46</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", chapter 4, p.110.

<sup>47</sup> Yu-Shan Wu (2007) 'Taiwan's Development State: After the Economic and Political Turmoil', *Asian Survey*, Vol.47, No.6 (November/December, 2007), p. 978.

administration's security vision: that Taiwan's sovereignty was under threat. As some have argued, given Chen's sovereignty-centred perspective and his controversial ways of manipulating domestic politics to keep himself in power, 'Chen was more interested in ideological purity than economic pragmatism'.<sup>48</sup> As Taipei and Beijing have coexisted amid conflict across the Strait for decades, it should not surprise us that the emphasis on it by Chen's administration, with its advocacy of self-determination, generated a vigorous attack on Beijing's stance towards Taiwan. In fact, it is unlikely that political leaders in Taiwan, by then the current anti-independence KMT president, Ma Yin-jeou or a successor, will anytime soon concede the issue of the ROC sovereignty in response to Beijing's demands, not least in view of Taiwan's democratic system and public opinion.<sup>49</sup> From Chen's perspective, 'the ROC is Taiwan'. Taipei's firm stance on the ROC's sovereignty and independence corresponded to the status quo across the Strait.

### ***Competition over Defining the "Status Quo"***

It was important for President Chen Shui-bian to endorse the strategy of upholding the cross-Strait status quo as a strategic choice in order to defend himself against the internal and external accusation that his anti-one-China government was beholden to the so-called "Taiwan independence movement".<sup>50</sup> The purpose of endorsing the status quo was to prevent the Taiwan independence movement from escalating the clash of domestic identities as found in the competition between Chinese and Taiwanese nationalism. Such a clash was seen as potentially raising a challenge to the prevailing regional order led by the US to stabilize cross-Strait relations.<sup>51</sup> However, both Taipei and

---

<sup>48</sup> Rigger, Shelly (2005) 'The Unfinished Business of Taiwan's Democratization', Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), p. 16.

<sup>49</sup> Robert A. Scalapino (2001) *Taiwan- Opportunities and Challenges*, in Tan, Alexander C., Steve Chan, Calvin Jillson (2001) *Taiwan's national security: dilemmas and opportunities* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp.14-5.

<sup>50</sup> The definition of "status quo" in this context is the set conditions which a nation intends to preserve as 'the existing state of affairs' and which confers benefits in its favour.

<sup>51</sup> Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (2005) 'Strategic Ambiguity or Strategic Clarity', in Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 186-188; Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot*, pp. 333-334.

Beijing claimed to pursue a policy of maintaining the status quo across the Strait, for the sake of maintaining stability and peace. Chen Shui-bian's administration grounded its status quo claim in the observation that two sovereign states had clearly co-existed across the Strait for decades. In contrast, Beijing justified its status quo policy with reference to the "one China" principle, which has not only been generally recognized by international society but also accepted by some of Taiwan's political parties, e.g. the anti-independence KMT.<sup>52</sup> Accordingly, the PRC insists upon the recovery of Taiwan which it asserts is a part of China's sovereign territory. Thus, the two incompatible perspectives of the status quo were competing with each other across the Strait and the competition was in fact a continuation by other means of the pursuit of the sovereignty claim in each one's favour.

To contest Beijing's notion of the status quo, Chen first defined his perception of the cross-Straits situation as "one side, one country" (*yibian yiguo*) on 3 August 2002.<sup>53</sup> Chen's new initiative to define the cross-Straits relations can also be regarded as his counterattack on Beijing for its increasing pressure on him as Nauru switched recognition to Beijing, following Chen's accession to the post of chairman of the DPP.<sup>54</sup> According to this definition, Taiwan was already an independent sovereign state separated from Mainland China and called the "Republic of China". Therefore, there was no need to formally declare Taiwan's independence. This was what the administration later argued in the statement "the Republic of China is Taiwan", which derived from the "Theory of the Four Stages of the Republic of China".<sup>55</sup> Within the fourth stage of the theory, "the ROC is Taiwan", Chen argued, adding that, 'on the basis of the fact

---

<sup>52</sup> KMT's 'one China' policy is the so-called "92 Consensus" whereby both Mainland China and Taiwan belong to one China, with both sides having different interpretations over the meaning of 'one China'. See Su Chi (2003) *Brinkmanship*, pp.16-21.

<sup>53</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan*, pp.35-37. Although President Chen first promulgated the doctrine of "one side, one country" on 3 August 2002, he had already publicly used the same phrase at least nine times before he became President in 2000. In fact, his "one side, one country" slogan is similar to former president Lee's "two states theory". See Su Chi (2003) *Brinkmanship*, p.155.

<sup>54</sup> Hughes (2006) *Chinese Nationalism in the Global Era*, p. 129.

<sup>55</sup> Chen defined the four stages of the ROC as: 1) "the old ROC", from 1912 to 1949; 2) "the ROC that moved to Taiwan", from 1949 to 1988; 3) "the ROC on Taiwan", from 1988 to 2000; and 4) "the ROC is Taiwan", from 2000 to 2008. See National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", pp.64-5.

that the two sides of the Taiwan Strait are under separate sovereignty and administration, this identity determines that all people living in Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Mazu should enjoy full national sovereignty and the right to decide their own future.<sup>56</sup> Chen's definition of the status quo stemmed from a domestic perspective associated with the evolving historical experiences and national identity in Taiwan's society. Furthermore, Chen's intention of invoking identity to define Taiwan's status quo as an independent sovereign state reflected the need to resolve the crisis of domestic unity, which involved ethnic alienation, the diversification of state identity and crises of confidence in Taiwanese society. Nevertheless, the main problem of this particular interpretation of the status quo, even though it may have been generally accepted in Taiwan, concerned the question of how Taipei could convince Beijing and the wider international audience, especially the US, to accept Taipei's sovereignty stance- "one side, one country".

The main reason for this radical move on the sovereignty issue compared with his earlier centrist stance encapsulated in the 'Five Nos' doctrine can be understood as his frustration that Beijing would not negotiate with the government in any way without it accepting the one-China principle.<sup>57</sup> Moreover, to understand how Chen dealt with this problem, we may also refer to his progressivist strategic perspective, which applies a synthesis of conflict and compromise to produce change. On the one hand, Chen's administration challenged the notion that Taipei and Beijing did not coexist under Beijing's "one China" norm. The way to do so was to discuss what the cross-Strait status quo was and should be in terms of sovereignty. Chen also adopted an offensive posture in response to Beijing's unilateral implementation of the "one China" norm via the Anti-Secession Law. Chen's administration argued that this law ignored the reality of Taipei as a sovereign state and was designed to undermine the cross-Strait status quo.<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, Chen pledged that 'Taiwan has no intention of [unilaterally] changing the status quo'.<sup>59</sup> On occasion, Chen did

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Shelley Rigger (2005) 'Unfinished Business of Taiwan's Democratization', in Nancy Berkoff Tuckner (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait*, pp. 18-20.

<sup>58</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", pp.64-65.

<sup>59</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", p.156.

indeed demonstrate that the government preserved an open mind concerning future ties between Taiwan and China. This was apparent, for instance, with respect to the idea of a confederation with China across the Strait, in order to leave political space for Beijing's decision-makers.<sup>60</sup> As both sides had their bottom line in relation to the sovereignty issue, Chen's administration suggested the adoption of four "basic principles", namely, 1) the peaceful resolution of disputes, 2) the obligation to engage in consultations, 3) balance and parity and 4) mutual respect, as a way of opening the cross-Strait negotiations.<sup>61</sup> In the end, the pro-independence government's embrace of the compromise suggestion that options to discuss Taiwan's future with Beijing should be explored served the fundamental purpose of Chen's grand strategy: to secure Beijing's acceptance and recognition of the ROC's existing sovereignty. This was the progress that the administration felt it had earned by its compromise.

### ***Possibilities of a Future "One China"***

The perspective of a future "one China", which Chen raised at his inauguration in 2000, was undoubtedly one of the most dramatic ideas by the pro-independence administration. Again, the origins of his future "one China" idea were to be found in the administration's overall national strategy, rapprochement with Beijing by way of a more flexible sovereign stance under the 1999 self-determination formula. 'I'm sure that nobody living in Taiwan wants to see tense cross-Strait relations', Chen said; 'with this in mind, the peaceful stability of the Taiwan Strait region requires the adjustment of relations with China, which demands an understanding of China's policy toward Taiwan.'<sup>62</sup> Seeing the unification principle as the unshakable element of Beijing's Taiwan policy, the government's rapprochement strategy thus sought to slacken the tensions in the cross-Strait relations which had intensified due to the sovereignty deadlock between Taipei and Beijing over Taiwan's status. On

---

<sup>60</sup> Richard C. Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot: Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press), p.65.

<sup>61</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", p.153

<sup>62</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2000) *The Son of Taiwan*, p.129.

31 December 2000, Chen went further by launching a “cross-Strait integration” proposal to substantiate his notion of a future “one China”. Inspired by the European model of integration, Chen’s “cross-Strait integration” manifesto focused on three major interrelated themes: “one China”, sovereign dignity and integration.<sup>63</sup>

On the issue of “one China”, Chen posited that, according to the ROC constitution, there might in fact not be a problem for Taipei over “one China”. However, as the “one China” definition was controversial and fundamentally different on each side of the Strait, he appealed to Beijing to understand why the people of Taiwan were worried and keen to find a way for the two sides to jointly reach a new consensus. On the second theme, sovereign dignity, Chen restated that the existence of the ROC on Taiwan had been a fact for decades and he was obligated, as the President of the people in Taiwan, to preserve its sovereign statehood. As both sides of the Strait shared a common heritage in terms of ethnic, cultural and historical relations, he urged that neither side should set out to hurt or eliminate the other. The government called on Beijing to respect Taipei’s “living space and international dignity” and to renounce the use of force to resolve disputes. With these two points in mind, the administration then proposed a way forward for cross-Strait integration. For one thing, Chen Shui-bian suggested that, despite their different stances on the sovereignty issue, cross-Strait integration could still be achieved if both sides began by cooperating in economic, trade and cultural affairs. After moving forward with integration, both sides could then work together to explore “the space of unlimited possibilities” from establishing a new framework of enduring peace and political integration.<sup>64</sup>

Chen’s view that a future “one China” was possible was embedded in the “cross-Strait integration” manifesto, which was intended to fulfil Taipei’s desire to preserve its de facto sovereignty as well as to satisfy Beijing’s aim of

---

<sup>63</sup> Chen Shui-bian’s presidential address, “*Cross-Century Remarks*”, Office of President, 31 December 2000, ([http://www.president.gov.tw/1\\_president/subject-044.html](http://www.president.gov.tw/1_president/subject-044.html)) (accessed on 21 September 2009).

<sup>64</sup> Chen gave a detailed explanation of his cross-Strait integration proposal in Chen Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century*, pp.109-116.

achieving national unification. The linkage between the security of the ROC's sovereignty and the PRC's aim of unification, encapsulated in the prospect of a possible future "one China", represented the very core of the government's national grand strategy of rapprochement as a way of handling cross-Strait relations. In terms of Taiwan's status and future, according to the DPP's 1999 self-determination formula, Chen was open to a possible future "one China" across the Strait, but with precondition that any such change would have to be decided by the people of Taiwan. From Chen's perspective, this flexibility would pave a middle way to overcome the competition between Taipei's insistence on sovereignty and Beijing's on unification. Without the notion of a possible future "one China", each side would seek to unilaterally impose its position on sovereignty, which would produce exactly the kind of political antagonism that had undermined the cross-Strait status quo. The consequence of that in turn would be that both sides would escalate their confrontation to secure their fundamental national interest – sovereignty. In other words, the pro-independence government's "cross-Strait integration" idea served to mediate Taipei's claim of independence and Beijing's claim of one-China across the Strait. For Chen's administration, implementing the "cross-Strait integration" scheme was meant to lead to peaceful coexistence between Taipei and Beijing. However, this did not mean in the eyes of the Taiwanese government that conflict between the two sides had been resolved or that either side accepted the understanding of the status quo of the other. Indeed, from Taipei's point of view the perspective on a future "one China" amounted only to a sign of good will and denoted the "New Middle Road" approach to addressing its political conception of sovereignty.

In the event, Chen's "cross-Strait integration" manifesto was immediately rejected and criticised by Beijing, which had consistently refused to talk with the President since the very first day of his administration.<sup>65</sup> Beijing seemed to prefer to make a deal with the pro-one-China KMT and did not want to give any credit to the self-determination advocating DPP administration, nor any chance to resolve the cross-Strait confrontation. This was no surprise, given the two

---

<sup>65</sup> Beijing's critics on Chen's "cross-Strait integration" proposal see Bush (2005) *Untying the Knot*, pp.272-276.

sides' apparently incompatible positions on the one-China issue, while Beijing seemed to have confidence in its power to direct the future development of cross-Straits relations. Nevertheless, Beijing may have missed a good opportunity at the time to bring the DPP to the negotiating table. As Chen Shui-bian asserted, 'as long as Beijing still insists on its own "one China" principle and the doctrine of "one country, two systems", no matter who is [and will be] the leader in Taiwan, it is impossible to achieve change or a breakthrough in the [deadlocked] cross-Straits relations.'<sup>66</sup>

When moved into the domestic front, Chen's reconciled proposal on the one-China issue did not change the antagonism of the anti-independence KMT either. This was because there was still no consensus on the future of Taiwan associated with the one-China issue, on the island also referred to as the "national identity" (*guojia rentong*) issue, which polarized Taiwan's politics and society to an unprecedented degree in the post-nationalist era. The emergence of the pan-Green and pan-Blue coalitions by then demonstrated this polarization; clearly, the primary political cleavage between the two camps was derived from the national identity rather than socio-economic causes.<sup>67</sup> The severely contested identity politics in combination with Taiwan's poor constitutional design, which does not offer proper mechanism for resolving stalemates between the legislative and executive branches, resulted in the DPP's minority government nearly heading into a situation of 'paralysis'.<sup>68</sup> During the eight years of Chen's presidency, the pan-Blue coalition led by the KMT firmly dominated the Legislative Yuan with such a comfortable majority that Chen could not forward on his agenda unless his minority government made concessions to the pan-Blue camp. Hence, for instance, the first session of the Legislative Yuan in 2005 passed the lowest number of bills in its history.<sup>69</sup> In

---

<sup>66</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan*, p.38, (my translation).

<sup>67</sup> A discussion of the national identity issue and political struggle between the pan-Green and pan-Blue coalitions during Chen Shui-bian era, see Gunter Schubert and Stefan Braig (2011) 'How to Face Embracing China'; Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan*; Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy*, Chapter 8; Rigger (2005) 'The Unfinished Business of Taiwan's Democratization'; and J. Bruce Jacobs (2012) *Democratizing Taiwan*, chapter 6 (Boston: Brill).

<sup>68</sup> A discussion of Taiwan's poor constitutional design and its consequence, see Rigger (2005) 'The Unfinished Business of Taiwan's Democratization', p. 33-35.

<sup>69</sup> Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy*, p. 168.

vital issues such as the Fourth Nuclear Power Plant, the Referendum Act and the arms procurement proposal, Chen's administration had no chance to do what the government wanted. In the 22 December 2005 edition of *A-Bian' E-Newsletter*, the President expressed his frustration: 'In the past five years, the confrontation between the Blue and the Green camps has resulted in a political stalemate (*zhengzhi jiangju*) that has affected the function of the government and damaged the interests of all of the people of Taiwan.<sup>70</sup> Given the lack of institutional mechanisms to resolve the stalemate, the most effective strategy for the President therefore rested on a direct appeal to the Taiwanese people to support his political agenda. Chen was known as a talented political communicator, but the method of directly invoking the sensitive sovereignty issue inevitably made him look provocative and rhetorical.

### **C.7.3 Internationalising the Cross-Strait Conflict**

The management of Taiwan's strategic environment in Chen Shui-bian's administration was dominated by Taipei's perception of a "US-dominated uni-polar global system".<sup>71</sup> The pro-independence administration described 'a global strategic landscape characterized by one superpower and many regional powers' from which the United States, because of its unmatchable strength, had tried 'to shape a new international order which it led' in spite of the "multi-polar international system" which other regional powers, e.g. China, Russia, France, were intending to promote.<sup>72</sup> Accordingly, the perception and practice of Chen's administration of ways to manage Taiwan's strategic environment was associated with a strategy to internationalise the cross-Strait conflict, which related to three interrelated factors (1) strengthening ties with the US, (2) the influence of globalization and (3) the rise of China.

#### ***Strengthening Ties with Washington***

---

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", Chapter 2.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*, p.7.

A weak state whose internal strength is not sufficient to resist an external threat posed by a great power and which does not want to comply with its wishes, naturally looks to external sources of power to bring checks and balances to the threat.<sup>73</sup> According to this classical insight into balance-of-power security strategy, it was natural for the DPP government to continually seek to strengthen its security ties with the United States. Seeking to involve Washington has always been one of the key constant components of Taiwan's grand strategy, as previous chapters showed. Regarding the American political-military involvement as "decisive" to Taiwan, President Chen said: 'Since the first day I took office, I have spent most of my time and efforts on building Taipei-Washington relations. Because I believe that if I can manage relations with Washington properly, cross-Strait relations will be stable.'<sup>74</sup> To ensure good security ties with Washington, Chen revealed that in 2000 his administration even consulted Washington's opinion in advance for views on the content of his first inaugural address.<sup>75</sup> Chen's decision to associate closely with Washington was based on the calculation that good relations with the United States would gain him international support for his cross-Strait rapprochement strategy, in particular if or when Beijing refused to make any deal with the government.

US-Taiwan relations have been guided in part by the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) of 1979. They are also shaped by American national interests, which have been perceived and prioritized differently in response to particular challenges arising in a dynamic international context. With regard to US interests in addressing the cross-Strait confrontation, Washington does not seem to have favored any particular political outcome, i.e. unification or independence. But it has been concerned about a peaceful process of resolving the tension between Taipei and Beijing.<sup>76</sup> According to the TRA and the US

---

<sup>73</sup> Michael I. Handel (1981) *Weak States in the International System* (London: Frank Cass), p. 257-258.

<sup>74</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century*, p.114. (Translation by me)

<sup>75</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan*, p.27

<sup>76</sup> Richard C. Bush (2003) *United States Policy toward Taiwan*, in Zagoria, Donald (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger), p.13; see also in Shirley A. Kan (2006) *China/Taiwan: Evolution of the "One China" Policy – Key Statements from Washington*,

experience of handling the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis, Washington's process-oriented approach relied on two operative codes for resolving the cross-Strait confrontation: (1) demanding that the antagonists commit themselves to peaceful means and (2) opposing unilateral actions. In the March 2006 statement of its national security strategy, Washington made it clear that: 'China and Taiwan must also resolve their differences peacefully, without coercion and without unilateral action by either China or Taiwan.'<sup>77</sup> Chen's administration soon linked Washington's statement with its strategy of rapprochement, calling for a "peace and stability framework for cross-strait interactions". In its 2006 *National Security Report* (NSR), Taipei responded and made clear that 'Taiwan has no intention of changing the status quo and strongly opposes any non-peaceful means to bring about change.'<sup>78</sup> Nevertheless, the 2006 NSR emphasis on no unilateral intention and action to make change can be better understood as Chen's administration endeavouring to redeem its ignorance of Washington's anger about Chen's sovereignty movements, e.g., the 'one side, one country' and Referendum initiatives, which were derived from his own political agenda; by then he not only surprised Washington but failed to consult the US altogether.<sup>79</sup>

Washington's opposition to the use of force and unilateral actions in changing the relations between the two parties indicates that American decision-makers have favoured the status quo of peaceful coexistence. In fact, the United States has for decades pursued an incongruous dual track policy of pursuing positive official relations with Beijing but simultaneously accepting Taiwan both as a de facto ally and a separate political entity.<sup>80</sup> During the period of Chen's government, there were three identifiable components of Washington's cross-Strait policy under its dual track policy: (1) the "one China" policy, (2)

---

*Beijing and Taipei*, CRS Report to Congress, p.7, at (<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL30341.pdf>) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

<sup>77</sup> The White House, *The National Security Strategy*, March 2006, p.42, at (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/>) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

<sup>78</sup> National Security Council ROC, "2006 National Security Report", Chapter 4, p.156.

<sup>79</sup> A discussion of Washington's anger about Chen's policies, see, for example, Tuckner (2005) 'Strategic Ambiguity or Strategic Clarity', pp. 203-204.

<sup>80</sup> Robert A. Scalapino (2003) Cross-Strait Relations and the United States, in Donald Zagoria (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger), pp.8-9; Robert J. Art (2003) *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp.137-8.

opposition to unilateral change in the status quo across the Strait and (3) “non-support” for Taiwanese independence. However, while Washington had its own interpretation of these three policy components, both Taipei and Beijing also had their own perspective and interpretation of them. Deliberately or not, Washington merely had no clear and substantial definitions of the key terms in question.<sup>81</sup> For instance, the United States still adopted an ambivalent stance on the sovereignty issue associated with the cross-Strait status quo,<sup>82</sup> which was at the very core of the rivalry between Taipei and Beijing. In addition, the US had pointed out its security involvement to Taiwan under the TRA and admitted to having a “profound disagreement” with China over this commitment.<sup>83</sup> Washington’s ambivalence on its security involvement and definition of the status quo reflected its insistence on the process-oriented peaceful approach to resolve the cross-Strait disputations in the context of its ‘dual track’, accepting the coexistence between Taipei and Beijing. In the event, Washington’s ambivalence offered space for Taipei and Beijing in which to maneuver.

Chen’s commitment to the “Five Noes” in his 2000 inaugural address satisfied Washington’s demands. In April 2001, President George W. Bush stated that the US commitment to Taiwan represented an obligation whereby Washington would do “whatever it took to help Taiwan defend herself.”<sup>84</sup> In the same month the President approved a substantial arms sale package for Taiwan, including Taipei’s long-desired diesel submarines.<sup>85</sup> This would not have happened without the efforts of Chen’s administration, but it was also believed that the Bush government did favour Taipei more than any US administration had done since diplomatic relations had ended between Taipei and Washington in 1979.<sup>86</sup> That the Bush administration began with a bold and positive gesture

---

<sup>81</sup> John J. Tkacik, Jr. (2005) *America’s “China Policy” Is in Urgent Need of Definition*, Heritage Lecture 874, 19 April 2005, at (<http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/hl874.cfm>) (accessed 21 April 2010).

<sup>82</sup> Shirley A. Kan (2006) *China/Taiwan: Evolution of the “One China” Policy*, pp.7-9.

<sup>83</sup> The White House, *The National Security Strategy*, September 2002, p.28, at (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>84</sup> Chase, Michael S. (2008) *Taiwan’s Security Policy: External Threats and Domestic Politics* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers), p.4.

<sup>85</sup> Kerry Dumbaugh (2006) *Taiwan-U.S. Political Relations: New Strains and Changes*, CRS Report to Congress, 10 October 2006, pp.6-7. at (<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/IS/2006/CRS-1006.pdf>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

to redefine US policy toward Taiwan proved important in improving Taiwan's strategic environment, while the DPP government faced extreme pressure and explicit hostility from Beijing. However, two factors emerged on the way which modified and obscured Washington's positive gesture toward Taipei: the war on terrorism and Taiwan's domestic politics.<sup>87</sup> On the one hand, the 911 World Trade Center terrorist attack fundamentally refocused Washington's global strategic focus toward the war on global terrorism that in turn elevated Beijing's strategic role. On the other hand, Chen Shui-bian manipulated domestic politics and sensitive cross-Strait issues mainly for his own political benefit and arguably disregarded the negative implications of Washington's changing attitudes.

Accordingly, the improved relations between Taipei and Washington soon faced serious setbacks and turned into mutual mistrust in view of Chen's "one side, one country" statement in 2002, the 2004 referendum, and the 2006 constitutional reform, etc.<sup>88</sup> To be sure, the discord also stemmed in part from the different perspectives of Washington and Taipei on the meaning of the "status quo" in relation to the cross-Strait situation. While Chen's administration was unlikely to retreat from his "bottom line" on the Taiwan sovereignty issue, Taipei endeavoured to convince Washington that Taipei's moves were meant to assure everyone that its notion of the cross-Strait status quo merely implied that "the ROC is Taiwan". Considering the "decisive" role that America played in Taiwan's grand strategy, Taipei could have been expected eventually to follow Washington's cross-Strait policy. This was why the president had repeatedly pledged to Washington that he would honour his commitment to the "Five Noes" and stated in the 2006 NSR that Taipei did not intend to unilaterally change the status quo across the Strait. In view of Taiwan's vulnerability vis-à-vis China, most of the diplomatic efforts of Chen's government were devoted to the perceived requirement to retain very close ties with the United States, not least because Taipei believed that Washington had the will and

---

<sup>87</sup> Tuckner (2005) 'Strategic Ambiguity or Strategic Clarity', pp. 203-204; Hughes (2006) *Chinese Nationalism in the Global Era*, p. 142.

<sup>88</sup> Problems between Bush-Chen administrations see in Dumbaugh (2006) *Taiwan-U.S. Political Relations*, pp. 6-15.

capacity to impose a policy of peaceful coexistence between Taipei and Beijing and to provide Taipei with vital military equipment to enable it to better defend itself if the need arose. By pursuing close strategic ties with the US, the government believed that ‘all these countries [China and Japan, for instance] have no choice but to maintain a certain level of strategic cooperation with the United States’.<sup>89</sup> In the end, the Taipei-Washington strategic ties were also expected to provide an indirect strategic linkage between Taiwan and other American security allies in Asia, Japan in particular, and enhance Taiwan’s strategic position accordingly. How successful Taiwan was in drawing in and involving the US in cross-Straits relations would thus depend on the nature of Taipei’s ties with Washington, in terms of Taipei’s compliance with Washington’s global and regional strategy. While Chen Shui-bian regarded the Taipei-Washington relations as among the most important factors in Taiwan’s national strategy, his management of Washington, Taiwan’s most important security provider, was rather controversial and inconsistent.

