

A Preliminary Probe into the Chinese Policy of the Ma Ying-jeou Administration

Jiann-fa Yan

Director, International Cooperation Office

Ching Yun University, Taoyuan, Taiwan

Abstract

The asymmetric relations between Taiwan and China are structural and developmental. This article indicates that Ma Ying-jeou's pro-unification policy and soft strategy will be accommodated to China's peace strategy. The strategic risks derived from setting aside disputes, the retreat in military strategy, the diplomatic truce, the enlarged cross-strait economic cooperation, and silence toward China's democracy and human rights will bring Taiwan into disadvantageous situations. The strengths of China are not only shown in the political, economic, and military capacities, but also the strategic thinking and tactical measures. The green camp is worried that Taiwan will be forced into the orbit of Chinese system and finally annexed by China. The author also indicates the significance of the US role. The presence of the US may present opportunities as well as risks simultaneously. At any rate, the pan-green camp has to cope with the engaged cross-strait realities shaped by both the CCP and the KMT.

Keywords: peaceful development, Hu's Six-point Opinions, Hard-Rock Strategy, diplomatic truce, ECFA

Introduction

Either in a positive or negative sense, there is no doubt that China has been a conditioning factor for cross-strait developments. Both the pan-green¹ and pan-blue camps have extraordinarily different interpretations and prospects over China factor in gauging Taiwan's destiny. Over the past one year, the green-colored political ecology has drastically been changed into the blue one since President Ma Ying-jeou administration conceded on sovereign issues by accepting "92 consensus" as well as proposing "one country, two areas," initiated dramatic retreat in military and diplomatic policies, and opened up the three links across the Taiwan Strait. In a pan-green view, Taiwan has been tilted toward China under the Ma administration. The global financial meltdown has incidentally brought about further rise of China's role in revitalizing the global economy as well as Taiwan's economy.

Held in London on April 2nd, the G-20 summit represented China's irreplaceable role in recovering the global financial order. China is quite influential in strengthening the function of the International Monetary Fund. The meeting of American President Barack Obama and Chinese President Hu Jin-tao on the eve of G-20 summit has dubbed China and the US as "G-2." Besides, Chinese government is to pour thousands of billion dollars into the domestic construction and consumption. These huge economic stimulus programs are likely to attract more and more Taiwanese export-oriented investors to shift their focuses from exportation to China's domestic market. Consequently, we will see a much more interdependent economy across the Taiwan Strait and the weight of China's influence over the Taiwan Strait will

¹ According to the Wikipedia, Pan-Green Camp, is currently an informal political alliance of the Republic of China, commonly known as "Taiwan," consisting of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), Taiwan Solidarity Union (TSU), and the minor Taiwan Independence Party (TAIP). The name comes from the colors of the Democratic Progressive Party, which originally adopted green in part because of its association with the environmental movement. In contrast to the Pan-Blue Coalition, the Pan-Green Coalition favors Taiwan Independence over Chinese reunification, although members in both coalitions have moderated their policies to reach voters in the center. See Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pan-Green_Coalition).

increase without question. From a pan-green perspective and assumption, this article is to depict the cross-strait developments shaped by Ma's strategic, military, diplomatic, economic, political thinking and arrangements.

Besides, the US has been a dominating factor for Taiwan's development. Even though Ma's takes a grand engagement policy toward China and, apparently, China will have no instantaneous intent to disturb the status quo in the Taiwan Strait. Nevertheless, as the US puts China in an important position as a partner, Chinese leaders' tactically soft and cooperative approach may confound the US. In a pan-green view, this article will also tackle the role of the US and appraise its policy toward Taiwan.

Peaceful Development as China's Propaganda for Seducing Taiwanese

There is no doubt that cross-strait relationship has marked huge progress after President Ma inaugurated on May 20, 2008. Beijing authorities sent goodwill messages to Taiwan with Hu Jin-tao's Six-point Opinions. The main contents of the six points include: adhering to the basic principles of peaceful reunification; firmly grasping cross-straits relations and peaceful development; strengthening the cross-straits exchanges and cooperation; bringing continuous well-being to compatriots on both sides of Taiwan Straits; protecting national sovereignty and negotiating foreign affairs; and ending the status of hostility and seeking peace agreements. In the texts, the wording of "unification" appears for 25 times (*Liberty Times*, 2009).

Seemingly, there is nothing new for pro-independence Taiwanese to hear Hu's Six-point Opinions. There are some tactical concerns behind the political languages. Being under the process of the three types of war-legal, media and psychological wars, this is a conventional way for the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) leadership to consolidate its ideology and policy toward Taiwan affairs. For Hu Jin-tao, clearly, he intentionally harvests all the fruits of Taiwan policy done by his predecessors over the past three decades. He also tries to divide the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) by offering an

olive branch to the pragmatists. He maintained everything is possible as long as the DPP promises not to move toward independence. If these tactics work, the DPP may be divided into “light green” and “dark green,” and the Kuomintang (KMT) heavyweights may compete one another in appeasing China for more resources.

In reaction to Hu’ Six-point Opinions, President Ma Ying-jeou made a positive comment. He asserted Taiwan further study the implications of Hu’s statement. Ma’s soft tone of endorsing Hu’s policy in a tacit manner has demonstrated a new progress of harmonious status quo for a cross-strait relationship. It is very much demanded for both sides, even though the two sides of the Taiwan Strait have different interpretations and motivations in setting aside sovereign issues. For the KMT, two divided entities are real, and the suspension of sovereign issues will help both sides to go beyond the political deadlock. For the CCP, the suspension is to save the KMT’s face in the transition toward ultimate cross-strait unification. Hence, a peaceful cross-strait relationship under one China principle becomes the common language for both sides of the Taiwan Strait.

