

**Identity Politics and Foreign Policy:  
Taiwan's Relations with China and Japan, 1895-2012**

Yinan He

Forthcoming 2014, *Political Science Quarterly*

[Abstract]

Nation is a product of self-other separation and exclusion. Divergent, or even competing, narratives about the national Self and Other advanced by various nationalist entrepreneurs can shape conflicting policy preferences regarding the foreign country in question. The two primary Others for defining Taiwan's identity, China and Japan, have been frequently set against one another in its political discourses as elites wage a pitched battle over whom the Taiwanese are and where their future lies. This was evident during Japanese colonization in 1895-1945, the rule by the KMT regime after the war, and post-democratization period. For the new KMT government led by Ma Ying-jeou since 2008, anti-Japanese resistance is a cornerstone of its nationalist foundation, but a Taiwan-centered identity in opposition to China and popular affection for Japan prevent Ma from promoting an explicit pro-China, anti-Japan nationalism. As long as China and Japan get along well and Beijing maintains a moderate approach to cross-strait relations, Taiwan prefers to befriend both powers and enjoy the economic and security benefits. Should the Sino-Japanese rivalry intensify and Beijing turn more assertive to Taiwan, however, Taiwan's neutrality would face stern challenges both from China and Japan externally and from internal forces contesting national identity.

On 7 September 2010, a Chinese fishing boat collided with two Japanese Coast Guard vessels near the disputed Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands within Japan's claimed Exclusive Economic Zone. The Japanese Coast Guard detained the crew and ship but thereafter let them go, only to hand over the Chinese captain to prosecutors for obstructing its execution of duties. The Chinese government immediately protested to Japan and demanded the release of the captain. The situation only calmed down in late September when the Japanese government set free the captain but refused to apologize or give compensation.

When the diplomatic tensions escalated, nationalist activists across the Taiwan Strait quickly mobilized. Meeting in Taipei on 11 September, activists from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau said that they planned to sail from a fishing port in northern Taiwan to Diaoyu/Senkaku to stage a protest there. At this *baodiao* [defending Diaoyu] forum, Taipei County Councilor, King Chieh-shou, from the Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) and Hong Kong Legislative Council member Leung Kwok-hung called for the Chinese and Taiwanese governments to work together and take a stronger stance against Japan. Chinese activists were also scheduled to leave port Xiamen for the islands at roughly the same time.<sup>1</sup> These moves echoed the voices from mainland China and Hong Kong urging the two sides of the Taiwan Strait to jointly protect the maritime sovereignty of the motherland.<sup>2</sup> Further, cross-strait cooperation received implicit endorsement from Beijing. When asked to comment on the *baodiao* activities in Taiwan, the spokeswoman for the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council stated twice that safeguarding sovereignty over the islands conforms to the common interests of people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait.<sup>3</sup>

Pressed by calls for joint actions with Beijing, responses from Taipei were rather cool. During the incident, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs reiterated the Republic of China's (ROC)

sovereignty claim but denied that it was siding with China. Ships of the Coast Guard Administration (CGA) escorted a Taiwanese fishing boat to protest at the islands, but the CGA said it was to protect Taiwanese fishermen, not to support *baodiao* activists, and that the action had nothing to do with China.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, Taipei blocked Hong Kong and Macau activists from using Taiwanese fishing boats to stage protests by threatening to revoke the Taiwanese captains' licenses and deny entry visa to the activists in the future.<sup>5</sup> In the meantime, Taipei repeatedly called on all parties to exercise restraint. President Ma Ying-jeou made it clear on September 28 that the government will protect Taiwan fishermen's interests and rights but also wants to maintain the status quo of these islands because Taiwan is in a sensitive position.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, during the recent flare-up of the disputes from July 2012, Taipei asserted sovereignty rights but called for restraint and peace, and rejected cooperation with China.

Taiwan's position seems perplexing. Not only had Taipei led the way of protest since 1970, shortly after the United States included them as part of Okinawa to be returned to Japan's control, but also Ma himself is known for being a *baodiao* activist and legal specialist.<sup>7</sup> Why did the Ma government try hard to stay out of Sino-Japanese territorial disputes despite its own stake in it? How to explain Taiwan's complex attitude towards China and Japan? Because Taiwan has always been a sensitive issue in Sino-Japanese relations, and cross-strait relations can potentially become one of the most dangerous flashpoints in the region, one need to understand the Taiwan-China-Japan triangle.

The existing literature on Taiwan-Japan relations has covered extensively their historical and cultural links, economic and security interdependence, and shared democratic ideology – often in comparison with Taiwan's respective ties with China.<sup>8</sup> Recognizing the relative importance of China and Japan to Taiwan is certainly useful to understanding their triangular

relations. But Taiwan is not merely a prize for Sino-Japanese competition, whereby whichever power demonstrating more shared interest or cultural traits with Taiwan would draw Taiwan closer. Nor are Taiwan's external behaviors always a coherent strategic choice based on a rational cost-benefit calculation. Rather, the behaviors are often intertwined with the shifting self-images of Taiwan in relation to outside powers and the intense tug of war between domestic forces taking interest in these self-images. In other words, one cannot fully comprehend Taiwan's foreign relations if leaving out the psychological and political contestation over national identity.

This paper treats identity politics as an important domestic determinant of foreign policy preferences and uses the Self-Other conception to approach it. The first section introduces the conception and spells out the impact of national "Othering" on foreign policy. It becomes particularly complex when this approach is applied to a settler colony, like Taiwan, where the national Self is defined first and foremost in response to the perception of its master nations. There, creole nationalism vis-à-vis the ethnic/cultural mother countries often functions as a critical ideology shaping national identity discourse. The next two sections illustrate the argument through a historical analysis of the role played by China and Japan as the two primary Others in Taiwan's self identification, first in 1895-1980s, and later during the Lee Teng-hui and Chen Shui-bian administrations. The analysis focuses on an imaginary China vs. Japan battle long prevalent in Taiwan's identity politics separate from, if not entirely independent of, Sino-Japanese relations in the real world. This identity discourse has been utilized not only by the Japanese and Chinese rulers who tried to win over the local population when they descended on Taiwan, but also by Taiwan's creole nationalists who draw upon Japanese colonial legacy in order to form a unique historical and cultural basis for a national identity detached from China.

The subsequent section explores Ma Ying-jeou's attempt to redirect Taiwan's identity

discourse so that it would no longer set the two Others against each another but instead portray them both as Taiwan's friends. The new identity construct has motivated the Ma government to draw close to China and Japan simultaneously. This policy is designed not only to gain economic and security benefits for Taiwan but also to maximize his domestic political support vis-à-vis the opposition. But implementing this policy is no easy job, given the competitive Sino-Japanese relationship that frequently pressures Taiwan to take sides. China's policy to Taiwan is another uncertain factor constraining Taiwan's diplomacy. The paper concludes that as long as China and Japan get along well and Beijing maintains a moderate approach to cross-strait relations, Taiwan may befriend both powers. Should the Sino-Japanese rivalry intensify and Beijing turn more assertive to Taiwan, however, Taiwan's ambivalent diplomacy would meet stern challenges both from China and Japan externally and from internal forces contesting national identity.

### **SELF-OTHER CONCEPTION, CREOLE NATIONALISM, AND IDENTITY POLITICS IN FOREIGN POLICY**

Identity is a voice inside you saying “this is the real me,” says Erik Erikson.<sup>9</sup> Self recognition is necessitated by one's encounter with the external world. As Charles Tilly says, “identities reside in relations with others: you-me and us-them,” and “identities center on boundaries separating us from them.”<sup>10</sup> Nation is a product of such self-other separation and exclusion, or what I call “Othering.” Delineating the national Self versus the Other is a prior condition for national integration; those belonging to the Self hold a sense of common fate and mutual attachment, therefore generating national unity and loyalty. The Other can be ethnic, religious, political, or cultural communities inhabiting the same territories of the Self, or can be outside nations that closely interact with the Self in certain historical and political contexts.

While national identity is defined relationally, it should be noted that the national Self and Other do not have to be simply confrontational but can assume alternative modes of interaction, such as being competitive, collaborative, or even harmonious.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the self-other social boundaries are not fixed or consistently salient, nor do the targets and modes of Othering stay the same.<sup>12</sup> At any given time various nationalist entrepreneurs may offer divergent, or even competing, narratives about the national Self and Other. Such a debate can involve not just a single Other but also a set of important Others assigned conflicting values and characteristics. For example, according to Ted Hopf, Russian identity discourses in the late 1990s diverged over the historical Other (the Soviet past), internal Other (rural and ethnic periphery), and external Other including the US, Europe, and the West in general. An identity that rejects Western markets and democratic practices would at the same time appreciate the Soviet achievements and unique traditions of the Russian nation, as well as sympathize with the peripheral; conversely, an identity that admires Western practices would dismiss the Soviet past and hold a mixed evaluation about the peripheral.<sup>13</sup> In this case, multiple Others for the Self contradict one another in the discursive realm, regardless of whether they do so in the real world, and identity shifts are accompanied by paradigmatic changes in the Self's view of these Others.

At least two broadly defined motivations give rise to a particular mode of national Othering. One is the desire to counteract perceived threats to the physical or spiritual integrity of the population in question. Therefore, in the 1930s-40s Japan became the foremost, negative Other for China because its massive invasion endangered the *raison d'être* of the Chinese nation. Today, pro-independence Taiwanese fear that an increasingly powerful China can not only threaten Taiwan's security but also undermine its distinctive identity through economic and cultural penetration. The other motivation is to use national Othering to legitimize certain

policies or political ideologies. In Communist China, for example, the socialist nationalism calling for class struggle has since the 1980s been replaced by a stronger ethno-centric tone emphasizing the biological and cultural roots of “Chineseness.” The new discourse treats Western countries which oppressed China in modern history, such as Japan, as the Other.<sup>14</sup> It serves to salvage the declining legitimacy of the regime and dampen the secessionist movements of ethnic minorities. Because of these heavy political stake, how to define the relationship of a particular Other with the Self becomes a battlefield where elites struggle for power and influence. Whoever gains dominance in this identity contestation secures the privilege to determine the vision and purpose of the nation, which in turn brings about greater public following.