### *The Influence of Globalization*

Globalization, a phenomenon of international society in 21<sup>st</sup> century, has been defined as ‘the process of increasing interconnectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world more and more have effects on people and societies far away’.<sup>90</sup> The impact of globalization on national grand strategy, in terms of strategic environment assessment and management, is associated with the consequence of processing multi-calculated interdependences, e.g. those pertaining to co-operative security and market economics, in a global community. In the era of globalization, Martin Shaw suggests that a growing consensus on norms and beliefs to establish ‘a new cosmopolitan global security order’ has had significant impacts by constraining states’ behaviors within international society.<sup>91</sup> Accordingly, Taipei’s strategy of internationalizing the

---

<sup>89</sup> National Security Council ROC, “2006 National Security Report”, Chapter 2, p.7.

<sup>90</sup> Steve Smith and John Baylis (2001) ‘Introduction’, in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) (2001) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.7.

<sup>91</sup> John Baylis (2001) ‘International and Global Security’, in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) (2001) *The Globalization of World Politics*, p.270.

Taiwan issue, or the cross-Strait confrontation, was designed to draw on the influence of globalization to improve Taiwan's strategic environment. The way it was to do so would involve Taiwan relying on growing interdependence among societies and states to translate the nature of the cross-Strait confrontation from what Beijing referred to as a "domestic issue" into a global concern. Such a perspective would favour the diplomatically isolated Taiwan. And to characterize the cross-Strait issue from the perspective of the global community would enable President Chen to internationalize, if not globalize, his rapprochement national strategy – with the aim of pursuing peaceful coexistence across the Strait. Wanting to think and act in the context of globalization and the global community, Chen's administration proposed an innovative approach to achieving its four "strategic diplomatic objectives": 1) 'establishing a new balance of power [in the Taiwan Strait] that supports democratic Taiwan and cross-Strait peace'; 2) 'promoting a multi-track diplomatic strategy to seek international support and to establish alliances based on shared values'; 3) 'adopting flexible tactics and applying creativity to seek support and recognition from the international community'; and 4) 'carrying out a reform of foreign affairs and developing a foreign policy community'.<sup>92</sup> An overall idea behind these four strategic diplomatic objectives was to establish 'a framework of the global village', an idea of global civil society, in which nations share rights and duties, as well as risk and rewards, based on mutual trust and interdependence under a mechanism of global governance.<sup>93</sup> As Chen's administration reckoned, 'such moves will enable Taiwan to expand its overall diplomatic strength and meet the challenges of increasingly complex international situations.'<sup>94</sup>

With these four strategic goals in mind, Taipei proposed to pursue four perceived prevailing values closely linked to the idea of globalization, namely "democracy", "peace", "humanitarianism" and "mutual benefit", in order to promote what was called "flexible and multi-track diplomacy".<sup>95</sup> In other words,

---

<sup>92</sup> National Security Council (2006), "2006 National Security Report", Chapter 4, pp.102-9.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, p.102. For a discussion of Chen Shui-bian's idea of global civil society, see Lo Chih-cheng (2002, October 10) 'Taiwan and International organizations', *Taipei Journal*, <http://www.scu.edu.tw/politics/member/lowww/news/gio2.htm> (accessed on 8 October 2012).

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, p.102.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, p.102.

Taipei tried to shape its national strategy by appealing to the influential role of norms and beliefs associated with the idea of the global community in the globalization era. From the perspective of the Chen administration, the aforementioned four perceived values provided a moral ground on which Taipei could justify its head-to-head resistance to the unilateral unification claim of Beijing, because the PRC is associated with an authoritarian regime against democratic values, the use of force against peace, the neglect of Taiwan people's rights, and a disposition for avoiding mutual benefit in the cross-Strait confrontation. By emphasizing these differences the cross-Strait sovereignty competition was to be highlighted once more as a moral confrontation between Taipei and Beijing. While Taiwan constituted a liberal democratic state tuned into the prevailing values of globalization, the PRC remained a communist authoritarian regime that threatened the integrity and vitality of Taiwan's liberal democratic society. Accordingly, in the interests of democratic societies in the global community, Taipei under Chen's government appealed to the global community to defend democratic Taiwan, to promote democracy in undemocratic countries such as China and to establish a framework ensuring peace and stability for cross-Strait interaction.<sup>96</sup>

Chen's administration had a firm belief that the assumptions about the global spread of values and thoughts of interdependence would benefit Taipei's rapprochement strategy. While China could and would apply its overwhelming comprehensive power against Taiwan, Taipei's counter-strategy to enhance its national capabilities was to appeal in the name of the values of "democracy", "peace", "humanitarianism" and "mutual benefit" to be allowed to comply with the trend of globalization so as to attract international support in withstanding Beijing's threats. As such, Taipei's willingness to bring into play the attractiveness and persuasiveness of its culture, its political ideas and foreign policies constitute the use of so-called "soft power".<sup>97</sup> Positioning Taipei against Beijing and its reliance on hard power, President Chen himself used to quote the Chinese Taoist dictum, that "the pliant and weak will conquer the hard

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, p.103.

<sup>97</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs), pp.11-14.

and strong” (*rouruo sheng gangqiang*) as an inspiration behind his national grand strategy. Put differently, to use “soft power” was a strategy, which was more promising for a small state such as Taiwan in the face of China’s threats. As Chen said, ‘if the international society is convinced that we [Taiwan] have done our best in goodwill, we should not be regarded as a troublemaker. Accordingly, the international society will support our stance of peace, reconciliation and benevolence on cross-Strait relations.’<sup>98</sup> Adopting a strategy that relied on balancing rather than a bandwagoning to manage its strategic environment in the face of China’s coercive zero-sum diplomatic blockade, the administration’s appeal to alliances based on the “shared values” of the global civil society to improve Taiwan’s strategic environment in the globalization era reflected the importance of ideational factors as a constant key aspect of Taiwan’s national grand strategy.

### ***The Challenge of the Rise of China***

Taipei’s emphasis on “shared values” in a globalizing world was closely related to the way in which it dealt with the daunting challenges associated with the rise of China. It is believed that ‘the single most important development in the post-Cold War world’ is China’s rise as a great power.<sup>99</sup> This rise was fuelled by China’s rapid economic growth and a dramatic increase in its comprehensive national power that likely enables China to possess the capability and confidence to direct in its favour development of cross-Strait unification. In the 2006 National Security Report, Taipei asserted that ‘China’s rise and strategic expansion’ would produce ‘a profound effect on the future strategic situation in the East Asia region as well as the world’ and have ‘a great impact on Taiwan’s security environment’.<sup>100</sup> Taipei highlighted two ‘most noteworthy points’ concerning the impact of China’s rise on Taiwan: namely as regards (1)

---

<sup>98</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century*, p.115, (my translation).

<sup>99</sup> Rex Li (2004) ‘Security Challenge of an Ascendant China: Great Power Emergence and International Stability’, in Zhao Suisheng (ed.) (2004) *Chinese Foreign Policy: Pragmatism and Strategic Behavior* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe), p.23. For discussions of the issue of China’s rise, see Xia Lipin and Jiang Xiyuan (2004) *Peaceful Rise of China* (*zhongguo he ping jue qi*) (Beijing: Zhongguo she hui ke xue chu ban she); Edward Friedman (ed.) (2006) *China’s Rise, Taiwan’s Dilemmas and International Peace* (London: Routledge).

<sup>100</sup> National Security Council (2006), “2006 National Security Report”, Chapter 2, p.13.

‘China’s promotion of its maritime strategy’ and (2) ‘the role which it plays in East Asia’s regional integration process’.<sup>101</sup> On the one hand, China’s maritime strategy is shifting from ‘coastal defence’ (*jinghai fangyu*) to ‘offshore defence’ (*jingyan fangyu*) as Beijing pursues comprehensive maritime power, which will be consonant with the demands of its domestic economic development and entail a future naval force that can perform in certain operational scenarios. This includes an ability of warding off challenges over sovereignty claims amid the maritime interests of Taiwan, Japan, the US, India and the Southeast Asian states.<sup>102</sup> At the same time, the Chen administration believed that the rise of China, associated with its expansionist geo-strategy, meant that China would inevitably ‘challenge US and Japanese status in the region’ and eventually ‘dominate East Asia without needing to engage in war’ by virtue of its growing economic and diplomatic influence.<sup>103</sup> Taipei analysed the way in which China sought to increase its influence over its neighbours, which during the Chen government involved ‘establishing a free trade zone, holding strategic talks, carrying out security cooperation, building up multilateral mechanism and conducting “big power diplomacy”’.<sup>104</sup> It was in this context that the Chen administration endeavoured to manage its strategic environment in response to the rise of China, which caused a gradual structural change in Beijing’s favour and brought serious strategic challenges to Taipei.

One of Taipei’s most important methods to combat the perceived threat of China’s rise was to appeal to the international order<sup>105</sup> from the emerging global society for the pursuit of upholding the cross-Strait status quo. In the 2006 National Security Report, the DPP government repeatedly invoked the globalist

---

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

<sup>102</sup> Bernard D. Cole (2007) ‘China’s Maritime Strategy’, in Erickson Andrew S., Andrew R. Wilson, Lyle J. Goldstein and William S. Murray (eds.) (2007) *China’s Future Nuclear Submarine Force* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press), pp. 25-28; Eric A. McVadon (2009) ‘China’s Navy Today: Looking toward Blue Water’, in Andrew S. Erickson, Lyle J. Goldstein and Carnes Lord (eds.) (2009) *China Goes to Sea: Maritime Transformation in Comparative Historical Perspective* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press), pp.374-377.

<sup>103</sup> National Security Council (2006), “2006 National Security Report”, Chapter2, p.15.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> I adopt the term “international order” and its meaning from Hedley Bull. It refers here to the context of Pacific Asia. According to Bull, the “international order” is ‘a pattern of activity that sustains the elementary or primary goals of the society of states.’ For further details see in Hedley Bull (1995) *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (second edition) (London: Macmillan), pp.8-19.

perspective on international order that Taiwan favoured, among other, interdependence, the non-use of force, co-operative security, and liberal democratic values.<sup>106</sup> The government then began to raise questions about the phenomenon of the rise of China and argued that ‘China’s threats against Taiwan are pervasive and the international community has misgivings over China’s “non-peaceful rise” and its strategic expansion, with some even seeing this rise as a global threat.<sup>107</sup> Vowing to balance the growing “China threat”, the Chen administration emphasized the importance and advantages of Taiwan’s geo-strategic position and pledged that Taiwan would be ‘the “steadyng anchor” in maintaining a stable, peaceful and free East Asia and North Pacific.<sup>108</sup> According to Muthiah Alagappa, there are three prevailing primary goals of the regional security order in Asia: “national survival”, “national prosperity” and “regional peace and stability”.<sup>109</sup> Because these three primary goals are shared by Taiwan, the national strategy of the Chen administration was to reinforce the existing security order by arguing that China was an expansionist power in the region, so as to improve the strategic environment of Taiwan and reduce the effects of its diplomatic isolation. If Beijing had used military coercion and invaded Taiwan for the purpose of cross-Strait unification, it would seriously have destabilized the regional order, because it would have been obvious that Beijing was not only making an example of Taiwan by using military means to resolve the question of its proclaimed territory but was also demonstrating its long-term geopolitical and strategic ambitions as a revisionist power in the region. President Chen characterized Beijing’s unilateral cross-Strait unification policy as a “Chinese Monroe Doctrine”, which was designed to preserve and promote China’s superiority not only across the Taiwan Strait but also across the whole of the Asia-Pacific region.<sup>110</sup> The Chen administration’s expansive tactic of using the “China threat” was designed to internationalize the cross-Strait confrontation by linking the so-called “China

---

<sup>106</sup> National Security Council (2006) ‘Taiwan’s New Security Environment’, Chapter 2, pp. 6-30.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid, p.29.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid, p.27-29.

<sup>109</sup> Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) (2003), ‘Constructing Security Order in Asia’, in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) (2003) *Asian Security Order – Instrumental and Normative Features* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), pp.78-79.

<sup>110</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan*, pp.20-21.

threat”<sup>111</sup> with China’s rise so as to draw in possible international involvement to Taipei’s advantage.

Because Taiwan sought to involve external powers to better resist the perceived threat of the rise of China, it comes as no surprise that the Chen administration intended to benefit diplomatically from upholding the role of other powers in the existing regional order. From President Chen’s perspective, the core of Taiwan’s grand strategy, as he saw it, focused on improving its strategic environment by linking the fate of Taiwan with the existing security order of Pacific Asia, which was centred on the US-Japan alliance. Taiwan thus had to work within the American-led regional order.<sup>112</sup> It is worth noting that the Chen administration highlighted ‘Japan’s pursuit of becoming a “normal country” side by side with ‘the rise of China’ as the two influential dynamic changes in the East Asia security order.<sup>113</sup> However, unlike its negative perspective on the rise of China, the anti-one-China administration explicitly welcomed Japan’s moves towards becoming more of a “normal country” and the recommendation that Japan should play a more active role in international society, e.g. by becoming a permanent member of the UN Security Council, in accordance with its economic power. It also held that in order to maintain regional order Japan’s government should seek to revise Article 9 of Japan’s Peace Constitution, in which Japan committed itself to ‘[renouncing] war and [renouncing] the maintenance of armed forces’, so as to unleash the strength which it had gained from operating in the context of the US-Japan security alliance.<sup>114</sup> Given

---

<sup>111</sup> The theory of the “China threat” mainly derives from the realist view of power and competition in an anarchic world. For further discussion of this, see, for example, Rex Li (2004) ‘Security Challenge of an Ascendant China’, pp. 24-30.

<sup>112</sup> Chen Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century*, p.105, (my translation). Chen did not, however, give any further explanation of the meaning of the grand strategy.

<sup>113</sup> National Security Council (2006) ‘Taiwan’s New Security Environment’, Chapter 2, pp. 13. The term ‘normal country’ means that Japan should have formal armed forces - rather than “self-defence forces”- and should use them as most countries do, for instance, to participate in collective security arrangements, from which it currently refrains. This is because Japan’s Peace Constitution, Article 9, states that Japan would ‘renounce war, and renounce the maintenance of armed forces’. The idea of becoming a ‘normal country’ is closely related to the Koizumi administrations plea for reform in this situation. See The Economist (May 17, 2001) ‘Nationalism and Defence in Japan: A Normal Country’, <http://www.economist.com/node/626515> (Accessed on October 09, 2012).

<sup>114</sup> National Security Council (2006), “2006 National Security Report”, Chapter 2, pp. 16-20. For a discussion of Japan’s national security strategy, see for example Richard J. Samuels (2007) *Securing Japan: Tokyo’s Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Cornell, Ithaca: Cornell

historical issues, geostrategic competition, territorial disputation and a resurgent nationalism in both countries, Taipei assumed that ‘contradictions between Japan and China are not a transient phenomenon, but an objective reality’.<sup>115</sup> Taipei’s realist perspective on Japan’s role in the East Asia security order reflected the significance accorded to a classical balance of power strategy to manage the effects of the rise of China.

Accordingly, it is clear that Taipei’s method of handling the effects of the rise of China was to pursue regional peace and stability by upholding US hegemony in general and the balance of power arrangement between a rising China and the normalizing Japan. Chen’s pro-Japan policy is understandable under the conversational wisdom of the balance of power, but a major question remains: does Japan really have the will and capacity to check China, not least on Taiwan’s behalf? Unless this question is answered in Taiwan’s favour, this pro-Japan strategy could more likely have been counter-productive for Taipei, in particular when one takes into account the factor of nationalism associated with Sino-Japanese historical animosity. While the states of the region at times also worried whether Taiwan would become a revisionist power, in terms of pursuing so-called “Taiwanese independence”, which challenged the existing regional order, the pro-independence government repeatedly pledged to behave like a “responsible stakeholder” rather than a “trouble maker” in the region and promised that Taipei would not seek to change the status quo regarding cross-Strait relations.<sup>116</sup> Indeed, the Chen administration clarified that unless China initiated military action to deny Taiwan’s de facto sovereignty, it was unlikely that Taipei would formally declare independence, in accordance with President Chen’s “Five Noes”. As a result, as long as there was competition for power between the US-Japan alliance and China, it would enable Taiwan, despite its diplomatic isolation, to link the cross-Strait confrontation with the

---

University Press).

<sup>115</sup> National Security Council (2006), “2006 National Security Report”, Chapter 2, p.19.

<sup>116</sup> National Security Council (2006) “2006 National Security Report” Chapter 4, p.148. Robert Ross does not accept Taipei’s claim as a status quo power. See Robert Ross (2006) ‘Explaining Taiwan’s Revisionist Diplomacy’ *Journal of Contemporary China*, 15 (48) August 2006, 443-458. However the different aspects simply reflect the diverse definitions of the cross-Strait status quo by Taipei, Washington and Beijing. See my previous discussion in ‘Preserving Sovereignty through Upholding the “Status Quo”’.

competition between the major powers in the name of maintaining the existing regional security order. As a result, Taipei would be able to internationalize the Taiwan issue to its own advantage.

#### **C.7.4 Taipei’s “Active Defensive” Posture: “Effective Deterrence, Resolute Defence”**

During Chen’s administration, Taiwan’s strategic posture was centred on the fundamental goal of preventing war across the Strait under the doctrine of “Effective Deterrence, Effective Defence”. This overall defensive posture for preventing war was the same as that of its predecessor under the KMT’s Lee Teng-hui. Nevertheless, Chen’s administration emphasised an ‘active defence’ posture which was different from Lee’s passive “resolute defence, effective deterrence” to Chen’s active equivalent: “effective deterrence, resolute defence”<sup>117</sup>. The Chen government’s focus on ‘active defence’ was characterized by its adoption of an offensive concept to a complex deterrent operation as a default approach to the objective of preventing war.<sup>118</sup> Accordingly, with its “all-out defence” (*quanmin guofang*) policy, Taipei put into action a series of military reforms for the pursuit of ‘technological advancement, information and electronics superiority, joint interception and homeland defence’<sup>119</sup> to integrate the military and civilian sectors and, in the interests of war prevention, to establish a strong defensive power with credible counter-attack capabilities.

#### ***“Effective Deterrence”***

---

<sup>117</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2006), “2006 National Defense Report”, (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence, ROC), pp.98-99.

<sup>118</sup> The practice of Taipei’s “active defence” involved in methods of developing ‘long-range, precision, deep strike capabilities to effectively disintegrate or stagnate enemy forces or firepower advancements.’ By doing so, the “active defence” expected that an enemy would forego all military options according to its rational estimations of unacceptable battle damage and casualty. See “2006 National Defense Report”, p.99.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

Under President Chen's leadership, Taiwan's defence strategy identified three primary goals for its armed forces, listed in order of priority: (1) "preventing war", (2) "defending the homeland" and (3) "countering terrorism and responding to contingencies".<sup>120</sup> For these purposes, Taipei's military-related thinking and preparations were governed by the fundamental military doctrine of "effective deterrence, resolute defence" (*youxiao hezu, fangwei gushou*).<sup>121</sup> Compared with that of its KMT predecessors, perhaps one of the most distinct aspects of DPP military strategy for 'preventing war' was to prioritize 'deterrence' (*hezu*), which focused on discouraging Beijing from making any pre-emptive military move, rather than focus on 'defence' (*fangwei*), with a view to reducing any possible damage resulting from military action on the part of Beijing.<sup>122</sup> The emphasis on deterrence in the DPP's military strategy well reflected the new priority in strategic posture, moving beyond the KMT's "resolute defence, effective deterrence" to its "effective deterrence, resolute defence".<sup>123</sup> While emphasizing deterrence in its security strategy, the DPP's commitment to deterrence remained purely conventional in practice and did not involve a nuclear option. Accordingly, Taipei's conventional deterrence, as John J. Mearsheimer put, was a function of the capability of denying an aggressor's military objectives with conventional forces in the context of the battlefield.<sup>124</sup>

The Ministry of National Defence (MND) defined the concept of "effective deterrence" as follows:

'By establishing effective deterrent counterstrike and defence capabilities and by deploying forces capable of effectively neutralizing or delaying enemy attacks, the enemy will be persuaded to give up any military

---

<sup>120</sup> Ministry of National Defence, "2004 National Defence Report", (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence, ROC, 2004), Chapter 6.I

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> For a discussion of the content and differences between deterrence and defence, see Glenn H. Snyder (1961) *Deterrence and Defence – Toward a Theory of National Security* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press), pp.3-5.

<sup>123</sup> Ministry of National Defence (1998), "1998 National Defence Report", (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence and Liming Cultural Inc.), p.45.

<sup>124</sup> John J. Mearsheimer (1983) *Conventional Deterrence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), p.15.

ambition after rationally assessing the outcome.<sup>125</sup>

As this definition suggests, the strategy of “effective deterrence” was based on two interrelated components: the ability on the part of Taipei to launch a credible military counterattack, involving retaliation and denial; and Beijing’s rational analysis of potential costs, which would see risks that would outweigh possible gains achieved by the use of force. In practice, Taipei’s “effective deterrence” required, first, the credible capacity to launch a counterattack. It needed to be credible, not only to prevent the success of any surprise attack by protracting the conflict long enough to allow for possible international intervention by a third party, but also, more importantly, to retaliate against the invader at once as strongly as possible. In the view of the DPP government, it was time to rethink something which had been deliberately ignored since the 1990s – the value of military retaliation in deterring China’s military actions – and to reconsider its purely passive defensive tactics. The second component of “effective deterrence” focused on forcing Beijing to make a rational calculation, in the sense of instrumentally adapting means to ends. It was assumed that, if Taipei’s capabilities for counterattack were actual and credible, they would increase Beijing’s concerns about the risk of defeat and the possible cost of any military options. Consequently, Beijing would be more likely to resolve the cross-Strait conflict by peaceful means rather than by resorting to the use of force.

The core of the doctrine of “effective deterrence” then focused on the importance of having an active posture, strategic defence with offensive tactics, to strengthen Taiwan’s credibility in mounting its own defence. It suggested that after Beijing’s conventional first-strike, Taipei should still be able to wage war, drawing on its sea and air powers as well as missiles directed at mainland China to maximize the possible cost to the invader. It denied a free hand to Beijing to coerce or attack without any fear of punishment and was designed to check the invader’s military threats in time before it could launch any further destructive attack on Taiwan’s homeland. To implement this doctrine of active defence,

---

<sup>125</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2004), “2004 National Defence Report”, Chapter 6.I.

first proposed in June 2000, President Chen issued new guidelines for seeking “decisive battle outside the territory” (*jue zhai jing wai*).<sup>126</sup> Considering the island terrain of Taiwan, the guidelines placed emphasis on the decisive role of naval and air forces and not on the army, with a view to engaging with the threats of the PLA in Chinese mainland for instance.<sup>127</sup> Ballistic and cruise missiles were also crucial in the light of the new guidelines, which advocated that it was important to engage enemy threats outside the territory. In the 2006 *National Defence Report*, the MND for the first time revealed the establishment of “special type missiles” (*te zhong fei dan*) as a counterattack measure.<sup>128</sup> It is believed that at this stage Taiwan already possessed the Hsiung-Feng E-2 cruise missile with a range of over 600 km and was moving forward with an active programme of research focusing on the development of a tactical ballistic missile (Tien-Kung or Sky-Bow) with a maximum range of 1,000 km.<sup>129</sup> Since this range encompassed China’s major cities and high-value targets, such as Shanghai and the Three Gorges Dam, these ballistic missiles and cruise missiles were intended to back up Taiwan’s “effective deterrence” doctrine, which aimed to counterattack any aggression from China with the hope of either deterring further hostile action or improving Taipei’s negotiation position. Although the credibility of Taiwan’s deterrence was problematic and largely rhetorical, given the limited arsenal of conventional missiles, the DPP government set out to do what was possible to augment Taiwan’s deterrent capability because it served an indispensable part of its primary strategic aim: “preventing war”.

### **“Resolute Defence”**

---

<sup>126</sup> Chen Shui-bian’s address, “*Celebration of ROC Military Academy’s 76th Birthday*”, Office of President, 16 June 2000, at (<http://www.president.gov.tw>) (accessed on 21 September 2009).

<sup>127</sup> Command Centre for Chen Shui-bian’s Presidential Campaign (1999), *Chen Shui-bian’s Blueprint for State, National Defence* (Taipei: Commanding Centre for Chen Shui-bian’s Presidential Campaign); Martin Edmond and York Chen (2003) “An Assessment of the ROCN’s Modernization program”, in Martin Edmond and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2003) *Taiwan’s Maritime Security* (London: RoutledgeCurzon), pp.100-101.

<sup>128</sup> ‘Taiwan establishes the capability of “special type missiles”’, *Liberty Times*, 30 August 2006, at ([www.libertytimes.com.tw](http://www.libertytimes.com.tw)).

<sup>129</sup> “Taiwan To Test Fire Cruise Missile Capable Of Hitting China”, Taipei (AFP) Jul 06, 2006, at (<http://www.spacewar.com>); “Taiwan Admits Developing New Missiles”, Taipei (AFP) 30 August 2006, at (<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/AFP/2006/AFP-300806.htm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

Taiwan's military doctrine of "resolute defence" (*fangwei gushou*) was designed for homeland defence, which would be conducted on the terrain of Taiwan, against an invasion by the PLA, which was assumed to be intent on gaining geographical possession of part or all of Taiwan's territory. "Resolute defence" forms the second stage of Taipei's war plan, which comes into play in the aftermath of the failure of "effective deterrence". "Resolute defence" thus is a purely defensive posture, designed for the purpose of making it as difficult as possible for Beijing's military invasion to conquer Taiwan and its people. MND defined "resolute defence" as follows: 'Should deterrence fail and the enemy launches a military invasion against us, we will combine our comprehensive all-out defence capabilities and joint operation capabilities to firmly defend our homeland and stop, defeat and destroy the invading enemy.'<sup>130</sup>

At the very heart of Taiwan's "resolute defence" doctrine was the idea of "all-out defence", which was to wage total war by mobilizing all the available national resources to defend the homeland. According to Article 3 of Taiwan's National Defence Act, Taiwan's national defence was ultimately based on "all-out defence", which involves 'affairs pertaining to military, civil defence and those in [the] political, economic, psychological and technological domains.'<sup>131</sup> Taipei's "All-out defence", as had been claimed, had five key themes.<sup>132</sup> First, the nature of "all-out defence" was total and comprehensive, because the theatre of defence involved the whole territory of Taiwan and the forms of defence referred to a comprehensive set of capabilities relating to its overall national power. The concept of 'total and comprehensive' in "all-out defence" was reflected in Taipei's statement that 'national security is everyone's duty and everyone is responsible for national defence construction.'<sup>133</sup> Second, with regard to the possibility of a massive attack by China, Taipei's "all-out defence" demanded the active participation of the whole population in the

---

<sup>130</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2004), "2004 National Defence Report", Chapter 6.I.