Apparently, Hu Jin-tao’s conception of “peaceful development,” manipulated in a way of three-war tactics against Taiwan, is working. The CCP has never changed its political principle that sovereignty is indivisible. Speaking at a reception in San Francisco, the United States, June 18th, 2009, Director of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the Chinese State Council Wang Yi insisted that the mainland and Taiwan belong to one China (*Xinhua*, 2009). Like other Chinese leaders, he just rhetorically repeated the so-called a “peaceful development” approach with a variety of flexible measures. The nature of Chinese tactics is to be insistent on the principle but flexible in technical issues. Promoted by the three-war tactics, clearly, China is successful in the manipulation of the soft policy toward Taiwan. As for some Taiwan’s radical pro-unification liners, they are even losing their patience to wait; they hastily look for signing a peace agreement with China as soon as possible. They do not take sovereign claims as Taiwan’s bargaining chips like former DPP government did. For example, the Ma administration appreciated China’s acceptance of Lien Chen as the APEC delegation for Taiwan in

November, 2008; the Chinese Communist-Kuomintang forum bypassed Taiwan's legislative consent; the arrival of the two pandas had been criticized by the pan-green camp as breaking Taiwan's decade-long insistence on sovereign independence.

On "Taiwan Competitiveness Forum" held on December 24th, 2008, panelists urged the Ma administration to conduct a peace talk with China without setting any precondition. Earlier, Ma proposed China withdraw the missiles aimed at Taiwan so that Taiwan may sign peace agreement with China, but Deputy Secretary General Hsieh Ming-hui maintained that China did not need to remove the missiles targeting at Taiwan. His argumentation is that, in a sense, China's missiles may protect Taiwan from being attacked if someday Taiwan breaks a war with Japan due to the confrontation on the issue of disputed Diaoyutai Islands. In the conference, Former Vice Chair of Strait Exchange Foundation Chiu Cheyue echoed that only to sign the peace agreement could help Taiwan develop (Li, 2008).

Active pro-unification liners across the Taiwan Strait also work very hard in suffocating the space of the voices of Taiwan independence (Lao Pao, 2008). The pro-blue media are repeating the picture of former President Chen Shui-bian's indictment of corruption all day long. Pro-unification media inside the Greater Chinese community are trying to stigmatize the pro-independence DPP on the matter of clean politics. Under the tacit collaboration between the CCP and the KMT, the dominance of pro-unification legal symbolism and media is gradually undermining Taiwanese willingness and courage to support Taiwan independence liners. The kind of wishes from both Hsieh Ming-hui and Chiu Cheyue stated above is not unimaginable even though the CCP leaders see Taiwan as part of its territory and have never renounced the possibilities to unify Taiwan by force.

The Strategic Retreat in Military Deployment

Ma asserts that China's opening-up policy will bring about tremendous change in relations across the Taiwan Strait. Different from former President

Chen Shui-bian, he believes that cross-strait relations are moving toward peace and development. For him, as the president of the Republic of China, his mission is to help Taiwan gain more opportunities and reduce more risks. He believes that a peaceful development across the Taiwan Strait will amplify opportunities and reduce risks. To echo China's peaceful development, Ma's strategic retreat of military deployment from active defense to passive one has shown Ma's sincerity in seeking peaceful development with China. As a whole, Ma's vision of his national defense strategy is sort of passive defense which is based upon only a certain level of military deterrence.

Ma maintains that Chen's active defensive approach is too provocative to live with China. His option is passive defense based upon "solid defense" or the so-called "hard rock strategy," behind which the defense concepts such as "can't be frightened, can't be blockaded, can't be occupied, and can't be vanquished" are stressed as the main slogans to conserve capacities as a solid military system. To fulfill this aim, voluntary military service will fully replace the obligatory one in 4-6 years. A symposium held at the Institute of International Relations on Dec.5-6, 2008, in Taipei seems to test the public opinion (Liu, 2008). The Ministry of National Defense (MND) has started planning to push a fully professional voluntary military service system in a bid to build the country's military into "lean and mean" fighting force. In the conference, the so-called "hard rock strategy" or "porcupine strategy," proposed in Mr. William Murray's recent article "Revisiting Taiwan's Defense Strategy" has sparked heated debates. Mr. Murray assumes that the key facilities and equipment of Taiwan's navy and air force would be destroyed at the early stage of war so that he suggests a shift in Taiwan's defense strategy to emphasize a strong ground force and the conservation of combat power.

Basically, Ma's sending good will to China is welcome by international community. Yet, his drastic shift of military policy from the previous stage also arouses strategic concerns from the pan-green camp (*Taiwan News*, 2008). Fundamentally speaking, in the politico-military contexts, Taiwan's structural position is specifically conditioned and the freedom of Taiwan's military buildup is very limited, no matter which party rules in Taiwan. Nevertheless, if Taiwan tries to self-constrain its own freedom, then the situation will be

certainly worsened. While Chen Shui-bain's active defense was seen, by the pan-blue camp, too provocative toward China, apparently, Ma Yin-jeou administration is seen, by the green camp, as to make Taiwan more vulnerable to the threats from China.

A symposium on the examination of the Ma administration organized by Taiwan Thinktank, a typical green organization, and held at the Law School, Taiwan University, on May 9th, reveals that Ma's capacities in military defense are deteriorating in many respects due to Ma's pro-China policy (Taiwan's Friends of Frank Hsieh and Su Tseng-chang, 2009). For them, Ma's conception of the ultimate unification has not only disturbed and confused Taiwan's society, but also his passive military strategy makes Taiwan exposed to China's easier invasion. Ma's so-called "hard rock strategy" is a retreat from active defense with naval and air emphases. In the past, the military strategy was to defeat the enemy outside the territory. Ma's optimism to turn to passive defense is based upon China's promise in peaceful development. But the most worrying problem is the rapid increase of Chinese military build-up. The US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates identified the threats of Chinese military buildup by stating that "the areas of greatest concern are Chinese investments and growing capabilities in cyber and anti-satellite warfare, anti-air and anti-ship weaponry, submarines, and ballistic missiles" (Lin, 2009). The inappropriate military policy change has brought about the increasing imbalance of military capacities across the Taiwan Strait. The morale and capacities of civil defense are weakening and obsolete. Besides, in a social-psychological view, immersed in the era of the Cultural Revolution, China's incumbent leaders and their social base have been filled with struggle, destruction, collectivism, and cheating and some other negative, dark-sided elements innate in human nature. The Chinese communists are not so easy to deal with.