National identity contestation has significant implications for foreign relations. An obvious one is that competing "Othering" discourses will shape conflicting policy preferences regarding the foreign country in question. Those portraying a positive self-other relationship would support cooperation with that country, while those insisting on a negative one would advocate distance from or confrontation with it. Further, if several foreign countries are inversely linked to the Self in a paradigmatic debate of national identity, the debate would compel elites to choose sides between these countries. Thus identity politics constitutes a powerful domestic constraint on foreign policy options. The government would face less of a challenge to implementing a coherent foreign policy if the external Others are on good terms with one another; but if their relationship takes a turn for the worse, it would greatly energize domestic identity disputes and in turn tie the hands of the government in handling diplomacy.

The case that concerns us here, Taiwan, belongs to the category of settler colonies where the national Self tends to take up a uniquely complex and convoluted relationship with its Other. Settler communities, generated by empire expansion in modern history and spanning the

American continent, Oceania, and part of Africa and East Asia, is a global phenomenon, and yet they remain marginal in theoretical understanding of nationalism.<sup>15</sup> In his seminal book, *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson draws scholarly attention to them with a concept of creole nationalism that describes the nationalist movements led by the descendants of the original settlers/conquerors against the colonial rulers coming from the Old Country, with whom they share a common language, kindred, and cultural heritage.<sup>16</sup> Nostalgic about the imperial metropole, creole elites nevertheless justify their pursuit of severance with a new national identity bred by "their distinctive history, and especially their demographic blending of settler and indigenous peoples, to say nothing of local traditions, geographies, climates, and so forth."<sup>17</sup> What frequently reinforces creole patriotism is a bitter sense of dispossession and alienation toward the discriminatory and even oppressive system imposed by the metropole on the colonies. The creoles in Spanish America, for instance, denigrated to be tainted and inferior people compared to the peninsulars born in Spain, were systematically excluded from high public office.<sup>18</sup> In British America, colonial resistance leading up to the revolution was directly provoked by a series of laws passed in the parliament, including the Stamp Act of 1765, Townshend Acts of 1767, and Coercive Acts of 1774, that the colonies saw as crude violation of their natural rights. Similarly, Taiwanese independence movement emerged after the Chinese mainlanders took over political control of the island from Japan and treated the posterity of earlier Han immigrants to Taiwan as second-class citizens.

Anderson's theory suggests that the colonial motherland is ultimately the most significant Other against which a settler nation constructs an image of the Self. A nationalist movement would lack popular support if the colony fails to differentiate itself from the motherland or repudiate charges of its own inferiority. For this reason the creoles typically search for an

autonomous foundation of national inspiration and self-pride. Cultural symbols are frequently invoked and historical narratives manipulated to promote an identity discourse centered on the colony itself. So British Americans claimed themselves to be a special category because of their superior civic values, such as republicanism and the principle of social equality, as opposed to the British model of government and aristocratic society.<sup>19</sup> And Mexican Spaniards sought to deny their Spanish origins by identifying themselves with an idealized Indian past and creating the myth of "Our Lady of Guadalupe" as an independent source of religious authority for the Mexican Church.<sup>20</sup> Taiwan-centric elites today make their case for separation with all of the above arguments, namely Taiwan's democracy (versus China's authoritarianism), indigenismo, and unique historical and cultural experiences, especially under Japanese colonization. To fully explore Taiwanese nationalism is beyond the scope of this article. I focus on the third argument here because it drives home the foreign policy effect of identity politics.

As the following historical analysis shows, in modern history Taiwanese elites have searched for national identity by constantly comparing Taiwan with what Masahiro Wakabayashi calls two "unforgettable Others," China and Japan.<sup>21</sup> China is the Old Country for both the vast majority of the population there today, the Taiwanese, who immigrated there a few hundred of years ago, and the mainlanders, most of whom fled to Taiwan after the KMT lost the Chinese civil war. Regimes on the Chinese mainland twice ruled Taiwan, during the Qing Dynasty and after WWII. Between the two periods was fifty years of Japanese colonization. Interestingly, the two master nations have been frequently set against one another in Taiwan's political discourses as elites wage a pitched battle over who the Taiwanese are and where their future lies. This was evident in the de-sinicization campaign by the Japanese colonizers, the push for de-Japanization

and China-centrism by the postwar KMT government, and a renewed Japanophilia nurtured by the creole nationalists in democratic Taiwan to downplay Chinese elements there.

It is noteworthy that in the course of these identity shifts Taiwanese elites have responded to both the China within and China without. Resentful of the Japanese rule, many colonial intellectuals in Taiwan developed a melancholy affection for the motherland China that was beyond their reach. But after 1945 this "motherland complex" gave way to a burgeoning creole nationalism against the China within, the KMT regime, which posed itself as a conqueror of Taiwan. Harking back to the history of Japanese period, Taiwanese creoles claimed that Taiwan had a separate, more advanced source of civilization than China. Since Taiwan democratization in the 1990s, the mainlanders' political privileges over the Taiwanese have diminished, but a rising China across the Strait become the new stimulus for Taiwan's creole nationalism. What makes Taiwan different from those creole colonies that eventually formed their own states, however, is that a powerful China anxious to unify Taiwan has ruled out its de jure independence in the foreseeable future. Realistically, what most Taiwanese nationalists try to do today is to defend Taiwan's de facto independence and curb a trend toward unification.

### **CHINA AND JAPAN IN TAIWAN'S IDENTITY POLITICS, 1895-1980S**

Japanese colonization in 1895-1945 and postwar KMT rule of Taiwan have often been juxtaposed in terms of their "wrestling with the challenge of subordinating the native society to its authoritarian rule."<sup>22</sup> The success of both regimes in accomplishing the goal lies in an adaptive practice of governance that over time managed to co-opt, incorporate, and transform the local elite to support the regimes' nation-building and state-building vision. To facilitate the process, both made systematic attempts to construct a dominant Japanese or Chinese identity in the Taiwanese society, often through a coercive cultural policy to suppress local consciousness.

Specifically, after WWI the Japanese colonial government tried to acculturate the Taiwanese under the "principle of homeland extensionism" [*naichi enchō shugi*], proclaiming to treat them the same as Japanese citizens. Further, in the 1930s-40s, to sustain an all-out war first with China and later with Western powers as well, a Japanization campaign was launched to immediately turn the Taiwanese people into "subjects of the emperor" [*kōminka*]. *Kōminka* facilitated the extraction of massive resources, manpower, and logistic assistance from Taiwan. The Taiwanese were urged to wear Japanese clothes, adopt Japanese customs, switch from local religions to Shintoism, and speak the Japanese language. The primary target of this assimilation policy was the China Other, which not only had deep cultural roots in Taiwan but also was a major enemy country in the war that Japan was waging. Taiwanese allegiance to Japan would be highly suspect if their spiritual ties with China remained thick. Therefore, from the very beginning Japanization was carried out hand in hand with de-sinicization. Schools prohibited the use of Chinese language, Chinese newspapers were banned altogether, and even people's Chinese names were replaced by Japanese ones. By the end of the war, it was estimated that two-thirds of the Taiwanese population had been Japanized.<sup>23</sup> The younger generation, who would experience the transition to the KMT rule later, was more receptive to Japanization, and many of them were sent to battlefields in China, though not always voluntarily.

When Japan surrendered in 1945, its colonial subjugation campaign was halted. Even before controlling Taiwan, the KMT government was determined to reverse the influence of Japanization and foster a China-centered identity.<sup>24</sup> Similar to the Japanese imperialization of Taiwan, the sinicization campaign of the KMT was aimed at both national integration and securing Taiwanese support to its conflict with the Communists on the mainland. After losing the civil war in 1949, the KMT regime headed by Chiang Kai-shek faced an even more critical task

of nationalizing Taiwanese people in order to justify its governance, both locally vis-à-vis Taiwanese population and internationally under the legitimacy challenge from the Communist regime. In the officially promoted "One China" vision, Taiwan was claimed to be a part of the ROC along with the mainland, the Taiwanese were Chinese, and the KMT government was the sole legitimate government representing China.<sup>25</sup>

In the KMT's identity discourse, though not so much in its foreign policy that will be addressed later, Japan became a negative national Other. New cultural policy in direct denial of the colonial legacy was introduced from 1946 onwards, beginning with promoting Mandarin Chinese and forbidding the use of Japanese in schools. Japanese newspapers and magazines in Taiwan were also eliminated.<sup>26</sup> History textbooks of the 1950s-80s described Chinese suffering since the 1894-95 Sino-Japanese War, including Taiwan's colonization at the hands of the Japanese, and stressed the mutual inspiration and assistance of the Taiwanese and Chinese in resisting Japanese invasion.<sup>27</sup> The government also encouraged and sometimes directly sponsored the production of anti-Japanese war movies, such as through the state-run *Zhongying* [Central Film Company]. The 1970s in particular saw a wave of war movies because of the urgent need to boost national confidence after the ROC lost its seat at the United Nations. While most of these movies focused on the heroic struggles of the Nationalist forces on the mainland, a few depicted Taiwan's resistance movement. One prominent example is the 1976 film *Meihua* [Plum Blossom], named after the national flower of the ROC, which used a family tale to spell out the connections between the resistance campaigns in Taiwan and mainland. It was a big hit once released, and the theme song *Meihua* became one of the most popular songs in Taiwan.