<sup>131</sup> *National Defence Act* (2003), full text of the law at ([http://www.cns.mii.edu/straittalk/01%20Opening%20page%20strait\\_talk.htm](http://www.cns.mii.edu/straittalk/01%20Opening%20page%20strait_talk.htm)) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>132</sup> Details of content, guidelines and measures of "all-out defence" see Ministry of National Defence (2004), "2004 National Defence Report", Chapter 6 and 15 and *National Defence Law* (2003), chapter 5.

<sup>133</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2004), "2004 National Defence Report", Chapter 15.

defence effort. In safeguarding the nation there could be no distinction between the general populace and the military. Not military forces alone but the total nation must conduct the defence. Thus, the effective execution of “all-out defence” demanded the adaptation of the military-civilian mobilisation system for the purpose of defence. Third, the doctrine argued that the participation of large masses in “all-out defence” made it crucial to devote special effort, by means of political warfare, to morale and generating consensus at home. In other words, Taipei in particular was concerned about the non-violent threats emanating from Beijing, for example, its application of “three-fold warfare”, which refers to “legal contention”, “propaganda contests” and “psychological assaults”.<sup>134</sup> From Taipei’s perspective, the success of “all-out defence” depended not only on material resources but also, more importantly, on drawing on ideational factors, e.g. determination and consensus, for resistance against the enemy’s invasion. Fourth, preparations for “all-out defence” must begin before the outbreak of any overt military clash. During peacetime, all preparatory measures concerning military, economic or psychological factors and technological infrastructure would influence substantially the readiness for combat in the event of an enemy attack. Fifth, in order to achieve an integrated and efficient defence effort during the war, “all-out defence” would be directed by one centralized administrative and operational authority, that of the commander-in-chief, the President.<sup>135</sup>

“Resolute defence” referred to the homeland’s “all-out defence” which served as Taiwan’s last defensive line and relates to matters of life or death for the state. Although there were two types and stages within Taiwan’s military doctrine, the above-mentioned “effective deterrence and resolute defence”, the implementation of Taiwan’s overall military strategy was seriously deficient if either of them was missing. The concepts of “effective deterrence” and “resolute defence” were interrelated and each of them was always in play to a greater or lesser extent in a dynamic strategic context. This was a strategy of blending defence with the implementation of deterrence and grounding deterrence within the defence infrastructure. Nevertheless, despite all Taiwan’s military efforts in

---

<sup>134</sup> National Security Council (2006), “2006 National Security Report”, pp.77-84.

<sup>135</sup> National Defence Act (2003), the Article 8 and 24.

relation to “resolute defence” and “effective deterrence”, the prevailing external assessment of Taiwan’s “homeland defence”, such as the RAND expert Michael D. Swaine, is that Taiwan is incapable of resisting an all-out and prolonged attack from the PRC without international assistance, namely, that of the United States.<sup>136</sup> The Chen administration was also in agreement. In March 2005, Minister of Defence General Lee Jye publicly reached a similar but more pessimistic conclusion, namely that Taiwan’s military possessed ‘enough equipment and supplies to sustain a conflict with the Mainland for two weeks at most.’<sup>137</sup> To the extent that the DPP government considered “resolute defence” doomed, it is clear why Taipei prioritised the “effective deterrence” option in the first place, associated with its “active defence” (*ji-ji fang-wei*) strategic posture for ‘the fundamental [defence] objective of “war prevention”’.<sup>138</sup>

### ***Military Reform***

The implementation of the military doctrine of “effective deterrence, resolute defence” was linked to Taiwan’s military reform, which here refers to a process of self-improvement to pursue the most efficient and excellent military performance. This raises the basic question: what should be the primary areas of Taiwan’s military self-improvement to match its proposed task? Although Taiwan’s military reforms were extremely wide-ranging in scope, there were three key areas that the DPP government identified in terms of military reform:<sup>139</sup> the reconstruction of Taiwan’s military organization and force

---

<sup>136</sup> Michael D. Swaine (1999) *Taiwan’s National Security, Defence Policy and Weapons Procurement Process* (Santa Monica: RAND), p.xii.

<sup>137</sup> Bernard D. Cole (2008) *Taiwan’s Security- History and Prospects* (London: Routledge), p.184.

<sup>138</sup> The Chen administration used the term “active defence” in its 2006 National Defence Report to emphasize “effective deterrence” for preventing war. See Ministry of National Defence (2006), “2006 National Defence Report”, (English Edition) (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence), pp.99-100.

<sup>139</sup> For the DPP’s measures of military reform, see in Ministry of National Defence (2002, 2004, 2006), “National Defence Report”, (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence); National Security Council (2006), “2006 National Security Report”; Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2006) *Taiwan’s Defence Reform* (London: Routledge); Commanding Centre for Chen Shui-bian’s Presidential Campaign (1999), *Chen Shui-bian’s Blueprint for State, National Defence*; Chen Shui-bian and Ko Chen-heng (1992) *White Paper on the Black Box of Defence* (Taipei: Formosa Foundation), Chapters 3,4,5. Chen Shui-bian and Zhou Wan-jing (1996) *Cross-Century Warcraft: Chen Shui-bian’s Visions of Defence Policy and Management* (Taipei: China Times Publishing Co.), Chapter 1.

structure, the establishment of a joint operational capability and the acquisition of modern weapon systems.

The first of the DPP's military reforms concerned the reconstruction of Taiwan's military organization and force structure. Under the new legislation, the *National Defence Act* (2003) and the *Organization Act of the MND* (2002), the DPP's reconstruction of military organization was central to promoting the "nationalization" (*quojia hua*) of Taiwan's armed forces. This refers to a reinforcement of the rule that civilian-led armed forces should maintain neutrality towards all political parties and strengthen the relations between themselves and democratic civil society. The organizational reconstruction also involved integrating the command system of the General Staff Headquarters (GSH) with the administrative system of the MND. In the new defence system, the civilian Defence Minister thus came to be in charge of both the military command and the administrative system, under the direct orders of the President. President Chen praised the reconstruction as 'the most important change in our national defence system.'<sup>140</sup> With regard to the reconstruction of Taiwan's force structure, the DPP government passed the "*ROC Armed Forces Refining Program*", which was designed to (1) simplify the command structure of the armed forces, (2) downsize the units of the Army, (3) integrate and eliminate units and organizations with similar functions and (4) achieve appropriate proportions of staffing in the various branches of the armed forces.<sup>141</sup> Guided by "*The Military Service Comprehensive Review and Steering Task Force*", the MND also introduced a new military service system for Taiwan's armed forces to convert the existing enlistment-oriented system to a conscription-oriented system, so as to be able to rely on highly professional military personnel in an era of information and technological warfare.<sup>142</sup> All of these, military organization, force structure and military personnel reconstruction, related to a single theme: the establishment of greater military professionalism to serve the liberal democratic government.

---

<sup>140</sup> Dennis V. Hickey (2006) 'China's Military Modernization and Taiwan's Defence' Reform, in Martin Edmonds and Michael M. Tsai (ed.) (2006) *Taiwan's Defence Reform*, p.44.

<sup>141</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2006) *National Defence Report*, pp.107-120.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid, pp. 128-130.

The second area of the DPP's military reforms focused on establishing a joint operational capability.<sup>143</sup> Central to this objective was the pursuit of the so-called "Revolution in Military Affairs" (RMA), which depended on the high-tech-based "system of systems", a system that would 'collect, process, fuse and communicate information and ... apply military force.'<sup>144</sup> The implementation of the joint capability reform includes the following steps: the construction of the C4ISR (command, control, communication, computer, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance) systems to provide crucial information for jointly engaging the enemy at the right time and right place; the integration of various weapons platforms to maximize their potential fighting capabilities; the improvement of the joint operational command mechanism to unify interdiction operations against the enemy; and the formulation of joint operational doctrines to improve joint force training and performance. Taipei's focus on establishing joint operational capabilities served to 'strengthen the effectiveness of joint forces and synchronize the efforts of forces from the army, navy and air force.'<sup>145</sup>

The third area of Taipei's military reform concerned the pursuit of task-oriented modern weapon systems, which was mainly suggested and supported by the United States.<sup>146</sup> During the DPP regime, major items in the government's procurement of advanced modern weapon systems included automatic command and control systems (Project Program C4IRS), KIDD class destroyers, long-range defensive radar programs, a ballistic missile defence system (the PAC-3 system), follow-up counter-sea forces (P3-C long-range anti-submarine aircraft), diesel-electric submarines and F16C/D jetfighters.<sup>147</sup> To stop the

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibid. pp. 153-165.

<sup>144</sup> Lawrence Freedman (1998) *The Revolution in Strategic Affairs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 318).

<sup>145</sup> Ministry of National Defence (2004), "National Defence Report", chapter 5.IV.2.

<sup>146</sup> For a representative view of American suggestions and critics of Taiwan's military reform in recent years, see Swaine (2005) *Taiwan's Defence Reforms and Military Modernization Program: Objectives, Achievement and Obstacles*, in Tucker (2005) *Dangerous Strait*, pp.131-161.

<sup>147</sup> Until the end of 2006, for example, the DPP government had failed 63 times to get the crucial budget for the PAC-3, P3-C and submarines passed in the Legislative Yuan against the opposition of what was called the Pan-Blue coalition, led by the KMT. For the plan to purchase F16C/D jetfighters, see *Taipei Times*, 11 Nov. 2006, at

continued decline of Taiwan's military spending after 1994, the Chen administration, to improve its military infrastructure, decided in 2006 to raise its national defence budget to 3 percent of its GDP per year until the end of his presidency.<sup>148</sup> The buildup of modern weapons systems also related to the effect of the defence and industry integration policy in strengthening the research and development of defence technologies and weapons systems. These modern weapons systems would improve Taipei's capabilities to counter a possible preemptive long-range precision strike by China and thus ensure the continuity of government and the protection of critical infrastructure. The primary purpose of acquiring a modern weapons system was to enhance Taiwan's combat capabilities in order to compensate for its numerical disadvantages and help to maintain a fragile cross-Straits military balance.

The DPP government embarked on the process of military reform in 2000. The reconstruction of Taiwan's military organization and the structure of its forces was an impressive achievement, as regards the "nationalization" of Taiwan's armed forces in particular. With American assistance, the DPP government also made some progress in constructing its C4ISR system to improve its joint operational capabilities. Nevertheless, due to the KMT's opposition in the Legislative Yuan, the DPP government failed to procure major new weapons systems. Eventually, this failure led to concern in Washington over Taiwan's will to defend itself.<sup>149</sup> To prevent Taipei from adopting extraordinary measures against Beijing, Washington kept a close eye on the DPP's military reform and discouraged the development of Taiwan's offensive capabilities, e.g. ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction (WMD). As a result, the achievements of the DPP's military reform were undermined by the combination of domestic handicaps and foreign constraints, even though Taipei's primary goal of military reform was associated with the idea of "active

---

(<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/TT/2006/TT-111106.htm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

<sup>148</sup> National Security Council (2006), "2006 National Security Report", p.88.

<sup>149</sup> American Institute in Taiwan (2006), Press Conference, October 2006, at (<http://ait.org.tw/en/news/speeches/docs/20061026-dir.pdf>) (accessed on 21 April 2010); Michael A. Needham and John J. Tkacik, Jr. (2006) *Grim Future of Taiwan Defence*, The Heritage Foundation, WebMemo #1243, 31 Oct 2006, at (<http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/wm1243.cfm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

defence” to enhance Taiwan’s deterrent capabilities against a military threat from China.

### **C.7.5 Conclusions: Taiwan’s Grand Strategy under Chen Shui-bian from 2000-2008**

Given the unacceptable consequences that any war across the Strait would have, Taiwan’s grand strategy under President Chen Shui-bian’s leadership rested on the primary strategic goal of “preventing war” associated with the “Five Noes” doctrine, under the self-determination formula proposed by *the 1999 Resolution of Taiwan’s Future*. The resolution accepted the element in the status quo across the Strait that the DPP government accepted the name of the ROC and would not declare Taiwan’s independence. While Chen proclaimed his government to be in favour of the status quo, the main difference between him and his predecessor Lee Teng-hui was Chen’s distinct perspective of ‘the ROC is Taiwan’ associated with endorsing the self-determination formula and the explicit objection to Beijing’s one-China principle. Chen adopted a comprehensive approach, giving particular emphasis to consolidating Taiwan’s domestic political consensus and enhancing its international connections to refocus its national grand strategy in the context of the cross-Strait sovereignty confrontation. This chapter has argued that the re-evaluation and refashioning of Taiwan’s grand strategy under President Chen Shui-bian’s distinct sovereignty perspective was pursued with respect to four interrelated themes, namely the centrism of “the New Middle Road”, the preservation of Taiwan’s sovereignty through the “status quo”, the pursuit of internationalizing the Taiwan issue, and the modified military doctrine of “effective deterrence, resolute defence”. First, while President Chen advocated the centrist idea of “the New Middle Road” to map out the national strategy focused in essence on rapprochement to reduce the tensions across the Strait, his administration clearly failed to persuade China to accept his proposed cross-Strait interaction framework for this purpose. China’s refusal to engage through dialogue with Chen’s administration well reflected Beijing’s hostility toward the government, but China’s negative perspective on

Chen's administration also meant losing a valuable opportunity to directly discuss the unification issue with the DPP government.

Second, while Chen's government endeavoured to maintain Taiwan's economic development and reduce the impact of the deepening cross-Straits economic relations, Chen's administration placed the preservation of Taiwan's sovereignty as the prime goal of its national grand strategy. To circumvent any accusation of conspiring to bring about Taiwanese independence, Chen's strategy for preserving Taiwan's statehood was to legitimize the existing separation between Taiwan and China with reference to the cross-Straits status quo, under which the ROC was Taiwan. Nevertheless, while insisting that Taiwan was an independent sovereign state, the government, in advocating self-determination surprisingly accepted that a future "one China" was possible under the precondition of a total consensus from the Taiwanese people. By doing so, the government hoped to resolve the dilemma of sovereign competition across the Strait. In the event, Chen's reconciled stance on the "one China" issue was rejected by Beijing and the pan-Blue camp. As a result, Chen had little choice but to adhere to what he called the "bottom-line" of safeguarding Taiwan's own sovereignty, not least by resisting Beijing's claims of the one-China principle. Third, Chen's administration emphasized the vital influence of external powers, principally the United States, the impact of globalization and the rise of China, which were all seen to matter in Taipei's management of its strategic environment. Chen's efforts to enlist international involvement and support was in fact monopolized by efforts to promote its strategic ties with the United States, given that Washington was by then the only country in the world which had the will, the power and the commitment to impose a peaceful resolution across the Strait. However, as the differences between Taipei and Washington gradually became visible due to the US global war on terrorism and the complexity of Taiwan's domestic politics, the support from the Bush administration to Chen's government was dynamic rather than consistent. While endorsing the US-led international order in East Asia, Chen also invoked a globalist perspective, highlighting "democracy", "peace", "humanitarianism" and "mutual benefit". By appealing to these values, Taipei also hoped to be in a better position to

defend itself against Beijing's pressure. Indeed, Chen's administration built on the notion of "allies based on shared values" to reinforce the existing regional security order so as to counterbalance the increasing challenge of China's rise. Finally, Chen's defensive strategic posture of "effective deterrence, resolute defence" served the ultimate goal of preventing war. The DPP government paid particular attention to the value of military offensive options to deter war across the Strait and embarked on Taiwan's military reforms to achieve greater efficiency and excellence in military performance in the context of implementing its "active defence" doctrine of "effective deterrence, resolute defence".

Chen's administration highlighted two strategic pillars within its national grand strategy, namely consolidating "a democratic Taiwan committed to sustainable development" and "pursuing dialogue and seeking peace", to advance the nation's long-term development.<sup>150</sup> The first strategic pillar involved promoting democratic values at home, as well as protecting the idea of popular sovereignty and sustaining the economic prosperity and social justice needed for domestic consolidation. This strategy of consolidation on the domestic front was also expected to deal with the increasing threat of Beijing's United Front; the second then concerns cross-Strait relations and focused on "establishing a peace and stability framework for cross-Strait interactions". Nevertheless, given its refusal to compromise on its sovereignty stance in exchange for Beijing's "one-China" principle, the self-determination stance of Chen's administration prevented any progress on cross-Strait relations. Furthermore, the achievements of Chen's administration, in terms of national grand strategy, were seriously undermined by the KMT's control of the Legislative Yuan. Notably, the KMT blocked the DPP's proposed military budget to massively upgrade its major weapons systems more than 60 times.<sup>151</sup> The credibility of Chen's administration was also severely damaged by President Chen's controversial leadership and problematic family issues, in that in his second term Chen and his wife were

---

<sup>150</sup> National Security Council (2006), "2006 National Security Report", p. iv.

<sup>151</sup> Useful discussion about KMT's opposition to Chen's military budget see Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy*, pp.87-105.

charged with embezzlement.<sup>152</sup> This was perhaps an ironic and tragic end for the first non-nationalist administration, which thereby not only lost a very rare chance to prove itself a capable government, but also disappointed its supporters, who had regarded the DPP as more efficient and less corruptible than the KMT. In other words, the Taiwanese independence movement suffered a significant setback because of mainly domestic issues rather than external developments. In the end, the DPP government's failures led to the resumption of power by the KMT. In summary, constituted as the first non-KMT government in Taiwan since 1949, Chen's administration left a legacy in relation to Taiwan's grand strategy which is controversial rather than fruitful.

---

<sup>152</sup> 'Taiwan President Pledges Response to Allegation', *Washington Post*, 5 November 2006, at (<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/WP/2006/WP-051106.htm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010). For more details of Chen's allegation see in the section 'Chen Shui-bian and Embezzlement Charges' at (<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/TSR-Recall-2.htm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

## **Chapter 8 Conclusions and Implications: Continuity, Changes and Prospects in Taiwan's Grand Strategy**

A nation's grand strategy centres on the way in which a nation perceives itself and the outside world in the context of applying all available resources to the pursuit of its proposed national interests. This thesis has argued that Taiwan's grand strategy (TGS) over the past six decades has been driven by a prime factor: to secure the perspective of the ROC's sovereign status as understood by Taipei's leaders. This primary aim has constantly been threatened by the twin threats of Beijing's resolute claim of sovereignty over Taiwan and its overwhelming comprehensive national power. The decision-making process in relation to formulating the TGS, as argued in this thesis, has been closely associated with the exercise of exclusive presidential power. This is true both for the authoritarian regime that ruled the island from 1949 to 1988 and the democratic era thereafter.<sup>1</sup> The evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy has quite evidently been conditioned by the cross-Strait confrontation, changes in the international context, the unique strategic perspective of the Presidents, domestic political developments and the Taiwan-China asymmetry of national power. This thesis has proceeded by examining of three key questions: what has been the core of TGS, in what ways has the TGS been consistently practised and how has the substance of TGS changed over time? To answer these questions, the thesis began by developing an analytical framework for exploring the concept of grand strategy, which set out to offer an understanding of the development of Taiwan's grand strategy.

As grand strategy, also referred to as national strategy in this dissertation, is a policy-relevant activity, this thesis has suggested that the conceptual framework for understanding strategy needs to take account of the strategic actor's

---

<sup>1</sup> President Chen Shui-bian did not enjoy as much exclusive presidential power as his predecessors had, because of the poor design of Taiwan's constitutional design and its polarized identity politics, as described in chapter 7. Given his initiatives in the reform of its defence reform, the national security outline and the sovereignty issue, for instance, Chen relatively is still Taiwan's most prominent leading figure in terms of building its grand strategy.

capabilities as well as ideational factors affecting choices, the environment in which that actor operates, as well as the overall approach or posture that is adopted to further or defend its proposed strategic choices. First, strategic choice is about the question of *why the state decides on*, which has to strike a balance between desired ends and available means. Why strategic choices are made with respect to what is at stake as the expected outcome is the central concern of the ends-means reconciliation in the realm of grand strategy. Second, a state's strategic capability concerns the question of *what resources the state possesses*. Significantly, while capabilities often tend to be associated with material resources, this thesis also highlights the importance of emphasising ideas and creativity as resources that decision-makers may possess. Third, the strategic environment concerns the question of *where the state is situated*, which entails that strategic actors have to identify merits and restrictions about the strategic environment, which is mutual constructed by the strategic relations between structure and agency. Fourth, the strategic posture concerns the question of *how the state responds*, which must explore the synthesis of offence and defence as a way of ascertaining the success of the strategic choice. Furthermore, it is worth noting that strategy is a self-referential practice, because it is in the context of the practice of strategy that these four questions matter in the analysis of strategy. In other words, strategic reasoning is a blending analytical activity which incorporates why they behave, what actors are capable of, in what contexts they operate and how they respond. Strategy thus can be understood as a process of convergent activity in which a cognitive actor takes actions to create and manipulate power, so as to attain its proposed choices in a perceived dynamic environment.

The goals of this thesis have been twofold. First, in its specific intention, it has sought to provide an alternative approach to strategic analysis, by introducing the kind of convergent analysis described above and by doing so to enrich the existing approaches to strategic studies, which have generally been classified somewhere on the spectrum between war-centred and peace-centred perspectives of strategy. Second, in its overall intention, the central goal of this thesis has been to offer an account of the development of Taiwan's grand strategy since 1949, from Chiang Kai-shek to Chen Shui-bian. To this end, it

has examined what are identified here as the six major crises across the Taiwan Strait. In this concluding chapter, the main tasks are to offer a brief summary of the conclusions, to discuss the implications of the main findings and to outline the prospects and suggestions for the future development of Taiwan's grand strategy.

### **C.8.1 Summary of Chapters**

In Chapter 2, “An Analytical Framework of Grand Strategy”, this thesis outlined an on-going debate in the strategic studies literature between classical war-centred and neo-classical peace-centred strategic perspectives. Trying to bridge these different perspectives, the thesis opted for what was introduced as a convergent approach which would enable this study to take into account various levels of analysis and to fuse both the war and peace perspectives. This convergent approach emphasizes the duality of ideational and material factors, the reconciliation of ends and means, the interdependence of agents and structures as well as and the synthesis of defence and offence. It aims to provide for a convergent framework for strategic analysis than are offered by the war and the peace-centred approaches to strategy. The argument is that the analyst must identify the ideational and material factors that impinge on the decision-making in relation to strategy and that it is necessary to take full account of both ends and means to understand why decision-makers opt for any particular choice. Also the framework is able to highlight how contexts shape decisions and how decisions create new contexts. The framework moreover puts the spotlight on whether decision-makers rely on defensive or offensive postures or how they combine both of these. As such, the convergent approach aims to overcome the narrowness, partiality and one-sidedness of any particular perspective, such as the military-oriented, diplomatic-oriented, material-oriented, neo-realist or neo-liberalist strategic perspective, in the complex realm of analyzing strategy. The contribution of this thesis is then in part to have established an alternative and viable analytical framework to enrich, to some extent, the subject of strategic studies in general and to have applied this

framework to the analysis of the development of Taiwan's grand strategy in particular.

In Chapter 3, "The First and Second Military Crises in the Taiwan Strait, 1954-5 and 1958", I analysed Taiwan's grand strategy under the Chinese Nationalist government, which withdrew to Taiwan after losing the Chinese civil war to the Chinese Communists in October 1949. Initially, the authoritarian regime of Chiang Kai-shek (CKS) pursued the survival and integrity of the ROC's sovereignty by adopting an outward-looking strategic choice: planning to retake Mainland China and eradicate the PRC. Mindful of CKS's 'one-China' principle, whereby 'the ROC was China', CKS's outward-look choice was integral to the sovereignty claim over China as a whole and challenged the legitimacy of the PRC accordingly. Other options, such as to accept the status quo by allowing two Chinas to coexist across the Strait, were not contemplated although they might have constituted a favourable outcome for Washington, Taipei's military ally.<sup>2</sup> As regards military strategy, Taipei adopted a strategic-offensive posture, being relentlessly bent on staging an attack to retake mainland China if the opportunity arose.

At the time, Taiwan's grand strategy built on two key assumptions: one related to the island's strategic environment; the other to the importance given to ideas, broadly understood. From Taipei's perspective, the ROC enjoyed a favourable strategic situation as a result of the US strategic focus of global containment to prevent the expansion of a hostile international Communism. During the 1954-5 and 1958 Taiwan Strait crises, which were both initiated by PRC attacks on the offshore islands of Jinmen and Mazu, Taipei's sought to maintain control over these remote offshore islands. This decision was very much in keeping with its strategic-offensive posture and regarded as indispensable in the context of a possible counter-attack. The two Strait crises did not radically depart from the context of the Chinese civil war between the ROC and the PRC. Both sides regarded the use of military force as an inevitable and desirable instrument to break the deadlock across the Strait. Beijing sought to probe Washington's

---

<sup>2</sup> Dennis Van Vranken Hickey (2007) *Foreign Policy Making in Taiwan: From Principles to Pragmatism* (London: Routledge), p. 10.

security commitment to Taiwan. Taipei's strategic-offensive posture at the same time demonstrated a strong belief in the power of ideas and spirit, which was expected to overcome its asymmetrical material disadvantage vis-à-vis Beijing. The assumptions about the eventual triumph of ideational power were derived from Chiang Kai-shek's revolutionist belief in a global trend to anti-communism, the lessons learnt from his experiences during the Chinese civil war, his moral convictions, and the preparedness to allow for an imaginative leap to think the unthinkable in seeking to retake Mainland China.

