
U.S. China Policy and the “Two-State” Theory

JIEMIAN YANG

Senior Fellow and Director
Department of American Studies
The Shanghai Institute for International Studies

The Sino-U.S. relationship is one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world. The two countries have common interests in many areas, as well as great differences. The post-Cold War Sino-U.S. relationship is never short of complexities and complications, and, at its core, the Taiwan issue has always been the most important and sensitive one. Particularly since Mr. Lee Teng-hui described the cross-Strait relationship as a “state-to-state relationship,” the trilateral relationship between and among the Chinese mainland, Taiwan and the United States has been meeting new challenges.

The International Background

Since the end of the Cold War, the configuration of powers in the world is changing. The original bipolar confrontation is being replaced by the coexistence of one superpower and several major powers. Although this pattern has basically remained stable, U.S. superiority is on the rise. Moreover, the United States is trying hard to translate its superiority into the advancement of its interests in politics, diplomacy, security and economy.

The U.S. superiority in the international co-relation of power has further been strengthened. In the past years, the basic pattern of the coexistence of one superpower and several major powers has remained stable. But in the change of the co-relation of power the U.S. superiority has been further strengthened vis-à-

vis a weakened Russia, an economically injured Japan and a not-yet-a-peer Europe. In handling world affairs, the United States is often hegemonic, hot-headed and inclined to interfere with others' internal affairs and solve regional conflicts by force. The United States has even gone so far as to bypass the UN and use

U.S. strategic thinking emphasizes leadership, confrontation, and military means with an obvious intention to contain China.

military force. Just since August 1998 the United States has used force, either individually or multilaterally, against Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq, and Yugoslavia. By contrast, China calls for the es-

tablishment of a fair and just new international order, advocates respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all countries, opposes interference in others' internal affairs, and rejects the use or threat of use of force. In the past one or two years, China and the United States have greatly differed on the handling of such issues as the relationship with Iran and Iraq, post-nuclear tests Indian-Pakistani relations, the international trial of the former Khmer Rouge leaders, and particularly the Kosovo crisis. Therefore, some Americans even claim that there is no cooperation basis for the proposed strategic partnership between the two countries.

The globalization of the world economy has begun to show its negative side. The Asian financial crisis has already affected Russia and Latin America. The gap between developed countries and developing ones is widening. The development model of the developing nations is facing new challenges. The developing countries and regions have to wait for some time before they can embark on a new leap forward. Being a major economic and financial power, the United States spares no effort to translate its superiority in power and technology into leadership over the developing countries. In its external economic relations, the United States is anxious to expand its economic interests by exerting pressure on the others.

The United States is still indulging in Cold War thinking in security matters. During the initial stage of President Clinton's first term, the U.S. Administration once put forward the concept of a "New Pacific Community." American academic circles explored possible collective models ranging from the Northeast Asian Security Cooperation Conference to the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). However, in recent years, Cold War thinking is picking up in the United States. According to the U.S.'s new strategy put forward in 1997, the United States takes as guiding principles molding a conducive international environment, maintaining the capacity to win two theater wars at the same time, and preparing for unforeseeable crises. It is stepping up a security system in the Asia-Pacific region by strengthening bilateral military alliances under its leadership. The United States has already produced the U.S.-Japan defense guideline and is inclined to establish

in the Asia-Pacific region the Theater Missile Defense system (TMD). It has also stirred up one wave of noise after another to protect Taiwan from the so-called missile threat from the China mainland. The U.S. Congress is considering passing a new Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, and its administration is stepping up arms sales to Taiwan. This strategic thinking of the U.S.'s emphasizes its leadership, confrontation and military means with an obvious intention to contain China. China has always advocated the casting away of Cold War thinking, called for common and cooperative security, and opposed obtaining one's "security" at the expenses of the others. If TMD covers Taiwan, this does not only violate the three Sino-U.S. joint communiqués, but also gravely encroaches upon China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. China cannot but react strongly to the issues of TMD and U.S. arms sales to Taiwan.

In order to fulfill the above-mentioned goals of its still-valid 1997 security strategy, the United States needs to cooperate and coordinate with its allies. In Europe, the United States has worked out a security network by strengthening and enlarging NATO. In the Asia-Pacific Region, the United States has made the U.S.-Japan alliance a cornerstone with a system of bilateral alliances with Japan, South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, and Australia.