Thus the Other images of China and Japan were pitted against one another in top-down identity projects to nationalize Taiwan both by the Japanese and by the KMT. Meanwhile, such a

China-Japan image clash was played out in social resistance against official culture in both periods. Wakabayashi argues that the very birth of modern Taiwanese nationalism was a response to Japanese colonization. The Taiwanese people did not realize a distinct Self until they became discriminated members of the Japanese empire.<sup>28</sup> Striving for equality and dignity, colonial nationalist elites emphasized Taiwan's uniqueness and from the 1920s petitioned for self-rule by establishing Taiwan's own parliament. The political campaign was accompanied by the activities of the Taiwan Culture Association to bring cultural enlightenment to Taiwan. But it is hard to see these developments as creole nationalism yet since colonial resistance in Taiwan, even at the highest point, never developed into a full-fledged independence movement.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, an important, though not the entire, theme of the cultural movement was to urge Taiwanese people to appreciate their Han Chinese traditions. It is in this sense that "the colonial nationalist projects of 'Taiwanese consciousness' were in many cases endeavors including a pursuit of 'Chineseness'."<sup>30</sup> To be sure, Taiwan was physically isolated from China for the large part before 1945. But native elites were seized with a sentimental draw to the ancestral homeland in either an open or inner opposition to Japanese colonization.<sup>31</sup>

After WWII, Taiwanese people initially welcomed the Chinese rule, but they soon resented the wholesale repudiation of Japanese legacy by the new regime. Forbidden to speak Mandarin Chinese or local dialects, colonial Taiwan had been using Japanese as the only intellectual language and Japanese education as the bridge to the outside world. Native elites felt a loss of self-identity when the Japanese language was abruptly banned in social life.<sup>32</sup> Cultural frustration was compounded by socio-economic grievances as Taiwanese resources were siphoned off to support the KMT's war against the Communists, official corruption went rampant, and mainlanders enjoyed political and economic privileges while native elites were largely kept

out of the new government. The KMT's justification for denying the Taiwanese of political participation is that, having been "enslaved" in the Japanese empire and "infected" by the colonial education for half century, Taiwan not only lagged behind Chinese cultural progress but also was disloyal to the motherland; so before being reintegrated into China through lengthy reeducation programs, the Taiwanese were unfit to govern themselves.

Like in British and Spanish Americas where discontent toward the imperial metropole led to the colonies' assertion of the cultural and political Self, the oppressive rule of a mainlanders' regime sparked the creolization of Taiwanese nationalism vis-à-vis the Chinese motherland. By 1946, Taiwanese elites had commonly believed that the KMT was treating Taiwan as a colony, and likened it to the Japanese colonizers, except that the KMT colonization was even worse. They began to draw upon past experiences of striving for self-government during the Japanese period to demand greater political influence.<sup>33</sup> But their attempt collapsed in the February 28 Incident in 1947, in which an island-wide uprising of native Taiwanese was violently put down by Nationalist forces. Thereafter, the KMT regime blamed the "poisonous" effect of Japanization for causing the incident, and made it clear that calling for self-government was tantamount to seeking independence.<sup>34</sup> Although temporarily suspending political activism in the island, after the incident Taiwanese nationalists actually abandoned the moderate goal of self-government and gravitated to an explicit movement to create an independent Taiwan state. Pro-independence Taiwanese, largely operating in exile, rejected the "One China" thesis with a Taiwan-centered creole identity. They played down the historical and cultural bonds between the Taiwanese and mainlanders while stressing the latter's contempt for and discrimination against the former in the past centuries. Further, they claimed that culturally and materially Taiwan was far ahead of the mainland, citing the half century of modernization and westernization introduced

during Japanese colonization.<sup>35</sup> By this logic, Taiwanese civilization would be both different from and superior to that of China, and China had lost Taiwan by moral forfeit. Ironically, the cultural influence of the Japan Other, which used to be the target of Taiwanese nationalist struggles before 1945, was now held up as a powerful symbol to resist the China Other personified by the KMT regime.

## **DEALING WITH THE OTHERS UNDER LEE AND CHEN**

By the 1980s, identity politics had little influence on Taiwan's foreign policy. Colonial Taiwan had no foreign policy of its own. Facing a Communist China in the Cold War setting, the KMT regime's diplomatic autonomy was also greatly compromised. To rebuild national morale and enhance regime legitimacy, postwar KMT foreign policy initially targeted at the Japan Other, including to hold massive trials of Japanese war criminals and Chinese traitors, and to demand Japanese war reparations. But after losing the civil war, the ROC desperately needed international recognition for it to be the sole legitimate government of China. The U.S. determination to facilitate Japanese restoration and rearmament and the People's Republic of China (PRC)'s active courting of Japan through a semi-official diplomacy convinced Chiang that a hostile policy to Japan would only gain Taipei more international isolation. Grudgingly, Chiang opted to "repay violence with virtue," renouncing war reparation claims while developing strategic partnership with Tokyo. Throughout the Cold War Taipei kept an intimate relationship with Tokyo, especially through the pro-Taiwan faction in the Liberal Democratic Party. Their high-level semiofficial contacts continued even after Sino-Japanese diplomatic normalization.<sup>36</sup> Chiang did carry on anti-Japanese propaganda, but mainly for domestic consumption, and with a dictatorial rule he managed to insulate foreign policy from societal pressure at home.

A significant identity shift occurred following Taiwan's democratization in the 1990s. The political upheavals were set in motion in the late 1970s, when dissident movements of the Taiwanese and mainlanders coalesced to a new *Dangwai* [Non-Party] movement pushing for democratic reforms.<sup>37</sup> Open confrontations between *Dangwai* and the authoritarian government erupted in the Kaohsiung Incident in December 1979, in which the government cracked down a human rights demonstration and rounded up dissident leaders. But the opposition received so much sympathy and support from the public afterwards that the government had to release Kaohsiung Incident defendants early. This incident pressured Chiang Ching-kuo, who had assumed leadership after his father died in 1975, to implement liberalization measures, such as to lift the martial law imposed in 1949, to allow new political parties, and to accommodate more Taiwanese elites in the government. By legalizing the political opposition, democratization and localization of Taiwan politics also emboldened its call for self-determination of Taiwan, thus allowing the Taiwan-centric identity discourse, used to be heard only among the émigrés, to be introduced into Taiwan.<sup>38</sup> Entering the 1990s, especially after Lee Teng-hui, a native Taiwanese, won the first direct presidential election in Taiwan in 1996, the Taiwan-centric discourse gradually moved to the mainstream. The first non-KMT regime in Taiwan led by Chen Shui-bian of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) in 2000-2008 further shattered the hegemonic "One China" discourse.

In the meantime, Taiwan's external environment changed profoundly. The island is now confronted with a more formidable China than ever before. The PRC's policy of "peaceful reunification," in place since the 1980s, carried greater firmness and urgency under Jiang Zemin in the 1990s. Beijing not only tried to strangle Taipei's "international living space," but also actively built up military capabilities and showed a willingness to use them, such as in the 1995-

1996 Taiwan Strait Crisis. True that creole nationalism vis-à-vis the China within, the KMT regime, had gained strong currency by then, and Taiwan in the form of ROC was already a de facto state. But most Taiwanese agreed that under the Chinese pressure making this independence de jure would jeopardize Taiwan's survival. Since Hu Jintao succeeded Jiang in the early 2000s, Beijing has maintained its principled stand on the Taiwan issue but changed from a hawkish strategy to a moderate one emphasizing diplomatic means and cross-strait social and economic ties.<sup>39</sup> Hu's charm offensive alarms Taiwanese nationalists, too, because it is quietly expanding Chinese influence in the island and luring Taiwanese population with material benefit. It has also boosted popular support to the KMT-dominated pan-blue camp that advocates a closer relationship with China and threatened the legitimacy of the DPP government.

Thus the immediate task for Taiwan-centered elites was to stop Taiwan from drifting to China and indefinitely put off unification. Doing so is also useful in undermining the political credibility of the pan-blues and strengthening that of the pan-greens. National Othering discourse highlighting Taiwan's distinctiveness was employed to facilitate this nationalist project. Textbook changes were particularly evident. Reforms since the mid-1990s drastically decentralized the education system, thus subjecting it to more native Taiwanese opinions than before. School curriculum now shifted the educational focus away from Chineseness to the "Taiwan people [*taiwanren*]" and "Taiwan consciousness [*taiwan yishi*]."<sup>40</sup> Two typical themes of creole nationalism stood out in the new curriculum. One is to acknowledge the multiethnic nature of Taiwanese culture, including both the Han and indigenous origins, instead of simply favoring Chinese influence. The other, as analyzed below, is to reevaluate the historical legacy of Taiwan's two primary Others, positioning the Self away from China and closer to Japan.

For instance, the KMT's narrative had long praised Koxinga (or Zheng Chenggong), a half-Japanese pirate and Ming loyalist, for liberating Taiwan from the Dutch colonization in the 17th century. But Western historians question if Zheng is a real Han patriot and suspect that he conquered Taiwan simply to use it "as more of a refuge than a springboard back to the mainland."<sup>41</sup> Taiwanese nationalists are even more cynical, arguing that Zheng never cared about Taiwan until his army was routed by Manchu forces. They also believe that Taiwan had never belonged to China before the Dutch came, so there was no "restoration" in any sense; rather, he simply imposed an outside regime on Taiwan's aborigines.<sup>42</sup> Unsurprisingly, with the direct intervention of Cheng Shui-bian's Ministry of Education, new textbooks deleted language describing Zheng as a "national hero [*minzu yingxiong*]" for "restoring [*shoufu*] Taiwan."<sup>43</sup>

Regarding the KMT regime in Taiwan, from the 1990s textbooks adopted a more neutral stand, crediting it for developing Taiwan's economy but criticizing its China-centered policy and lack of democracy.<sup>44</sup> Textbook coverage of the February 28 Incident also went from complete omission to including entire sections on it. Meanwhile, the purely negative view on the Japanese colonization was dropped. New textbooks denounced Japanese oppression and discrimination but acknowledged its role in bringing modernization and development to Taiwan. The previous wording contrasting the benign KMT and evil Japanese, such as "Japanese occupation [*riju*]" and the KMT's "recovery [*guangfu*]" of Taiwan, were also replaced by such unemotional expressions as "Japanese rule [*rizhi*]," and KMT "takeover [*jieshou*]" or "take control [*jiéguan*]."<sup>45</sup>

In addition to textbooks, historical commemoration also leaned towards remembering Taiwanese suffering at the hands of the KMT more than that under Japanese rule. From 1990, the government took ever bigger efforts to investigate and memorialize the February 28 Incident, including organizing an official investigation team, passing legislation to compensate the victims,

and building the 228 Memorial Park in Taipei. In 1995, President Lee issued an official apology in front of the 228 Monument in the park. Two years later, under the auspices of the Chen Shui-bian-led Taipei municipal government, the Taipei 228 Memorial Museum was opened.