Taiwan's methods of dealing with the Communist military threat to the offshore islands in the two Strait crises played an important role in testing, as well as formulating and adjusting the content of Taiwan's grand strategy. Notably, the ROC did pass the security test it had been given by attaining the goal of keeping the offshore islands. However, the chapter argued that in the two Strait crises Taipei failed to acknowledge its strategic vulnerabilities and to make the most of its precious opportunities during the crises, when Beijing was generally being regarded by international society as an invader, by accepting the status quo across the Strait through international settlement. By this time, the peaceful coexistence of two de facto sovereign Chinas across the Strait was generally welcomed by international society, promoted by the anti-communist side in particular, a large element of which built on the fear that any change in the cross-Strait status quo at the height of the Cold War might impel an unwanted military clash between the two superpowers. In the end, Taipei's overall offensive outward-looking strategic choice, focusing on Mainland China instead of the homeland Taiwan and pursuing change in the cross-Strait status quo by military means, produced negative strategic consequences for the period of international isolation that was to come.

Chapter 4 examined Taiwan's grand strategy after the decisive change in the island's strategic environment as a consequence of the "Nixon shock". The Nixon Shock rocked the very foundation of the US-Taiwan alliance and triggered the beginning of the end of Taipei's international recognition, which culminated in the ROC's expulsion from the United Nations in October 1971. After the second Strait crisis in 1958, Taiwan's grand strategy had remained

largely unaltered, at least in the sense of its outward-looking focus, which was underpinned by the adamant refusal to accept the status quo across the Strait. Taipei's relevant military preparation had peaked again during the Cultural Revolution in the 1960s. At this time, it was the US that regularly restrained the ROC's strategic ambitions. Significantly, however, Taipei's outward-looking strategic orientation in conjunction with its offensive posture came under even greater pressure as the strategic environment changed in two fundamental ways: (1) international détente moved ahead; (2) the Sino-Soviet split turned violent. Consequently, when Nixon subordinated the Taiwan issue in favour of rapprochement with the PRC, Taipei was forced to revise its very assumptions on the overall strategic environment and whether Taiwan's strategic role was still relevant to the free world and especially the US.

In the face of the unfavourable change in its strategic environment, CKS's preconception of the ROC's sovereign status remained, but he adjusted his strategic-offensive posture from military counter-attack to political counter-attack. This modified strategy, which re-emphasized the importance of political warfare over military means, was encapsulated in the doctrine of "70 percent political work and 30 percent military effort". This doctrine had already been introduced in 1958 when Taipei half-heartedly renounced the use of force across the Strait in the second Strait crisis under pressure from Washington. Despite the gradual change in the 1960s to a strategic environment in Beijing's favour, Taipei had continued to aspire to its ultimate strategic goal of retaking Mainland China and contested any challenge to its claim to sovereignty in international society. That Taiwan was so relentlessly insistent on being the world's one and only legitimate representative of China had always been regarded as an international joke. This attitude was reinforced as Washington opted for rapprochement with Beijing. Soon thereafter Taipei lost its seat at the most important international organization, the United Nations. In the end, Taipei's strategic choice of pursuing a sovereignty competition against Beijing drew it into a dangerous strategic situation: that of a small state facing off a much stronger power in conditions of international isolation.

A major argument developed in this chapter was that, facing all these fundamental changes in its strategic environment, Taipei took its national sovereign status as read and ignored the consequences of international isolation on the sovereignty issue. Chiang Kai-shek's administration initially misjudged the changes in the international environment and consequently failed to respond flexibly to the unfavourable conditions, finally losing the diplomatic battle to defend the sovereign status of the ROC in the international arena. The main reason for this was attributed to Chiang Kai-shek's insistence on the "one-China" principle and uncompromisingly fighting a sovereignty competition against the PRC. This strategic choice served as the single most important characteristic of Taiwan's grand strategy and informed the application of its strategic resources, the leaders' interpretation of their strategic environment and the adoption of Taiwan's strategic posture in the 1960s and early 1970s. The chapter also showed that, after the expulsion from the UN, Taipei squandered what was probably the last opportunity for it to have made use of the influence of international organizations against Beijing's unilateral claim to sovereignty.

Chapter 5, entitled "The Challenges of Taiwan's Self-Defence: the Uncertainty of Washington's Security Commitment", highlighted the crisis which resulted from the termination of the US-ROC diplomatic relations and the Mutual Defense Treaty. This period is referred to here as the third phase of Taiwan's grand strategy, during Chiang Ching-kuo's regime in the late 1970s and 1980s. The difference between Chiang Ching-Kuo's (CCK) and Chiang Kai-shek's (CKS) national grand strategy, in terms of defending the ROC's sovereign survival, is marked. Compared with CKS's outward-looking strategic choice, which emphasized a zero-sum competition across the Strait, CCK adopted a more flexible and realistic perspective on the 'one China' competition between Taipei and Beijing. Indeed, CCK came to the conclusion that an inward-looking strategic choice would be preferable: that is, to secure the ROC's de facto sovereignty by focusing on its domestic development.

When Washington withdrew its diplomatic recognition of the ROC in 1979, it was the first time in three decades that the ROC could no longer take for granted its national security, especially in the sovereignty term. The central task

of Taiwan's grand strategy shifted from cross-Strait unification to securing the ROC's sovereignty against Beijing without having the advantage of Washington's formal recognition as a sovereign state and an unambiguous security guarantee. Adhering to the notion of "domestic concerns come first", Taiwan sought to react to the change of its strategic environment by adopting an inward-looking doctrine, the purpose of which was 'to develop Taiwan into a *San Min Chu I* [*The Three Principles of the People* by Sun Yat-sen] model province of China'. The inward-looking doctrine was by then vital, for two main reasons. First, for its obvious message: the development of Taiwan was prioritized as the state's key mission, a message which was closely associated with the Chinese nationalist perspective on Taiwan's status, a province of China. Second, for its underlying message: it maintained the continuity of ideological difference and sovereign competition between the ROC and the PRC. From CCK's perspective, the ROC represented the free China and the PRC was still an illegitimate regime. The inward-looking strategic focus was a realistic and logical decision for Taipei. First, it served in part the purpose of countering the much stronger Communist opponent. In other words, Taipei sought to enhance its own strategic capability, or national comprehensive power, by fostering domestic development. Second, the decision also acknowledged that Taipei would not have much control over the given external context involving Washington and Beijing. The response was therefore to concentrate on the domestic context to enhance its own defence. Despite Taipei's very limited influence on the external strategic environment, Taipei thus continually tried to alleviate the impact of the termination of the bilateral defence alliance and US-ROC diplomatic relations.

Not surprisingly, Taiwan's grand strategy in CCK's aimed to secure the political-military linkage with the US by lobbying for the passing of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). With this legislation, Washington committed itself to providing Taiwan with weapons for Taipei's self-defence. More importantly, Washington also legally committed itself to the 'peaceful resolution' of the conflict across the Strait. To respond to the changes in the strategic environment in the 1980s, Taipei outlined a new strategic posture: a defensive-oriented deterrent strategy. This chapter showed that the deterrence posture included four

interrelated features: the endorsement of a non-offensive defense posture, a strategic plan to wage war on Taiwan during which a decisive battle would be fought, a willingness to accelerate a self-sustained military modernization effort in preparation for war, and the development of a nuclear deterrent capability to prevent war. This chapter also demonstrated that during Chiang Ching-kuo's authoritarian regime Taipei for the first time since 1949 moved beyond its zero-sum competition against Beijing and developed in its place an appreciation of the choice of peace as a desired means and ends to compete with Beijing across the Strait. Furthermore, this chapter argued that it was only when the security of Taiwan was actually under threat that the KMT authoritarian regime started to commit itself to political reform, so as to justify the Nationalist rule and consolidate the domestic front against external challenges. While trying to pursue the goal of "unifying China under *San Min Chu I*", Taiwan's grand strategy during CCK's regime focused on defending the ROC's sovereign status by way of peaceful competition across the Strait and enhancing its overall strategic capability on the back of substantial economic success. CCK's legacy of elevating domestic development above the cross-Strait issue and the strategic posture of deterrent-oriented measures has since then profoundly and permanently influenced Taiwan's grand strategy.

Chapter 6, "The Third Taiwan Strait Crisis, 1995-96", examined the fourth phase of Taiwan's grand strategy, which stretched from the start of Lee Teng-hui's presidency in 1988, through to the turmoil of the third cross-Strait military crisis in 1995-96, to his controversial proposal of 'a special state-to-state relationship' in 1999. The most marked change in Taiwan's grand strategy during Lee's period was the dramatic shift of the vision of Taiwan from being in effect a means of carrying out the unification mission to being an end in itself. Indeed, during the presidencies of CKS and CCK, the main strategic purpose of Taiwan had been the fulfillment of national unification, either by way of CKS's "counter-attack" or by focusing on CCK's "model province of China". It was the first time in four decades that the strategic choice outlined in Taiwan's grand strategy had disconnected Taiwan from the burdensome mission of pursuing Chinese unification by recognizing the PRC's legitimacy. This change can be understood by Lee's perception that the ROC's sovereign status was 'the

ROC on Taiwan' (ROCOT), which was different from CKS's 'the ROC as China' and CCK's 'the ROC as the free China'. Nevertheless, given the sensitive nature of the competition for sovereignty across the Strait, Lee's strategy of ROCOT was also designed to separate the issue of the ROC's sovereign status from the issue of Chinese-Taiwanese ethnic division in the context of the deconstruction of Chinese nationalism within Taiwan. If they could be separated, Lee could not only circumvent the one-China principle's implications, acknowledging that the PRC claimed sovereignty over Taiwan, but also leave open the possibility for future cross-Straits unification. This was because being part of the Chinese community also represented an opportunity for the island. This strategy of keeping relations with China was clearly presented in the 1991 National Unification Guidelines.

To be sure, Lee's dramatic adjustment reflected the prime strategic aim of ensuring the very existence of the ROC on Taiwan as an independent state. Accordingly, the aspiration of "New Taiwanese" self-preservation was encapsulated in Lee's pursuit of "Taiwan's existence and identity", which was defined in terms of establishing the people of Taiwan as the ROC on Taiwan by substantiating Taiwan's popular sovereignty. According to this vision, 'the people of Taiwan can fully express their free will and build their own future.'<sup>3</sup> From Lee's perspective, Taiwan's grand strategy had been distorted by the prolonged Chinese civil war between the ROC and the PRC. To end the civil war, Lee took the initiative in May 1991 to declare the end of the Period of Mobilization to suppress the Chinese Communist Rebellion. By doing so, in conjunction with the "sovereignty of the people" principle, the ROC conceded important ground in the sovereignty competition with the PRC but confirmed that the ROC's claim to sovereignty would concern the Taiwan area only. In the end, Lee's strategic choice to pursue "Taiwan's existence and identity" by redefining the ROC's sovereign status on Taiwan, not only marked the end of Taipei's historical claim to the whole China and beyond, but also sparked a new and difficult phase of Sino-Taiwanese conflict across the Strait.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lee Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy: Taiwan's Pursuit of Identity* (Tokyo: PHP Institute), pp. 51-2.

This new phase culminated in the 1995-1996 cross-Strait crisis. In the event, Beijing's military coercion produced two profound counter-effects: Lee's landslide triumph in the presidential election and the biggest demonstration of US naval forces in East Asia since the Vietnam War. Nevertheless, the 1995-6 missile crisis also demonstrated the extreme vulnerability of Taiwan to the PLA threat, despite the physical obstacle of the Taiwan Strait. After the Strait crisis, Lee promoted the notion of "Taiwan's existence and identity" more enthusiastically, since it was important for him not only to justify the ROC's very existence, but also to consolidate the domestic front against the threat of annexation by Beijing. Lee's determination to implement the idea of "Taiwan's existence and identity" reached another climax when in July 1999 he went on to conceptualise the relations between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC as "a special state-to-state relationship" in order to highlight the fact that the population of Taiwan exercised sovereignty over Taiwan, which makes the ROC a state. The evolution of Lee's cross-Strait policy from the 1991 National Unification Guideline to the 1999 'special state-to-state' perspective was derived from his frustration over the failure of the first ever cross-Strait rapprochement, as well as his determination to defend the ROC's sovereignty, given the deadlock over the sovereignty competition associated with the 'one China issue' between two sides.

The chapter then argued that, although Lee maintained CCK's strategic posture of defensive-oriented deterrence, the distinctive characteristic of Taiwan's grand strategy during Lee Teng-hui's period could be identified by Taipei's strategic choice to pursue "Taiwan's existence and identity", which was significantly different from CCK's inward-looking strategic choice. The discourse of Lee's "Taiwan's existence and identity" built on the combined factors of Taipei's goal of self-preservation, the "New Taiwanese" nationalism, the perception of sovereign equality across the Strait and the aspiration to end Taipei's international isolation. The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait crisis thus reflected much continuity in the sovereignty competition across the Strait but occurred in a very different strategic setting which saw renewed debate and change in Taiwan's discussions about national identity, determination in Washington to

implement a “peaceful resolution” of the cross-Strait conflict and increasing economic interdependence between Taiwan and China.

Chapter 7, “The DPP’s Accession to Power and the Pursuit of Self-determination”, focused on the fifth phase of Taiwan’s grand strategy, from 2000 to 2008, a time during which the Democratic Progress Party (DPP) was in power after the successful ending of 50 years of rule by the Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) in Taiwan. Once the KMT’s Lee Teng-hui had proposed adopting the controversial “special state-to-state” formula, it made easier the stance of opposing the idea of one China. President Chen Shui-bian proclaimed his party’s position on Taiwan’s sovereignty: that Taiwan was an independent sovereign state and any change in this independent status quo must be decided by all residents of Taiwan by means of a plebiscite. This self-determination formula was imposed in 1999 by the DPP’s *‘The Resolution Regarding Taiwan’s Future’*, as a replacement for the party’s *Taiwan Independent Clause*. Nevertheless, aware of Beijing’s hostility and possibly believing that a cross-Strait war was more likely with the accession to power of the DPP, the DPP administration which adopted Taiwan’s grand strategy had focused on one fundamental question: how such a war could be prevented while at the same time it promoted the idea of Taiwan’s self-determination.

In mapping out this question, Chen’s administration proposed the doctrine of ‘Four Noes, One Without’, or ‘Five Noes’ (*sibu yimeyou*)<sup>4</sup>. Under the terms of this doctrine, Taipei would not take definite steps toward formal independence on condition that Beijing would not use and would not intend to use military force against Taiwan. Chen’s government, advocating self-determination, initially renounced independence for three major purposes: to defuse Beijing’s hostility, to win Washington’s support and to ensure domestic consensus. In the end, the doctrine of “Five Noes” helped the Chen administration to handle the tension across the Strait. It also became the major instrument of Chen’s administration for dealing with the complex triangular relations between Taipei, Beijing and Washington. This chapter showed that the very strategic choice

---

<sup>4</sup> The list and discussion of the ‘Five Noes’, see Chapter 7.1 in this thesis.

encapsulated in the “Five Noes” doctrine focused on upholding the cross-Strait status quo and rejecting Beijing’s notion of one China. For such a government, as this chapter has argued, maintaining the status quo was not a setback for Taiwan’s independence movement, but instead a continuation by other means of the latter’s core objective. This chapter also demonstrated that Taiwan’s grand strategy under the DPP government embodied five interrelated moves: consolidating popular sovereignty in Taiwan, preserving Taiwan’s sovereignty vis-à-vis Beijing through a competing definition of the cross-Strait status quo, seeking dialogue and peace with the rising China, encouraging external interest in a peaceful resolution of the cross-Strait conflict by appealing to the common values of liberal democracy and adopting a modified military posture of ‘effective deterrence, resolute defense’ in preparation for war.

### **C.8.2 Main Findings and Contributions**

In the context of the ROC-PRC antagonism, Taiwan’s grand strategy has at its core sought to balance changes in domestic politics against changes in the island’s external strategic environment and to incorporate one when addressing the other in such a way as to secure the ROC’s sovereign status, as Taipei perceived it. This thesis has sought to show that the development of Taiwan’s grand strategy has been generally incremental but punctuated by Taipei’s experiences of national security crises in conjunction with each president’s overall perspective on national grand strategy. The thesis makes contributions both to the broader literature on strategy and, above all, to the more specific literature on Taiwan’s grand strategy. Other researchers specializing in the Taiwan conflict often emphasise the military and diplomatic aspects of Taiwan’s national security policy, but do not explicitly or systematically engage with the literature on strategic studies. In contrast, this thesis has implications both for what Taiwan’s case can tell us about strategy and for what strategy can tell us about the Taiwan case. There are six main findings, as follows:

First, by analysing in depth the various definitions of what constitutes the nature of grand strategy, this thesis has tried to present strategic analysis in a concise

yet fairly comprehensive and conceptual form. The concept of strategic analysis employed here is in some ways different from other strategic analyses, which are more instrument-informed in nature, because, according to John Garnett, ‘strategy is fundamentally about means rather than ends’.<sup>5</sup> That is to say, existing strategic analyses have been focused either on the classical war-centered approach, specifically on the application of military power to achieve particular political objectives, or on the neo-classical peace-centered approach, where they have exclusively highlighted several dimensions, e.g. military, economic, political, social, technological, psychological, etc., in order to offer special advice on ways of sorting out strategic questions in a given context. Unlike them, this thesis has suggested that an analysis of strategy is not only concerned with explaining how these special dimensions have been applied to answer these questions, but also, equally important, is about understanding what these questions mean as regards the nature and origin of these questions. This is why André Beaufré emphasizes the importance that strategy is “a method of thought”.<sup>6</sup> This thesis has sought to provide an alternative analytical framework - a “convergent strategic analysis” - which attempts to take account of the beliefs and actions of the strategic actor, i.e. the individual or institution, by means of incorporating and exploring ideas in relation to key questions, which necessarily relate to the proposed four conceptual aspects of strategy: namely *strategic capability, strategic choice, strategic environment and strategic posture*.

In the case of Taiwan’s national strategy, this thesis has applied the convergent approach, demonstrating that it is important to understand the implicit assumptions and arguments embedded in Taiwan’s grand strategy and focus on the beliefs held and actions taken by the key strategic actor, namely the president and the administration in charge of governing the state on the former’s behalf. Furthermore, it has argued that the beliefs and actions of the president are themselves crucially mediated by the overall strategic context, which is

---

<sup>5</sup> Garnett John (1987) ‘Strategic Studies and Its Assumption’, in John Baylis, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I: Theories and Concept* (London: Croom Helm), p.5.

<sup>6</sup> André Beaufré (1965) *An Introduction to Strategy* (tr. R.H. Barry) (London: Faber & Faber), pp.11-13.

constituted by Taiwan's limited national capability, the constraints bearing down on political choice, the dynamic domestic-international environment and the proposed military posture. A full understanding of the development of Taiwan's grand strategy cannot, it was argued, be obtained without taking account of the aforementioned four key aspects of strategy. In the end, this research into Taiwan's grand strategy adds to the literature by offering more comprehensive answers to key questions. For example, how, why and to what extent can a small state like Taiwan survive in the context of significant external security threats from a much stronger foe? This thesis has argued that, in the complex realm of strategy, it is vital to examine the way in which the strategic actors make choices to apply such ideational and external power as they have. Notably, the way in which ideational and material power is applied explains why small states may sometimes win and why stronger states may sometimes lose in this asymmetric competition.

Second, this thesis has argued that the president's conceptualisation of the ROC's sovereign status has been the prime force behind the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy, despite the changes in the leadership and the domestic-international context. However, while the sovereignty issue is a natural and continuous security concern to which Taiwan's grand strategy has had to respond, the meaning of the ROC's sovereign survival has itself varied over time. This thesis has divided the development of Taipei's sovereign identity into four different phases. In shorthand, these can be identified as follows: first, during Chiang Kai-shek's regime, *the ROC as China*; second, during Chiang Ching-kuo's period, *the ROC as the free China*; third, during Lee Teng-hui's administration, *the ROC on Taiwan*; and fourth, in Chen Shui-bian's government, *the ROC as Taiwan*. These different and changing state identities have represented the Taipei leaders' respective sovereign perspective on the ROC, in response to dynamic international challenges and the democratic development at home. Accordingly, deciding in what way to secure the respective sovereign status of the ROC has constantly been the central aspiration of Taiwan's grand strategy. Importantly, the different ways in which Taiwan's leaders have thought about the ROC's sovereign status and the political reality across the Strait have influenced decisions on how to apply

strategic capability, what substance to give to strategic choices, whether and how to respond to the changing strategic environment and how to shape Taiwan's strategic posture. Hence, this thesis has argued that, given the ROC-PRC failure to reach an agreement to settle the cross-Strait sovereignty issue, no administration in Taiwan has formulated and pursued its national grand strategy without first identifying the meaning of the ROC. This has involved responding to two fundamental and interrelated questions: what is the ROC and what is Taiwan? Clarifying the relationship between the ROC and Taiwan accordingly stands at the heart of shaping cross-Strait relations and Taiwan's grand strategy. For CKS and CCK, this was not an issue because Taiwan was just a province of the ROC and the PRC was an illegitimate regime. For both Lee Teng-hui and Chen Shui-bian, having accepted the PRC's sovereignty over mainland China, they had to redefine and defend the ROC's sovereign status since there was no agreement on this between the two sides. The difference between them was Lee's 'the ROC on Taiwan' and Chen's 'the ROC as Taiwan'. However, for Lee and Chen, it was more difficult, complex and delicate to put their sovereignty perspectives into practice than to arrive at such a perception itself. This was because both them, in Taiwan's post-authoritarian era, also had to circumvent the sensitive one-China issue to prevent domestic, cross-Strait, and international pressures simultaneously. As a result, this thesis has argued that, despite the influential external structural factors, e.g. the US, PRC pressure and the constraints of the international system, the formulation and evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy were driven by domestic factors, especially, Taipei leader's respective shifting perspective on the ROC's sovereign status on Taiwan.

Third, this thesis has argued that Taiwan's grand strategy has evolved in line with changing interpretations of the cross-Strait status quo during different presidencies. During the 1950s and 1960s, when it benefited from US recognition, Taipei's view of the cross-Strait status quo was that there was only "one China", the ROC, which extended across the Strait. After the signing of the Shanghai Communiqué and during Chiang Ching-kuo's administration, Taipei's perspective on the status quo shifted slightly. It began to involve an acknowledgement that there was still one China across the Strait but this one

China was divided temporarily, though it would surely be reunified once more. However, during the 1990s Lee Teng-hui's administration revised the notion of "one China" across the Strait, when Taipei acknowledged that the cross-Strait status quo was a "special state-to-state" relationship between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC on the mainland, which emphasised the fact that the two Chinas had coexisted across the Strait since 1949. For the Chen Shui-bian government, the equilibrium was explicitly defined as that of "one side, one state", meaning that there was no so-called "one China" but two Chinas across the Strait. This thesis has argued that the dynamics of Taipei reconceptualising the cross-Strait status quo also relate to the president's perspective of the ROC's sovereign status, as become evident not least in the various crises experienced across the Strait. However, the process of Taipei defining and re-defining the cross-Strait status quo was also significantly shaped by the strategic environment, which was influenced not merely by Beijing's stance but also, perhaps more importantly, by Washington's policy towards the PRC and its preferences regarding the status quo across the Strait.

Fourth, as regards the ways in which Taiwan's grand strategy has been affected from Chiang Kai-shek to Chen Shui-bian, the thesis has pointed to at least five influences: (a) the island's geographical location, (b) a strong belief in Taiwan's geostrategic importance, (c) domestic political divisions within Taiwan, (d) sensitivity to Taiwan's military vulnerability and (e) the political-military reliance on the US.

(a) The geography of the Taiwan Strait has obviously been a persistent influence on Taipei's strategic attitudes and behaviour. The influence has affected much strategic thinking and Taiwan's psychological predisposition. The Taiwan Strait has not only made an invasion by Beijing more difficult but also required the formulation of Taiwan's armed forces to fit into this geographical context. Psychologically, the natural maritime obstacle reinforced the political antagonism in this area and led to considerable estrangement and alienation from the PRC as Taiwan has grown more distant from Mainland China. This situation is in some ways and to some extent similar to that of Japan,

geographically a group of offshore islands off the continent of Asia, which has developed its unique strategic character.<sup>7</sup>

(b) Due to its unique geographical location at the centre of the first chain of islands in East Asia<sup>8</sup>, Taiwan's grand strategy has reflected a strong belief in its own geostrategic importance. This thesis has shown that Taiwan's leaders have constantly seen themselves as playing an active role to support a US-led regional order, not least to deal with the so-called 'China threat'. To be sure, there are also obvious political motives. The two main objectives behind Taipei openly pointing to its geostrategic importance are, first, to identify its function as a member of the international society; and, second, to find a way to draw international support in its favour to neutralise the threat posed by Beijing.

(c) The third distinct influence on Taiwan's grand strategy has been domestic politics. This thesis has drawn attention to the role of the president, not least the values and preferences regarding the ways of handling domestic issues in the context of the cross-Strait sovereignty competition. During Chiang Kai-shek's dictatorship, Taipei focused on upholding domestic security involving the reconstruction of the KMT, political militarization, the military buildup and modernization and emphasis on social stability. After a series of international setbacks in the 1970s, Taipei under Chiang Ching-kuo's presidency adopted an overall inward-looking strategy to consolidate the domestic front by his methods of pursuing economic development, striving for Taipei's political survival, maintaining domestic order, implementing constitutional democracy and proposing the 'Three Noes' policy against Beijing's United Front. During the KMT's authoritarian regime, domestic political divisions had been limited, because there were no multi-party politics until the DPP was illegally formed in 1986. The Presidents mainly focused on unifying domestic consensus and justifying the KMT's dictatorship in Taiwan by advocating Chinese nationalism to safeguard the ROC against the PRC. By then, they enjoyed relative freedom

---

<sup>7</sup> Naoko Sajima (1999) 'Japan: Strategic Culture at a Crossroads', in Booth, Ken and Russell Trood (eds.) (1999) *Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region* (London: Macmillan), pp.69-71.