Furthermore, in the regional security contexts, the interests of Taiwan's military buildup are highly involved with democratic allies such as the US, Japan, and their security partners in the Asia-Pacific region. The subtle interaction between Taiwan and China may weaken justification of future US-Taiwan military cooperation or the US and Japanese willingness to help Taiwan

defend itself. Ma administration will encounter strategic choice among military powers.

The Diplomatic Truce

The diplomatic rivalries between Taiwan and China are temporarily and superficially diminishing thanks to the diplomatic truce initiated by Ma. China has not formally recognized this initiative. Clearly, China has been trying to avoid the diplomatic tension against Taiwan so that it can conduct its peace strategy and flexible tactics toward Taiwan. Chinese officials and scholars have become more cautious than before in touching some sensitive issues regarding cross-strait relations. Paralleled with the diplomatic truce, the substantial exchanges across the Taiwan Strait have been enhanced to the unprecedented level. The doctrine of diplomatic truce is regarded as a welcome or positive diplomatic deed by the neighboring powers like Australia and the United States. The representative of the Australian Commerce and Industry Office Alice Cawte appraised Taiwan's ceasing check diplomacy and making efforts to better cross-strait relationship (*Taipei Times*, 2008).

Owing to the relaxed cross-strait relations, Taiwan was invited by the Secretary General of the World Health Organization to attend the 62nd World Health Assembly as an observer under the name of Chinese Taipei. It was greatly welcome by the international society. Superficially, it is successful, just like the experience of Beijing's acquiescence to Lien's attendance at the APEC summit 2008 as a goodwill gesture from Beijing. In the past, Beijing was trying very hard to focus on the formality, but recently Beijing has changed its strategic exit departing from the substance, namely, proposing a functional step-by-step approach and temporarily setting aside fundamental, or sovereign, disputes. Sovereign "disputes," instead of "matters," are set aside. They do not argue, but problems remain out there.

Earlier China had set its bottom line at one China principle. The two sides of the Taiwan Strait might take the WHA observer issue as the priority to negotiate. In other words, in a pan-green view, the tacit consensus across the

Taiwan Strait will be at the expense of Taiwan's sovereign independence. From a critical point of view, the green supporters are worried that Taiwan is being forced to move into the orbit of Chinese system. Too many emphases on bilateral negotiation across the CCP and the KMT have turned Taiwan into a CCP-KMT co-managing formula. Turning from a global framework into a cross-strait framework may be a realistic approach which helps Taiwan win some concrete steps away from a suffering position, but any formal application under China's consent will legitimize China's one China policy over Taiwan.

In real politics, it's impossible for the great powers to support Taiwan to enter the international organizations without China's consent. However, the absence of Taiwan in the global disease networks will pose great risks for the international society. This may account for the international supports in terms of realism. It is criticized by the pan-green camp that it does not fit Taiwan's interests earning minor interests as an observer while trading the nonnegotiable interests on sovereign issues. The reason why the pan-green supporters have lost confidence upon the Chinese communists can be traced to its decades-long records on cross-strait interactions. Underneath the options proposed by China is an ultimate concern. i.e.: Taiwan is part of China; the People's Republic of China is the sole legitimate government. The question is: If China will not change its firmly-held stance, any compromise would just hide conflicts and frictions in the future. Any immediate brakes on the pace will create hostility and animosity between Taiwan and China and, further, Taiwan's previous concession to China will be wasted.

The Fabric of Economic Cooperation across the Taiwan Strait

The closer economic integration between Taiwan and China has become an inevitable trend especially after both the CCP and the KMT governments are fastening the speed of cross-strait economic exchanges through signing more agreements. The KMT government tries to persuade Taiwanese people that China is an indispensable market for Taiwan to maintain its economic competence in the world. Similar to the experience of Hong Kong, the

convenience of speaking Chinese language makes Taiwanese easier to survive in China. The increasing exchanges between Taiwan and China have created a huge Chinese language-based market. China has become the most attractive destination for many Taiwanese to invest or to work. In a pan-green concern, Taiwan's new generations will be accustomed to Chinese-speaking environment and gradually be away from other parts of the world relatively. With poor global views and too much Chinese disposition, Taiwanese society will gradually distance itself from the outside world. Above all, in the wake of direct flights across the Taiwan Strait, closer economic integration between Taiwan and China has entered into a new era.

Furthermore, during the first session of the 11th National People's Congress (NPC) and the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC), March 3rd-18th, 2009, Beijing leaders focused their attention on cultivating domestic consumption to cure the ailing economy from recession. Director Chang-ping of China's State Development and Reform Commission announced that the whole package was as follows: 400 billion yuan for the livelihood engineering construction; 370 billion yuan for agriculture, 1500 billion for infrastructure, 150 billion yuan for social enterprises, 210 billion yuan for energy reduction, 370 billion yuan for technological innovations, and 1000 billion yuan for post-earthquake rehabilitations (*China Review News*, 2009).