Interestingly, the 1990s also saw an outburst of Taiwanese popular memories of Japanese war atrocities, particularly about the "comfort women" (actually sex slaves in the Japanese imperial army drawn from Japan and elsewhere in Asia, including Taiwanese women). Initially grabbing wide societal attention and propelling the government to demand a Japanese apology, after the DPP came to power in 2000 the salience of comfort women memory waned.<sup>46</sup> Compared to the detailed documentation of the February 28 Incident, Taiwanese textbooks typically mentioned the "comfort women" in passing. The Taipei 228 Memorial Museum simply skipped the issue when narrating Japanese colonial history.

In democratic Taiwan foreign policy could no longer be isolated from domestic politics as the government is now held accountable to the constituency. This also allows leaders to deliberately exploit foreign policy for internal political gains. As the China Other and Japan Other quietly traded places in Taiwan's national identity discourse, foreign policy became the acting out of the new Self-Other conception by elites on the international stage. For Taiwan-centric leaders like Lee and Chen, this performance means to create political distance, or even tension, with China while cultivating intimacy with Japan. In the early 1990s, as the leader of both the ROC and KMT, Lee inherited the Chiang-era policy treating Taiwan as part of China, although he abandoned the ROC's sovereignty claim over mainland China in 1991. While open to the semi-official Kuo-Wang talks with Beijing, he also sought to elevate Taiwan's international status via "vacation" diplomacy to countries that recognized the PRC. To be sure, Lee remained cautious in advocating "Taiwan consciousness" until 1995, after being repeatedly

rejected by Beijing. Following China's missile exercises during Taiwan's 1996 presidential election, Lee openly slammed China for trying to "oppose democracy." He also proposed to "manage a great Taiwan" because with its traditional culture and absorption of Western values and technologies Taiwan could lead the mission to build a new cultural center.<sup>47</sup>

In May 1999, Lee published a book, *Advocating for Taiwan*, in which he reminded Beijing that China was currently divided into two separate political entities, and demanded that the equal rights of Taiwanese people be respected when the two sides gradually move toward a peaceful unification. He particularly ruled out Beijing's "one country, two systems" framework and refused any predetermined timetable for unification. Economically, he declared the policy of *jieji yongren* [avoid haste, be patient] to restrain large-scale Taiwanese capital investment on the mainland.<sup>48</sup> Two months later, to prevent Jiang Zemin from pushing for a breakthrough toward unification in the next Kuo-Wang talks in October, Lee made a significant statement in an interview with Deutsche Welle that cross-strait relations had been designated "as a state-to-state relationship or at least a special state-to-state relationship."<sup>49</sup> After the KMT lost the presidential election in 2000, Lee left the party and became the spiritual leader of the Taiwan Solidarity Union, a pan-green party openly promoting Taiwan sovereignty. Thereafter he had little reservation in speaking of Taiwanization. He moved so "radically in support of a separate Taiwan nation" that even President Chen found his rhetoric unrealistic.<sup>50</sup>

In fact, when first entering office, Chen made conciliatory gestures to China through the "five nos" policy, which spelt out respect for the cross-strait status quo and willingness to improve ties with the mainland. Deeply suspicious of a DPP government, however, Beijing refused to engage Chen. At home, Chen's political control was tenuous because he won the presidential election not by majority votes but against a divided opposition, who in combined

force dominated the legislature and were determined to thwart the president's political initiatives. Meanwhile, with his soft approach to China receiving no reciprocation, other DPP leaders felt increasingly uneasy about his policy.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, two years into his first term Chen, anxious to consolidate his power base and concerned about reelection, began to play the card of identity politics. In August 2002, he spoke of "One side [of the Strait], One country [*yibian yiguo*]," in line with Lee's two-state theory. His rhetoric thereafter jettisoned the symbol of "ROC" and instead moved "Taiwan" to the center of national representation.<sup>52</sup>

After winning reelection in a tight, controversial race, Chen was subsequently mired in corruption scandals implicating himself and his family. In his second term Chen emphatically mobilized Taiwanese identity on an anti-China premise, not only to check Hu Jintao's enticement and coercion to Taiwan, but also to arrest the sharp decline of his popular support within the island.<sup>53</sup> To Beijing's fury, he terminated the functioning of the National Unification Council and the application of the National Unification Guidelines in 2006. He also carried out an offensive *fenghuo waijiao* [cutthroat diplomatic war] that scrambled for foreign diplomatic recognition at the expense of China. More dramatically, he pushed the envelope of de jure independence with a number of referendum proposals demanding bold enunciation of Taiwan's international sovereignty.<sup>54</sup> The fact that these referenda were held on the same day of the presidential elections of 2004 and 2008 respectively drives home their domestic political motivations.

While moving away from China, Lee and Chen took care to curry favor with Japan, not only to gain external sympathy to Taiwan's fate but also to convince the domestic public that Taiwan was not part of China because it had more similarities and closer bonds with Japan. In his interview with Japanese writer Shiba Ryōtarō in 1994, for instance, Lee said that the KMT government was a regime imposed on Taiwan by outsiders. He also criticized the Beijing regime

for treating the country as a private asset and thereby acting against liberal democratic values. At the same time, he spoke favorably of Japanese colonial legacy in Taiwan and admitted that he himself was a Japanese citizen until 22 years old.<sup>55</sup> Departing from the KMT's official objection to Japanese nationalist view of history, Lee showed more understanding and tolerance. In a dialogue with a well-known Japanese right-wing cartoonist Kobayashi Yoshinori published in 2001, Lee assailed the "masochistic history" taught in Japanese schools that caused the younger generation to be shameful of their country and therefore crushed their self-confidence. Lee also urged Japan to take up a leadership role in Asia in defiance of China's pressure. Lee's remarks were applauded by Kobayashi, who commented that, having been bombarded by China and other countries on the history issue, an exhausted Japan found Lee's words quite soothing to hear.<sup>56</sup>

A few elite figures tied to the pan-green camp concurred with Japanese rightists in rationalizing the history of aggression. In February 2001, presidential advisor Hsu Wen-lung told Kobayashi in an interview that Taiwanese "comfort women" voluntarily joined the service because they wanted to "stand out among others," and the Japanese imperial government did not force or trick them because their parents sold them out of poverty.<sup>57</sup> When Hsu came under fire in Taiwan for "pandering to Japanese," Kin Birei (or Jin Meiling), a Taiwan-born, pro-independence activist residing in Japan, defended Hsu by arguing that evidence was insufficient to determine the truth of "comfort women," and that the issue was a political game played by the Japanese left.<sup>58</sup> Kin and other overseas Taiwanese nationalists used to be blacklisted by the KMT, but were welcome back by the DPP government with honor. Of this group, Kin and Ng Chiautong (or Huang Zhaotang) were appointed as Chen Shui-bian's personal advisors, and Koh Se-kai (or Xu Shikai) became Taiwan's top diplomat in Tokyo. Having spent many years in Japan, this group had strong ties with the rightist, pro-Taiwan faction of the conservative forces there.<sup>59</sup>

Further, in 2005 chairman of the Taiwan Solidarity Union, Shu Chin-chiang, paid homage to the Yasukuni Shrine that enshrines fallen Japanese soldiers, including WWII war criminals.

Lambasted by the pan-blue camp and Beijing, Su's shrine visit was welcomed by Japanese right-wingers, for whom the Taiwanese independence movement was the best evidence showing Japan's beneficent colonial legacy and rebuttal against China's sovereignty claim over Taiwan.

Hence Japanese historical revisionism and Taiwan-centric nationalism found each other in a comfortable alliance against the common Chinese enemy.<sup>60</sup> The fact that this alliance emerged at a time of heated history disputes between China and Japan was not a coincidence. In China, patriotic propaganda emphasizing Japanese wartime atrocities and heroic Chinese resistance have since the mid-1980s replaced the tired communist ideology to boost the weakened regime legitimacy. Meanwhile, with its economic miracle stunted and political reform stagnating, many Japanese politicians played to nationalist groups to boost national confidence and win popular votes.<sup>61</sup> When Chinese and Japanese nationalism clashed head on, creole nationalists in Taiwan cleverly exploited it to reinforce the China vs. Japan dichotomy in identity discourse. Inside these people, many of whom experienced Japanese colonization, feelings about Japan were far from wholehearted embracing.<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless they chose affinity with Japan in order to vindicate Taiwan's alienation from China.

It should be added that Lee and Chen courted a broader political circle in Japan than just the extreme right. For one thing, Taiwan's new democracy, as they often emphasized, appealed to many Japanese people, including members of the largest opposition party at the time, the Democratic Party of Japan. Young Japanese in particular held neither colonial nostalgia for Taiwan, nor feelings of guilt towards China, but they were more likely attracted to Taiwan because of shared democratic values. There are also plenty of pragmatic politicians in Japan who

paid little attention to either normative values or historical/cultural ties but only to national interest. For this *kokueki* [national interest] faction, the pan-greens were easier to work with because they opposed China, Japan's chief strategic rival. To attract this faction, Chen Shui-bian once suggested forming a security alliance with Japan against China.<sup>63</sup> Lee and Chen also downplayed Taiwan's conflict of interest with Japan in favor of cooperation. After leaving office, Lee spoke to Japanese media in 2002 that even though the Taiwanese have fishing rights at the disputed Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands, their sovereignty belongs to Japan and the documents that China bases its claim on have no legal validity.<sup>64</sup> Representing the Chen government, Koh Se-kai said at his first news conference in Japan on 7 July 2004 that the Islands were so close to both Taiwan and Okinawa that its ownership should be settled through bilateral talks.<sup>65</sup> With this statement Koh clearly wanted to win Japan's good will. In fact, one day before departing for Tokyo, he had declared that his mission was to seek Japanese support to Taiwan independence and to normalize bilateral relations.<sup>66</sup> Further, between 1996 and 2005 Taipei held as many as 15 meetings with Japan on fishery disputes, in which it carefully separated fishery from sovereignty issues.<sup>67</sup>