The United States has clear-cut targets in these two strategic regions. First and foremost, the United States tries to maintain its global and regional leadership. It wants to continue to weaken Russia so that there will be no way for the Russians to challenge the Americans once again in the future. In the Asia-Pacific region, the United States has a hedging policy to prevent China from becoming its peer sometime in the next century.

The recent air attacks by U.S.-led NATO forces against Yugoslavia were a practical experiment of NATO's so-called new concept of strategy, which actually advocates the pre-eminence of human rights over sovereignty and justifies NATO's intervention in other countries' internal affairs even by military means. If not checked in this case, the Yugoslavian case will have set a very dangerous precedent.

However, the United States is restrained by many factors. The multipolarization of the world is an insurmountable barrier to a unipolar world. Indeed, the U.S. ability to control world affairs is relatively declining rather than ascending. Domestic constraints also keep the U.S. away from excessive interventions overseas. The Kosovo incident has also indicated what limits the U.S. and NATO have. In sum, peace and development remains the major theme of the world today.

New Challenges in the Sino-U.S. Relationship

The dual nature of the Sino-U.S. relationship has become even more evident. On the one hand, the two countries have much in common, ranging from global

strategic interests to regional peace and bilateral economic benefits. On the other hand, mutual frustration has reached a dangerous point. In China's view, the United States has created one trouble after another. These include the so-called political contribution case, the espionage case, the TMD, the Cox Report, the last-minute rejection of the package deal with the visiting Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji on China's accession to the World Trade Organization(WTO), and the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade.

The mutual frustration has turned into mutual suspicion. The worst scenario has prevailed in some cases. Foreign policy depends very much on perceptions. If people just think the worst of each other, sensible and reasonable policies will not be made and implemented. The United States is the most developed country and the only remaining superpower in the world. It has almost monopolized the world's mass media. Some of the U.S. media has often depicted China in a very negative way, and the self-fulfilling prophecy is very likely to prevail.

The Clinton Administration's policy towards China is sometimes in disarray. President Clinton missed a very good opportunity when he balked at signing the WTO package with the visiting Chinese premier last April. President Clinton mistakenly thought that the Congress would oppose this package. Because of intensifying partisanship and the coming presidential election, the U.S. China policy will likely fall victim to the American domestic politics, thus making the Sino-U.S. relationship even more unstable and uncertain.

An injured Sino-U.S. relationship would definitely exert a negative impact on cross-strait relations. Since the Taiwan Strait crisis in 1995–1996 and especially President Jiang's visit to the United States in 1997, the U.S. has exercised some restraint and caution on the Taiwan issue. The executive and legislative branches and others in the mainstream have reached a sort of consensus, namely, that the United States should seek to maintain the status quo in the cross-strait relationship and prevent Taiwan from making provocative moves. However, some American officials are concerned that latent and serious instability exists in the cross-straits area. Therefore, the United States wishes to avoid being trapped in the predicament. However, the United States is being pulled by two opposing forces—one is to improve the Sino-U.S. relationship, and the other is to strengthen its ties with Taiwan. The United States wrongly accuses China of threatening Taiwan's security and safety. The United States has infuriated China by its increased arms sales to Taiwan, the U.S.-Japan defense guideline, and the proposed TMD. More importantly, these developments have a great deal of ripple effects. For instance, Mr. Lee Teng-hui was encouraged to move further down on his path of separatism.

However, the Sino-U.S. relationship is too important to become out of control. The two countries are doing repair work. They have reached agreement on the U.S. compensation on the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade.

It is encouraging to see that the two presidents exchanged damage control calls after both the bombing and Mr. Lee Teng-hui's two-state remarks. China and the United States are slowly but surely moving beyond the bombing and working towards a more constructive relationship. The impending meeting between Presidents Jiang and Clinton at the APEC meeting will restart the negotiation on the WTO accession and improve their coordination in global and regional affairs.

Lee Teng-hui's Two-State Theory

Mr. Lee Teng-hui has rocked the boat and become a troublemaker again. It has almost become a rule that Mr. Lee Teng-hui comes out to turn back the clock when the cross-Straits relationship has moved forward. It was true in 1995 when he went to the U.S. It is true again this time. On July 9, Mr. Lee Teng-hui in an interview advocated that the cross-Straits relation is a state-to-state, or at least a special state-to-state one.¹ This statement later became known as the two-state theory.