In Face of Chinese government's historic-big state-led domestic investment with thousands of billions of projects, more and more Taiwanese businesses will be attracted to China. It will unavoidably create economic magnetic effects toward Taiwan. Taiwan's businesses will benefit from their China's investment in high-tech consumers' industries, including 3G, LCD TV, NB/Netbook, and LED, and so on and so forth (Topology Research Institute, 2009). However, at the same time, they will be highly integrated into a Chinese economic system. Taiwan will be more rely on Chinese economy and the consequences will be: on one hand, Taiwan's economic cycles will be greatly affected by China's big-wave economic cycles; on the other hand, Taiwan's politics will be greatly influenced by Chinese politics.

In a pan-green view, the on-going integration between Taiwan and China will make Taiwan's economic resilience dwindle in the long run; under a state-led model reined by Chinese authorities, Taiwan will gradually lose its own autonomy and flexibility. Although Taiwan's foreign reserves have been maintained at the level of US\$ 270 billion, the economic structure has been deteriorating thanks to its being tilted toward China. The weakening purchasing power has indicated that Taiwan is in a serious recession. The drain of Taiwan's economic resources, including capital, technologies, talented people, and investment, has enriched China's economic structure while hollowing out Taiwan's industries. Currently, Taiwan has experienced the difficulties of dual economic structure. The polarized Taiwan's economic structure has alienated the upper level of Taiwan's economy from the lower one. Under a dual structure, further economic integration between Taiwan and China will abbreviate the lower-level economy and result in increasing unemployment rates. It is foreseeable that a new wave of investment toward China will emerge very soon and the economy of southern Taiwan will be jeopardized (Huang, 2008). Being part of Taiwan's economic structure, deteriorating southern Taiwan economy will drag on the upgrading of Taiwanese economic structure. The benefits derived from the direct links will go into the pockets of big businesses and those who promote easier transportation across the Taiwan Strait. The approach based upon liberal economics is risky and fragile while it is applied to Taiwan case in the contexts of cross-strait economic exchanges. Besides, the side-effects of liberal economy will be extended to social and political spheres of life. Social resentment and political will be potentially rampant.

Since peace is the basic theme by both ruling governments across the Taiwan Strait, a certain set of rules of game has become prerequisite. However, under abnormal political reality across the Taiwan Strait, the issue of the mechanism for cross-strait economic cooperation between Taiwan and China has aroused hot debates. Secretary General of the National Security Council Su Chi revealed to the media that the CECA is an already-tuned policy on the negotiation process with the Chinese counterpart on February 14th, and next day, Kuomintang' Vice-Secretary General and Director of the Department

of Mainland Affairs Chang Jung-kung echoed him immediately. But, after two weeks, Premier Liu Chao-Shiuan told the media that there is no time table and the final resort will be in the hands of the majority of the legislature. Then, President Ma revised it by removing the cap of “comprehensive” away and putting another one on. Speaking to the media on February 27th, 2009, President Ma Ying-jeou changed the name from the fiercely-attacked “CECA” (Comprehensive Economic Cooperation Agreement) to the “ECFA” (Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement). From the meaning of “comprehensiveness” to “framework,” what he has done is just trying to bring it from a concrete and broad level back to a more abstract level. The tone is different, but the reality is the same. Certainly, there will be a slight difference with the new name, but for the green camp, it is strategically meaningless. Besides, a rapid change of policy has also shown a rough process of the policy-making in such an important agenda. Chinese President of State Hu Jin-tao must be confused by Ma’s change because the concept of CECA was early proposed in Ma’s election campaign and Hu just echoed him in the Six Points of Opinions.

At any rate, a rough policy change is not the most fatal matter. For the pan-green camp, the fatal damage to Taiwan is that institutional settings for the ECFA will further bring Taiwan into not only economic but also structural dependency on China. In Hu’s Six-point Opinions, he maintains that both sides of the Taiwan Strait inquire possible ways to link the common development of cross-strait economy and economic cooperation mechanisms in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. Apparently, here, the key word is “to link”; Chinese strategy is to bind Taiwan and China together. The institutional settings will require that Taiwan’s participation be under the consent of China or through the negotiation between the two sides of the Strait. This is the way to refrain Taiwan from moving toward independence. If Taiwan accepts this procedure, it implies that Taiwan yields its autonomy to China. For the pan-green camp, the follow-up consequences will be disastrous. The benefits that Taiwan may earn from the ECFA will not exceed what Taiwan may lose.

Taiwan's Withering Democracy

As stated above, the CCP and the KMT are trying to facilitate cross-strait exchanges by setting aside sensitive sovereign annoyance, from military retreat, diplomatic truce, and the fabric of economic cooperation across Taiwan Strait. Amid the dialogues, the CCP-KMT Forum, initiated by Hu and Lien, has been at the top of the pyramid of cross-strait politics. Nevertheless, in essence, this pattern of cross-strait interaction is not undertaken in parity. For China, Hu is the genuine power holder since China is a party-ruled country. But for Taiwan, Lien is only an honorary chairman of the KMT; he cannot represent Taiwanese or even the ruling government. At most, he only partially represents a certain portion of vested interests. Hence, relatively, China may exercise the power game easier and more flexible and then earn much more political interests from the mechanism. On Taiwan side, without being challenged by the ruling government or monitored by the legislature, the CCP-KMT Forum has presented itself as a dominant supra-fabric underneath which all the dialogues are undertaken.

However, it contradicts democracy. The voices of Taiwanese people, legislature, and media lose their positions in the arena; and the Ma administration is only a substitute to be a tool to accomplish Hu-Lien's decisions. In a sense, we may say that at the policy level, the core of cross-strait policies is determined by Hu Jin-tao, cosponsored by Lien Chen, and endorsed by the participating delegates. The role that Ma assumes is only an executive director accomplishing the assignments from the forum. Consequently, any cooperative projects from both sides of the Taiwan Strait will be only technical. Lien Chen will become the nominal representative to fit China's interests and Ma Yin-jeou is merely a democratically-selected governor to accommodate to China's decision-making process. In the future, even though Taiwan may enjoy some economic resources from China, Taiwan has to pay the cost that its development should be co-determined by the China side. It will jeopardize Taiwan's long-term interests. The potential harms are not only on technical or economic level; it is structural.