## **AMBIVALENT DISCOURSE AND DIPLOMACY TO CHINA AND JAPAN UNDER MA**

Since the KMT led by Ma Ying-jeou regained power in May 2008, the new government has tried to reorient Taiwan's identity discourse regarding the two primary Others. It gradually reversed some of the de-sinicization practices during the previous administration. Thus "ROC" was restored to the names of state-run enterprises and institutions after being replaced by "Taiwan" in Chen's campaign to "rectify names,"<sup>68</sup> and all government agencies must use "mainland China" or simply "the mainland" instead of the word "China" in written documents to avoid giving the impression that Taiwan was a separate country from China.<sup>69</sup> In 2009 and 2012,

Ma also presided over memorial ceremonies to pay tribute to the Yellow Emperor, the mythical ancestor of the Han race, symbolizing his emphasis on core Chinese values.<sup>70</sup>

The KMT also brought back the history of anti-Japanese resistance as an important reference point for defining Taiwanese identity. In an article published back in 2005, as the KMT chair and Taipei mayor at the time Ma presented a historical narrative that tightly linked Taiwan's anti-Japanese resistance movement to that on the Chinese mainland.<sup>71</sup> From 2005, the KMT alternated giant portraits of anti-Japanese heroes from Taiwan, such as Jiang Weishui (founder of Taiwan Cultural Association and Taiwan People's Party in the 1920s), Luo Fuxing (anti-colonial activist and member of Sun Yat-sen's Tongmenhui), and Mona Rudao (aboriginal leader of the revolt of Wushe in 1930), on the external walls of its Central Committee building. After entering power, Ma and other party leaders made high-profile appearances at commemorative events in honor of the anti-Japanese history.<sup>72</sup> Particularly on 25 October 2011, Ma opened the Memorial Monument for the Victory of Anti-Japanese War and Recovery of Taiwan at the Zhongshan Hall in Taipei. The monument, completed in 1999 at the KMT's urging, had borne no inscription because the Legislative Yuan claimed that the history was too controversial to be definitely interpreted. The 2011 ceremony presented an inscription narrating China's history of anti-Japanese resistance, in which the Taiwanese's contribution and sacrifice were highlighted.<sup>73</sup>

Despite these changes, some important notions of Taiwan-centric nationalism have remained in the mainstream of identity discourse. School curriculum, for instance, now allocates more space to Taiwan's anti-Japanese resistance campaign than before, and longer teaching time to Chinese history than Taiwanese history in the compulsory curriculum.<sup>74</sup> But the logic of dual evaluation of Japanese colonial legacy in Taiwan is kept in the textbooks.<sup>75</sup> Meanwhile, the

focus on Taiwanese local culture and history remains intact alongside the neutral view on Koxinga and the KMT rule in Taiwan. Similarly, the new government did not change the historical narrative presented by the 228 Museum.<sup>76</sup> The opening section of the exhibition still labels the ROC as an "outside regime," along with the Dutch and Spanish colonialists, Zheng family, Qing Empire, and Japanese Empire. The museum also maintains that a significant cross-strait cultural gap existed after the war as a result of their long-term separation and Japanese colonial development in Taiwan.<sup>77</sup> Additionally, the president has issued an annual apology for the February 28 Incident on behalf of the government.

Why has Ma not completely rolled back the previous governments' cultural policy? Why is he not simply promoting the China Other against the Japan Other in identity conception? To be sure, when reemphasizing the history of anti-Japanese struggle Ma wants to undercut the historical and cultural legitimacy of the pro-independence forces. But he is uninterested in encouraging a narrow-minded, anti-Japanese nationalism in Taiwan. Since Ma's power base is the centrist mainstream on the island, and having twice won the presidential election with a comfortable margin, he does not have as much a problem of power insecurity as his predecessor, Chen, who tended to overplay the identity issue for partisan interest. Yet identity politics is still important for Ma because to maintain his centrist position and have his party stay in power he must align himself with the self-image of the majority of the population.

Two features of the current public opinion in Taiwan prevent leaders from endorsing a straight-forward pro-China, anti-Japan identity discourse. One is that the percentage of Taiwanese who think of themselves as only Taiwanese has consistently outstripped that of those who think they are both Taiwanese and Chinese since 2008, and exceeded 50 percent since 2009. The percentage of those who think they are only Chinese has hovered below 5 percent in the

same period. On the relationship with the mainland, those favoring either "status quo now, decision later" or "permanent status quo" surpassed 60 percent from 2009.<sup>78</sup> The other feature is Taiwanese affection for Japan. According to a 2009 poll conducted by Japan's diplomatic representative office in Taiwan, 52 percent of respondents considered Japan to be their favorite country other than Taiwan itself, compared to the distant second (eight percent for the US) and third (five percent for China) choices. Also, as many as 62 percent of respondents felt close to Japan, and 44 percent wished to travel to Japan (compared to 29 percent for Europe and ten percent for China that trail behind Japan). The same poll shows that a slightly higher percentage of respondents believed that in the future Taiwan should develop a close relationship with China (33 percent) than Japan (31 percent).<sup>79</sup>

These data show that most Taiwanese people wish to maintain a peaceful relationship with the mainland, not because they embrace a Chinese identity, but due to their fear of turbulence that would result from cross-strait conflict. Taiwan's democratization that legalized competing nationalist programs, decline of the China-centric propaganda under Lee and Chen, and several cross-strait crises in the past two decades have entrenched a Taiwan-centered national self-imagination in the island. In the meantime, while feeling estranged about China and intimate about Japan, Taiwanese people are not short of political pragmatism given China's significance to the security and prosperity of Taiwan. For its own interest, Taiwan must find a way to interact peacefully with China. Creole nationalism vis-à-vis the powerful and ambitious China remains more an idea than action guide for most islanders.

Under such circumstances, Ma must walk a fine line between the aspiration and reality as he too maneuvers in Taiwan's identity politics. From what the president has said and done since 2008, one senses that he wishes to end the long-standing discursive confrontation between the

China Other and Japan Other so that Taiwan no longer needs to choose sides. Although stressing Taiwan's anti-Japanese history as an important reminder for its China connection, Ma also pays tribute to Japan's contribution to Taiwanese development. This was exemplified by his speech at the opening of Hatta Yoichi Memorial Park in Tainan on 8 May 2011, in which he claimed that instead of being "anti-Japanese," he is "pro-Japanese" and the best friend of Japan. Regardless of many disputes during Japanese rule of Taiwan, said Ma, Japan's efforts in building Taiwan's infrastructure, such as the water conservancy constructed by Hatta Yoichi, should be remembered.<sup>80</sup> In the meantime, he incorporates the Taiwan symbol into his vision for the island's future. When he ran for Taipei mayor back in 1998, he was endorsed by Lee Teng-hui at an election rally as a "New Taiwanese [*xin taiwanren*]" because despite his mainland origin he was brought up in Taiwan. His presidential inaugural speeches in 2008 and 2012 mentioned the word "Taiwan" 51 and 42 times respectively, compared to the word "*zhonghua*" [China, or Chinese nation] that was used only 12 and 15 times, signaling to the public the Taiwanese-ness of his government even though under the legal and political roof of ROC.<sup>81</sup>

Innovative but full of compromises as it is, Ma's conception of Taiwan identity has given rise to a rather ambivalent policy towards China and Japan. In his first term, Taiwan made unprecedented strides toward improving cross-strait relations, such as to allow two-way tourism, direct flights, mail, and shipping, as well as to sign the landmark Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement in 2010. Ma also resumed the semi-official dialogue with China that had been suspended for nearly a decade, not to mention various inter-governmental contacts. Additionally, he introduced a cease-fire to the Chen-era fierce diplomatic war with the PRC and pursued instead *huolu waijiao* [flexible diplomacy] that offered Beijing reassurance in exchange for Taiwan's diplomatic space.<sup>82</sup>

Despite his accommodation to China, Ma has stuck to his campaign promise in 2008 of a "three-nos" policy: no pursuit of de jure independence, no negotiations with the mainland about unification, and no use of force. His first term pursued economic and cultural ties with China but avoided the political agenda of peace agreement or reunification. Despite his cautious position, a significant proportion of the public feels that cross-strait exchanges are going "too fast" and Ma is too pro-China. Particularly after the KMT Honorary Chairman Wu Po-hsiung commented in Beijing in March 2012 that Ma defines the cross-strait relationship to be "one country, two areas," opinion polls show that more than half of Taiwanese respondents found the position unacceptable.<sup>83</sup> Even Ma's clarification in his inaugural speech in May that the "one country" means ROC has failed to quell public suspicion. Given the high political risk, Ma in his second term hardly has incentive moving forward with the "hard" political issues.

Similar to his guarded attitude vis-à-vis China, Ma has been circumspect in conducting diplomacy to Japan. He has distanced himself from pro-independence Taiwanese activists in Japan, albeit keeping connections with Japan's powerful conservative politicians. He was also quick to push back any signs that Japan may back Taiwan independence, such as in the 2009 controversy over the interpretation of the Japan-ROC peace treaty.<sup>84</sup> On the island disputes with Japan, Ma has appeared more nationalistic than its DPP predecessor. As soon as his presidency began, in June 2008 Ma's Japan policy was put to a test by the *Lianhehao* Incident, in which a Taiwanese fishing boat sank near the disputed Islands after being rammed by a Japanese Coast Guard ship. Taipei responded firmly by reasserting Taiwan's sovereignty over the islands, demanding Japanese compensation, and recalling Taiwan's top representative to Japan. But such a tough stand is more of the KMT wanting to show a policy difference from the DPP than of an intended showdown with Japan. The new government's diplomatic inexperience and domestic

public opinion also contributed to the initial escalation. When Beijing began to weigh in on the Taiwan side, and *baodiao* activists in Taiwan and Hong Kong planned joint protests, however, Tokyo and Taipei quickly reached a settlement. Ultimately, Ma's position does not vary significantly from that of the previous administrations, which is to prioritize the negotiation of fishing rights but shelve the sovereignty issue.<sup>85</sup> Likewise, Taipei shunned the opportunity to act in unison with Beijing against Japan in the island disputes in 2010 and 2012.