The two-state theory is a deliberate political move. As disclosed by the Taiwan officials, they have already worked on the possible shift towards state-to-state relation for more than one and a half years.² Mr. Lee's book *The Viewpoints of Taiwan*, which was published a couple of months earlier, advocates dividing China into seven pieces.³ Some key Taiwan officials for mainland affairs openly rejected the "one China" policy. Taiwan's representative Chen Xifan even said that the Taipei Office in Washington, DC is in fact an "embassy" and he is the "ambassador."⁴

By defining the cross-strait relationship as a state-to-state relationship, Mr. Lee Teng-hui is trying to sabotage the reunification process. Fundamentally speaking, the Taiwan issue is an internal affair of China's. Starting as a legacy of China's civil war, the final resolution of Taiwan issue will be the final step for China's reunification. But Mr. Lee Teng-hui wants to move in the opposite direction. He wishes to go down in history as the founding father of the independent Taiwan. His more immediate motive was to make Mr. Wang Daohan's planned visit impossible, for Mr. Wang's visit would be a journey of peace and publicity of reunification.

Mr. Lee Teng-hui is using his two-state theory to help Mr. Lien Chan in the upcoming election. The polls showed that the rebellious James Soong has become far ahead of Mr. Lee's designated candidate Lian Chan. If Mr. Soong wins the election, the whole political landscape will be remade. Not only would the ruling KMT be driven out of power, Mr. Lee's own future would also be left hanging in the air. Mr. Lee Teng-hui therefore tries to use the state-to-state relationship to enhance Mr. Lian's position. Besides, Mr. Lee also hopes his successors will follow this framework of a state-to-state relationship in dealing with

mainland China. In the worst-case scenario he could even declare a state of emergency and postpone the general election.

Miscalculation of the international situation is another explanation. Mr. Lee saw the Kosovo crisis as a good opportunity to internationalize Taiwan's security issue. He also thinks that the U.S.-Japan defense guideline and the TMD will ensure military assistance in the event of a cross-Straits crisis.

The Chinese government, military forces, and people are giving continual warning that Lee Teng-hui should not play with fire.

The Chinese mainland's reaction has been predictably strong, criticizing and repudiating Mr. Lee's separatist remarks and motivations. Mr. Tang Shubei, executive vice-president of ARATS, characterized Lee's statement as "fallacious remarks" and a crude sabotaging of cross-Straits relations and the understanding between ARATS and SEF. The

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Mr. Zhu Bangzao also warned Lee and the Taiwan authorities not to underestimate the firm resolve of the Chinese Government to safeguard state sovereignty, dignity, and territorial integrity or the courage and strength of the Chinese people to fight against separation and Taiwan's independence.⁵ The Chinese government, military, and people are giving continual warning that Mr. Lee should not play with fire.

The major Chinese media have kept on denouncing the two-state theory and enlisting the possible consequences. A recent national survey shows that the Chinese people are angered too. A total of 94.7 percent of people inquired said they were "shocked" and felt "disgusted" when they learned of Lee's remarks. 86.9 percent of people surveyed said they agree with the government's stance on the Taiwan issue that when necessary, the government can resort to military measures to resolve the Taiwan issue. A total of 47.8 percent said Mr. Wang Daohan should postpone his visit to Taiwan until Lee and Koo Chen-fu clarify.⁶

Strong as its attitudes are, the Chinese mainland's actual counter-movements have been measured. The Chinese government differentiates strictly between Mr. Lee Teng-hui and the people of Taiwan, between political condemnation and commercial activities, between short-term reaction and long-term responses. The Chinese mainland still leaves the door open for Mr. Lee and his people to return to the "one China" principle and resume the Wang-Koo talks. During his meeting with the visiting Heritage Foundation group including some Congressmen, Mr. Wang Daohan expressed his readiness to visit Taiwan provided that Mr. Lee Teng-hui backtracks on his two-state theory.⁷ Mr. Lee should not miss this last chance and put at stake the welfare of the 22 million Taiwanese people as well as the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region.

The U.S. has had dual reactions. The American initial reaction was gener-

ally a negative one. The White House and the State Department reiterated their "one China" policy. On July 18, President Clinton requested to call President Jiang. During his hotline talk, President Clinton reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to the "one China" policy and promised no change of U.S. position on Taiwan. The U.S. government also directed AIT representative in Taipei Mr. Darryl Johnson and AIT chairman Dr. Richard Bush to seek personal and direct clarification from Mr. Lee Teng-hui. The U.S. government also postponed a scheduled military delegation to visit Taiwan and threatened to suspend some military sales. The two-state theory has also been criticized by American China experts. Those who expressed their grave concerns include Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, David Lampton, Harry Harding and Michel Oksenberg.

