

THE WHITE HOUSE
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

CO 034-01

INCOMING

DATE RECEIVED: MAY 09, 1989

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: DR. DAVID W. TSAI

SUBJECT: WRITES AGAIN FURTHER CONCERNING RIGHT OF
PEOPLE ON TAIWAN TO DECIDE THEIR FUTURE FOR
THEMSELVES

ROUTE TO: OFFICE/AGENCY	(STAFF NAME)	ACTION		DISPOSITION	
		ACT CODE	DATE YY/MM/DD	TYPE RESP	C COMPLETED D YY/MM/DD
CHARLES BACARISSE		ORG	89/05/09		C 89/05/13 DJ
99 DOS	REFERRAL NOTE:				
	REFERRAL NOTE:		89/05/13 DJ		RA 8906/01 CJ
	REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /		/ /
	REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /		/ /
	REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /		/ /

COMMENTS: SEE ID 017636

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENTS: MEDIA:L INDIVIDUAL CODES: _____

PL MAIL USER CODES: (A) _____ (B) _____ (C) _____

```

*****
*ACTION CODES:          *DISPOSITION          *OUTGOING          *
*                       *                       *CORRESPONDENCE:  *
*A-APPROPRIATE ACTION  *A-ANSWERED          *TYPE RESP=INITIALS *
*C-COMMENT/RECOM       *B-NON-SPEC-REFERRAL *           OF SIGNER *
*D-DRAFT RESPONSE      *C-COMPLETED        *           CODE = A   *
*F-FURNISH FACT SHEET  *S-SUSPENDED         *COMPLETED = DATE OF *
*I-INFO COPY/NO ACT NEC*                       *           OUTGOING *
*R-DIRECT REPLY W/COPY *                       *                       *
*S-FOR-SIGNATURE       *                       *                       *
*X-INTERIM REPLY       *                       *                       *
*****

```

REFER QUESTIONS AND ROUTING UPDATES TO CENTRAL REFERENCE
(ROOM 75, OEOB) EXT-2590
KEEP THIS WORKSHEET ATTACHED TO THE ORIGINAL INCOMING
LETTER AT ALL TIMES AND SEND COMPLETED RECORD TO RECORDS
MANAGEMENT.



台 · 灣 · 國 · 際 · 關 · 係 · 中 · 心
CENTER FOR TAIWAN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

731 Eighth Street, S.E. • Washington, D.C. 20003 • Tel. (202) 543-6287 • Fax: (202) 546-4784 • Telex: 510 601 7738

May 3, 1989

a. Bacause
President George H.W. Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President,

As you may recall, on February 15 of this year, I wrote you on behalf of our Center and eight organizations representing Taiwanese-Americans. We contacted you out of our concern for the right of the 20 million people on Taiwan to decide their future for themselves.

On April 7, Mr. David G. Brown, the Taiwan Coordination Advisor of the U.S. Department of State, was kind enough to write me a response on your behalf.

We very much appreciate the prompt and concise response from Mr. Brown. However, we believe that a number of points continue to require clarification.

First, Mr. Brown states that during your trip, you reaffirmed that the three joint communiques between the United States and the People's Republic of China (PRC) of 1972, 1979, and 1982 "would continue to form the basis of U.S. policy toward China." We strongly support the U.S. government's recognition, stated in the latter two communiques, that the government of the PRC is "the sole legal government of China." We believe that this recognition has both promoted peace and stability in the Pacific Basin region and has advanced American interests.

As far as the future of Taiwan is concerned, though, we believe that U.S. policy is governed not only by these communiques, but by the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (TRA). Furthermore, to the extent that the principles of the communiques conflict with the TRA, a duly enacted U.S. law, the Act takes precedence.

We believe that the 1982 communique seriously contradicts the TRA. As we stated in our previous letter to you, the Act bases U.S. arms sales to Taiwan solely upon a Presidential and Congressional assessment of Taiwan's defensive needs. We believe that the PRC constitutes the main security threat to the island because it refuses to rule out the

use of force in pursuit of "reunification." The 1982 communique, in effect, makes the PRC a party to determining the level of U.S. arms sales to Taiwan. We believe that this is incompatible with the provisions of the TRA, and that the duly enacted law supercedes the communique when there are conflicts between them.

Furthermore, the 1982 communique is inconsistent with longstanding U.S. interest in the peaceful resolution of the question of Taiwan's future, since virtually no one on Taiwan today supports the PRC's proposal for "reunification under the one country, two systems concept." This U.S. interest is clearly articulated in the TRA, the 1972 communique, and numerous statements by U.S. government officials, including your four immediate predecessors in office.