The deteriorating democracy related to China factor also worries the pan-green camp. Earlier in November 2008, the street protests against the visit of Chinese official Chen Yunlin were notoriously oppressed by the police. The follow-up interviews of the protestors by the police have created the atmosphere of the White Terror back to 1980s. In December 2008, Tibetan spiritual leader Dalai Lama was rejected by Ma Ying-jeou when he proposed to visit Taiwan. Ever since the protest of Tibetans erupted in March of 2008, over 7000 Tibetans have been detained and 218 were killed. Ma's rejection is not only a frustration for Tibetans but also for the democrats all over the world.

For the pan-green camp, it seems that the KMT tactically shift the public attention away from economy to former President Chen Shui-bian's financial scandals. This has been a controversial issue and Chen's human rights have been violated. The "Freedom of the World" survey 2009 conducted by Freedom House claimed that it will closely scrutinize the follow-up developments in some areas of concern such as freedom of assembly and the independence of the judiciary. This is a signal that the party alternation in 2008 does not bring Taiwan with more democracies but more oppression. The green camp believes that that's a revival of conservative and anti-democratic forces (Li, 2008). In a pan-green view, under the Ma administration, Taiwan is de-linking with international democracies. Taiwan's value in global democracy is being depreciated while pro-China forces are getting stronger in Taiwan. This is a warning for both Taiwan and the US to think of their strategic situations.

The Bottom Line of US Engagement Policy toward China

As a world leader, President Barack Obama's inaugural speech has caught world-wide attention. There is no surprise that, as the core value of the Democrats, democracy and human rights remain the main concern for the Obama administration. From a strategic point of view, to ensure democratic value and global security is essential for Obama to consolidate and nurture its existing relationships with the like-minded countries such as European,

Japanese, Australian and some Southeast Asian allies. In this regard, China certainly is not a part of the chain.

American Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's visit to Asia for the Obama administration on February 15th-22nd, 2009, marked a significant shift on the US global grand strategy. Her visit in Indonesia became strategically significant in counterbalancing China's influence in Asia. It is seen as a re-stress of the US presence in the Southeast Asia. It is very true that the US credibility deteriorated during Bush administration triggering the Iraqi war in 2003. At the same time, in the Muslim-dominated region, with the rise of anti-American sentiments, China has won more political support and social credibility than ever and has gradually bitten the domain conventionally monopolized by the US. Over the past one decade, China has conducted a good and well-formulated neighboring policy. China signed the *Free Trade Agreement* with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, before applying the entry of the World Trade Organization in November 2001. China offered the ASEAN an early harvest measure, with which the ASEAN enjoys benefits more and earlier than China. The ASEAN decade-long suspicion of China threat has been temporarily replaced by anti-American sentiments.

From this point of view, Secretary Clinton's route is meaningful to show America's strong commitment to the ASEAN and strong will to win the ASEAN back before she visited China. Theoretically, the improvement of China-ASEAN relationship does not mean there is no problem between them. With centuries-long anti-Chinese Chauvinism, the tensions between ethnic Chinese and indigenous people have been potentially persistent. China's economic advantages may bring about some contradictions subsequently. Hence, if the US may develop a good strategy focused on the universal value, the reappearance of the US in Southeast Asia will be very likely.

However, China's economic presence in this region has become indispensable in this region. It is worth noting that the emergence of rising China makes the US feel ambivalent. One on hand, China has become a potential rivalry for the US, but on one hand, the US does need China's cooperation on many global issues, such as regional security, energy

cooperation, climate change, and economic and financial commitments. China will be the most challenging rivalry against the US efforts in its global democratization potentially. But, temporarily, China is no match for the US influence in Asia. Besides, relatively, it seems that the US politicians are much greener than the Chinese counterparts, who were well-trained during the great era of the Cultural Revolution. They were experienced during the fierce struggles. They know how to skillfully and flexibly play two-hand tricks against the US. Earlier on Jan. 30th, 2009, Premier Wun Jia-bao fiercely back-fired for US Treasury Tim Geithner's outspoken wordings criticizing Chinese manipulation of the exchange rate of RMB. But, on the media coverage at Clinton's trip, Chinese government had been trying to create a harmonious atmosphere to welcome Secretary Clinton. Chinese government also tried to make an impression that the US needs more cooperation from China.

Apparently, Chinese leaders were successful in manipulating the tactics. Hence, many human rights activists felt disappointed when Clinton announced that she is seeking "to reach consensus on issues that are less contentious than Taiwan, Tibet and human rights," and "the US pressing on those issues can't interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change, crisis, and the security crisis" (Eimer, 2009).

However, Clinton's rapprochement policy toward China without insisting its universal principles had sent a wrong message not only to the world but also to the Chinese people. The US commitment to democracy is overshadowed by commitment to international trade with China. The economic relationship between the US and China is co-dependent. It has even changed dramatically to the detriment of the US than to China (Ladd, 2009).

Nevertheless, Chinese economy has been dependent on foreign investments and exportation. Chinese economy is externally dependent. The US does need some cooperation from China, but China cannot do without the US. Asian countries need a leader to help them put forth democratization. China has had great success in economic development, but its records of human rights, democracy, and political transparency are notorious. The US is one of the few countries which dare to criticize China's misconduct. Robert Sutter's

research interviews 2004-2006 shows that “most Asian governments maneuver and hedge against China’s rise, and they find a strong US presence in Asia fundamentally important and reassuring” (Sutter, 2007). Obama is unlikely to be confrontational with China or anyone else. But democratic Asia needs US leadership if it is to balance China (Tkacik, 2009). Hence, too much appeasement of the US toward China may confound Asia’s attitude and policy toward China. Besides, Clinton’s de-linking human rights issue with other global concerns did discourage the efforts of democracy and human rights of Chinese people inside China (*Human Rights Watch*, 2009).

