

Rep. Steve Chabot (R-OH)
In a speech to The Heritage Foundation, September 16, 2003

John . . . Thank you for that kind introduction, and let me also thank the Heritage Foundation for inviting me and my colleague from across the aisle, Bob Andrews, here this morning to share with you our concerns about the direction of our China policy, and how it impacts America's interests in the Pacific and especially in Taiwan.

Just ten days ago, on September 6th, 150,000 people marched in the streets of Taipei - in the largest demonstration Taipei has ever seen - to demand that government agencies, companies and private institutions which use "China" in their names replace it with "Taiwan".

I don't want to prejudice the issue one way or the other -- but I personally see nothing wrong with those sentiments. In fact, I think they are a healthy reminder of what's at stake in Taiwan.

First, let me say that America's interests are my uppermost concern.

Not just our strategic and economic interests, but even more profound than those are our interests in protecting and promoting our values as a nation. Those values include democracy, representative government, the rule of law, free markets, and the people's sovereignty over their own nation. These are values that Taiwan's people share with Americans. And it does America no good to avert its eyes when Totalitarian States threaten democracies that share our values.

Over the past several years, I'm afraid I have seen America's interests in Taiwan eroded by a thoughtless reverence for the shibboleth of "One China." Too many Americans -- even high government officials -- seem to think that "One China" somehow means that the United States accepts that democratic Taiwan is a part of communist China.

This hit home with me last year, in July of 2002, when I was in China with the House Asia Subcommittee and we had a chance to visit China's National Defense University, which is the major training academy for China's military strategists and thinkers.

And we had pretty frank discussions with Chinese Army generals where Taiwan came up repeatedly.

The thrust of the their position was that Taiwan's separation from China in 1949 was somehow akin to the American Civil War. They pointed to the Chinese Civil War -- and they tried to justify Beijing's claim to sovereignty over Taiwan, and declared China had a "right" to use force to bring Taiwan under Beijing's control. They were convinced of the LEGITIMACY of the use of force against Taiwan, a legitimacy that was based on their sovereignty over the Island. And they thought -- because the United States had a "one China policy" -- that we agreed with their argument.

We tried to be polite, and we explained that Beijing's differences with Taipei should be resolved through diplomacy and through discussions rather than any sort of military action or threat of any type of hostility.

And I emphasized over and over again that the United States Congress, in particular, had a strong commitment to stand with Taiwan . . . and I tried to send a clear message to China that -- as President Bush has said very clearly -- we'll "do whatever it takes" to help Taiwan defend itself.

Of course, I said I fervently hoped it wouldn't come to that . . .

Our delegation also hoped that, by making it clear to China that we will stand with Taiwan, that day will never come.

But in the year since then, China's military buildup continues. If the annual reports our committee gets from the Pentagon are accurate -- and I have every confidence that they are -- the Chinese People's Liberation Army is amassing an armed force that will be able to launch operations against Taiwan in a matter of years. Already China has deployed a force of 450 short-range ballistic missiles targeted against Taiwan -- and that number is increasing at a rate of 75 missiles a year.

Like others, I hope the Chinese military expansion is just intimidation and bluster, but I fear that it is not.

And I am coming to a horrifying realization that Washington's "One China policy" may actually be encouraging China in its threats of War.

"How?" you ask. Because Chinese leaders think America already agrees that Taiwan is "Part of China," and they think that America "opposes Taiwan's independence."

And for the Chinese -- this is half the battle right there.

-- If the United States considers Taiwan as part of China, -- if the United States opposes "Taiwan Independence", then the United States must -- ipso facto -- recognize the sovereign right of China to use force to effect the unification of Taiwan with China.

Let me spell this out a bit more . . . In October of 1976, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger asked his top China hands, and I quote:

"if Taiwan is recognized by us as part of China, then it may become irresistible to them . . . our saying we want a peaceful solution has no force, it is Chinese territory, what are we going to do about it?"

[REPEAT] "What are we going to do about it?" Indeed, that is the conundrum today.

Arthur Hummel, at the time, the State Department's senior China Hand (and later ambassador to Beijing) responded very logically to Kissinger's anxieties.

"Down the road," Hummel said, "perhaps the only solution would be an independent Taiwan."

Hummel and Kissinger both understood the nuance of "one China", and why it is dangerous to grant formal recognition of China's claim.

At the time -- October 1976 -- Everyone in the State Department understood what America's position on the Taiwan issue was -- the United States did not, and does not, recognize China's claim to Taiwan.

This was clear at the time of our Normalization with China in 1979, when we (again, I quote) "acknowledged the Chinese position that Taiwan is part of China". Immediately after that, then-Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher assured the U.S. Senate, that the current Chinese position was "not our position."

And in 1982, President Reagan gave the so-called "Six Assurances" to Taiwan's President -- the Fifth Assurance was "The United States Has Not Changed Its Long-Standing Position on the Matter of Sovereignty over Taiwan."