<sup>8</sup> Allan M. Wachman (2007) *Why Taiwan? Geostrategic Rationales for China's Territorial Integrity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), Chapter 2.

from domestic constraints in building their national strategy. Nevertheless, in the post-authoritarian era associated with the phenomena of the deconstruction of Chinese nationalism, both Lee Teng-hui and Chen Shui-bian had to deal simultaneously with increasing domestic political divisions and Beijing's United Front strategy. In the analysis of Lee Teng-hui's idea of 'Taiwanese subjectivity', this thesis argues that the innovation of 'Taiwanese identity' was designed to advocate popular sovereignty as a way of unifying the hearts and minds of Taiwan's people and also of competing with the DPP to re-establish the KMT's legitimacy and rule over the island. Analysing of Chen Shui-bian's centrist perspective of the "New Middle Road", this thesis has shown that the centrist movement enabled the DDP government's advocacy of self-determination to modify its original radical stance on Taiwan's independence so as to compete with the KMT in elections and handle the sensitive cross-Strait relations. Nevertheless, given China's rigid stance on sovereignty and its policy of isolation, the administration of Chen in its opposition to Beijing's focus on the one-China principle put its emphasis on preserving Taiwan's sovereignty through upholding the status quo. Chen Shui-bian called for the consolidation of the island's democratic system and for the loyalty of its citizens to defend the country's sovereignty and counterattack the united front of the CCP and KMT. Chen Shui-bian's unique sovereign perspective of 'the ROC is Taiwan', associated with his endorsement of the self-determination formula and the explicit opposition to the one-China principle made him different from his predecessor Lee Teng-hui. As demonstrated, the primary political and social cleavage has been and remains the issue of Taiwan's sovereignty status, often referred to as the "unification-independence" (*tong du*) issue of state identity. Given the combined forces of the polarized identity politics and the highly contested electoral politics in Taiwan's post-authoritarian era, the absence of a clear domestic consensus on state identity has not only been perceived by political leaders to exacerbate the threat posed by Beijing, but also led them to respond in their particular ways.

(d) The fourth influence on Taiwan's grand strategy has been the realization of Taipei's military vulnerability. This thesis has argued that TGS has been an attempt to deal with Beijing's overwhelming strategic capability, which has

increased decisively with China's economic achievements since the 1990s. Sensitivity to the possibility of military defeat by Beijing was particularly apparent when Washington terminated its diplomatic relations and defence commitment to Taiwan in the late 1970s. Indeed, by 2005 Taipei's own assessment was that its capacity to defend itself and hold out against an all-out military invasion by Beijing had shrunk from one year, as presumed in the 1980s, to a mere two weeks.<sup>9</sup> The awareness of Taiwan's vulnerability and related pessimistic calculations have yielded the crucial assessment that Taiwan alone cannot defend itself against China in military terms.

(e) As a small state as Taiwan is, the development of Taipei's national strategy has constantly taken account of the strategic environment which has primarily been affected by the dynamics of Sino-American relations. Put differently, Taiwan's grand strategy has constantly been influenced by and to some extent subordinated to America's global strategy. As such, governed by the strategy of others, the development of Taiwan's grand strategy has shown that Taipei had little room to make its own strategic decisions; indeed, its national strategy has always been gauged in terms of the specific strategic environment in which it was operating. This explains, for example, why Taiwan, having secretly developed a nuclear weapon for several decades from the mid-1960s to enhance its limited strategic capability, nevertheless decided in 1988 to forgo this nuclear option so as to maintain its security relations with the US. Clearly, this was one of Taipei's most important and controversial strategic decisions. It must, however, also be noted that the ROC's leaders achieved a reasonable security link to America, even at the height of Sino-American strategic cooperation in the 1970s and 1980s, not least by identifying common interests with Washington and exploiting every opportunity arising from the conflicts and competition in US-China relations.

Fifth, this thesis has argued that the evolution of TGS up to 2008 comprises five distinct stages: the first was its "installation period", in which the KMT sought to install itself on Taiwan in an effort to manage its very survival following its

---

<sup>9</sup> Bernard D. Cole (2006) *Taiwan's Security - History and Prospects* (London: Routledge), p. 184.

defeat on mainland China before concluding the Sino-American Mutual Defence Treaty in 1954; the second was marked as the “outward-looking period”, during which Chiang Kai-shek’s government relentlessly prepared a military-political counter-attack on China against the backdrop of the Cold War from the mid-1950s to the end of the 1960s; the third was the “inward-looking period” from the 1970s to the end of the Chiang Ching-kuo administration in 1988, during which the administration changed its strategic focus from cross-Strait relations to domestic development after the onset of Taipei’s international isolation; the fourth, “the rapprochement period”, which involved the first efforts ever made towards political reconciliation with Beijing, coincided with Lee Teng-hui’s government in the 1990s, which adopted rapprochement with Beijing by conceding the prolonged sovereignty competition on mainland China, albeit with the intention of winning consensus from Beijing for the pursuit of Taipei’s international legitimacy and recognition; and the fifth phase, which for present purposes will be considered the “consolidation period”. This was managed by the advocates of self-determination in Chen Shui-bian’s administration, keen to ensure Taiwan’s sovereign independence from the PRC by promoting popular sovereignty via the installation of the Referendum Act.

Sixth, although most theorists of strategy, in particular those making up what is generally called the war-centred classical school, would focus on the way in which states pursue political ends by applying military means, this classic military-political formula of strategy does not capture the pursuit of national grand strategy by the ROC’s leaders. In empirical terms, after examining the development of Taiwan’s grand strategy since 1949, I have argued that there is simply no strong evidence to suggest that military means have played a decisive role in achieving Taipei’s political ends. On the contrary, the political ends to be gained by Taiwan’s grand strategy have instead been achieved by relying on non-military factors, such as the ability to appeal to other states, mainly Washington, for help and support. Moreover, during the “outward-looking period” of Chiang Kai-shek’s regime, Taipei’s insistence on preparing for military counter-attack in the confrontation with China in the 1950s-60s not only ended in failure, but also gave way to events, which caused Taipei’s international isolation. Ever since the “inward-looking period” began in the

1970s, Taipei's military construction has turned to a deterrent-oriented defensive posture to deal with Beijing's possible invasion, but the credibility of this deterrent capability has always been doubtful, even in Taipei's own assessment. Taipei's problematic experiences in relation to reliance on military means have been reflected in two crucial aspects of TGS: Taiwan's rather insufficient military capabilities in the face of the threat posed by Beijing and Taipei's preference, following Sun Tzu, for traditional Chinese strategic thinking, with its focus on "winning without fighting". Taipei's negative perspective on the use of force has thus had two profound impacts on TGS. First, it has become fundamentally dependent on Washington's willingness to assist in extending the cross-Strait status quo to secure Taiwan as a de facto state. Second, assuming certain military defeat in the event of war with Beijing, if Taipei fought on its own, and attempting accordingly to prevent such a war at all costs, the democratic government in Taiwan has opted for another strategic illusion. This amounts to a naïve pacifism indifferent both to danger as well as opportunity, which always also exists in the event of war. As a result, because of the remarkable period of relative peace across the Strait since the 1970s, this thesis has argued that Taipei has taken the peaceful situation across the Strait too much for granted. Accordingly, Taipei's political leaders, such as President Ma Ying-jeou's "No Unification, No Independence and No Use of Force" doctrine, have not only become infatuated with a perceived growing ability to rely more and more on non-military means against Beijing's military threat, but also have perceived this threat itself more skeptically. Hence, according to many experts in Washington, 'Taiwan simply does not take Chinese military threat as seriously as it should'.<sup>10</sup> Given Taipei's strategy of focusing on non-military means, not least on Washington's security commitment, the lack of credibility in its boasts of the power to defend itself will result not only in Beijing's military advantage, but also will likely undermine Washington's will to intervene in the event of war.

### C.8.3 Future Research Agenda

---

<sup>10</sup> Michael S. Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy: External Threats and Domestic Politics* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers), p.155.

The historical developments linked to the transformation of the ROC's state identity have provided a dynamic context for the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy. The research undertaken in this thesis has examined and explored Taiwan's grand strategy in the context of a series of crises across the Strait in conjunction with the perspectives and solutions of Taipei's authorities in dealing with them, while attempting to unify the themes discussed in a chronological framework. Through studying and connecting the various themes in the formulation and re-evaluation of its national grand strategy, this thesis has sought a better understanding of the distinctive features in the evolution of Taiwan's grand strategy explored here. However, because of different research focuses and space constraints, there remains a rich agenda for further research on Taiwan's grand strategy. The following will offer a cursory sketch that should be followed up by more detailed research.

First, the presidency-centred perspective of national grand strategy is a useful tool with which to deal with the emergent historical and political context out of which national strategies are made. However, the president does not stand still and alone in making national grand strategy. On the contrary, national grand strategy is the product of the dynamic process with which the president purposively engages with his surroundings, the strategic environment. This point has been generally valid, but it raises a potential research agenda when the concept is associated with small state theory.<sup>11</sup> Given the finding that a small state such as Taiwan has significantly been affected by the strategy of others, this combined theoretical perspective will provide an insight into the way to look at national grand strategy of a state's leader more specifically, not least how to win in asymmetric competition.

---

<sup>11</sup> On the theory and practice of small states in foreign policies and war, see for example, Christine Ingerbitzen, Iver Neumann, Sieglinde Gstohl and Jessica Beyer (eds.) (2006) *Small States in International Relations* (Seattle: University of Washington Press); Ivan Arreguin-Toft (2005) *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Rod Thornton (2007) *Asymmetric Warfare* (Cambridge: Polity Press); Robert L. Rothstein (1968) *Alliances and Small Powers* (New York: Columbia University Press); T. V. Paul (1994) *Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiation by Weaker Powers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); Handel, Michael I. (1990) *Weak States in the International System* (London: Frank Cass); Ronald P. Barston (ed.) (1973) *The Other Powers: Studies in the Foreign Policies of Small States* (London: George Allen & Unwin); Marshall R. Singer (1972) *Weak States in World of Powers: The Dynamics of International Relationships* (New York: The Free Press).

Second, another potential research direction to enhance our understanding of Taiwan grand strategy is to develop a theory of strategic culture, which refers to ‘a nation’s traditions, values, attitudes, patterns of behavior, habits, symbols, achievements and particular ways of adapting to environment and solving problems with respect to the threat and use of force.’<sup>12</sup> Given the finding of the vital role of the prime strategic actor’s perspective in making Taiwan’s grand strategy, the idea of strategic culture would potentially provide an alternative approach to explaining how the ideational factor, e.g., perception and belief, can play in broader aspects of the external cultural setting in which Taiwan’s military strategy has been distinctively formulated and developed. Although the strategic culture has a special focus on the military dimension, analysis of the cultural-military setting will offer provide insights into the way to understand how Taiwan’s unique geo-strategic situation, resources, history, military experiences and political beliefs are involved in making national strategy.

Third, while the thesis has demonstrated the importance of domestic factors, it has argued the role of the president’s perspective is decisive in initiating and shaping national grand strategy. While acknowledging that other domestic factors also matter, not least Taiwan’s party politics and poor constitutional design, this thesis has not explored them in the same detail. This became particularly clear when Chen Shui-bian’s administration suffered an unprecedented domestic political stalemate due to the polarization of the issue of state identity within the island’s party politics and the lack of an institutional mechanism to resolve the deadlock between the executive and legislative

---

<sup>12</sup> Alan Macmillan and Ken Booth (1999) ‘Strategic Culture - Framework of Analysis’, Booth, Ken and Russell Trood (eds.) (1999) *Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region* (London: Macmillan), p. 363. Other classic discussions of strategic culture theory, see Jack Snyder (1977) *The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation Report R-2154-AF); Ken Booth (1979) *Strategy and Ethnocentrism* (London: Croom Helm); Basil Liddell Hart (1935) *The British Way in Warfare: Adaptability and Mobility* (Harmondsworth: Penguin); Russell Weigley (1973) *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy* (New York: Macmillan); Colin Gray (1986) *Nuclear Strategy and National Style* (Lanham, MD: Hamilton Press); Alastair Iain Johnston (1998) *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press); Elizabeth Kier (1997) *Imaging War: French and British Military Doctrine Between the Wars* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press); Alan Macmillan (1996) *Strategic Culture and British Grand Strategy, 1945-1952* (Aberystwyth: University of Wales, Aberystwyth).

branches.<sup>13</sup> As Randall L. Schweller observes, domestic constraints often lead statesmen to respond slowly, ineffectively, haphazardly, or halfheartedly to external security threats.<sup>14</sup> This suggests us to undertake a further research on the relations between state leaders and domestic constraints in the context of making national security strategy. Indeed, from a theoretical standpoint, this also reminds us of the limits of structural realism, which exclusively focuses on the international system and its effects on foreign policy and pays insufficient attention to domestic factors, such as the influential force of ideational effects.

Fourth, in addition to domestic politics, further research should also focus on examining more closely the impact on Taiwan's grand strategy of the deepening cross-Straits economic relations. The cross-strait economic exchanges were not a major aspect of Taipei's relations with Beijing until Lee Teng-hui's rapprochement in the early 1990s. This is because both CKS and CCK simply forbade it. Given CCK's 'Three Nos' and his rejection of the 'Three Links' (*san tong*) (direct air transport, shipping and postal services), he was aware that the economic connection was part of Beijing's United Front policy. As demonstrated, Lee Teng-hui's and Chen Shu-bian were both cautious over Beijing's true intention behind the promotion of cross-Straits economic relations, given Lee's 'no haste, be patient' and Chen's 'reduction of the impact of China's magnetic effect'. Nevertheless, soon after the KMT retook power, the 'Three Links' were finally opened up on 15 December 2008, which was regarded as 'a major turning point for Taiwan's domestic politics and its relations with China'.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, although cross-Straits economic integration is accelerating, according to Christopher Hughes, there is still a long way to go before economic integration will be transformed into a greater political

---

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of identity issues and domestic politics in Taiwan see, for example, Christopher R. Hughes (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism: National Identity and Status in International Society* (London: Routledge); Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan*; Gunter Schubert and Jens Damm (ed.) (2011) *Taiwanese Identity in the Twenty-first Century: Domestic, Regional and Global Perspectives* (London: Routledge).

<sup>14</sup> Randall L. Schweller (2004) 'Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing', *International Security*, No.29, No.2 (Autumn, 2004). A empirical analysis of Taiwan's domestic factors in building national security, see Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy*, Chapter 8. A general discussion of domestic factors in national grand strategy, see Rosecrance, Richard and Arthur A. Stein (ed.) (1993) *The Domestic Basis of Grand Strategy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

<sup>15</sup> Christopher R. Hughes (2009) 'New Trend in Taiwan's China Policy', *The International Spectator*, 44: 2, p. 59.

integration because democratic norms and sovereignty consensus are still lacking across the Strait.<sup>16</sup> As a result, given the insight of liberal internationalism, it is worth further analysis to determine how and how far economic factors can improve or jeopardize Taiwan's security in the context of cross-Strait political deadlock.

#### **C.8.4 Further Policy Suggestions**

For further policy suggestions on this subject involves the question of how Taiwan's grand strategy is likely to evolve in the near to medium term. With respect to the more immediate prospects of TGS as a platform to uphold the survival of the ROC on Taiwan as a sovereign state, one should expect no big change, because the DPP, with its advocacy of self-determination, and the pro-one-China KMT cannot agree on the way in which the one-China principle is supposed to relate to Taiwan. On the one hand, since the former DPP government in 2000 proposed the doctrine of the 'Five Noes' to reconcile the dilemma between independence and unification, it is unlikely that the DPP will radically depart from this stance in the foreseeable future as long as China does not attempt any radical military intimidation to revise the status quo across the Strait. On the other hand, as popular sovereignty has been practised in the context of Taiwan's democratization since the 1990s, it would also be a mistake to assume that the KMT is likely to renounce the ROC's de facto sovereign independence in order to comply with Beijing's "one China" principle. Although the two major parties both reject Beijing's one-China principle, the strategic choice of the incumbent KMT government will focus on continuing to pursue peaceful coexistence across the Strait. This will imply proposing its own version of the "one China" principle to resume the dialogue with Beijing. Fresh evidence of the KMT's stance on this can be examined by the KMT's Ma Ying-jeou administration, which took power in May 2008.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, pp. 73-74.

In his inaugural address with the title “Taiwan’s Renaissance”, President Ma Ying-jeou pledged to ‘to achieve peace and co-prosperity’ across the Strait. He reiterated the so-called “1992 Consensus” whereby, with regard to the one-China principle, the two sides should follow the consensus already attained in the form of “one China, respective interpretations” to let cross-Strait interaction proceed.<sup>17</sup> While arguing in favour of ‘resolving cross-strait issues, what matters is not sovereignty but core values and the way of life’, Ma’s government proposed a new three Noes doctrine, “No Unification, No Independence and No Use of Force” (*bu du, bu tong, bu wu*), to ‘maintain the status quo across the Strait’ in order to secure Taiwan’s core values and way of life.<sup>18</sup> Ma justified the “Three Noes” doctrine with reference to two main factors: the need to represent “mainstream public opinion” in Taiwan and to act in accordance with the ROC’s Constitution.<sup>19</sup> It is also worth noting that Ma emphasized the status of Taiwan as ‘a beacon of democracy to Asia and the world’, saying that ‘Taiwan is the sole ethnic Chinese society to complete a second democratic turnover of power. Ethnic Chinese communities around the world have laid their hopes on this crucial political environment.’<sup>20</sup> By way of preventing an explicit confrontation with Beijing on the difference between their stances on sovereignty, Ma’s perspective on pursuing liberal democratic values and maintaining the cross-Strait status quo was well encapsulated in his “Three Noes” doctrine as the new underpinning for TGS in the context of the cross-Strait political-military confrontation. Accordingly, the new KMT government’s self-image of the ROC’s sovereign status can be regarded as a re-statement of *the ROC as Free China on Taiwan*.<sup>21</sup> To implement peaceful

---

<sup>17</sup> President Ma Ying-jeou’s inaugural speech (21 May 2008), English version in [http://www.president.gov.tw/en/prog/news\\_release/document\\_content.php?id=1105499687&page\\_id=1105499687&category\\_number=145&category\\_number\\_2=145](http://www.president.gov.tw/en/prog/news_release/document_content.php?id=1105499687&page_id=1105499687&category_number=145&category_number_2=145) (accessed on 14 June 2010)

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. Although Ma’s government has not explained whether there is any special preference ranking among the “Three Noes”, it is worth noting that the pro-unification government puts “No Unification” ahead of the “No Independence” in the doctrine.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid

<sup>20</sup> Ibid

<sup>21</sup> In an interview by *Newsweek* at 26 December 2005, Ma, as the then mayor of Taipei City, proclaimed a cross-Strait perspective of eventual reunification, but he has never mentioned it since he became president in 2008. Instead he proposed “No Unification” in his inaugural speech. In the 2005 interview, Ma said, ‘Actually, the mainland is not pushing unification any more. ... For our party [the KMT], the eventual goal is reunification, but we don’t have a timetable. At the moment, we don’t believe that either side is prepared to have unification... The

coexistence associated with its version of the “one China” principle, the pro-unification Ma government is likely to try to work towards a consensus with Beijing which will re-define and re-shape the status quo across the Strait. At the same time, Ma’s administration has continued to enhance Taiwan’s limited strategic capabilities by pursuing military innovation and economic growth, while also seeking to improve its strategic environment through keeping close relations with Washington and maintaining its deterrent-oriented defensive posture to prevent war. However, due to Taipei’s stance on its de facto sovereign independence, it is still unlikely that the sovereignty deadlock between Taipei and Beijing will be broken dramatically in the foreseeable future, despite the increasing economic interdependence and social interaction under the Ma government’s promotion of the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA) across the Strait.<sup>22</sup>

With regard to the longer-term prospects, the unprecedented scale and speed of China’s economic growth and military buildup over the last two decades have raised serious challenges to Taiwan’s grand strategy. A number of questions will need answering: first, can Taiwan preserve its de facto independence forever in the face of China’s threat? And what can possibly influence Taipei’s choice about whether or not to preserve its de facto political independence? What direction might any change take? There is no simple and straightforward strategy while Taipei struggles to address these questions. For example, while acknowledging Beijing’s military force as an important factor affecting Taiwan’s grand strategy, it is still hard to find anything that will compensate, with regard to strategic capabilities, for Taipei’s material-rooted weakness. However, if the development to date of TGS teaches anything, it is that likely effective compensation can come from outside the structure of the Taiwan-China asymmetric confrontation itself, namely, from the dynamics associated with the American factor. And the path and extent of America’s possible intervention in the cross-Strait issue will still depend on the complex Sino-

---

conditions are really not ripe yet.’ See <http://www.newsweek.com/2005/12/25/conditions-aren-t-ripe.html> (accessed in 14 June 2010)

<sup>22</sup> For reports for the ECFA from Ma’s perspective, see <http://www.chinapost.com.tw/taiwan/china-taiwan-relations/2010/06/13/260544/Taiwan-China.htm> (accessed in 14 June 2010) A detailed analysis of Ma’s China policy, see Hughes (2009) ‘New Trends in Taiwan’s China Policy’, pp. 59-74.

American relationship, as part of Washington's overall understanding of its role in the world, which is outside of Taiwan's control. Furthermore, there is also considerable uncertainty as regards possible domestic changes in the vision of the cross-Strait status quo held in either Taipei or Beijing, which will remain connected to the enduring debate of the unification-independence issue associated with the controversy surrounding Taiwan's sovereignty. For the present, there is still no consensus in the unification-independence debate in Taiwan, let alone between Taipei and Beijing.

Nevertheless, the DPP, advocating self-determination and the KMT, advocating one-China do have some common ground on the question of Taiwan's national security: that is, to protect the cross-Strait status quo, with regard to Taiwan as a *de facto* independent sovereign entity not subject to the PRC's control. Although both parties have their own political vision of Taiwan's future status, Taipei's vision of the status quo might also evolve further in the longer term as a function of the referendum mechanism, which was established by the Chen Shui-bian government. Should relevant situations arise, those in which Taiwan's leaders and people either need to respond to a tempting proposal by China or are intimidated by China's deliberate or accidental attack, the Taiwanese might dramatically revise their stance on the status quo which exhibits ambiguity on the issue of the longer-term desirability of either unification or independence. That Beijing's diplomatic influence succeeded in depriving Taipei of its international recognition as a sovereign state and that China's military threat has made it difficult for Taipei to consider the explicit declaration of Taiwan's independence is beyond doubt. However, Beijing's military-diplomatic coercion in challenging what the ROC has been for decades in Taiwan has produced significant insecurity and estrangement from China within Taiwan and hence has made it unlikely that any Taiwanese political party, even the KMT, will proceed with unification negotiations of any kind across the Strait in the foreseeable future. One of the obvious examples of this is that the KMT President Ma Ying-jeou publicly rejected cross-Strait reunification associated with the "Three Noes" doctrine under his administration; and it is even less likely that the anti-one-China DPP would endorse any cross-Strait unification proposal. Accordingly, a possible change in Taipei's current stance

on sovereignty, which would see the island move beyond the status quo, will rest on not only Taipei's assessment of prevailing external pressures, but also its future experiences of cross-Strait interaction. Ever since CCK, the unification or independence issue has not been the prime asset in Taiwan's grand strategy. However, given no solution on the sovereignty competition between the ROC on Taiwan and the PRC, the rigidity of Beijing's stance on sovereignty over Taiwan and its heavy hand against the island's having an international status have evidently resulted in a clear threat to the survival of the ROC's sovereignty. Beijing's threat, accompanied with the absence of a clear domestic consensus in Taiwan on the one-China issue, have led to a situation where the issue of state identity (*guojia rentong yiti*) rather than socio-economic cleavage has set a unique context for Taiwan's party politics.<sup>23</sup> It is in this context that the president's perspective of the ROC sovereign status has become crucial and relevant not only to the security strategy of the island but also the necessity of electoral politics. Given Beijing's military threat to impose its sovereignty claim, to proclaim the status quo, often referred to as 'no unification and no independence' in Taiwan's post-authoritarian era, it has become a salient strategy to secure the ROC's de facto sovereign status as a means of circumventing a direct clash with Beijing. As a result, the core underpinning of Taiwan's grand strategy will become the way in which Taipei's authority addresses and redefines the cross-Strait status quo to deal with Beijing and Washington and this will affect its future development accordingly.

This thesis also wants to point out that Taipei should give further thought to balancing the enthusiasm for pursuing non-military means with the continued inclination to strengthen the island's capability and determination for self-defence in the context of cross-Strait confrontation. Taiwan has to manage the threat posed by China's overwhelming military capability despite its insufficient military resources and the limited credibility of its deterrent. Nevertheless, the limitations of Taipei's military capabilities and the extended experience of securing relative peace by non-military means should not normally have blunted Taiwanese leaders' sense of the potential merit of employing military means to

---

<sup>23</sup> A further discussion of identity issues and party politics, see Fell (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan*, pp. 85-142.

resist the threat. Given the evidence of a decline in Taipei's military expenditure, regardless of China's substantial investment in its military buildup since the 1990s, Taipei's pacifism and obstinacy in applying non-military means in order to deal with Beijing's military threat have become more obvious and increasingly look naïve. Michael S. Chase describes this phenomenon as 'the puzzle of Taiwan's security policy'.<sup>24</sup> Indeed, Taipei's apparent indulgence in pacifism might not only undermine Taiwan's own fighting spirit, but also encourage China to resort to a coercive stance, including possible military action, and affect American attitudes to intervention. Taipei's way of endorsing non-military means can be encapsulated in the increasingly desperate belief in avoiding war, as if unilaterally renouncing war could achieve peace and hence stand as the core of Taiwan's grand strategy. The Ma administration's doctrine of "No Unification, No Independence, No Use of Force" also represents this kind of pacifism. While facing China's increasing military preparations for the event of war, Taipei has still chosen unilaterally to renounce the use of force in advance, reflecting Taiwan's optimistic view that non-military options will resolve the cross-Strait confrontation. The problem with this unilateral good will, which to some extent smells of appeasement, might not yield the expected favourable result of preventing a future military clash. This thesis therefore suggests that, as long as Taipei's principal strategic choice is concerned solely with avoiding war while Beijing continues to prepare for war if it fails to achieve its political objectives, the only possible settlement across the Strait will in the end be on terms dictated by Beijing. With Beijing sensing the advantage of exploiting and pursuing its military coercive posture, it is understandable that Chinese leaders have consistently declined to renounce the use of force in resolving the Taiwan issue.