The United States opposition to the two-state theory comes from the following major concerns. First, the United States holds that some Taiwan politicians often provoke the Chinese mainland out of political motives on cross-Straits matters and then leave the United States to clean up the mess. Second, the fact that Taipei produced the two-state theory without prior consultation with Washington indicates that Taipei tries to trap the U.S. in the cross-Straits crisis. But the United States does not want to take the risk of military confrontation with the Chinese mainland by unconditionally supporting Taiwan. Third, the two-state theory hampered the repair work of the Sino-U.S. relationship. The United States is trying to mend the damage inflicted by the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, and does not want to be linked to another conspiracy. Fourth, the two-state theory halted Wang Daohan's much-anticipated visit to Taiwan and circumvented the U.S. proposed interim agreements. Originally, the United States hoped very much to capitalize on these two opportunities to stabilize Cross-Straits relations. Fifth, and most importantly, the two-state theory has interfered with the U.S.'s strategic plan to stabilize the Asia-Pacific region as well as the cross-Straits relationship. Taipei's move has obviously intensified the tensions in this region.

However, the other side of the coin is that the basic cross-Straits policy of the U.S. remains unchanged. The United States has much at stake in Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait. It also takes Taiwan as a successful model to transplant its own political system and values to Asia. The United States can maximize its national interests to the extent that the separation of the Chinese mainland and Taiwan is prolonged. Therefore, the U.S. criticism of the Two-State theory has its limit. President Clinton stressed three pillars to cope with cross-Straits relationship, namely, the "one China" policy, cross-Straits dialogue and peaceful resolution.⁸ The Clinton Administration stresses that China should not use force to defend its territorial integrity and sovereignty. In the meantime, the United States decided to sell \$550 million worth of weapons to Taiwan on July 30. Some U.S. congresspeople even went so far as rejecting the "one China" policy. During this congressional recess, some congressmen and senators visited Taiwan to demon-

strate their support for the two-state theory. There is a danger that the U.S. could give tacit consent to the so-called state-to-state relationship and accept it as a *fait accompli*.

Wang Daohan's Abortive Visit to Taiwan

As a follow-up to the Wang-Koo talks in 1993 and 1998, the Chinese mainland was sparing no efforts to make the planned visit by Mr. Wang Daohan to Taiwan this fall a success. The Chinese mainland showed sufficient realism and flexibility on the key issue of "one China." It had been at pains to find a definition acceptable by both sides. The most recent version, the so-called 86-Chinese-Character, ran as follows:

There is only "one China" in the world. Taiwan is part of China. China is yet to be reunified. The two sides of the Taiwan Strait, under the principle of "one China" and through mutual efforts, ought to negotiate on the basis of equality and discuss how to proceed with reunification. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of a country are indivisible. Taiwan's political status may be discussed under the principle of "one China."

Since the very beginning, the Chinese mainland never expected that Mr. Wang Daohan's visit would produce a dramatic outcome. However, it holds that the two sides should take full advantage of Mr. Wang's visit to reach the following results: (1) to increase mutual understanding, especially that of the people through mass media and individual contacts; (2) to continue the process of the Wang-Koo talks, the most important semi-official channel between the two sides; and (3) to promote the talks in broader and deeper ways to include economic and political agendas. In late June and early July alone, four large-scale conferences on the cross-Straits relationship were held in Hangzhou, Hong Kong, Macao, and Quanzhou.

As intense preparation was under way by the Chinese mainland for Mr. Wang Daohan's visit, the news came of Mr. Lee Teng-hui's two-state rhetoric, thus disrupting the preparation process. Shortly after Mr. Lee Teng-hui's irresponsible and provocative remarks, Mr. Wang Daohan stated that he was shocked by Taiwan's redefinition of the cross-Straits talks as "bilateral talks between two states," and that the new terminology undermines the foundation for ARATS's contacts, exchanges, and dialogues with Taiwan's SEF. He also demanded a clarification from his counterpart Mr. Koo Chen-fu.⁹

After some deliberation and delay, Mr. Koo made the clarification on July 30. His words simply echoed Lee Teng-hui's viewpoints. On explaining the rejection of Mr. Koo's speech, the ARATS official said:

This lays bare attempts by Lee Teng-hui to cling to splittism. His acts have seriously deteriorated cross-Straits relations and destroyed the basis of contacts and

dialogues between ARATS and SEF. Lee should bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising from this.¹⁰

In the meantime, Mr. Lee Teng-hui is not showing any sign of returning to the "one China" principle. On August 10, Mr. Lee went so far as to say that the more controversial the two-state theory is, the better. Taiwanese officials even avoid using the modifier "special" before the "state-to-state relationship." Therefore, the Taiwanese side has made Mr. Wang's visit almost impossible.