Not only tepid about cooperating with Beijing on maritime controversies, Taipei also continues national defense buildup and stays vigilant for the PLA forces deployed across the Taiwan Strait. Further, Ma stresses the importance of US-Japan alliance to Taiwan's national security.<sup>86</sup> Even before becoming the president Ma had tried to dispel his reputation of being an anti-Japanese hardliner. In visits to Japan in 2006 and 2007, he emphasized close Taiwan-Japan cooperation and sought Japanese understanding of his conciliation toward China.<sup>87</sup> After the *Lianhehao* Incident calmed down, Taipei dedicated 2009 to advance Taiwan-Japan "special partnership." Some notable steps under the initiative include the signing of a memorandum of understanding to strengthen exchanges and cooperation in April 2010; an open skies agreement in November 2011 that allows an unlimited number of flights operated by Taiwanese and Japanese carriers between Taiwan and Japanese destinations, including outside of Tokyo; and another agreement to upgrade non-governmental mutual investment in September 2011. Taipei's quick and generous assistance to Japan after the Tohoku earthquake in 2011 further testifies its eagerness to mend fences with Japan. It was in that year that Taipei's Foreign Ministry declared that "bilateral ties between Taiwan and Japan are at their best ever."<sup>88</sup>

These friendly overtures notwithstanding, Ma has stayed clear of any security and political deals with Japan that might provoke China. Ma also wants to forestall the kind of

domestic political backlash, mainly from the KMT, when the DPP government played favoritism with Japan against China. Ma is careful not to jeopardize his strongest support within his own party. Therefore, contrary to the DPP's push for a Taiwan-Japan alliance or a Japanese version of the Taiwan Relations Act, the new government has refrained from seeking a tangible security relationship framework with Japan. Taipei also dissolved the Council of Japanese Affairs set up by Chen in the Foreign Ministry and brought back instead the Association of East Asian Relations to handle Japan policy. These are symbolic name changes meant to remove the impression that the ROC is conducting state-to-state diplomacy with Japan for Japan has a formal diplomatic relationship with the PRC.<sup>89</sup>

Undoubtedly, staying on good terms with China and Japan simultaneously can bring Taiwan handsome economic and security dividends. The Chen-era provocation to China exacerbated Taiwan's isolation and insecurity as it not only resulted in cross-strait tension but also damaged Washington's trust in Taipei. In the 2008 presidential election Taiwanese voters showed their support to a leader who could restore tranquility to the Taiwan Strait while focusing on domestic issues.<sup>90</sup> Diplomatic neutrality between China and Japan would also mediate the competing nationalist voices in Taiwan and maximize the constituency of the KMT government. Economically, a strong partnership with both China and Japan would greatly contribute to Taiwan's success. The ideal scenario, according to Taiwan's economic elite, is for Japan and Taiwan to team up in exploring the enormous commercial opportunities in China, given Japan's technological and management advantage and Taiwan's cultural and language convenience, as well as Taiwan's cumulative experience doing business in China and deep capital penetration of the market there.<sup>91</sup>

Avoiding taking sides is indeed Ma's policy preference, but whether it can be successfully implemented depends not just on the cleverness of the policy design per se but also on at least two exogenous factors beyond Taipei's control. One is the state of affairs of Sino-Japanese relations. The other is Beijing's approach to Taiwan. At the beginning of his presidency Ma managed to keep close to both Beijing and Tokyo without visibly displeasing either one because the two countries had since 2006 repaired their badly damaged relationship, easing the pressure on Taipei. Ma's first term also saw the continuation of Beijing's effort to promote reconciliation with the KMT-led pan-blue camp. While reserving the use of force as the last resort to deter Taiwan's de jure independence, Hu Jintao appreciated Taiwan's domestic politics more than his predecessor Jiang Zemin, and was willing to concede certain degree of diplomatic flexibility to Taiwan so that people there would be open to cross-strait economic integration and possibly future negotiation of a political agreement.<sup>92</sup>

However, uncertainty will emerge if these exogenous factors begin to intrude on Taipei's diplomacy. The recent row over the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands serves as a good example. Ever since the possibility of Japanese nationalization of the disputed islands arose in July 2012, Taipei reaffirmed its sovereignty claim and even sent CGA ships to escort Taiwanese *Baodiao* ships to the islands. Short of these actions, Ma would be going against the general tide of public opinion in Taiwan and offend the pan-blues in particular.<sup>93</sup> But time and again the Ministry of Foreign Affairs rejected cross-strait collaboration against Japan despite Beijing's rather obvious hints. Still, Ma was under attack from the opposition for being "pro-China" because he asserted the sovereignty rights of the ROC, not Taiwan. Chen Yi-shen, a historian with pan-green background, made it clear that Taiwan would not have a foundation to join the island disputes

until it becomes independent.<sup>94</sup> At the same time, Ma received warning from the Japanese side that he was getting "overly close to China."<sup>95</sup>

As former U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia Randy Schriver points out, among the three parties to the island disputes, Taiwan is the only claimant that lacks an internal consensus, and as the smallest player "Taiwan has a difficult road to navigate" between China and Japan.<sup>96</sup> This case indicates that escalating Sino-Japanese rivalry threatens to suck in Taiwan and shrink its diplomatic space of maneuver. It is also unlikely that Beijing will be forever patient with Taipei's delaying on cross-strait political negotiation. If the post-Hu Chinese leadership reverts to the Jiang-era policy of disengagement and pressure, it may push Taipei to Tokyo's arms, like what happened to the Lee and Chen administrations. Friction with either one of the two powerful countries can also sharpen the ideological division between Taiwan's nationalist groups that advocate different attitudes to the two national Others. This would defeat the purpose of Ma's middle-of-the-road strategy, which has precisely aimed at ending Taiwan's plight of being sandwiched between China and Japan in both domestic identity politics and foreign relations.

## CONCLUSION

For nearly one century since Taiwan was ceded to Japan, Taiwanese people have constantly wrestled with the question of how to define their national Self. In the course of this political battle, a paradigmatic debate pitting the Chinese and Japanese Others against one another took shape between different groups of nationalist elites. For those who wished to mobilize support for a non-Chinese political entity (i.e. Japanese colonial regime and Taiwanese creole nationalists), Japan was presented as a benign and intimate Other in order to suppress or dilute feeling of Chineseness in the island. Conversely, for those who opposed a non-

Chinese political entity (i.e. anti-colonial elites and postwar KMT regime), China assumed a father figure in contrast to a vicious Japan.

This discursive confrontation is not simply a product of the Sino-Japanese conflict in the real world. Aside from their two wars in modern history, China and Japan were not each other's archenemies and even had some degree of cooperation, such as during the nationalist revolution in late Qing and after their diplomatic normalization in 1972. Neither is the China versus Japan dichotomy a reflection of spontaneous emotions or purely historical perception. Taiwan's pro-independence elites, for instance, claim a long-standing, widespread sense of separation in Taiwanese society vis-à-vis the mainland -- the so-called *fantangshan* tradition -- ever since the Qing takeover and well before the February 28 Incident, which contradicts the fact that most native Taiwanese initially embraced China after Japan surrendered.

While identity politics is first and foremost about domestic power competition, it significantly shapes and constrains foreign policy. An identity discourse portraying two national Others as mutual adversaries naturally disposes the Self to choose between them in foreign policy. While international structural factors trumped Taiwan's diplomatic preferences in the early Cold War era, leading Chiang to side with America's ally Japan against Communist China, democratic Taiwan under Lee and Chen did the same largely due to identity politics. Favoring Japan over China may not be the optimal foreign policy maximizing Taiwan's overall interest, as it resulted in considerable external tension and worsened Taiwan's security environment, but it served the political agenda of the ruling bloc seeking to legitimize a Taiwan-centric identity as opposed to a China-centric one. Since coming to power, Ma Ying-jeou has recalibrated Taiwan's foreign policy to carve out a more neutral position between China and Japan. The reason is more than the simple fact that Taiwan is the weakest, peripheral pole in this asymmetric triangle.<sup>97</sup> To

a large extent Ma is oriented by a new identity conception that, instead of presenting China and Japan as the "either-or" choices, links them with Taiwan in two mutually independent self-other nexus, each containing a bifurcated interpretation of the Other in question. That is to say, Japanese colonization oppressed Taiwanese people but contributed to local development, and Japan can still help Taiwan today; China is the ultimate fatherland but the mainlanders should take responsibility for their misrule of Taiwan in early postwar decades comparable to Japanese colonization. Also, acknowledging the clear trend of creole nationalism in Taiwan, the new discourse concurs with the Taiwan-centric discourse from the Lee and Chen eras that Taiwanese people have formed a unique culture tradition in addition to Chinese elements and deserve the right to determine their own life. Overall, Ma wishes to convince people in Taiwan that they can be both Taiwanese and Chinese, and befriending China and Japan simultaneously should not be an ideologically prohibited option.

Essentially intended to reconcile the polarized political views in Taiwan, Ma's new identity discourse appeals to those Taiwanese who are ambiguous and undetermined about where Taiwan belongs. His policy of cooperation with both China and Japan initially also seemed useful to control the diplomatic damages by the previous Chen government. After Ma entered his second term and expectations for permanently resolving the cross-strait impasse is ratcheted up, however, this way of handling foreign relations is under challenge. The sheer power of China and its unswerving ambition about national greatness constitute an omnipresent pressure for Taiwan to operate in China's orbit. At the same time, Ma must be mindful of the growing apprehension of Japan and other Asian countries toward an ever stronger and assertive China in the region. Neutrality between China and Japan is particularly difficult in light of a Sino-Japanese rivalry currently unfolding in the real world. While Sino-Japanese conflict of interest

can be moderated by their shared interest, which is quite substantial, their contrasting values represented by an autocracy and democracy cannot. When the two major powers lock horns, the implications for Taiwan are profound. In the 2012 Sino-Japanese island disputes, both countries watched Taiwan's moves closely and hoped to draw it to their own side of the fence.

Domestically, the Ma government is jostled by those eager to approach China and others who resolutely reject China, in addition to the moderate majority who nevertheless identify themselves increasingly with Taiwan. How it reacts to a Sino-Japanese crisis is subject to internal scrutiny, and any missteps can easily be turned into political campaign issues. All these forces stand to push Ma's delicate foreign policy off balance.