In conclusion, with regard to further policy suggestions about Taiwan's grand strategy, this thesis has outlined certain general choices open to Taipei to stave off conflict with an increasingly strong China in which the latter possesses overwhelming material powers. These choices can be summarized in the following five ways. The first involves adopting an indirect approach, which

---

<sup>24</sup> Chase (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy*, pp.1-3.

would lead Taipei to circumvent a head-to-head independence-unification contest and to exploit the common ground and areas of ambiguity between these alternatives by defending the status quo, so as to minimize a possible military showdown across the Strait. Because of the political and societal estrangement between Taiwan and China, Taipei may still endorse its status quo strategy but has to keep an open mind as regards the unification option, if its terms are satisfactory to Taiwan, to maintain China's reasonable expectations on possible cross-Strait unification. All in all, the core of the indirect approach is designed in the first place, to deflect Beijing's will to fight. Second, planning for the day when the cross-Strait war occurs, triggered either by China's military coercion or invasion to impose unification, Taipei should opt for the classical realist self-help approach in holding its own against Beijing, by constructing solid self-defence capabilities involving every possible means, with a view to making Beijing fully conscious of the high costs of pursuing military options and to prolonging the military confrontation as long as possible until external assistance of any kind arrives or a favourable development emerges. Third, given the unique territorial advantage of the Taiwan Strait and the distribution of Taipei's limited and precious military resources, Taipei may need to consider more of an asymmetrical than a conventional approach to structure its armed forces against Beijing's overwhelming material power. As an extreme measure, Taipei should not totally exclude or discard its former nuclear programme in the interests of asymmetric warfare, as a desperate situation may demand desperate measures to deter war. In the event of conventional warfare, it is evident in the history of modern warfare that no amphibious invasion can be successfully implemented without command in the air. Accordingly, Taipei could focus its military efforts on the preparation for air warfare and supremacy in information warfare. The asymmetric approach, possibly involving a nuclear option or more conventional means, would serve to maximize Taipei's intrinsic military potential in order to raise the risk of war for Beijing to the highest possible level. Fourth, Taipei has to secure the moral foundation against Beijing's military actions with reference to the values of democracy, justice and peace. Taipei's embrace of a convincing moral cause is not only essential to establish the necessary domestic consensus against Beijing's military coercion but is also vital to sustain any prolonged or total war against Beijing in the event of a

military invasion. Fifth, though Taiwan may endeavour to defuse the cross-Strait conflict as well as to defend its own existence as a first consideration, this does not mean that Taiwan can afford to neglect the chance to exploit the strength of others. In fact, from Taipei's own past experience in relation to the cross-Strait confrontation, the TGS has always taken account of the international environment, in particular the American factor, though it has also been constrained by the same. Accordingly, Taipei needs a cocktail strategy, which builds on a combination of realist and liberalist insights, to further internationalise the Taiwan issue at all costs to increase the likelihood of international intervention in its favour in the event of war, so as to compensate for its own limited material power. In short, given the historical evidence that possessing superior material power does not necessarily lead to military-political domination, the small state of Taiwan might still have a fair chance of finding a way to deal with China to preserve its *de facto* sovereign independence. As Chiang Ching-kuo once put it, well encapsulating Taiwan's grand strategy, when facing unexpected and unmanaged changes in the dynamic strategic environment, 'Small nations have to adjust to international geopolitical circumstances and protect themselves the best they can.'<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Ray S. Cline (1989) *Chiang Ching-kuo Remembered: the Man and his Political Legacy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Global Strategy Council), p. 124.

## Bibliography

Academia Historica (ed.) (2000) *Documentary Collection on One China Discourse, Vol. I&II* (Taipei: Academia Historica).

Alagappa, Muthiah (ed.) (1998) *Asian Security Practice- Material and ideational Influences* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Alagappa, Muthiah (ed.) (2003) *Taiwan's Presidential Politics: Democratization and Cross-Straight Relations in the 21st Century* (Taiwan in the Modern World) (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Paperback).

Alagappa, Muthiah (ed.) (2003) *Asian Security Order – Instrumental and Normative Features* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

American Institute in Taiwan (2006), Press Conference, October 2006, at (<http://ait.org.tw/en/news/speeches/docs/20061026-dir.pdf>) (Accessed on 21 September 2009).

Arreguin-Toft, Ivan (2005) *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hartmann, Anja V. and Beatrice Heuser (ed.) (2001) *War, Peace and World Orders in European History* (London: Routledge).

Aron, Raymond (1976) *Clausewitz – Philosopher of War* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Arreguin-Toft, Ivan (2005) *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Art, Robert J. (2003) *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Art, Robert J. and Patrick M. Cronin (2003) *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press).

Art, Robert J. (2009) *America's Grand Strategy and World Politics* (London: Routledge)

Audi, Robert (1999) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Austin, Greg (1997) *Missile Diplomacy and Taiwan's Future: Innovations in Politics and Military Power* (Canberra: Strategic and Defence Studies at Australian National University).

Bagby, Wesley M. (1999) *America's International Relations since World War I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Barnett, A. Doak (1977) *China Policy: Old Problems and New Challenges* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution).

Bau, Tzong-ho and Wu Yu-shan (ed) (1999) *Contending Approaches to Cross-Straight Relations* (Taipei: Wu-Nan Publishers)

Baylis, John, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I and II: Theories and Concept* (London: Croom Helm)

Baylis, John and N.J. Renger (eds.) (1992) *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Baylis, John, James Wirtz, Eliot Cohen and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World – An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Baylis, John, James Wirtz and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2010): *Strategy in the Contemporary World - An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (Third Ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Baylis, John and James J. Wirtz (2010) ‘Introduction’, in Baylis, John, James Wirtz, and Colin S. Gray (ed.) (2010) *Strategy in the Contemporary World- An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (Third ed) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Beaufre, Andre (1965) *An Introduction to Strategy* (tr. R.H. Barry) (London: Faber & Faber)

Beaufre Andre (1965) *Deterrence and Strategy* (tr. R.H. Barry) (London: Faber & Faber).

Bedford, O. and Hwang, K. (2006). *Taiwanese identity and democracy: the social psychology of Taiwan's 2004 elections*. (New York, N.Y., Palgrave Macmillan).

Bellows, Thomas J. (1979) “Normalization: A Taiwan Perspective”, *Asian Affairs*, 6:6 (July/August), pp. 339-358.

Bienen, Henry (ed.) (1992) *Power, Economics and Security* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Biersteker , Thomas J. (2005) ‘State, Sovereignty and Territory’ in Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse and Beth A Simmons (eds.) (2005) *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage), pp. 157-176.

Black, Jeremy (2009) *Geopolitics* (London: Social Affairs Unit).

Bloom, W. (1990). *Personal identity, national identity and international relations*. (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Blouet, Brian W. (2001) *Geopolitics and Globalization in the Twentieth Century* (London: Reaktion Books).

Bond, Brian (1998) *The Pursuit of Victory: From Napoleon to Saddam Hussein* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Booth, Ken (1973) *The Military Instrument in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Aberystwyth: The United Service Institute for Defence Studies).

Booth, Ken (1979) *Strategy and Ethnocentrism* (London: Croom Helm).

Booth, Ken and Eric Herring (1994) *Strategic Studies: Keyguide to Information Resources* (London: Mansell, 1994).

Booth, Ken and Steve Smith (1995) *International Relations Theory Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Booth, Ken and Russell Trood (eds.) (1999) *Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region* (London: Macmillan).

Bowie, Robert R. and Richard H. Immerman (1998) *Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bowker, Mike and Phil Williams (1988) *Superpower Détente: A Reappraisal* (London: Sage).

Bristow, Damon (2003) ‘Taiwan’s Defence Modernization’, in Edmonds, M. and M. M. Tsai (eds.) (2003) *Defending Taiwan*.

Brodie, Bernard (1973) *War and Politics* (London: Cassell).

Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (eds.) (1996) *East Asian Security* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press).

Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (eds.) (2004) *Offense, Defense and War: An International Security Reader* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press).

Brown, M. J. (2004). *Is Taiwan Chinese?: The Impact of Culture, Power and Migration on Changing Identities*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Barston, Ronald P. (ed.) (1973) *The Other Powers: Studies in the Foreign Policies of Small States* (London: George Allen & Unwin)

Bull, Hedley (1995) *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (2<sup>nd</sup>.) (London: Macmillan).

Buruma, Ian (1996). “Taiwan’s New Nationalists,” *Foreign Affairs*, 75(4).

Burr, William (ed.) (1998) *The Kissinger Transcripts: The Top-Secret Talks with Beijing & Moscow* (New York: The New Press).

Bush, Richard C. (2005) *Untying the Knot: Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press).

Bush, Richard (2005) ‘Lee Teng-hui and “Separatism”’, in Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 70-92.

Bush, Richard (2006) ‘The US Policy of Dual Deterrence’, in Tsang, Steve (2006) *If China Attacks Taiwan: Military Strategy, Politics and Economics* (New York: Routledge), pp 35-53.

Buzan, Barry (1987) *An Introduction to Strategic Studies: Military Technology and International Relations* (London: Macmillan/IISS).

Buzan, Barry (ed.) (1987) *The International Politics of Deterrence* (London: Frances Printer).

Buzan, Barry (1991) *People, State, and Fear* (2<sup>nd</sup>) (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Buzan, Barry, Charles Jones, and Richard Little (1993) *The Logic of Anarchy-Neorealism to Structuralism Realism* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Buzan, Barry (1993) 'The Level of Analysis Problem Reconsidered', in Buzan, Barry, Charles Jones, and Richard Little (1993) *The Logic of Anarchy- Neorealism to Structuralism Realism* (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 198-216.

Buzan, Barry (1995) 'The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations Reconsidered', in Booth, Ken and Steve Smith (1995) *International Relations Theory Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press), pp.198-216.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, Jaape de Wilde(1998) *Security – A New Framework for Analysis* (London: Lynne Rienner).

Buzan, Barry and Lene Hansen (2009) The Evolution of International Studies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse and Beth A Simmons (eds.) (2005) *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage).

Carlsnaes, Walter (2007) 'Actors, Structure, and Foreign Policy Analysis', in Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne Ed. (2007) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 85-100.

Ceadel, Martin (1987) *Thinking about Peace and War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Chan, Steve (1978) 'Chinese Conflict Calculus and Behavior: Assessment from a Perspective of Conflict Management', *World Politics*, Vol.30, No.3, (April, 1978).

Chang, M. (2005). "Taiwan's Nationalistic Politics and Its Difficult 'Status Quo'." *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, 21(0).

Chao, Ching (1966), "A General Review of the Chinese Communist Artillery Shellings on Kinmen and Matsu During the Past Decade," *Issues and Studies* (Taipei), Vol.II, No.10 (July 1966).

Chao, Linda and Ramon H. Myers (1998) *The First Chinese Democracy: Political Life in the Republic of China on Taiwan* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press).

Charlton, Michael (1987) *From Deterrence to Defense: The Insight Story of Strategic Policy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press).

Chase, Michael S. (2005) 'US-Taiwan Security Cooperation: Enhancing an Unofficial Relationship', in Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Chase, Michael S. (2008) *Taiwan's Security Policy: External Threats and Domestic Politics* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers).

Chen, Pi-chao (2000) 'The Military Balance across the Taiwan Strait', from conference paper (January 2000) (Taipei: Taiwan Research Institute).

Cheng, Chen (1961) *Land Reform in Taiwan* (Taipei: China Publishing Company).

Chen, Ching-Pu (2006) 'Defense Policy-Making and Civilian Roles', in Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (ed.) (2006) *Taiwan's Defense Reform* (Oxon: Routledge).

Chen, Ming-tong and the Taiwan Security Research Group (2006) *The China Threat Cross the Strait: Challenges and Strategies for Taiwan's National Strategy* (Taipei: Dong Fong Color Printing).

Chen, Peng-ren (1990) *The Life of Chiang Ching-kuo* (Taipei: Central Daily News Publishers).

Chen, Shui-bian (1990) *Conflict, Compromise and Progress*, (Taipei: Chen Shui-bian Parliament Office).

Chen, Shui-bian and Ko Chen-heng (1992) *White Paper on the Black Box of Defence* (Taipei: Formosa Foundation).

Chen, Shui-bian and Zhou Wan-jing (1996) *Cross-Century Warcraft: Chen Shui-bian's Visions of Defence Policy and Management* (Taipei: China Times Publishing Co.).

Chen, Shui-bian's inaugural address, 'Taiwan Stand Up: Advancing to Uplifting Era', Government Information Office, 20 May 2000, at (<http://th.gio.gov.tw/pi2000/>) (Accessed on 21 September 2009).

Chen, Shui-bian's statement (2000), 'Celebration of ROC Military Academy's 76th Birthday', Office of President, 16 June 2000, at (<http://www.president.gov.tw>) (Accessed on 21 September 2009).

Chen, Shui-bian's presidential statement, 'Cross-Century Remarks', Office of President, 31 December 2000, at ([http://www.president.gov.tw/1\\_president/subject-044.html](http://www.president.gov.tw/1_president/subject-044.html)) (accessed on 21 September 2009).

Chen, Shui-bian (2000) *The Son of Taiwan: The Life of Chen Shui-bian and his Dreams for Taiwan* (English edition, tr. by David J. Toman) (Taipei: Taiwan Publishing Co., Ltd).

Chen, Shui-bian (2001) *The Maiden Voyage into the New Century: Meditation of Political Parties Rotation, Five Hundred Days After* (*Shiji shouhang: zengdang lunti wubaitian di chensi*) (Taipei: Eurasian Press).

Chen, Shui-bian (2004) *Believe Taiwan: President A-bian Reports to the People* (*Xiangxin taiwan: abian zongtong xiang renmin baogao*) (Taipei: Eurasian Press).

Chen, York W. and Martin Edmonds (2006) 'An Overview of Taiwan's Defense Reform', in Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2006) *Taiwan's Defense Reform* (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 63-78.

Cheng, T. J. (2005) 'China-Taiwan Economic Linkage: Between Insulation and Superconductive', Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Chiang, Ching-kuo (1986) *China's Reunification and World Peace* (Taipei: Kuomintang).

Chiang Ching-kuo (1992) *Collected Speeches of Chiang Ching-Kuo* (*Jiang jingguo xiangsheng quanji*), Vol.1-24 (Taipei: Government Information Office)

Chiang, Kai-shek (13 March, 1950) "Mission and Goal of My Return", at <http://zh.wikisource.org/zh/復職的目的與使命> (accessed on 5 August, 2010).

Chiang, Kai-Shek (1952), *Selected Speeches and Messages of President Chiang Kai-Shek, 1949-52* (Taipei: Office of the Government Spokesman).

Chiang, Kai-shek (1957) *The Digest of the Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare* (Taipei: General Department of Political Warfare of Military of National Defense, 1957).

Chiang, Kai-shek (1957) *Soviet Russia in China: A Summing-up at Seventy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy).

Chiang, Kai-shek (1963) *The Works of President Chiang* (Taipei: Institute of National Defence Study).

Chiang, Kai-shek (1971) *The Collection of Military Speeches of President Chiang* (Taipei: the Editorial Committee of the Zhongxing Speeches Collections of President Chiang).

Chiang, Kai-shek (1974) *Aphorisms of President Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: Government Information Office).

Chiang, Kai-shek (1975) *The Digest of Instructions of the Late Leader on Political Warfare* (Taipei: General Department of Political Warfare of Ministry of National Defence).

Chiang Kai-shek (1984) *Complete Collection of President Chiang's Ideas and Speeches' (Xian zongtong jianggong sixiang yanlun zongji)*, Vol. 1-40 (ed. by Qin Xiaoyi) (Taipei: the Kuomintang (KMT) Historical Committee).

Chien, Fredrick F. (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 1: Diplomatic Dynamics (Qian Fu huiyi lu: waijiao fengyun dong)* (Chinese Edition) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing Group).

Chien, Fredrick F. (2005) *The Reminiscences of Chien Fu, Vol. 2: the Arduous Journey to Washington (Qian Fu huiyi lu: wai iao fengyun dong)* (Chinese edition)

*China and the Asian-African Conference* (1955) (Beijing: Foreign Language Press)

Ching, Ping and Dennis Bloodworth (1976) *The Chinese Machiavelli: 3000 Years of Chinese Statecraft* (London: Secker & Warburg).

Chiu, Hungdah (ed.) (1973) *China and the Question of Taiwan: Documents and Analysis* (New York: Prager).

Chiu, Hungdah (ed.) (1979) *China and the Taiwan Issue* (New York: Prager).

Chou, En-Lai, 'On Taiwan Fighting', in Young, Hum Kim (ed.) (1968) *Twenty Years of Crisis: The Cold War Era* (London: Prentice-Hall International).

Christensen, Thomas J. (1996) *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Chu, Yun-han and Lin, Jih-wen (2001) 'Political Development in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Taiwan: State-Building, Regime Transformation and the Construction of National Identity', in Goldstein, S. M. and R. L. Edmonds (eds.) (2001). *Taiwan in the twentieth century: a retrospective view.* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Chung, Chien (2000) High-tech War Preparation of PLA - Taking Taiwan without Bloodshed., *Taiwan Defence Affairs*, Vol.1.

Cimbala, Stephen J. (1994) *Military Persuasion – Deterrence and Provocation in Crisis and War* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press)

Clark, Cal (2001) ‘Successful Democratisation in the ROC: Creating a Security Challenge’, in Tan, Alexander C., Steve Chan, Calvin Jillson (2001) *Taiwan’s National Security : Dilemmas and Opportunities* (Aldershot : Ashgate), pp. 18-59.

Clausewitz, Carl von (1993) *On War* (tr. Michael Howard and Peter Paret) (London: Everyman’s Library).

Clausewitz, Carl von (1976) *On War* (eds. and tran. Michael Howard and Peter Paret) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Cline, Ray S. (1989) *Chiang Ching-kuo Remembered: the Man and his Political Legacy* (Washington, D.C.: United States Global Strategy Council).

Clubb, O. Edmund (1959), “Formosa and the Offshore Islands in American Foreign Policy, 1950-55,” *Political Science Quarterly*, LXXIV, No.4 (December 1959), 517-31.

Cohen, Warren I. and Akira Iriye (eds.) (1990) *The Great Powers in the East Asia: 1953-1960* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Cole, Bernard D. (2006). *Taiwan’s Security: History and Prospects*. (London: Routledge).

*Collected Documents of Sino-American Relations* (1960), vol.2, part 2 (Beijing: World Knowledge Publishing House),

Collins, Alan (ed.) (2007) *Contemporary Security Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Collins, John M. (1973) *Grand Strategy: Principles and Practices* (Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press).

Collins, John M. (2002) *Military Strategy: Principles, Practices and Historical Perspectives* (Washington, D.C.: Brassey).

Commanding Centre for Chen Shui-bian’s Presidential Campaign (1999) *Chen Shui-bian’s Blueprint for State, National Defence* (Taipei: Commanding Centre for Chen Shui-bian’s Presidential Campaign), at (<http://forums.chinatimes.com.tw/report/newgov/paper/520-3.htm>) (accessed on 21 September 2009)

Cooper, Andrew F. and Timothy M. Shaw (ed.) (2009) *The Diplomacies of Small States: Between Vulnerability and Resilience* (London: Palgrave Macmillan).

Cooper, John F. (1996) *Taiwan: Nation-State or Province* (Boulder: Westview Press).

Gordon A. Craig (1998) ‘The Political Leader as Strategist’, in Paret, Peter (ed.) (1998) *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 481-510.

Cronberg, Tarja (2005) 'US Missile Defence: Technology Primacy in Action', in Heurlin, Bertel and Sten Rynning (eds.) (2005) *Missile Defence - International, Regional and National Implications* (New York: Routledge).

Crotty, Michael J. (1998) *The Foundation of Social Research: Meaning and Perspectives in the Research Process* (London: Sage).

Crozier, Brian (1976) *The Man Who Lost China: The First Full Biography of Chiang Kai-Shek* (London: Angus & Robertson).

Dannreuther, Roland and John Peterson (2006) 'Introduction: Security Strategy as Doctrine', in Dannreuther, Roland and John Peterson (ed.) (2006) *Security Strategy and Transatlantic Relations* (London: Routledge).

DeNardo, James (1995) *The Amateur Strategist: Initiative Deterrence Theories and the Politics of the Nuclear Arms Race* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press);

Deibel, Terry L. (2007) *Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Dessler, D. (1989) 'What is at Stake in the Agency-Structure', *International Organization*, Vol.43, No.3, pp.441-73.

Devine, Fiona (1995) 'Qualitative Methods', in Marsh, David and Gerry Stoker (ed.) (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science* (London: Macmillan).

Dewitt, David B. (1994) 'Concept of Security for the Asia-Pacific Region', in Bunn Nagara and K.S. Balakrishnan (eds.) (1994) *The Making of Security Community in the Asia-Pacific* (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Institute of Strategic and International Studies).

Dickson, Bruce J. and Chien-min Chao (eds.) (2002) *Assessing the Lee Teng-hui Legacy in Taiwan's Politics: Democratic Consolidation and External Relations* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe).

Dittmer, Lowell (1987), 'The Strategic Triangle- A Critical Review', in Kim, Ilpyong (ed.) *The Strategic Triangle* (New York: Paragon House).

Dittmer, Lowell (1992) *Sino-Soviet Normalization and its International Implications* (Seattle: University of Washington Press).

Division of Lee Teng-hui's Oral History (ed.) (2004) *Witness Taiwan: President Chiang Ching-kuo and I* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication).

Edward R. Drachman and Alan Shank (1997) *Presidents and Foreign Policy* (New York: State University of New York Press).

Dreyer, June Teufel (1997) 'A History of Cross-Strait Interchange', in James R. Lilley and Chuck Downs (eds.), *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: National Defence University Press).

Dreyer, June Teufel (2007). "Understanding the Status Quo- Perception and Reality on China-Taiwan Relations." *The RUSI Journal*, Vol.152, No.1, p.48.

Dumbaugh, Kerry (2006) *Taiwan-US Political Relations: New Strains and Changes*, CRS Report to Congress, 10 October 2006, at (<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/IS/2006/CRS-1006.pdf>) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

Dunn, Keith A. (ed.) (1987) *Conflict Termination and Military Strategy: Coercion, Persuasion and War* (Boulder: Westview Press).

Earle, Edward Mead (ed.) (1943) *Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Eastman, Lloyd E. (1974) *The Abortive Revolution: China under Nationalist Rule, 1927-1937* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2003) *Defending Taiwan: The Future Vision of Taiwan's Defence Policy and Military Strategy* (London: RoutledgeCurzon).

Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (Eds.) (2003) *Taiwan's Maritime Security* (London: RoutledgeCurzon).

Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2006) *Taiwan's Defense Reform* (Oxon: Routledge).

Ehrlich, Robert (1985) *Waging Nuclear Peace: The Technology and Politics of Nuclear Weapons* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Eisenhower, Dwight D. (1963) *The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953-1956* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday).

Eisenhower, Dwight D. (1965), *The White House Years, Vol.II, Waging Peace, 1956-1961* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday).

Erickson, Andrew S., Andrew R. Wilson, Lyle J. Goldstein, and William S. Murray (eds.) (2007) *China's Future Nuclear Submarine Force* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press)

Erickson, Andrew S., Lyle J. Goldstein, and Carnes Lord (eds.) (2009) *China Goes to Sea: Maritime Transformation in Comparative Historical Perspective* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press).

Fell, Dafydd (2005) *Party Politics in Taiwan: Party Change and the Democratic Evolution of Taiwan, 1991-2004* (London: Routledge).

Feng, Zhong-ping (1994) *The British Government's China Policy, 1945-50* (Keele: Ryburn Publishing).

Finnemore, Martha (1996) *National Interests in International Society* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Fitzgerald, C. P. (1964) *The Chinese View of Their Place in the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Foch, Ferdinand (2002) *Principles of War* (tr. Hilaire Belloc) (New Delhi, India: Reliance Publishing House).

Freeman, Chas. W., Jr. (July-August 1998) "Preventing War in the Taiwan Strait: Restraining Taiwan-and-Beijing", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, pp. 6-11.

Freedman, Lawrence (1989) *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (London: Macmillan/IISS)

Freedman, Lawrence, Paul Hayes and Robert O'neill (ed) (1992) *War, Strategy, and International Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Freedman, Lawrence (ed.) (1994) *War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Freedman, Lawrence (ed.) (1998) *Strategic Coercion – Concepts and Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Freedman, Lawrence (1998) *The Revolution in Strategic Affairs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 318).

Freedman, Lawrence (2002) 'The Future of Strategic Studies', in Baylis, John, James Wirtz, Eliot Cohen and Colin S. Gray (eds.) (2002): *Strategy in the Contemporary World - An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Freedman, L. (2006). *The transformation of strategic affairs*. (Abingdon, New York: Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 379).

Friedman, Edward (ed) (2006) *China's Rise, Taiwan's Dilemmas and International Peace* (London: Routledge).