As a whole, the rise of China makes the US keep changing its strategy toward China over time. In coping with the global financial meltdown, China’s presence as a vital part of the global Marshall Plan capable of providing aids for troubled economies and creating jobs for China itself is also greatly encouraged (Plate, 2009). Besides, recently, the US has been keen to ensure that China continues to support US bonds with \$767.9 billion as of March and Obama openly claimed that “There is much to be gained from a close relationship with China” (Chen, 2009: 9; Chen & Decker, 2009: 15). China and the US are momentarily complementary in economic action: “The US must save more and spend less, but China has to do the opposite” (Powell, 2009: 68). Obama will still regard China as a rivalry but he will not reduce the level of the policy of constructive engagement continuing to involve and lock China into the rules-based institutions that guarantee global growth and stability. But those issues that Obama does not agree will be also proposed, including human rights, democracy and free speech (Chen & Decker, 2009: 15). Democracy and human rights remain very important issues for the US on the agenda of the dialogues with China. Nevertheless, like his predecessor George W. Bush, Obama has been in a low key in any criticism of China’s human rights record (*South China Morning Post*, 2009: A6).

In these global contexts, the present may be the worst timing for the green camp to cope with China. For them, the US policy shift will offer the pro-China KMT government a good excuse to legitimize its clientist approach toward China, covering setting aside sovereign disputes, retreat in military strategy, diplomatic truce, cross-strait economic cooperation, and silence

toward China's democracy and human rights. With decade-long relations, Taiwan has stood at an irreplaceable position for the US to engage China both in the security and value aspects. In a foreseeable future, the US government will keep reiterating "maintaining the status quo" as its typical answer to define the red line on the Taiwan Strait. The US will be happy to see peaceful exchanges across the Taiwan Strait, but any unilateral change of the status quo will be contradictory against its interests. From this perspective, even though Ma administration sets China policy as the first priority beyond anything, he has to estimate the US interests simultaneously because, after all, the US is the most crucial factor for Taiwan's security concerns and the most important back-up for Taiwan to negotiate with China. In fact, President Ma Ying-jeou said on June 19th that Taiwan still needs help from the United States in defending its national security even if cross-strait relations become more relaxed since he inaugurated in May 2008 (*Central News Agency*, 2009).

China has upgraded its national capacities and status to the level of top global players over the past few years. Neighboring countries' appeasement toward China is nothing new. ASEAN countries do that. The KMT government is no exception. Under these contexts of an appeasement policy, China has enjoyed an unprecedented privilege to exercise its power and influence. The pan-green camp is worried that if the US takes a similar policy, the degree and extent that the KMT government leans toward China will be more and greater. Then, even though the form of the status quo across the Taiwan Strait rhetorically is insisted by the US, the contents of the status quo will drift away very fast. The US may see a flag change in Taiwan over night someday. As John Takcik said, "Taiwanese now feel they have nowhere left to go but China....Taiwan's inextricable economic dependence on China — absent counterbalancing action — will quickly drive the country beyond its 'tipping point' toward political and, ultimately, security dependence on Beijing." (Tkacik, 2009)

If the scenario Takcik depicted will come to be true, at most, for the US it is only a loss of a decades-long ally. Nevertheless, for Taiwanese, it's everything. Beyond that, Taiwan has been commonly recognized as a model of democracy in Asia. Taiwan's progress in democracy and human rights has

also been highly appraised as a successful and unique model to create new fusion of traditional and modern values. For most of the democracy fighters in the greater Chinese community, it is a matter of the demise of the hopes for democracy. The overseas Chinese and Chinese democracy advocates are looking forward to seeing Taiwan's today become China's tomorrow. Taiwan's democratic presence becomes significant and important for China's democratization. Without the presence of Taiwan, the future of China will become more unpredictable. On May 17th, tens of thousands of protesters marching through Taipei protested against Ma's China-friendly policy. Just like DPP chairwoman Tsai Ing-wen asserts that Ma is placing Taiwan's destiny and future in the hand of Chinese (Agencies in Taipei, 2009: A7). For the pan-green camp, Ma's pro-China policy and the clientist approach have made Taiwan's de facto sovereignty stay in peril.

Conclusion

From a view of security, a rising economy of China will expose itself to the dependence of resources externally. Most of the Chinese policy circle asserts that China should build its own aircrafts carriers to beef up transporting natural resources from abroad. Huge increase in the demand of foreign oil and other resources have structurally force Chinese to think more to protect its long distance supply line (Qingdao, 2009), the security of Taiwan Strait will become very much extraordinary. Taiwan's presence in the Strait may choke China's lifeline if necessary. But the blurring delimitation between Taiwan and China will paralyze Taiwan's alert and security function. Here, in a pan-green concern, enlarged cross-strait economic exchanges will play a role to make it happen. The pro-unification pundits assert that Taiwan should take a dual axis strategy by changing its US-oriented trade policy mentality into the equal weight to America and China. The proposed signing of an economic cooperation framework agreement (ECFA) between Taiwan and China will help Taiwanese explore Chinese market efficiently and consolidate a free-market framework, which allows free flow of people and goods (Kuo, 2009). As a matter of fact, China has made a lot of efforts to put forth the idea to consolidate closer economic ties between Taiwan and China. On "The Cross-

straits Forum” held in Xiamen, May 15th-22nd, Beijing unveiled new measures to help Taiwan weather the financial crisis (Clem, 2009). The enhancement of economic exchanges between Taiwan and Fujian Province will tightly link Taiwan and China together. The subsequent impacts of the bilateral economic fusion on cross-strait politics will be very crucial and significant to the development of politics across the Taiwan Strait.

