

# Ambiguity and Immorality on Taiwan Policy<sup>1</sup>

By Chung-Chih Li

---

Thirty years ago, when the USA tried to advance the frontline of the Cold War from the West Coast across Pacific Ocean to Central Asia against the former Soviet Union, the Washington needed double security.

Each dimension of the security was based on a trade with a dictator: Mao Zedong and Chiang Kia-Shek. Ironically, the two were no friends, but they both played important roles in the Cold War and in doing so served America's interest. Mao Zedong's regime blocked Russian power from East Asia, while Chiang Kia-Shek's regime put a thorn on the back of Mao Zedong's communist China. How wonderful if both sides could be friends with the USA?

The difficulty was that: each regime claimed itself the only legitimate government to represent China, and each regime's legitimacy was based on the promise to eliminate the other.

No problem. Here came smart politicians. The solution was "strategic ambiguity" in terms of the "one China policy". The USA made sure two sides fully understood the world reality but let go two sides' political myth.

Thus, China on the one hand kept building up diplomatic relation with the USA. On the other hand, China kept educating (brain-washing, if you will) their people that China was split by American Imperialism and Taiwan was controlled by America just like that.

Meanwhile, in Taiwan, Chiang Kia-Shek faced the reality and withdrew his Chinese representative from the United Nations on the one hand. On the other hand, his regime kept telling Taiwanese that we were real Chinese and we should recover China one day.

It is understandable that under the tension of the Cold War American politicians should not be able to talk about morality too much, but rather needed to carefully maintain temporary stability in all regions. Thus, as long as

the two sides could toe the line, let them say their spells and tales at home.

Now, three decades later, except China, the world has changed a lot. Taiwan was not absent in this change. Taiwanese now enjoy their freedom and democracy and play an active and positive role in the world community. The fully democratic government of Taiwan no longer needs any political myth to sustain its ruling. People have real life problems to deal with.

Everyone in Taiwan knows what China means to them. China is not a savior to liberate Taiwanese from American Imperialism, neither is China a mother-country to reunite with, as Chinese still claim that way. Instead, China is a rising imperialist in its own right that still tries to cancel the existence of Taiwan based on the old curse that "Taiwan is a part of China".

What can Americans do? What had China learned from Clintonia "partner policy"? Yeah. Some Chinese become richer after you opened the entire Wal-Mart stock for them to load up their goods. But, does China as a whole become more reasonable? Why do they keep howling the nonsense about "nationalism" all the time upon every event?

The USA indeed needs to start a new chapter in dealing with China. It's time again for America to ask China to face the rule and reality of the new world, just as what America did to Chairman Mao and General Chiang three decades ago, no matter how unwilling they were.

Well, let's give some credit to the "strategic ambiguity" policy as an immoral must under the Cold War, but it's time for us to push it into the dustbin of history. We Taiwanese do welcome President Bush's remark on Taiwan policy. If China cannot understand what "We want peace" means, it's time to go more straightforward: "If you make trouble, you get kicked in the butt". ■

---

<sup>1</sup>Published in Sunday's **Herald American**, May 6, 2001, well-displayed on the front page of the Opinion section. The title was edited and changed to "**China vs. Taiwan**" with subtitle "**A Tale of Ambiguity and Immorality**".