The Circumvented Interim Agreements

The United States proposed interim agreements in order to stabilize the cross-strait relations and maintain its fundamental interests in the Asia-Pacific region and Taiwan Strait. Since last March, quite a few influential American officials and scholars have put forward various proposals to maintain the status quo for a long period of time. The U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth suggested on March 24 that the two sides of the Taiwan Strait sign interim agreements that would help to sustain momentum in their long pursuit of a peaceful resolution of their differences through dialogue. Mr. Roth made this recommendation during a seminar held in Washington, DC. to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act.¹¹ It was disclosed that the U.S. government had been discussing this option for quite some time, and interim agreements have become part of U.S. policy. This option is seen as a bridge between Taiwan's functional dialogue and the Chinese mainland's political one.¹²

Other U.S. scholars and officials made similar proposals, including Susan Shirk, Darryl Johnson, Harry Harding, David Lampton, Gerrit Gong, Ezra Vogel and others.

Taiwan was caught somewhat unprepared and gave confusing signals. On March 26, 1999, Mr. Jason Hu said that given the United States's position, Roth's remarks could be viewed only as something for Taiwan's reference. But Mr. Vincent Siew said on the same day that Taiwan is open to the signing of "interim agreements" with the mainland.¹³ This contradiction reflects Taiwan's uneasiness about any ideas related to framework and timetable to resolve the Taiwan issue. On May 18, Mr. Koo Chen-fu with his government's blessing responded to the American suggestions and called for interim agreements, starting from functional ones.¹⁴ On May 20, Mr. Su Chi, chairman of Taiwan's Mainland Affairs Council (MAC), stressed that MAC's stance has always been that it is easier to reach agreement on practical matters, because political issues are too complex to agree upon.¹⁵ It was generally believed that the Taiwanese side used this as a gesture to cope with the American pressure by redefining the interim agreements to its own advantage.

As known to all, later developments show that Mr. Lee Teng-hui does not even want to use redefined interim agreements as the basis for the proposed Wang-

Koo talks in coming fall. But the U.S. government will continue to work on the various proposals to prevent the Cross-Strait tensions from becoming military confrontation. Regrettably indeed, the U.S. plan to defuse the cross-Strait tensions was emasculated again by Taiwan, partly because of the U.S.'s own wrong policy and doing.

The Future in Doubt

It was Mr. Lee Teng-hui who created the trouble this time. It was Taiwan's authorities who wanted to abruptly change the rules of the game. Therefore, it is up to Mr. Lee and his people to take initiative and return to the "one China" policy. But unfortunately, to the date of this writing, the Taiwanese authorities still cling to the two-state theory. This has complicated the cross-Strait relationship and made the cross-Strait situation explosive and dangerous. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lee is taking the island of Taiwan and its people hostage to his two-state theory.

Even after Mr. Lee Teng-hui has advanced his two-state theory, the Chinese mainland still hopes that the Taiwanese authorities will realize that separatism goes nowhere and recant. Between August 16 and 18 China held a national conference attended by chiefs of provincial-level Taiwan Affairs offices. The conference called on the Taiwanese authorities to give up the two-state theory. When the Taiwanese side returns to the "One China" policy, the Chinese mainland is willing to continue its dialogues with Taiwan on broad subjects including political and economic matters.¹⁶ This is a clear indication that the Chinese mainland still adheres to the principle of "peaceful reunification" and "one country, two systems." The Chinese mainland will, as always, promote cross-Strait business, personal, cultural and other exchanges. It will continue to take into serious consideration the Taiwanese people's legitimate concerns.

But if Mr. Lee Teng-hui insists on splitting the country, then the Chinese government, military forces, and people have no choice but to look to non-peaceful alternatives. The Chinese Vice Premier Qian Qichen, who is also in charge of Taiwan Affairs, stressed that the "Chinese Government and its people are determined and capable of safeguarding China's sovereignty and territorial integrity."¹⁷

With the impending election in Taiwan, the situation may become even more complicated. Various Taiwanese political forces are trying to exploit cross-Strait relations to their own advantage. It is a very delicate matter for Taiwanese political elements to balance between island politics, cross-Strait relations, and external contacts. The days of Mr. Lee's political life are numbered. To a certain extent, the outcome of the impending election will decide future interactions across the Taiwan Strait. Therefore, it becomes even more important that his successor be clear-minded and prudent regarding the cross-Strait relationship.