In politics, theoretically speaking, Taiwan’s democracy plays a role model for most of the Chinese elites. Democratization is not only significant for the Chinese people in the political life, but also, as the case of India has shown, a key to a healthier and more sustainable function for the future of China (Huang, 2008: 40). In the wake of Hong Kong and Macau, the electoral culture will soon be requested by them. But, in a green view, the blurred and confusing mainstream politics across the Taiwan Strait are weakening Taiwan’s natural defense of democracy against authoritarian China. In China, Beijing controls the media and suppresses independent political organizations very well, and the political support of the growing urban middle class for Chinese government appears to be very high (Harding, 2007: 27). With Beijing’s manipulation of media, Taiwan’s democracy has lost its previous glamour thanks to the fierce confrontation between the blue and green camps, as has deteriorated the image and credibility of Taiwan’s democracy for China to imitate. An article written by Mr. An-tee in Zhon-hen Weekly maintains that Taiwan’s democracy is an experiment for China; the destiny of Taiwan’s democracy is the destiny of China’s democracy. But he warns by concluding that “After sweeping independence forces, Taiwan democracy is much more fragile than expected” (An Ti, 2008). With similar anxieties, the pan-green camp is also worried that the KMT government’s contentions of several prominent opposition leaders, especially former President Chen shui-bian, on corruption suspicions have demonstrated the worsening human rights conditions in Taiwan (*China Post*, 2008: 1). In coping with a rising and expansionist China, as a leader of Taiwan, Ma has to change his confrontational mindset and reach out his olive branch to the opposition parties or organizations inside Taiwan instead of only looking to Beijing. Realistically, without internal cohesion, Taiwan will be divided, defeated, and ruled by China in the long run.

Lastly, as for the proposal of “setting aside disputes,” it just manifests the Chinese-styled mentality and philosophy: ambiguity and postponement. In Chinese culture, time may heal problems. Sometimes, ambiguity and postponement do tackle complicated and intricate political relations. But, Ma’s deeds do not abide by the principles because he is so clear about sovereign claims by accepting ’92 consensus underneath which one China principle is the base. The pan-green camp argues it would undermine Taiwan’s sovereignty and pave the way for cross-strait unification. Furthermore, tactically speaking, insistence on principle is also very crucial to conducting political struggle with Chinese leaders. Just as Tibet’s spiritual leader Dalai Lama asserted that “The Chinese had initially a tough reaction, but then it can go smoothly. So as regards my visit ... at the beginning there was some kind of threat, then eventually not much sort of follow-up” (Brunnstrom, 2008: 1). In a pan-green view, Ma’s weak, instead of soft, approach will gradually accommodate Taiwan to China’s expansionism and also seduce China’s endless requests over Taiwan’s sovereign claims. It will make things become more complicated and worse. It will also make Taiwan’s globally democratic leverage against Chinese authoritarianism weakened and likely defeated. However, no matter how the pan-green camp criticizes or protests against the political realities, it is politically weak. While lingering on a green doctrine, the pan-green camp cannot do without coping with the engaged cross-strait realities shaped by both the CCP and the KMT, at least, before 2012.

References

- Agencies in Taipei. 2009. "Opposition Crowds Swamp Taipei." *South China Morning Post*, May 18, A7.
- An Ti. 2008. "Let's Carefully Protect Taiwan's Democracy in the Era of Post-three Links." *Tsung Heng Weekly*, November 2 (<http://blog.udn.com/star99/2524887>) (2009/6/18).
- Brunnstrom, David. 2008. "Europe Should Not Appease China, Be Frank: Dalai Lama." *China Post*, December 4 (<http://www.chinapost.com.tw/international/europe/2008/12/04/186068/Europe-should.htm>) (2009/6/18).
- Central News Agency. 2009. "Taiwan Still Needs U.S. Help in National Security: President." June 19 (http://www.etaiwannews.com/etn/news_content.php?id=981519&lang=eng_news&cate_img=83.jpg&cate_rss=news_Politics_TAIWAN) (2009/6/19).
- Chen, Edwin, and Susan Decker. 2009. "Bipartisan Choice Hunts for New US Future with China." *Standard*, May 28, p. 15 (http://www.thestandard.com.hk/news_detail.asp?pp_cat=20&art_id=82229&sid=23896852&con_type=3) (2009/6/18).
- Chen, Kathy. 2009. "Obama Taps Huntsman as Ambassador to China." *Wall Street Journal Asia*, May 18, p. 9.
- China Post. 2008. "Ma Calls for Human Rights Endorsement." December 11, p. 1 (<http://www.chinapost.com.tw/taiwan/national/national-news/2008/12/11/187079/Ma-calls.htm>) (2009/6/18).
- China Review News. 2009. "The Destinations of the Four Trillion Investment and Its Monitor: Detailed by National Development and Reform Commission." March 6 (<http://www.chinareviewnews.com/doc/1009/0/6/6/100906611.html?coluid=1&kindid=0&docid=100906611&mdate=0306162050>) (2009/6/18).
- Clem, Will. 2009. "Beijing to Help Taiwan Combat Financial Crisis." *South China Morning Post*, May 18, A7.
- Eimer, David. 2009. "Hillary Clinton China Visit Blamed for the Detention of Activists." February 21 (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/474202/Hillary-Clinton-China-visit-blamed-for-the-detention-of-activists.html>) (2009/2/23).
- Harding, Harry. 2007. "Think Again: China." *Foreign Policy*, No. 159, pp. 26-33.
- Huang, Tien Lin. 2008. "Eight Scenarios of Taiwan's Economic Futures in Huang Tien Lin's Prophecy." November 22 (<http://blog.udn.com/gwbush/2407236>) (2008/11/22).