Gaddis, John Lewis (1982) *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Gaddis, John Lewis (1998) *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Gaddis, John Lewis, Philip H. Gordon, Ernest R. May, and Jonathan Rosenberg (ed.) (1999) *Cold War Statesmen Confront the Bomb: Nuclear Diplomacy since 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Garnett, John (1987) 'Strategic Studies and Its Assumption', in Baylis, John, Ken Booth, John Garnett, and Phil Williams (1987) *Contemporary strategy I: Theories and Concept* (London: Croom Helm)

Garson, Robert (1994) *The United States and China since 1949: A Troubled Affair* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press).

Garthoff, Raymond L. (1994) *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Regan* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution).

Garver, John W. (1997) *The Sino-American Alliance: Nationalist China and American Cold War Strategy in Asia* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe).

Garver, John W. (1997) *Face Off: China, the United States and Taiwan's Democratization* (Seattle: University of Washington).

Gaston, James C. (ed) (1992) *Grand Strategy and the Decisionmaking Process* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press).

George, Alexander L. (1969) 'The "Operational Code": A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 13(2), (June, 1969), pp.190-222.

George, Alexander L. and Richard Smoke (1974) *Deterrence in American foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Columbia University Pres).

George, Alexander L. and Richard Smoke (1974) *Deterrence in American foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Columbia University Pres).

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Giddens, Anthony (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Ginsburg, Norton (1968) 'On the Chinese Perception of a World Order', in Tang Tsou (ed.) (1968) *Chinese in Crisis*, Vol.2 (Chicago: Chicago University Press).

Goldstein, Avery (1991) *From Bandwagon to Balance-of-Power Politics: Structural Constraints and Politics in China, 1949-1978* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Goldstein, Avery (2005) *Rising to the Challenge: China's Grand Strategy and International Security* (Stanford: Standford University Press).

Gordon, Kermit (ed.) (1969), *Agenda for the Nation* (New York: Doubleday).

Gordon, Leonard H.D. (1985) "United States Opposition to Use of Force in the Taiwan Strait, 1954-1962", *The Journal of American History*, Vol.72, No.3 (Dec., 1985), pp.637-660.

Goldstein , S. M. and R. L. Edmonds (eds.) (2001) *Taiwan in the Twentieth Century: A retrospective view*. (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Goldstein, Steven M. and Julian Chang (ed.) (2008) *Presidential Politics in Taiwan: The Administration of Chen Shui-bian* (Norwlk, CT: EastBridge).

Gray, Colin (1986) *Nuclear Strategy and National Style* (Lanham, MD: Hamilton Press).

Gray, Colin S. (1999) *Modern Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Greenstein, Fred (1967) 'The Impact of Personality on Politics: An Attempt to clear Away Underbrush', *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 61(3) (September, 1967), pp. 629-641.

Greenstein, Fred I. (1969) *Personality and Politics* (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company).

Guertner, Gary L. (1993) *The Search for Strategy: Politics and Strategic Vision* (Westport: Greenwood Press).

Gurtov, Melvin and Byong-Moo Huang (1980) *China under Threat: The Politics of Strategy and Diplomacy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Haas, Ernst B. and Philippe C. Schmitter (1964) 'Economics and Differential Patterns of Poltical Integration: Projections about the Unity in Latin America', in *International Organization*, Vol.18, No.4 (Autumn, 1964), pp.705-737.

Haas, Ernst B. (1968) 'Technocracy, Pluralism, and the New Europe', in Joseph S. Nye Jr, *International Regionalism: Readings* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown), pp.149-176.

Halperin, Morton H. (1966) *The 1958 Taiwan Strait Crisis: A Document History* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Memorandum RM-4900-ISA, December 1966).

Handel, Michael I. (1990) *Weak States in the International System* (London: Frank Cass).

Hargrove, Erwin C. and John E. Owens (eds.) (2003) *Leadership in Context* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).

Hartmann, Anja V. and Beatrice Heuser (ed.) (2001) *War, Peace and World Orders in European History* (London: Routledge).

Hau, Pei-tsung (1994) *Regretless (Wu kui)* (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing).

Hau, Pei-tsung (1995) *Fearless (Wu ju)* (Taipei: Wu-Si Bookshop).

Hau, Pei-tsung (1995) *Chiang Ching-kuo's late years in the Journal of General Hau (Hao zongzhang riji zhongdi jingguo xiangsheng wannian )* (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing).

Hau, Pei-tsung (2000) *Diary of Eight Years as Chief of the General Staff, Vol.1 & 2 (Banian canmou zongzhang riji)* (Chinese Edition) (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing).

Hay, Colin (2002) *Political Analysis - A Critical Introduction* (New York: Palgrave).

He Di (1990) "The Evolution of the People's Republic China's Policy toward the Offshore Islands", in Warren I. Cohen and Akira Iriye (eds.) (1990) *The Great Powers in the East Asia: 1953-1960* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Henderson, Gregory, Richard Ned Lebow and John G. Stoessinger (eds.) (1974) *Divided Nations in a Divided World* (New York: David McKay Company).

Henry L. Stimson Centre Working Group Report No.34 (2000), *Theater Missile Defenses in the Asia-Pacific Region*, from <http://www.stimson.org/japan/pdf/TMDReport.PDF> (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

Herring, Eric (1995) *Danger and Opportunity: Explaining International Crisis Outcomes* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Heurlin, Bertel and Sten Rynning (eds.) (2005) *Missile Defence - International, Regional and National Implication* (New York: Routledge).

Heuser, Beatrice (2002) *Reading Clausewitz* (London: Pimlico).

Hill, Christopher (2003) *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Hinsley, F. H. (1986) *Sovereignty* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Ho, Szu-yui and Liu, I-chou (2003) 'The Taiwanese/Chinese Identity of the Taiwan People in 1990s', in Lee, Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (eds.) (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America), pp. 147-183.

Hoffmann, Erik P. and Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. (eds.) (1980) *The Conduct of Soviet Foreign Policy* (New York: Aldine Publishing Company).

Holsti, Ole R. and James N. Rosenau (1997) 'The Meaning of Vietnam: Belief System of American Leaders', *International Journal*, No.32 (Summer, 1977), pp. 452-474.

Howard, Michael (1972) (History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Military Series) *Grand Strategy Vol. IV: August 1942- September 1943* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office).

Howard, Michael (1983) *Clausewitz* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Howard, Michael (1983) *The Causes of Wars and Other Essays* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) (London: Maurice Temple Smith)

Howard, Michael (1989) *The Continental Commitment: The Dilemma of British Defence Policy in the Era of the Two World Wars* (London: The Ashfield Press)

Howe, Jonathan (1971) *Multicrises: Seapower and Global Politics in the Missile Age* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Hsieh, Alice Langley (1962) *Communist China's Strategy in the Unclear Era* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall/RAND).

Hsieh, Chiao Chiao (1985) *Strategy for Survival: The Foreign Policy and External Relations of the Republic of China on Taiwan* (London: Sherwood Press).

Hsiung, James C. (Ed.) (1983) *Contemporary Republic of China: The Taiwan Experience, 1950-1980* (New York: American Association for Chinese Studies).

Hsu, Hsin-liang (1995) *The Rising People (Xinxing minzu)* (Taipei: Yuan Liu Chubanshe).

Hsu, Hui-you (2004) 'Origins of Problematic National Identity', in Taiwan Advocates (ed.) (2004). *Cross-Strait Exchange and National Security of Taiwan* (Taipei: Taiwan Advocates).

Hu, Ching-fen (2005) 'Taiwan's Geopolitics and Chiang Ching-kuo's Decision to Democratize Taiwan', *Stanford Journal of East Asia Affairs*, Vol.5, No.1 (Winter 2005), pp. 26-44.

Hu, Jason C. (1992) *Creating the Future: A New Era for the Chinese People* (Taipei: Government Information Office, ROC).

Hu, Pu-yu (1971) *The Military Exploits and Deeds of President Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: Chung Wu Publishing Co.).

Huang, Alexander Chieh-cheng (1997) 'Taiwan's View of Military Balance and the Challenge it Presents', in Lilley, James R. and Chuck Downs (eds.) (1997) *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press).

Huang, Chi (2008) 'Referendum and Democracy: The Experiences of Taiwan', in Philip Paolino and James Meerink (eds) (2008) *Democratization in Taiwan: Challenges in Transformation* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate).

Huang, Ren-yu (1994) *A Macro Historical Perspective on Interpreting Chiang Kai-shek's Diary* (Taipei: China Times Publishers)

Hudson, Valerie M. (2007) *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield).

Hudson, Valerie M. (2007) 'The History and Evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis', in Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne (eds) (2007) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.11-29.

Hughes, Christopher R. (1997) *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism – National Identity and Status in International Society* (London: Routledge).

Hughes, Christopher R. (1999) 'Democratization and Beijing's Taiwan Policy', in Steve Tsang and Hung-mao Tien (eds.) (1999) *Democratization in Taiwan: Implications for China* (London: Macmillan), pp. 130-147.

Hughes, Christopher R. (2001) 'Living with "One Country, Two Systems"? The Future of Beijing's Taiwan's Policy', in *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol.14 (2) (April 2001), pp. 124-138.

Hughes, Christopher R. (2006) *Chinese Nationalism in the Global Era* (London: Routledge).

Christopher R. Hughes (2009) 'New Trend in Taiwan's China Policy', *The International Spectator*, 44: 2, pp. 59-74.

Hughes, John A. and Wesley W. Sharrock (1997) *The Philosophy of Social Research* (London: Addison Wesley Longman).

Inbar, Efraim and Gabriel Sheffer (eds.) (1997) *The National Security of Small States in a Changing World* (London: Frank Cass).

Ingebritsen, Christine, Iver B. Neumann, Sieglinde Gstohl, Jessica Beyer (ed.) (2006) *Small States in International Relations* (Seattle: University of Washington Press)

Jackson, Robert (1999) 'Introduction: Sovereignty at the Millennium', *Political Studies*, Vol.47(3), (Specially Issue, 1999), pp. 423-430.

Jackson, Robert (1999) 'Sovereignty in World Politics: a Glance at the Conceptual and Historical Landscape', *Political Studies*, Vol.47(3), (Specially Issue, 1999), pp. 431-456.

Jacobs, J. Bruce (2012) *Democratizing Taiwan* (Boston: Brill).

James, Alan (1999) 'The Practice of Sovereign Statehood in Contemporary International Society', *Political Studies*, Vol.47(3), (Specially Issue, 1999), pp. 457-473.

Jervis, Robert (1976) *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Jervis, Robert, Richard Ned Lebow and Janice Gross Stein (1985) *Psychology and Deterrence* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Jervis, Robert and Jack Snyder (ed.) (1991) *Dominos and Bandwagons – Strategic Beliefs and Great Power Competition in the Eurasian Rimland* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Jessop, Bob (2008) *State Power* (Cambridge: Polity).

Ji, Le-yi (2006) *Safeguard Action: A Record of the 1996 Strait Missile Crisis* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Culture Enterprise)

Johnston, Alastair Iain (1998) *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Johnston, Alastair Iain (2004) 'Beijing's Security Behavior in the Asia-Pacific' in Suh, J.J., Peter J. Katzenstein and Allen Carlson (eds.) (2004) *Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power and Efficiency* (Stanford: Stanford University Press), pp. 34-96.

Johnston, Alastair Iain (2003). "Is China a status quo power?" *International Security*, Vol. 27(4), pp. 5-56.

Joffe, Ellis (1987) *The Chinese Army after Mao* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson).

Kallgren, Joyce (1963), 'Nationalist China's Armed Forces', *China Quarterly*, No.15 (Jul.-Sep., 1963).

Kagan, Richard C. (2007) *Taiwan's Statesman: Lee Teng-Hui and democracy in Asia* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press)

Kahin, George McTurnan (1956) *The Asian-African Conference: Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Kaldor, Mary (2007) *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) (Stanford: Stanford University Press)

Kalicki, J.H. (1975) *The Pattern of Sino-American Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Kallgren, Joyce (1963), 'Nationalist China's Armed Forces', *China Quarterly*, No.15 (Jul.-Sep., 1963), pp. 35-44.

Kan, S. (2002). "Taiwan: Major US Arms Sales Since 1990.", from <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL30957.pdf> (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

Kan, Shirley A. (2006) *China/Taiwan: Evolution of the "One China" Policy- Key Statements from Washington, Beijing and Taipei*, CRS Report to Congress, p.7, at (<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL30341.pdf>) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

Kao, Wen-ke (1991) *Taiwan Yu Dalu Fengyun Sishi Nian* (Forty Years of Confrontation between Taiwan and China) (ChangChun, Kirin: Kirin Wen Shi Publisher).

Katzenstein, Peter J. (ed.) (1996) *The Culture of National Security – Norms and Identity in World Politics* (New York: Columbia).

Kennedy, Paul (1987) *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economics Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (New York: Random House)

Kennedy, Paul (ed) (1991) *Grand Strategies in War and Peace* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Khalilzad, Zalmay M. and Jeremy Shapiro (eds.) (2002) *United States Air and Space Power in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Santa Monica: RAND).

Kier, Elizabeth (1997) *Imaging War: French and British Military Doctrine Between the Wars* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Kim, Ilpyong (ed.) (1987) *The Strategic Triangle: China, The United States and the Soviet Union* (New York: Paragon House).

Kissinger (1973), *A World Restored* (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin).

Kissinger, Henry A. (1979) *The White House Years* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson).

Kissinger, Henry A. (1994) *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone Book).

Klein, Bradley S. (1994) *Strategic Studies and World Order: The Global Politics of Deterrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Krasner, Stephen D. (2009) *Power, the State, and Sovereignty* (London: Routledge).

Kratochwil, Friedrich and John Gerard Ruggie (1986) 'International Organization: A State of the Art on an Art of the State', *International Organization*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Autumn), pp. 753-775.

Kuo Ming (1999) 'Tang Fei Reviewing TMD', *The Journalist (xin-xin-wen)*, No.651 (Taipei: 28 August 1999).

Lai, Ming-tang (1994) *The Reminiscences of General Ming-Tang Lai, Vol. I and II* (Taipei: Academia Historica).

Lai, Tse-Han, Ramon H. Myers and Wei Wou (1991) *The Tragic Beginning: The Taiwan Uprising of February 29, 1947* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Laster, Martin L. (1992) 'US Arms Sales to Taiwan', in Steven W. Mosher (Ed.) (1992) *The United States and the Republic of China: Democratic Friends, Strategic Allies and Economic Partners* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Periodicals).

Lasater, Martin L. (1993) *U.S. Interests in the New Taiwan* (Boulder: Westview Press).

Lauren, Paul Gordon, Gordon A. Craig, and Alexander L. George (2006) *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Challenges of Our Time*. (4th ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Layne, Christopher (2006) *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)

Lee, Bernice (1999) *The Security Implication of the New Taiwan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 331)

Lee, Bernice (1999) *The Security Implication of the New Taiwan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/IISS, Adelphi Paper 331).

Lee, David Tawei (2000) *The Making of the Taiwan Relations Act: Twenty Years in Retrospect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lee, Teng-hui (1991) 'The Goal and Meaning of the National Unification Guidelines' (Chinese version), in Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), pp. 367-377.

Lee, Teng-hui (1991) 'From Uncertainty toward the Pragmatic Era', in Lee Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.), pp. 379-390.

Lee, Teng-hui (1992) 'Termination of the Period of National Mobilization for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion', in Hu, Jason C. (ed.) (1992) *Creating the Future: A New Era for the Chinese People* (Taipei: Government Information Office, ROC), pp. 37-62.

Lee, Teng-hui (1995) *Managing the Great Taiwan (Jingying da Taiwan)* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.).

Lee, Teng-hui (1995) 'We Are All New Taiwanese', in Lee, Teng-hui and Zhang, Y. (1996). *Closely Read Lee Teng-hui (Xi du Li Denghui)*. (Taipei: Zhong Yang Ri Bao Chu Ban Bu).

Lee, Teng-hui's speech at Cornell University (9 June 1995) (English version): in <http://taiwanreview.nat.gov.tw/site/Tr/ct.asp?xItem=126&CtNode=119> (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

Lee, Teng-hui's inaugural speech as President (20 May 1996), Chinese version in [http://newcongress.yam.org.tw/taiwan\\_sino/05201.html](http://newcongress.yam.org.tw/taiwan_sino/05201.html) (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

Lee, Teng-hui & Zhang, Y. (1996). *Closely Reading Lee Teng-hui (Xi du Li Denghui)*. (Taipei: Zhong Yang Ri Bao Chu Ban Bu).

Lee, Teng-hui (1999) *The Road to Democracy: Taiwan's Pursuit of Identity* (English version) (Tokyo: PHP Institute).

Lee, Teng-hui (1999) 'Understanding Taiwan - Bridging the Perception Gap', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.78, No.6, pp.9-14.

Lee, Teng-hui and Nakajima Mineo (2000) *The Wisdom of Asia (Yazhou zhilve)* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.)

Lee, Teng-hui (2003) 'My Belief and Vision of Taiwan's Status and National Sovereignty', in Zhang Yan-xian (ed.) (2008) *An Interview of Lee Teng-hui: His Belief and Philosophy*, Vol. III (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication), pp. 215-223.

Lee, Teng-hui (2004) *Witness Taiwan: President Chiang Ching-kuo and Me* (Jianzheng taiwan: jiang jingguo zongtong) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication).

Lee, Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America).

Leifer, Michael (2001) 'Taiwan and South-East Asia: The Limits to Pragmatic Diplomacy', in Goldstein, S. M. and R. L. Edmonds (eds.) (2001). *Taiwan in the Twentieth Century: A Retrospective View*. (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Leites, C. Nathan (1953) *A Study of Bolshevism* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press).

Lewis, George, Lisbeth Gronlund and David Wright (1999) 'National Missile Defense: An Indefensible System', *Foreign Policy*, No. 117 (Winter), pp.120-137.

Lewis, John Wilson and Xue Litai (1988) *China Builds the Bomb* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).

Li, Rex (2004) ‘Security Challenge of an Ascendant China: Great Power Emergence and International Stability’, in Zhao, Suisheng (Ed) (2004) *Chinese Foreign Policy: Pragmatism and Strategic Behavior* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe).

Li, Rex (2009) *A Rising China and Security in East Asia: Identity Construction and Security Discourse* (New York: Routledge).

Liddell Hart, Basil (1935) *The British Way in Warfare: Adaptability and Mobility* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Liddell Hart, B. H. (1991) *Strategy* (2nd.) (London: Meridian).

Liddell Hart, Basil H. (1999) *Thoughts on War* (Staplehurst: Spellmount).

Lilley, James R. and Chuck Downs (eds.) (1997) *Crisis in the Taiwan Strait* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press).

Lin, Chia-lung (2001) ‘National Identity and Taiwan Security’, in Alexander C. Tan, Steve Chan, Calvin Jillson (2001) *Taiwan’s National Security*, pp. 60-83.

Lin, Chia-lung and Bo Tedards (2003) ‘Lee Teng-hui: Transformational Leadership in Taiwan’s Transition’ in Lee, Wei-chin and T.Y. Wang (eds.) (2003) *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui Era: Politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000* (Lanham: University Press of America).

Lin, Cheng-yi (1989) *A Triangle Lesson of Taiwan’s Security: The Influence of the Communist China and the United States* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Qui Quan Publisher).

Lin, Cheng-yi (1995), “Taiwan’s Security Strategies in the Post-Cold War Era”, *Issues and Studies* (Taipei), Vol.31, No,4 (April 1995).

Lin, Chong-pin (1997) ‘The Military Balance in the Taiwan Strait’, in Shambaugh, D. L. and R. H. Yang (eds.) (1997). *China’s military in transition*. (Oxford: Clarendon).

Lin Zhao-zhen (2007) The Shadow Troop: Japanese White Unite in Taiwan (Taipei: China Times Press).

Litwak, Robert S. (1984) *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lo, Chih-cheng (2002, October 10) ‘Taiwan and International organizations’, *Taipei Journal*, <http://www.scu.edu.tw/politics/member/lowww/news/gio2.htm> (accessed on 8 October 2012).

Luo Tain-bin (1995) *Military Strong Man - Lee Teng-hui* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Formosa Publisher).

Luttwak, Edward N. (2001) *Strategy – The Logic of War and Peace* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Ma Ying-jeou’s interview by *Newsweek* at 26 December 2005, in <http://www.newsweek.com/2005/12/25/conditions-aren-t-ripe.html> (accessed in 14 June 2010)

Ma Ying-jeou’s inaugural speech (21 May 2008), English version in [http://www.president.gov.tw/en/prog/news\\_release/document\\_content.php?id=11054](http://www.president.gov.tw/en/prog/news_release/document_content.php?id=11054)

[99687&pre\\_id=1105499687&g\\_category\\_number=145&category\\_number\\_2=145](http://www.nixoncentre.org/index.cfm?action=showpage&page=tmd)  
(accessed on 14 June 2010)

Mackinder, Halford John (2009) *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics and Reconstruction* (London: Faber and Faber)

Macmillan, Alan (1996) *Strategic Culture and British Grand Strategy, 1945-1952* (Aberystwyth: University of Wales, Aberystwyth).

Madsen, Robert A. (1999), *Chinese Chess: US China Policy and Taiwan, 1969-1979* (PhD thesis, International Relations at Oxford University).

Mahan, A.T. (1889) *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783* (5<sup>th</sup>.) (London: Sampson Low, Marston & Company)

Mahnken, Thomas G. and Joseph A. Maiolo (ed) (2008) *Strategic Studies: A Reader* (London: Routledge).

Mann, James (1999) *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China, from Nixon to Clinton* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Manwaring, Max G., Edwin G. Corr, and Robert H. Dorff (ed.) (2003) *The Search for Security: A U.S. Grand Strategy for the Twenty-First Century* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger)

Maoz, Zeev (1990) *National Choices and International Process* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Marks, Thomas A. (1998) *Counterrevolution in China: Wang Sheng and the Kuomintang* (London: Frank Cass)

Marsh, David and R. A. W. Rodes (ed) (1992) *Policy Networks in British Government* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Marsh, David and Gerry Stoker (ed.) (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science* (London: Macmillan).

Mautner, Thomas (2000) *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy* (London: Penguin Books).

May, Greg (1999) *Thinking About TMD: Relations With China and Asia's Stability*, from <http://www.nixoncentre.org/index.cfm?action=showpage&page=tmd> (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

McNeilly, Mark (2001) *Sun Tzu and the Art of Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

McVadon, Eric A. (2009) 'China's Navy Today: Looking toward Blue Water', in Erickson Andrew S., Lyle J. Goldstein and Carnes Lord (eds.) (2009) *China Goes to Sea: Maritime Transformation in Comparative Historical Perspective* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press)

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1983). *Conventional deterrence*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Meiertons, Heiko (2010) *The Doctrines of US Security Policy: An Evaluation under International Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Miao, Chia-chi (2003) *Chiang Ching-kuo's Life and the Transformation of his Ideas* (Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press).

Miller, W. L. (1995) 'Quantitative Methods', David Marsh and Gerry Stoker (ed.) (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science* (London: Macmillan), pp. 154-172.

Ministry of National Defense, ROC (ed.) (1970) *The ROC Sixtieth Commemoration, October 1970* (Taipei: Ministry History & Translation Bureau).

Ministry of National Defence (1992) *National Defence Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise).

Ministry of National Defence (1994) *National Defence Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise).

Ministry of National Defence (1996) *National Defence Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise).

Ministry of National Defence (1998) *National Defence Report* (Chinese version) (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise).

Ministry of National Defence (2000) *National Defence Report* (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence, ROC).

Ministry of National Defence (2002) *National Defence Report* (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence and Liming Cultural Inc).

Ministry of National Defence (2004) *National Defence Report* (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence)

Ministry of National Defence (2006) *National Defence Report* (Taipei: Ministry of National Defence)

Moller, Bjorn (1992) *Common Security and Nonoffensive Defense: A Neorealist Perspective* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).

Moon, Chung-in and Chaeaung Chun (2003) *Sovereignty: Dominance of the Westphalian Concept and Implications for Regional Security*, in Alagappa, Muthiah (ed.) (2003) *Asian Security Order – Instrumental and Normative Features* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Morgan, Patrick M. (2003) *Deterrence Now* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Morgenthau, Hans J. (1952) *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Mosher, Steven W. (Ed.) (1992) *The United States and the Republic of China: Democratic Friends, Strategic Allies and Economic Partners* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Periodicals).

Murray, Williamson, MacGregor Knox and Aalvin Bernstein (1994) *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Murray, William S. (2008) 'Revisiting Taiwan's Defence Strategy', *Naval War College Review* (Summer, 2008), from <https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/ae650b06-a5e4-4b64-b4fd-2bcc8665c399/Revisiting-Taiwan-s-Defence-Strategy---William-S--.pdf> (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

William Murray, Richard Hart Sinnreich, and James Lacey (eds.) (2011) *The Shaping of Grand Strategy: Policy, Diplomacy, and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Nagara, Bunn and K.S. Balakrishnan (eds.) (1994) *The Making of Security Community in the Asia-Pacific* (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Institute of Strategic and International Studies).

Naoko Sajima (1999) 'Japan: Strategic Culture at a Crossroads', in Booth, Ken and Russell Trood (eds.) (1999) *Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region* (London: Macmillan), pp.69-71.

National Security Council (2006), "2006 National Security Report", Government Information Office, Taipei, 20 May 2006, (<http://www.gio.gov.tw/taiwan-website/download/2006nsreport.pdf>) (accessed on 16 June 2010).

National Unification Council (1992). *The Meaning of 'One China'*, (Taipei).

Needham, Michael A. and John J. Tkacik, Jr. (2006) *Grim Future of Taiwan Defence*, The Heritage Foundation, WebMemo #1243, 31 Oct 2006, at (<http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/wm1243.cfm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

Nelson, Michael (ed.) (1998) *The Presidency and the Political System* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) (Washington, D.C.: A Division of Congressional Quarterly Inc.).