The United States should play a positive role. Fundamentally speaking, the Taiwan issue is an internal affair between the Chinese across the Taiwan Strait,

and the United States should not interfere with China's internal affairs. However, the Chinese side can discuss the Taiwan issue with the Americans, because the United States created the Taiwan issue half a century ago and still possesses great influence over Taiwan.

The Taiwan issue has always been the most important and sensitive issue at the core of the Sino-U.S. relations. The U.S. executive branch and Congress should not play a negative role in the process of China's reunification. The United States should abide by the three joint communiqués and keep to its commitment of "one China;" the U.S. Congress should encourage cross-Straits dialogue instead of Taiwanese independence.

Generally speaking, the initial response towards Mr. Lee's two-state theory has been constructive. President Clinton and the executive branch reaffirmed their commitment to the "one China" and "Three No's" policy toward Taiwan. However, in the course of development, the United States might shift its gravity of attention from criticizing the two-state theory to dissuading China from using force. This is not a proper attitude. The U.S. commitment to "one China" should be matched by concrete deeds, not empty words.

Since security issues have acquired increasing prominence in Sino-U.S. and cross-Straits relations, the United States must be very careful in its handling of the Taiwan issue. In recent years, the United States has been working hard to weave a security network in the Asia-Pacific region by strengthening its bilateral ties with its allies. The U.S.-Japan defense guideline has actually included Taiwan in its coverage, and the proposed TMD would provide Taiwan with protection. This is not only a serious breach of China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, but also an encouragement to perpetuate the division between the Chinese mainland and Taiwan. As regards Taiwan, it tries to internationalize its security issue by joining TMD and resists the pressure for reunification.

According to the statistics, Taiwan has stepped up its arms procurement since Mr. Lee Teng-hui came into power, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Taiwan purchased from the United States and other Western countries weapons of U.S.\$6.461 billion in the period of 1983 to 1991. Between 1994 and 1998 Taiwan's import of weapons jumped to U.S.\$11.311 billion, ranking the first among the weapon buyers in the world.¹⁸ But the Taiwanese authorities should realize that the best way to seek Taiwan's security is to ease the cross-Straits tensions instead of relying on the purchase of more weapons. It would be even more mistaken if Taiwan should embark on the road of independence with these weapons.

With all its complications, the Taiwan issue is extremely difficult to resolve. Prudence and patience are needed. However, because of the accelerated separatist moves by Mr. Lee Teng-hui and his like, the Taiwan issue cannot drag on indefinitely and a sort of timetable should be worked out. The Chinese government and people are determined to achieve reunification. Most of the countries of the world support

“one China.” This is the general trend of the time. Those who go with it will benefit, and those who go against it will encounter strong resistance. ❧

Notes

1. [Taiwan] Central News Agency, Taipei, 9 July 1999.
2. [Taiwan] The United Daily News, 10 July 1999, 2.
3. Lee Teng-hui, *The Viewpoints of Taiwan*, Chinese edition (Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co., Ltd., 1999) 241.
4. [Taiwan] *The United Daily News*, 13 August 1999, 3.
5. *China Daily*, 13 July 1999, 1.
6. *China Daily*, 20 July 1999, 1.
7. [Taiwan] *The United Daily*, 21 August 1999, 3.
8. [U.S.A] U.S.IA, 20 July 1999, Washington, DC.
9. *China Daily*, 13 July 1999, 1.
10. *China Daily*, 31 July 1999, 1.
11. [Taiwan] Central News Agency, Taipei, in English, 26 March 1999/BBC World wide.
12. [Taiwan] China Press, 29 July 1999.
13. [Taiwan] Central News Agency, Taipei, in English, 26 March 1999/BBC World wide.
14. [Taiwan] *The United Daily*, 19 May 1999, 1.
15. [Taiwan] Central News Agency, Taipei, in English, 20 March 1999/BBC World wide
16. *The People's Daily*, 19 August 1999, 4.
17. *China Daily*, 17 August 1999, 2.
18. Jiefang Jun Bao (*The PLA Daily*), 18 August 1999, 1.