- Huang, Yasheng. 2008. "The Next Asian Miracle." *Foreign Policy*, No. 167, pp. 32-40.
- Human Rights Watch*. 2009. "Clinton Remarks Undermine Rights Reform in China." (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/human-rights-watch/clinton-remarks-undermine_b_168689.html) (2009/2/20)
- Kuo, Deborah. 2009. "Taiwan Should Consider 'Dual Axis' Policy in Face of G2: Scholars." *CNA News*, April 5 (<http://english.cna.com.tw/SearchNews/doDetail.aspx?id=200904050010>) (2009/6/18).
- Ladd, Edward. 2009. "Summary." (<https://www.dreyfus.com/attachments/pdf/splash/dry-uschwp-0209.pdf>) (2009/7/15)
- Lao Pao. 2009. "Falling into a Prisoner's Dilemma." *Taiwan Times*, June 26 (<http://www.twtimes.com.tw/html/modules/news/article.php?storyid=11230>) (2008/6/26).
- Li, Chien Kuang. 2008. "The Forum for Taiwan's Competitiveness: To Open up New Opportunities for Taiwan through Singing Peace Agreement." *Central News Agency*, December 24 (http://news.pchome.com.tw/politics/cna_business/20081224/index-12301031415088722001.html) (2009/6/18).
- Li, Hung Tien. 2008. "Political Witch Hunt Scares Foreign Capital." *New Taiwan Weekly*, August 28 (<http://www.newtaiwan.com.tw/bulletinview.jsp?bulletinid=82824>) (2008/8/28).
- Liberty Times*. 2009. "Weekly Commentary: Hu's Six-point Speech, Calling for Ma's Surrender." January 4 (<http://www.libertytimes.com.tw/2009/new/jan/4/today-p4.htm>) (2009/6/18).
- Lin, Cheng-yi. 2009. "China's 2008 Defense White Paper: The View from Taiwan." (http://www.jamestown.org/programs/chinabrief/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34458&tx_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=25&cHash=e3f16ee84a) (2009/2/5)
- Liu, Yung Hsiang. 2008. "The All-volunteer Military Recruitment System Will Be on the Way in 2014 and the Transitional Obligatory Service Will Be One Year." December 6 (<http://forum.slime.com.tw/thread239982.html>) (2009/6/18).
- Plate, Tom. 2009. "Working with China." *South China Morning Post*, May 18, A11.
- Powell, Bill. 2009. "China's Hard Landing." *Fortune*, March 5, p. 68 (http://money.cnn.com/2009/03/04/news/international/powell_china.fortune/index.htm) (2009/6/18).
- Qingdao. 2009. "China's Navy: Distant Horizons." *Economist*, April 23 (http://www.economist.com/displayStory.cfm?story_id=13527979) (2009/6/18).
- South China Morning Post*. 2009. "Obama Sends Strong Message to Beijing with Envoy's Appointment." May 18, A6.

- Sutter, Robert. 2009. "China's Rise and the Durability of US Leadership in Asia." (http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/riecano_eng/Content?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/Elcano_in/Zonas_in/Asia-Pacific/ARI+89-2007) (2007/27/7)
- Taipei Times*. 2008. "Australia Praises Ma for Avoiding Dollar Diplomacy." October 27 (<http://www.taipetimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2008/10/27/2003427083>) (2009/6/18).
- Taiwan News*. 2009. "Editorial: KMT Policy Making Taiwan Less Secure." June 10 (http://www.taiwannews.com.tw/etn/news_content.php?id=972279&lang=eng_news&cate_img=46.jpg&cate_rss=news_Editorial) (2009/6/10).
- Taiwan's Friends of Frank Hsieh and Su Tseng-chang. 2009. "Examinations on the Anniversary of the Ma Government's Inauguration: Frank Hsieh's Speech at Taiwan Thinktank (May 9)." May 7 (<http://city.udn.com/59274/3421877>) (2009/6/18).
- Tkacik, John. 2009. "An Obama TPR: Too little, Too Late?" *Taipei Times*, April 29 (<http://www.taipetimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2009/04/29/2003442283>) (2009/4/29).
- Topology Research Institute. 2009. "China's Domestic Market Will Lead the Industry to Grow in the Next Half Year." June 17 (http://www.eettaiwan.com/ART_8800575810_617723_NT_406ebfdc.HTM) (2009/6/17).
- Xinhua*. 2009. "Official: Chinese Mainland to Promote Economic, Cultural, Educational Co-op with Taiwan." June 23 (http://big51.chinataiwan.org/sy/yw/200906/t20090623_926654.htm) (2009/6/23).

初探馬英九政府的中國政策

顏建發

清雲科技大學國際合作處處長

摘要

兩岸不對稱的關係乃是結構的、發展的。站在泛綠的觀點，本文指出馬英九終極統一的統派政策以及對中國的柔軟策略，將使台灣的作為走向順應中國的和平發展戰略而為其系統所吸納。源自於政治上的擱置爭議、軍事上的固若磐石、經貿上的擴大兩岸合作以及對於中國民主與人權的噤若寒蟬，在在使得台灣日益陷入不利與被動處境。中國的優勢不僅表現在政治、經濟和軍事實力上，也其策略思考與計謀作為也值得警惕。泛綠陣營憂慮，在馬英九政府軟弱的政策作為下，台灣將被迫陷入中國系統的軌道之中，而最終恐將遭到中共的併吞。作者也指出美國在兩岸關係的互動過程中的角色的重要性。美國的存在與政策作為，對於台灣而言，固存在機會，但也伴隨風險。但無論如何，國共所建構的兩岸關係與，都是泛綠陣營在誇談主權獨立時，必須面對的政治現實。

關鍵字：和平發展、胡六點、固若磐石、外交休兵、經貿合作框架協定