Neumann, Iver B. and Henrikki Heikka (2005) 'Grand Strategy, Strategic Culture, Practice: The Social Root of Nordic Defence', Cooperation and Conflict, Vol.40 (1) (March 2005), pp.5-23.

Neustadt, Richard E. (1990) *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan* (New York: The Free Press).

Nixon, Richard M. (1968), "Nixon's View of the World - from Informal Talk", an interview in *US News & World Report*, vol. LXV, no. 12 (September 16, 1968).

Nixon, Richard M. (1983), *Real Peace* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson).

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. (1968) *International Regionalism: Readings* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown).

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: PublicAffairs)

O'Hanlon, M. (2000) "Why China Cannot Conquer Taiwan." *International Security* 25(2): 51-86.

Pape, Robert A. (1996) *Bombing to Win- Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

Paret, Peter (ed.) (1998) *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Palmer, Norman D. (1991) *The New Regionalism in Asia and the Pacific* (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books).

Paolino, Philip and James Meerink (eds) (2008) *Democratization in Taiwan: Challenges in Transformation* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate).

Parsons, Craig (2007) *How to Map Arguments in Political Science* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Paul, T.V. (1994) *Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiation by Weaker Powers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Posen, Barry R. (1984) *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

Preston, Thomas and Margaret G. Hermann (2004) 'Presidential Leadership Style and the Foreign Policy Advisory Process', in Eugene R. Wittkopf and James M. McCormick (2004) *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield), pp. 363-380.

Qi, Mao-ji (1991) *Chiang Kai-shek and Taiwan's Security* (Taipei: Li-Ming Culture Publisher).

Rapoport, Anatol (1964) *Strategy and Conscience* (New York: Harper & Row)

Read, Melvyn D. (1992) 'Policy Networks and Issue Network: The Politics of Smoking', in David Marsh and R. A. W. Rodes (ed) (1992) *Policy Networks in British Government* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Reid, Brian Holden (1998) 'Enduring Patterns in Modern Warfare', in Brian Holden Reid and Mungo Melvin (eds.) (1998) *The Nature of Future Conflict: Implications for Force Development* (London: The Strategic and Combat Studies Institute).

Research, Development and Evaluation Commission (1996) *A Construction of the Asia-Pacific Collective Security System and the Role of Our State* (Taipei: Research, Development and Evaluation Commission, Executive Yuan).

Rice, Condoleezza (2000), 'Promoting the National Interest', *Foreign Affairs*, January-February 2000.

Rigger, Shelley (1999) *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (London: Routledge)

Rigger, Shelley (2001) *From Opposition to Power: Taiwan's Democratic Progressive Party* (Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publisher).

Rigger, Shelly (2005) 'The Unfinished Business of Taiwan's Democratization', Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Rothstein, Robert L. (1968) *Alliances and Small Powers* (New York: Columbia University Press).

'ROC President Chiang Kai-Shek's Replies to Questions Asked in a Press Conference', in Chiu, Hungdah (ed.) (1973), *China and the Questions of Taiwan*.

'ROC President Chiang Kai-Shek's Replies to Questions Submitted by William Randolph Hearst, Jr, March 15, 1956', in Chiu, Hungdah (ed.) (1973), *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, p.268.

'ROC President Chiang Kai-Shek's Replies to Questions Submitted by Sven Stenberg, October 4, 1957', in Chiu, Hungdah (ed.) (1973), *China and the Questions of Taiwan*, p.275.

Rosecrance, Richard and Arthur A. Stein (ed.) (1993) *The Domestic Basis of Grand Strategy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Ross, Robert S. (1995) *Negotiating Cooperation: The United States and China, 1969-1989* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Ross, Robert S. (Fall 2000) 'The 1995-96 Taiwan Strait Confrontation: Coercion, Credibility and the Use of Force', *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 87-123.

Ross, Robert (2006) 'Explaining Taiwan's Revisionist Diplomacy', *Journal of Contemporary China*, 15(48), August 2006.

Rothstein, Robert Lewis (1968) *Alliances and Small Powers* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Roy, Denny (2000). "Tensions in the Taiwan Strait." *Survival* 42(1): 76-96.

Roy, Denny (2003) *Taiwan: A Political History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Russell, Richard L. (1999) *George F. Kennan's Strategic Thought: The Making of an America Political Realist* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger).

Skalnes, Lars S. (2000) *Politics, Markets, and Grand Strategy: Foreign Economic Policies as Strategic Instruments* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press)

Samuels, Richard J. (2007) *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Cornell, Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Sarkesian, Sam C. (ed.) (1984) *Presidential Leadership and National Security: Style, Institution, and Politics* (Boulder: Westviews Press).

Scalapino, Robert A. (1960), 'Communist China and Taiwan', Schurmann, Franz and Orville Schell (eds.) (1967) *Communist China: Revolutionary, Reconstruction and International Confrontation, 1949 to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books).

Schelling, Thomas C. (1966) *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Schelling, Thomas C. (1980) *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Schultz, Kenneth A. (2001) *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Schubert, Gunter and Jens Damm (ed.) (2011) *Taiwanese Identity in the Twenty-first Century: Domestic, Regional and Global Perspectives* (London: Routledge).

Schubert, Gunter and Stefan Braig (2011) 'How to Face Embracing China: the DPP's Identity Politics and cross-Strait Relations during and after Chen Shui-bian', Gunter Schubert and Jens Damm (ed.) (2011) *Taiwanese Identity in the Twenty-first Century: Domestic, Regional and Global Perspectives* (London: Routledge).

Schurmann, Franz and Orville Schell (eds.) (1967) *Communist China: Revolutionary, Reconstruction and International Confrontation, 1949 to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books).

Schweller, Randall L. (2004) 'Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing', *International Security*, No.29, No.2 (Autumn, 2004).

Scobell, Andrew (1998) 'Taiwan as Macedonia? Strait Tensions as a Syndrome', *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 21, Issue 2, pp. 181-216.

Scobell, Andrew (2000) 'Show of Force: Chinese Soldiers, Statesmen and the 1995-1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 115, No.2, pp. 227-246.

Segal, Gerald (1982) *The Great Power Triangle* (London: Macmillan).

Segal, Gerald (1985) *Defending China* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Segal, Gerald (1996) 'The Taiwanese Crisis: What Next?', *Jane's Intelligence Review* (June 1996).

Segal, Gerald (1996) 'East Asia and the 'Constrainment' of China', in Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (eds.) (1996) *East Asian Security* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press).

Segal, Gerald (1999) 'Does China Matter?', *Foreign Affairs* (September/October 1999), p.29.

Shambaugh, David (1996) 'Taiwan's Security: Maintaining Deterrence Amid Political Accountability', *China Quarterly*, No.148, (Dec. 1996).

Shambaugh, D. L. and R. H. Yang (1997). *China's military in transition*. (Oxford: Clarendon).

Shambaugh, David (2002) *Modernizing China's Military: Progress, Problems, and Prospects* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Shelvankar, K.S. (1938) *Ends Are Means: A Critique of Social Values* (London: Lindsay Drummond LTD.).

Shen, James C. H. (1983), *The US & Free China: How the US Sold Out its Ally* (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books Ltd).

Sheng Lijun (2002) *China and Taiwan: Cross-Straits Relations under Chen Shui-bian* (London: Zed Books).

Shi, Zheng-feng (2000) *Taiwanese National Identity*, (in Chinese) from (<http://www.wufi.org.tw/shih/f0008.htm>) (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

Singer, J. David (1960) 'International Conflict: Three Levels of Analysis', *World Politics*, Vol. 12 (3) (April, 1960), pp. 453-461

Singer, J. David (1961) 'The Level-of Analysis Problem in International Relations', *World Politics*, Vol. 14(1) (October, 1961), pp. 77-92.

Singer, Marshall R. (1972) *Weak States in World of Powers: The Dynamics of International Relationships* (New York: The Free Press).

Smith, Steve, Amelia Hadfield, and Tim Dunne (eds) (2007) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Smoke, Richard (1984) *National Security and the Nuclear Dilemma: An Introduction to the American Experience* (New York: Random House).

Snyder, Glenn H. (1961) *Deterrence and Defense - Toward a Theory of National Security* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Snyder, Jack (1977) *The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation Report R-2154-AF).

Snyder, Richard C., H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (eds) (2002), *Foreign Policy Decision-Making (Revisited)* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Snyder, Richard C., H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (2002) 'The Decision-Making Approach to the Study of International Politics', in Richard C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin (eds) (2002), *Foreign Policy Decision-Making (Revisited)* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 1-20.

Snyder, Jack (1984) *The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Sondhaus, Lawrence (2006) *Strategic Culture and Ways of War* (London: Routledge).

Spence, Jack E. (1967) *Republic Under Pressure: A Study of South African Foreign Policy* (London: Oxford University Press).

Stolper, Thomas E. (1985) *China, Taiwan and the offshore islands* (New York: M.E.Sharpe).

Strachan, Hew (2008) 'The Lost Meaning of Strategy', in Thomas G. Mahnken and Joseph A. Maiolo (eds.) *Strategic Studies: A Reader* (London: Routledge).

Stoessinger, John, G. (1993) Why Nations Go to War (New York: St. Martin's Press), pp.214-15.

Su Chi (2003) *Brinkmanship: From Two-State-Theory To One-Country-on-Each-Side* (Taipei: Commonwealth Publishing).

Su Chi (2004) 'Dividing Forces Behind Taiwan's Mainland Policy', in Steve Tsang (ed.) (2004) *Peace and Security across the Taiwan Strait* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 45-73.

Su Chi (2009) *Taiwan's Relations with Mainland China: A Tail Wagging Two Dogs* (London: Routledge).

Su, Chin-ch'iang (ed.) (1996) *ROC's Armed Forces Structure and Taiwan Strait Security* (Taipei: Institute for National Policy Research).

Suh, J.J., Peter J. Katzenstein and Allen Carlson (eds.) (2004) *Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power and Efficiency* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, (tr Samuel B. Griffith) (Oxford: Oxford University).

Sun Yat-sen (1983) *The Three Principles of the People* (Taipei: China Publishing Company).

Swaine, M. D. (1999). *Taiwan's National Security, Defence Policy and Weapons Procurement Process*. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND).

Swaine, Michael D. (1999) *Taiwan's National Security, Defense Policy, and Weapons Procurement Process* (Santa Monica: RAND)

Swaine, M. D. and J. C. Mulvenon, et al. (2001). *Taiwan's Foreign and Defense Policies: Features and Determinants*. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND).

Swaine, Michael D., Andrew N. D. Yang, Evan S. Medeiros and Oriana Skylar Mastro (ed.) (2007) *Assessing the Threat: The Chinese Military and Taiwan's Security* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment).

Swanson, Bruce (1982) *Eighth Voyage of the Dragon* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press).

Szonyi, Michael (2008) *Cold War Island: Quemoy on the Front Line* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Taiwan Advocates (ed.) (2004). *Cross-Straight Exchange and National Security of Taiwan* (Taipei: Taiwan Advocates).

Taiwan Foundation for Democracy (ed.) (2005) *Direct Democracy Practices in Taiwan: The Taiwan Referendum Act, Reports, and Analyses* (Taipei: Taiwan Foundation for Democracy Publication).

“Taiwan To Test Fire Cruise Missile Capable Of Hitting China”, Taipei (Agence France Presse, AFP) Jul 06, 2006, at (<http://www.spacewar.com>). (Accessed on 21 September 2009)

Tan, Alexander C., Steve Chan, Calvin Jillson (2001) *Taiwan's National Security : Dilemmas and Opportunities* (Aldershot : Ashgate).

Tang Tsou (1959b), ‘The Quemoy Imbroglio: Chiang Kai-Shek and the United States’, *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol.12, No.4 (Dec., 1959), pp.1075-1091.

Tang Tsou and Morton H. Halperin (1965), ‘Mao Tse-Tung’s Revolutionary Strategy and Peking’s International Behavior’, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol.59, No. 1 (Mar., 1965), pp. 80-99.

Tang, Tsou (ed.) (1968) *Chinese in Crisis*, Vol.2 (Chicago: Chicago University Press).

Taylor, Jay (2000) *The Generalissimo’s Son: Chiang Ching-kuo and the Revolutions in China and Taiwan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Taylor, Jay (2009) *The Generalissimo: Chiang Kai-shek and The Struggle for Modern China* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press)

Terriff, Terry, Stuart Croft, Lucy James and Patrick M. Morgan (1999) *Security Studies Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

*The China Yearbook*, 1979 (Taipei: China Publishing Co.).

*The China Yearbook*, 1960-72 (Taipei: China Publishing Co.).

The Mainland Affairs Council (ROC) (1991) “*Guidelines for National Unification*”, (English version) in <http://www.mac.gov.tw/english/english/macpolicy/gnueng.htm> (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

The Mainland Affairs Council (ROC) (1999), ‘*Parity, Peace and Win-Win: The Republic of China’s Position on the “Special State-to-State Relationship”*’, 1 August 1999, (Chinese and English versions) in ([http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/2nda\\_2.htm](http://www.mac.gov.tw/big5/rpir/2nda_2.htm)) (Accessed on 21 April 2010)

*The Reminiscences of General Ming-tang Lai* (1994) (Taipei: Academia Historica) The Taiwan Affairs and Information Office (PRC) (1993) “The Taiwan Question and the Reunification of China”, (Chinese version) at <http://www.china.org.cn/e-white/taiwan/index.htm> (Accessed on 21 April 2010).

*The ROC Yearbook, 2011*, at <http://www.gio.gov.tw/taiwan-website/5-gp/yearbook/contents.html> (Accessed on 23 August 2012).

The White House, *The National Security Strategy*, September 2002, p.28, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html> (accessed on 21 April 2010)

The White House, *The National Security Strategy*, March 2006, p.42, at (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/>) (accessed on 21 April 2010)

Thornton, Rod (2007) *Asymmetric Warfare* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Thornton, Richard C. (1989) *The Nixon-Kissinger Years: Reshaping America’s Foreign Policy* (New York: Paragon House).

Thucydides (1950) *The History of the Peloponnesian War* (tr. Richard Crawley) (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.).

Tien, Hung-mao (Ed.) (1983) *Mainland China, Taiwan and United States Policy* (Cambridge, Mass: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain).

Tien, Hung-mao (ed.) (1996) *Taiwan’s Electoral Politics and Democratic Transition: Riding the Third Wave* (Armonk: M.E. Shape).

Tien, Chen-Ya (1992) *Chinese Military Theory: Ancient and Modern* (Oakville: Mosaic Press).

Tkacik, John J., Jr. (2005) *America’s “China Policy” Is in Urgent Need of Definition*, Heritage Lecture 874, 19 April 2005, at (<http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/hl874.cfm>) (accessed on 21 April 2010).

Tong, Hollington K. (1953) *Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: China Publishing Company).

Tow, William T. (2001) *Asia-Pacific Strategic Relations: Seeking Convergent Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tsang, Steve (ed.) (1993) *In the Shadow of China: Political Developments in Taiwan since 1949* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press).

Tsang, Steve (1993) ‘Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT’s policy to reconquer the Chinese Mainland, 1949-1958’, Tsang, Steve (ed.) (1993) *The Shadow of China: Political Developments in Taiwan since 1949* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press).

Tsang, Steve and Hung-mao Tien (eds.) (1999) *Democratization in Taiwan: Implications for China* (London: Macmillan).

Tsang, Steve (1999) 'Transforming a Party State into Democracy', Tsang, Steve and Hung-mao Tien (eds.) (1999) *Democratization in Taiwan: Implications for China* (London: Macmillan).

Tsang, Steve (ed.) (2004) *Peace and Security across the Taiwan Strait* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Tsang, Steve (2006) *If China Attacks Taiwan: Military Strategy, Politics and Economics* (New York: Routledge).

Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (1993), *Taiwan, Hong Kong and the United States, 1945-1992: Uncertain Friendship* (New York: Twayne Publishers).

Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (2001) *China Confidential: American Diplomats and Sino-American Relations, 1945-1996* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (2005) 'Dangerous Strait: Introduction' and 'Strategic Ambiguity or Strategic Clarity', in Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf (ed.) (2005) *Dangerous Strait: The U.S.-Taiwan-China Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 1-15 and 186-211 respectively.

'US Congressional Authorization for the President to employ the Armed Forces of the US to Protect Formosa and Pescadores and Related Positions and Territories of that Areas', in Chiu Hungdah, (ed.) (1973), *China and the Questions of Taiwan*.

US Department of State (1971, 1973), *Department of State Bulletin*.

US Department of Defense (1995) *Dictionary of Military Terms* (London: Greenhill Books).

US President (1970), *US Foreign Policy for the 1970s: A New Strategy for Peace*. A Report to the Congress by Richard M. Nixon, 18 February 1970 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1970).

US President (1971), *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, 1969* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office).

US Congress, Senate (1959), Committee on Foreign Relations, *United States Foreign Policy: Asia*, a research report to the Committee, by Colon Associated, Ltd., 1 November, 1959 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Van Creveld, Martin (1989) *Technology and War: From 2000 B.C. to the Present* (New York: The Free Press).

Van Creveld, Martin (1991) *The Transformation of War* (New York: The Free Press).

Van Vranken Hickey, Dennis (1994) *United States-Taiwan Security Ties: From Cold War to Beyond Containment* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger).

Van Vranken Hickey, Dennis (1997) *Taiwan's Security in the Changing International System* (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers).

Van Vranken Hickey, Dennis (2007) *Foreign Policy Making in Taiwan: From Principles to Pragmatism* (London: Routledge).

Van Evera, Stephen (1997) *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Vital, David (1967) *The Inequality of States: A Study of the Small Power in International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Vital, David (1971) *The Survival of Small States: Studies in Small Power/Great Power Conflict* (London: Oxford University Press).

Wachman, Allan M. (2007) *Why Taiwan? Geostrategic Rationales for China's Territorial Integrity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Walt, Stephen M. (1987) *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Waltz, Kenneth (1959) *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Waltz, Kenneth (1979) *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill).

Wang, Bingnan (1985), *Review of Nine Years of Sino-American Ambassadorial Talk* (Beijing: World Knowledge Publishing House).

Wang, Ching-hung (2000) *Interview History: From Washington Archive seeing Taiwan* (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publisher).

Wang Feng (2010, 31 May) 'Taiwan's Nuclear Weapons and Missile Developer: General Tang Jun-bo', *China Times*, <http://news.chinatimes.com/world/0,5246,11050401x112010053100112,00.html> (accessed in 31 May 2010).

Wang, T.Y. (2003) 'Taiwan Foreign Relations under Lee Teng-hui's Rule, 1988-2000', in Lee, Wei-Chin and Wang, T.Y. (eds,) (2003). *Sayonara to the Lee Teng-hui era: politics in Taiwan, 1988-2000*. (Lanham, MD, University Press of America).

Wang, Y. (1990). *Foreign policy of the Republic of China on Taiwan: an unorthodox approach*. (New York: Praeger).

Watt, Donald Cameron (1963) *Personalities and Politics: Studies on the Formulation of British Foreign Policy in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* (London: Longmans).

Weigley, Russell (1973) *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy* (New York: Macmillian).

Wendt, Alexander (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Whiting, Allen S. (1960) *China Cross the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War* (Stanford: RAND/Stanford University Press).

Whiting, Allen S. (1975), 'New Light on Mao: 3. Quemoy 1958: Mao's Miscalculation', *China Quarterly*, No.62 (June, 1975), pp.263-270.

Wittkopf, Eugene R. and James M. McCormick (2004) *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield).

Wu, Hsin-hsing (1994) *Bridging The Strait: Taiwan, China and the Prospects for Reunification* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Wu, Jaushieh Joseph (1995) *Taiwan's Democratization: Forces behind the New Momentum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Wu, Yu-shan (1999) 'Taiwan's Mainland Policy: Structure and Rationality', in Bau, Tzong-ho and Wu Yu-shan (ed) (1999) *Contending Approaches to Cross-Strait Relations* (Taipei: Wunan Publishers).

Wu, Yu-shan (2003) 'Does Chen's Election Make Any Difference? Domestic and International Constraints on Taipei, Washington and Beijing', in Muthiah Alagappa (ed.) (2003) *Taiwan's Presidential Politics: Democratization and Cross-Strait Relations in the 21st Century* (Taiwan in the Modern World) (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Paperback), pp. 155-192.

Yu-Shan Wu (2007) 'Taiwan's Development State: After the Economic and Political Turmoil', *Asian Survey*, Vol.47, No.6 (November/December, 2007).

Xia, Lipin and Jiang Xiyuan (2004) *Peaceful Rise of China (zhongguo he ping jue qi)* (Beijing: Zhongguo she hui ke xue chu ban she)

Xu, Cheng-xi (ed.) (1995) *Beliefs of The ROC Armed Forces* (Chinese edition) (Taipei: Li-ming Wen-hua Publisher).

Xu, Shiquan (2003) 'The 1992 Consensus', in Zagoria, Donald (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger), pp. 81-102.

Xu, Zongli (2000) *Liang guo lun yu Taiwan guo jia ding wei* (兩國論與台灣國家定位) (Taipei: Xue Lin Wen Hua Shi Ye You Xian Gong Si)

Yang, Andrew N. (1997) 'Taiwan's Military Capability', in Austin, G. (ed.) (1997). *Missile diplomacy and Taiwan's future: innovations in politics and military power*. Canberra, Australia: Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University).

Yang, Chih-heng (2003) 'The Evolution and Adaptation of Taiwan's Military Strategy', in Edmonds, Martin and Michael M. Tsai (eds.) (2003) *Defending Taiwan: The Future Vision of Taiwan's Defence Policy and Military Strategy* (London: RoutledgeCurzon).

Yen, Wan-chin (2003) *Mainland Policy of Democratic Progress Party during an Opposition Party (Zaiye shiqi mingjindang dalu zhengce)* (Taipei: New Wun Ching Developmental Publishing Co. Ltd.).

Yin, Robert K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Method* (Thousands Oak, CA: Sage).

You Ji (1999) *The Armed Forces of China* (London: I.B.Tauris)

You, Zixiang (2006) *Leaders' Rhetoric: Important Speech Collections of Cross-Strait Leaders, 1906-2006* (Taipei City, Taiwan: Wu Nan Publishers)

Young, Hum Kim (ed.) (1968) *Twenty Years of Crisis: The Cold War Era* (London: Prentice-Hall International),

Young, Kenneth T. (1968) *Negotiating with the Chinese Communists* (New York: McGraw-Hill).

Young, Oran (1968) *The Politics of Force* (Princeton: Princeton University).

Zagoria, Donald (ed.) (2003) *Breaking the China-Taiwan Impasse* (Westport: Praeger).

Zhang, Qi-yun (ed.) (1984) *Complete Collections of President Chiang Kai-shek* (Taipei: Chinese Culture University Press).

Zhang, Shu Guang (1992) *Deterrence and Strategic Culture: Chinese-American Confrontations, 1949-1958* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Zhang, Yan-xian (ed.) (2008) *An Interview and Narration of Lee Teng-hui (Li denghui zongtong fangtan lu)*, Vol. I-IV (Chinese version) (Taipei: Academia Historica & Asian Culture Publication).

Zhang, Zhu-yi (2009) *Late Years of Chiang Ching-kuo* (Taipei: Tian-xia Yuan-jian Publishers).

Zhao, Suisheng (ed.) (1999) *Across the Taiwan Strait- Mainland China, Taiwan and the 1995-1996 Crisis* (London: Routledge).

Zhao, Suisheng (2002) 'Reunification Strategy: Beijing Verse Lee Teng-hui', in Dickson, Bruce J. and Chien-min Chao (eds.) (2002) *Assessing the Lee Teng-hui Legacy in Taiwan's Politics:Democratic Consolidation and External Relations* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe).

Zhao, Suisheng (Ed) (2004) *Chinese Foreign Policy: Pragmatism and Strategic Behavior* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe).

Zhong, Zhi-cheng (2006) *For a Better World - A Record of the Former President's State Visits Overseas* (Chinese version) (Beijing: The World Affairs Press).

Zhou, GU (2006) *1960 nian dai TaiBei Hua fu wai jiao mi xin* (一九六〇年代台北華府外交秘聞) (Taipei: Lian-Jing Chu Ban Shi Ye Gu Fen You Xian Gong Si).

Zimmerman, William (1980) 'Elite Perspective and the Explanation of Soviet Foreign Policy', in Erik P. Hoffmann and Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. (eds.) (1980) *The Conduct of Soviet Foreign Policy* (New York: Aldine Publishing Company), pp. 18-35.

Zou Jing-wen (2001) *A True Record and Confession of Lee Teng-hui's Regime (Li denghui zhizheng gaobai shilu)* (Chinese version) (Taipei: INK Publications).

## Other Sources: Newspapers, Journals and Internets

Central Daily News (*Zhongyang ribao*)

China Post

China Times (*Zhongguo shibao*)

Institute for National Polciy Research (<http://www.inpr.org.tw/?q=en>, assessed on 19 August 2012)

Issues and Studies (<http://iir.nccu.edu.tw/index.php?include=journal&kind=4>, assessed on 19 August 2012)

Journal of Strategic and International Studies (Division of Strategic and International Studies at Taiwan Research Institute, discontinued)

MND military periodicals (<http://www.mnd.gov.tw/Publish.aspx?cnid=35>, accessed on 20 August 2012)

Liberty Times (*Ziyou shibao*)

National Policy Foundation (<http://www.npf.org.tw/>, assessed on 19 August 2012)  
Newsweek  
People Daily (*Renmin ri bao*)  
Prospect Foundation (<http://www.pf.org.tw/>)  
Taiwan Defense Affairs (assessed on 19 August 2012, at  
[http://www.taiwanus.net/Taiwan\\_Future/national\\_defence/national\\_defence.htm](http://www.taiwanus.net/Taiwan_Future/national_defence/national_defence.htm))  
Taiwan Security Research (<http://www.taiwansecurity.org/>, assessed on 19 August 2012)  
The China Post  
The Military Balance (London: The International Institute of Strategic Studies)  
Ruters  
United Daily News (*Lian he bao*)  
Xinhua