Second, as you are perhaps aware, on February 26 and 27, the official media of the PRC, including both the **People's Daily** newspaper and the New China News Agency, reported that you told China's Premier, Mr. Li Peng, "that America will persist in a one China policy and will continue to observe the principles contained in the three communiqués. America states this policy clearly and openly so as to discourage separatists on Taiwan."

These reports were reprinted in the **Central Daily News**, the official organ of the ruling Nationalist Party on Taiwan. As you undoubtedly know from your long years of experience in Asian affairs, it is exceedingly rare for this newspaper to quote from Chinese Communist sources. Evidently, the governments and ruling parties on both sides of the Taiwan Strait are seeking to use reports about your discussions with Mr. Li to bolster their mutual claims that Taiwan is a part of China. While the U.S. has for many years acknowledged that this is the Chinese position, it has never accepted or recognized such a claim.

For over a week after these reports appeared, we were unable to obtain any response to them from either your office or the State Department. We were most concerned to know whether the reports constituted an accurate characterization of your discussions with Premier Li.

Finally, on March 6, Mr. Brown's office informed us of its "press guidance" on this issue. Mr. Brown's subsequent letter to us follows the same line of argument as that press guidance. It reiterates "the bedrock principle" of U.S. policy that "there is but one China." It states that in the joint communiqués, the U.S. government has made it clear that it has no intention of pursuing a policy of "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan."

At the same time, we understand from subsequent conversations with Mr. Brown's office that the U.S. explicitly upholds the right of the people on Taiwan to advocate Taiwan's permanent separation from China,

or any other position with respect to the ultimate resolution of the question of Taiwan's future.

Obviously, the U.S. can avoid pursuing a particular outcome with respect to that question--such as "one China, one Taiwan"--without actively opposing that outcome. Nevertheless, two questions remain unclear to us, and we would very much appreciate a clarification from you or appropriate officials of the U.S. government concerning these questions.

First, if the U.S. government indeed supports the right of the people on Taiwan freely and openly to discuss Taiwan's future, why does the U.S. government refuse to state this publicly, and why has the U.S. government failed to make vigorous public statements opposing the efforts of the Taiwan authorities to prosecute and incarcerate peaceful proponents of independence?

Second, as we noted in our earlier letter, we insist that sovereignty over Taiwan belongs to the people who live on the island, and to no one else. Should the people on the island choose to exercise that sovereignty, and formally declare themselves independent from the People's Republic of China, will the U.S. continue to have an interest in seeing the Taiwan question settled by peaceful means, regardless of the desires of the PRC government to annex Taiwan by force?

We strongly agree with your statement during your trip that the so-called "China card" strategy is now obsolete and was always a condescending approach to the people of China. To reiterate a point in our earlier letter, changing relations among the United States, China, and the Soviet Union have freed our country from any need to defer to the PRC on the issue of the future of Taiwan. At the same time, the U.S. continues to have important incentives it can offer the PRC for moderating its behavior toward Taiwan.

Therefore, we again urge you to uphold the right of the people on Taiwan to decide their future for themselves, free from outside coercion and restraints imposed by the authorities on the island.

Sincerely,



David W. Tsai, Ph.D.
President

cc: U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
U.S. House of Representatives Committee on
Foreign Affairs
Mr. David G. Brown, U.S. Department of State



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Mr. Tsai:

I have been asked to reply to your second letter, dated May 3, to President Bush. You asked for clarifications on a number of points in my first letter to you.

I of course agree with you that United States policy toward Taiwan is governed by the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) as well as by the three communiqués we have signed with the PRC. Secretary Baker made this point very clearly in his confirmation hearings when he reaffirmed our commitment to the TRA. All these documents are important statements of US policy.

While some people have argued that there is a theoretical contradiction between the US-PRC 1982 Communique and the TRA, the Administration has had no problems in dealing with arms sales in a manner that complies with both. Those people often ignore the PRC statement in the same communique that its "fundamental" policy toward Taiwan is to strive for a peaceful solution. This statement of PRC policy was an important factor in the US decision to sign the communique. I am sure you will agree that tensions between the PRC and Taiwan are currently at an all-time low. I believe that the consistency of American policy has contributed to the peace and prosperity which the people of Taiwan enjoy today.

We have stated publicly our commitment to freedom of speech, regardless of the views expressed, in successive human rights reports and elsewhere. The American Institute in Taiwan has conveyed our views to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs here and to the Taiwan authorities in Taipei. At the same time, we have made clear our one-China policy lest USG support for the free speech rights of those who advocate independence be misunderstood as support for those peoples' views. We weigh carefully how we make our views known, reserving open pressure for the most egregious cases.

Our hope is that the Chinese people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait resolve their differences peacefully, free from outside interference. As stated in the TRA, we would view with grave concern any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means.

Sincerely,


David G. Brown

Taiwan Coordination Advisor

Mr. David W. Tsai
President, Taiwan Center for Inter. Studies
731 8th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20003