Predictably, the deeply entrenched China versus Japan dichotomy will continue to enjoy currency in Taiwan's identity politics no matter how hard the Ma government tries to play it down. Even Ma himself has consciously played the Japan card to mitigate his pro-China image and used the anti-Japanese history to consolidate his support base within the KMT. Because it is inextricably tied to the ambivalent and ever-changing self-identity of Taiwanese people, striking a balance between the Chinese and Japanese Others is a creative but also daunting task. When managing Sino-Japanese and cross-strait relations, one should be sensitive to the complex identity politics in Taiwan and its impact on the Taiwan-China-Japan triangular relations.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Central News Agency*, 11 September 2010, available via *World News Connection*; *news.ifeng.com*, 12 September 2010.

<sup>2</sup> In August 2010, A PLA general proposed collaboration between the militaries of China and Taiwan to protect "the sovereignty of the motherland in South China Sea, East China Sea, and Diaoyu Islands." Quoted in Higurashi Takanori, "Senkaku mondai meguru chūdai kankei," *Tōa*, (January 2011), 29. For examples of media appeals for cross-strait cooperation on maritime disputes, see *International Herald Leader* (run by the Xinhua News Agency), 31 August 2010, and *Wenweipo.com* (Hong Kong), 23 September 2010, available via *World News Connection*.

---

<sup>3</sup> Press Conference Records of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, 15 September and 29 September, accessed at <http://www.gwytb.gov.cn/xwfbh/>, 26 April 2012.

<sup>4</sup> *Central Daily News Online*, 14-15 September 2010, available via *World News Connections*.

<sup>5</sup> *Central Daily News Online*, 13 September 2010, available via *World News Connections*; Press Releases of the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of China, 13 September 2010, accessed at <http://www.taiwanembassy.org/ct.asp?xItem=159229&ctNode=2237&mp=1&nowPage=1398&pagesize=15>, 26 April 2012.

<sup>6</sup> *Central Daily News Online*, 28-29 September 2010, available via *World News Connections*.

<sup>7</sup> Higurashi, "Senkaku mondai," 27; Asano Kazuo, "Kokumintō Ba Eikyū seiken no tainichi seisaku," *Mondai to kenkyū* 3, 4 (2008): 1-31, at 7-8. For a brief history of Taiwan's bottom-up campaign to reclaim the disputed islands in 1970-1971, see J. Bruce Jacobs *Democratizing Taiwan* (Leiden: Brill 2012), 44-46.

<sup>8</sup> For example, see Lam Peng-er, "Japan-Taiwan Relations: Between Affinity and Reality," *Asian Affairs* 30, 4 (Winter 2004): 249-267; Gregory W. Noble, "What Can Taiwan (and the United States) Expect from Japan?" *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 5 (2005) : 1-34; Jin Sun, "Japan Taiwan Relations: Unofficial in Name Only," *Asian Survey* 47, 5 (September/October 2007) 790-810; Thomas S. Wilkins, "Taiwan-Japan Relations in an Era of Uncertainty," *Asia Policy* 13 (January 2012), 113-32.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in David Laitin, *Identity in Formation: The Russian-speaking Populations in the Near Abroad* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1998), 20.

<sup>10</sup> Charles Tilly, *Identities, Boundaries, and Social Ties* (Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers, 2005), 8.

<sup>11</sup> For instance, when defining national identity over the centuries, Japanese elites have alternately looked to China and the West as the primary Other for not just rivalry but also inspiration, emulation, and collaboration. See Kazuhiko Togo, "Japanese National Identity: Evolution and Prospects," in Gilbert Rozman, ed., *East Asian National Identities: Common Roots and Chinese Exceptionalism* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2012).

<sup>12</sup> Tilly, *Identities, Boundaries, and Social Ties*, 132.

<sup>13</sup> Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), chap. 4.

<sup>14</sup> Yinan He, *The Search for Reconciliation: Sino-Japanese and German-Polish Relations since World War II*. (New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Suisheng Zhao, *A Nation-state by Construction: Dynamics of Modern Chinese Nationalism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004).

<sup>15</sup> Lyn Spillman, "Neither the Same Nation Nor Different Nations: Constitutional Conventions in the United States and Australia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 38, No. 1 (1996): 149-181.

<sup>16</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991), chap. 4.

<sup>17</sup> Anderson, Benedict, "Western Nationalism and Eastern Nationalism," *New Left Review*, 9 (May-June 2001), 33.

<sup>18</sup> Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 60; D. A. Brading, *The Origins of Mexican Nationalism* (Cambridge, U.K.: Centre of Latin American Studies, University of Cambridge, 1985).

<sup>19</sup> Spillman, "Neither the Same Nation," 160-162. For a comprehensive study of the ideological foundation of American nationalism, see Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the*

---

*American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992).

<sup>20</sup> Brading, *Mexican Nationalism*.

<sup>21</sup> Masahiro Wakabayashi, "Taiwanese Nationalism and the 'Unforgettable Others'," in Edward Friedman, ed., *China's Rise, Taiwan's Dilemmas and International Peace* (London ; New York: Routledge, 2006).

<sup>22</sup> Chu, Yu-han and Jih-wen Lin, "Political Development in 20th-Century Taiwan: State-Building, Regime Transformation and the Construction of National Identity," *The China Quarterly* 165 (2001): 102-129.

<sup>23</sup> Huang Ying-che, "Were Taiwanese Being 'Enslaved'? The Entanglement of Sinicization, Japanization, and Westernization," in Liao Ping-hui and David Der-wei Wang, eds., *Taiwan under Japanese Colonial Rule, 1895-1945: History, Culture, Memory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 312.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 314.

<sup>25</sup> Meihui Liu and Li-Ching Hung, "Identity Issues in Taiwan's History Curriculum," *International Journal of Education Research* 37 (2002): 567-586, 570.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 318-319.

<sup>27</sup> Edward Vickers, "Frontiers of Memory: Conflict, Imperialism, and Official Histories in the Formation of Post-Cold War Taiwan Identity," in Sheila M. Jager and Rana Mitter, ed., *Ruptured Histories: War, Memory, and the Post-Cold War in Asia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 214-216.

<sup>28</sup> Wakabayashi, "Taiwanese Nationalism."

<sup>29</sup> Chang Maukuei, "Understanding Contending Nationalist Identities: Reading Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson from Taiwan," in Susan Henders, ed., *Democratization and Identity: Regimes and Ethnicity in East and Southeast Asia* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2004), 73-74.

<sup>30</sup> Wakabayashi, "Taiwanese Nationalism," 9.

<sup>31</sup> Yinan He, "Competing Narratives, Identity Politics, and Cross-Taiwan Strait Relations," *Asian Perspective* Vol. 34, No. 4 (December 2010): 45-83, at 78.

<sup>32</sup> Huang, "Were Taiwanese Being 'Enslaved'?" 320-323.

<sup>33</sup> Steven Phillips, "Between Assimilation and Independence: Taiwanese Political Aspirations under Nationalist Chinese Rule, 1945-1948," in Murray Rubinstein, ed. *Taiwan: A New History* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1999). On some obvious similarities between the Japanese and KMT regimes in Taiwan, see Jacobs, *Democratizing Taiwan*, chap. 2.

<sup>34</sup> Phillips, "Between Assimilation and Independence," 296-299.

<sup>35</sup> For some examples of Taiwan-centric historical narratives, see Ng Yuzin Chiautong, *Taiwan Minshukoku no kenkyū: Taiwan dokuritsu undōshi no ichi danshō* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1970); Peng Mingmin, *Ziyou de ziwei: Peng Mingmin huiyilu* (Taipei: Qianwei chubanshe, 1988); Shi Ming, *Taiwanren sibainian shi* (San Jose, Calif.: Pengdao wenhua gongsi, 1980); Wang, Yude (O, Ikutoku), *Taiwan: Kumen de lishi* (Taipei: Zili wanbaoshe wenhua chuban bu, 1993). For a more systematic review of Taiwanese nationalist historiography after WWII, see He, "Competing Narratives."

<sup>36</sup> For details on Taiwan-Japan relations in the 1950-1980s, see He, *The Search for Reconciliation*, chaps. 3 and 4.

<sup>37</sup> The original *Dangwei* movement was promoted from 1957 by *Free China* publisher Lei Chen and other reformist intellectuals tied to him. See Shelley Rigger, *Why Taiwan Matters: Small*

---

*Island, Global Powerhouse* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), 68-69.

<sup>38</sup> Chang, "Understanding Contending Nationalist Identities."

<sup>39</sup> Chong-Pin Lin, "More Carrot Than Stick: Beijing's Emerging Taiwan Policy," *China Security* 4, No. 1 (Winter 2008): 1-27; Yijiang Ding, "Beijing's New Approach and the Rapprochement in the Taiwan Strait," *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 36, No. 4 (2009): 179-199.

<sup>40</sup> Wing-Wah Law, "Education Reform in Taiwan: A Search for A 'National' Identity through Democratisation and Taiwanisation," *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 32, No.1 (2002): 61-81; Liu and Hung, "Identity Issues."

<sup>41</sup> Ralph C. Croizier, *Koxinga and Chinese Nationalism: History, Myth, and the Hero* (Cambridge, Mass.: East Asian Research Center Harvard University, 1977), 22. Also see John E. Wills, Jr., "The Seventeenth-Century Transformation: Taiwan Under the Dutch and the Cheng Regime," in Rubinstein, ed., *Taiwan*, 96-98.

<sup>42</sup> He, "Competing Narratives," 60.

<sup>43</sup> *People.com.cn*, 25 July 2007.

<sup>44</sup> Liu and Hung, "Identity Issues," 582.

<sup>45</sup> Ministry of Education, Republic of China, *Putong gaoji zhongxue bixiu kemu "lishi" kecheng gangyao*, 2006 and 2008; Wang Zhongfu, "Lun zhongxue lishi jiaokeshu de xingzhi yu biansheng," *Haixia pinglun* (April 2012), accessed at <http://www.haixiainfo.com.tw/SRM/256-8437.html>, 23 January 2013.

<sup>46</sup> Shogo Suzuki, "The Competition to Attain Justice for Past Wrongs: The 'Comfort Women' Issue in Taiwan," *Pacific Affairs* 84, 2 (June 2011), 223-244.

<sup>47</sup> Quoted from Lee Teng-hui's inauguration speech on May 20, 1996, accessed at [http://newcongress.yam.org.tw/taiwan\\_sino/05201.html](http://newcongress.yam.org.tw/taiwan_sino/05201.html), 15 October 2012.

<sup>48</sup> Lee Teng-hui, *Taiwan de zhuzhang* (Taipei: Yuanliu 1999), 152-163.

<sup>49</sup> The text of the interview is available at the Web site of New Taiwan, accessed at <http://www.taiwandc.org/nws-9926.htm>, 10 May 2012.

<sup>50</sup> J. Bruce Jacobs and I-Hao Ben Liu, "Lee Teng-hui and the Idea of 'Taiwan'," *The China Quarterly* 190, (June 2007): 375-393, at 393.

<sup>51</sup> Rigger, *Why Taiwan Matters*, 152.

<sup>52</sup> Hui-Ching Chang and Rich Holt, "Taiwan and ROC: A Critical Analysis of President Chen Shui-bien's Construction of Taiwan Identity in National Speeches," *National Identities* 11, 3 (September 2009): 301-330, at 301.

<sup>53</sup> Rigger, *Why Taiwan Matters*, 156-157.

<sup>54</sup> For details on these referendum initiatives, see S. Philip Hsu, "Between Identity Quest and Risk Aversion: Lessons from the Chen Shui-bian Presidency for Maintaining cross-Strait Stability," *Journal of Contemporary China* 19, 66 (September 2010): 693-717.

<sup>55</sup> A Chinese translation of the interview transcript can be found in Lee, *Jingying da Taiwan* (Taipei: Yuanliu, 2005), 469-496.

<sup>56</sup> Lee Teng-hui and Kobayashi Yoshinori, *Li Teng-hui xuexiao de jiaohui* (Taipei: Xianjue, 2001).

<sup>57</sup> *BBC.Chinese.com*, 27 February 2001.

<sup>58</sup> Suzuki, "The Competition to Attain Justice," 241.

<sup>59</sup> Sun, *Japan-Taiwan Relations*, 800.

<sup>60</sup> Barak Kushner, "Nationality and Nostalgia: The Manipulation of Memory in Japan, Taiwan, and China since 1990," *The International History Review* 29, 4 (December 2007): 793-820.

- 
- <sup>61</sup> For a more detailed discussion of Sino-Japanese history disputes in the 1990s and 2000s, see He, *The Search for Reconciliation*, chap. 6.
- <sup>62</sup> Chang, "Understanding Contending Nationalist Identities," 79.
- <sup>63</sup> Noble, "What Can Taiwan Expect?" 2; Lee, *Taiwan de zhuzhang*, 201-207.
- <sup>64</sup> *BBC.Chinese.com*, 20 October 2002.
- <sup>65</sup> *International Herald Leader*, 20 July 2004.
- <sup>66</sup> *Taipei Times*, 6 July 2004, available via *World News Connection*.
- <sup>67</sup> Lü Jianliang, "Cong zhongri yuye xieding lun tairi yuye jiufen zhi jieju," *Wenti yu yanjiu* 50, 1 (March 2011): 35-65.
- <sup>68</sup> But some large state-owned enterprises, such as CSBC (China Shipbuilding Corporation), Taiwan and CPC (Chinese Petroleum Corporation), Taiwan, have retained "Taiwan" in their names partly due to the high financial cost of changing names.
- <sup>69</sup> *Central News Agency*, 1 January and 8 February 2011, available via *World News Connection*.
- <sup>70</sup> *Central News Agency*, 3 April 2012, available via *World News Connection*.
- <sup>71</sup> Ma Ying-jeou, "Jinian Taiwan guangfu yijiazhi: chongwen xianxian dianfan, zaizao Taiwan jingshen," *Zhongguo shibao*, October 25, 2005, accessed at <http://www.wretch.cc/blog/skater/3499268>, 17 May 2012.
- <sup>72</sup> See the Web site of the Taiwan Association of the Families of Anti-Japanese Patriots at [http://www.haixiainfo.com.tw/krc/index\\_about.html](http://www.haixiainfo.com.tw/krc/index_about.html)
- <sup>73</sup> The text of the inscription, accessed at <http://www.chinareviewnews.com/doc/1018/8/1/6/101881642.html?coluid=7&kindid=0&docid=101881642>, 10 May 2012.
- <sup>74</sup> However, if adding up the total teaching time for both the compulsory curriculum covered in Grade 1 and 2 and elective curriculum in Grade 3 of high school, the weight distribution between Chinese and Taiwanese history remains unchanged. For the new teaching guidelines for history subject issued in May 2011, and a chart indicating the changes compared to the 2006 guidelines, The Web site of the Curriculum Center for the History Subject established by the ROC Ministry of Education, accessed at <http://203.68.236.93/xoops2/instpage.php?r=&w=100%&h=800&url=203.68.236.92/95course/95-1.htm>, accessed on 19 May 2012.
- <sup>75</sup> See Lin Nengshi & Liu Xiangguang, eds. *Lishi*, First Grade of High School (Tainan: Nanyi shuju, 2009), Vol. 1, 81-129, 107-109; Wang Zhongfu et al., eds. *Lishi*, First Grade of High School (Taipei Xian: Kangxi wenhua, 2009), Vol. 1, 90-139; Lai Jingui et al., *Shehui: Teacher's Manual for First Grade of Middle School* (Tainan: Hanlin chuban, 2009), Vol. 2, 36-133.
- <sup>76</sup> The government did open a separate National 228 Memorial Museum in 2011 that focuses on presenting historical documents and original objects regarding the incident itself, and leaves out larger background issues such as Japanese colonization and the Taiwanese-mainlanders cultural tensions prior to the incident. Based on author's visit to the museum in July 2012.
- <sup>77</sup> Based on author's visit to the museum in October 2010.
- <sup>78</sup> Surveys conducted between 1992 and June 2012 by the Election Study Center of National Chengchi University in Taiwan, accessed at <http://esc.nccu.edu.tw/modules/tinyd2/index.php?id=3>, 24 January 2013.
- <sup>79</sup> Reports on the poll results, accessed at [http://www.koryu.or.jp/taipei/ez3\\_contents.nsf/Top/4B83AF9AE8363E8D492576EF002523D4?OpenDocument](http://www.koryu.or.jp/taipei/ez3_contents.nsf/Top/4B83AF9AE8363E8D492576EF002523D4?OpenDocument), 24 January 2013.

- 
- <sup>80</sup> *Central News Agency*, May 8, 2011, available via *World News Connection*.
- <sup>81</sup> Full text of Ma's inaugural speeches, accessed at <http://www.president.gov.tw/>, 24 January 2013.
- <sup>82</sup> Baohui Zhang, "Taiwan's New Grand Strategy," *Journal of Contemporary China* 20, 69 (March 2011): 269-285.
- <sup>83</sup> TVBS poll on 26-27 March 2012 shows 55 percent of disapproval rate, accessed at [http://www1.tvbs.com.tw/FILE\\_DB/PCH/201203/0fwcy3m9v1.pdf](http://www1.tvbs.com.tw/FILE_DB/PCH/201203/0fwcy3m9v1.pdf), 22 May 2012; and DPP poll shows 60.8 percent disapproval rate, see *China Post Online*, 30 March 2012.
- <sup>84</sup> In April 2009, Ma Ying-jeou stated that the signing of Japan-ROC peace treaty of 1952 formally confirmed that the sovereignty of Taiwan was transferred to the ROC. In response, Japan's top diplomatic representative in Taiwan Saitō Masaki spoke out that Japan merely renounced claim to Taiwan in the treaty, but Taiwan's status remained unresolved. Saitō's remarks were immediately condemned by the KMT but welcomed by the DPP. His later resignation was widely speculated to be linked to this controversy. See Nakagawa Yoshio, "WHO to Nikka heiwa jōyaku," *Tōa* (June 2009); and *Taipei Times*, 2 December 2009.
- <sup>85</sup> According to Ma's speech in his visit to Pengjia Islet on 7 September 2012, Taiwan must defend its sovereignty in order to protect the rights of Taiwanese fishermen, for whom the Diaoyu Islands had been important fishing grounds for centuries. Accessed at <http://english.president.gov.tw/Default.aspx?tabid=491&rmid=2355&itemid=28074>, 24 January 2013. When they resumed fishery talks in November 2012, Japan and Taiwan focused on fishing rights, not on sovereignty. See *Taipei Times*, 23 October 2012.
- <sup>86</sup> Momma Rira, "Dainiki Ba Eikyū seiken ga sutaato," *Tōa* (July 2012).
- <sup>87</sup> Asano, "Kokuminto Ba Eikyū seiken."
- <sup>88</sup> Quoted in Wilkins, "Taiwan-Japan Relations."
- <sup>89</sup> Asano, "Kokuminto Ba Eikyū seiken."
- <sup>90</sup> *Wall Street Journal*, 20 March 2008; Frank Muyard, "Taiwan Elections 2008: Ma Ying jeou's Victory and the KMT's Return to Power," *China Perspectives*, No. 1 (2008): 79-94.
- <sup>91</sup> For a recent expression of the view, see the cover story and interview with Christian Liu, then Minister of Taiwan's Council for Economic Planning and Development, in *Shūkan tōyō keizai*, 1 October 2011.
- <sup>92</sup> Ding, "Beijing's New Approach."
- <sup>93</sup> For example, in a recent poll 71 percent of Taiwanese respondents opposed Japanese nationalization of the disputed islands and 61 percent believed that the Ma government was too timid to Japan in the disputes. *Central News Agency*, 21 September 2012, available via *World News Connection*.
- <sup>94</sup> Chen Yi-shen, "Independence Vital to Diaoyutais," *Taipei Times*, 20 July 2012. For DPP's position on the disputes, see *Taipei Times*, 13 July and 17 August 2012.
- <sup>95</sup> *Taipei Times*, 16 July 2012.
- <sup>96</sup> *Taipei Times*, 19 October 2012.
- <sup>97</sup> For a study on Taiwanese foreign policy using the strategic triangle theory, see Mumin Chen, "Balancing or Bandwagoning? Taiwan's Role in China-Japan Relations," in Caroline Rose and Victor Teo eds., *The United States in Contemporary Sino-Japanese Relations* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).