And what was that "long-standing" position? As the State Department wrote in a letter to Senator John East in September of 1982 -- "The United States takes no position on the question of Taiwan's sovereignty."

That being the case -- it is clear to me . . . and it should be clear to the Administration . . . that while America might recognize "One China", THAT "One China" does not, I repeat, DOES NOT include Taiwan.

It is an incontrovertible fact -- the United States treats Taiwan as an independent country. We deal with Taiwan economically, militarily, strategically, politically, diplomatically, commercially, in every way -- EVERY WAY -- as separate from China.

This isn't odd -- there is NO country on earth that treats Taiwan as though it were a part of China. Not even China treats Taiwan as if it were part of China -- for the obvious reason that there is no PRC governmental, military, economic or commercial presence in Taiwan -- AND NEVER HAS BEEN.

It may be impolite to say so -- but "One China" is a fiction -- and a dangerous fiction -- that most of the international community has bought into in order to mollify China.

But ask yourself, "What sort of a country, much less a major world power, threatens war -- even nuclear war -- over a fiction?"

In February of 2000, when China again threatened Taiwan with armed invasion, President Clinton responded by stating firmly that The United States "will continue to reject the use of force as a means to resolve the Taiwan question. We'll also continue to make absolutely clear that the issues between Beijing and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and with the assent of the people of Taiwan."

It seems to me, if "Taiwan independence" has the assent of the people of Taiwan, then it's okay with me - that's not a fiction. And if Taiwan's President says "Taiwan is an independent, sovereign state, with the 'Republic of China' on this side, and the 'People's Republic of China' on that side -- one side, one country," Well, THAT'S NO FICTION!

I'll tell you what it is -- it's an inconvenient truth.

Woe betide the political leaders of the United States if they willfully reject the Truth simply because it's inconvenient.

When I hear rumors that President Bush is "opposed to Taiwan Independence", I dismiss them. Because I know The President doesn't have any philosophical problem with an independent Taiwan.

The President and his top foreign policy aides constantly refer to Taiwan as a "country" and sometimes even make the mistake of calling it "The Republic of Taiwan."

This is understandable because Taiwan is NOT a fiction. Moreover, according to the United States Code - by statute -- Taiwan is considered an independent country for the purposes of U.S. law.

So, no . . . there is no metaphysical problem with an "independent Taiwan" anywhere in the U.S. government.

If there IS "opposition" to Taiwan independence in the Administration or in the Congress, it is solely -- SOLELY -- because China threatens to go to war with Taiwan if Taiwan declares "independence."

And American leaders know that if there is a War, the United States will help defend Taiwan, and that war will be a costly one.

But does our "One China Policy" make war less likely? I can't see that it does.

In 1938, Britain and France had a virtual "One Germany" policy which recognized Hitler's claims to the Sudeten Land -- and Franco-British appeasement on the issue led to Hitler's occupation of the Czech Republic and ultimately to World War II in Europe.

More recently, in 1990, the U.S. seemed to follow a "One Arab" policy. On July 25, the American Ambassador in Baghdad told Saddam Hussein, "We take no position in territorial disputes between Arabs, like your border disagreement with Kuwait, our only interest is that they be resolved peacefully."

As you all know, the "border disagreement with Kuwait" was that Saddam Hussein claimed Kuwait as Iraq's 19th Province. The American Ambassador's assurance that the United States didn't take any position on the issue only encouraged Saddam to believe that America wouldn't intervene in Iraq's armed invasion of Kuwait.

But why --- WHY? do we have a "one China policy" that gives Beijing's leaders the same impression that Saddam had in 1990?

Well, the simple answer is because during the Cold War, the United States saw China as an invaluable ally against the expansion of the Soviet Union. And for two decades, China was a useful partner.

China, for its part, set aside its complaints about Taiwan in order to stabilize ties with Washington.

But the Soviet Union is LONG GONE. And with it, the grand organizing principle of the strategic partnership between the U.S. and China has also disappeared.

Now, the rising hegemonic power in Asia ---- is China.

Let's face it, China is a militarily powerful dictatorship. It has an expanding economy, which, by the way, relies on free access to America's markets in order to grow.

So, there is no reason, either strategically, or economically, OR MORALLY, why the United States should be timid in the face of China's threats to go to war over Taiwan.

China relies on the United States -- not the other way around. And as the World's preeminent power, we must not tolerate China's threats.

Would the United States tolerate China's threats of war if Korea did not unify with China? Taiwan is an even bigger market for U.S. exports than South Korea, yet we would never put up with a Chinese demand for suzerainty over Korea.

Japan? Don't be silly!

Southeast Asia? In the 1960's Chinese revolutionary movements flourished in the region. But we always sided with the independent democracies of Asia against the Chinese dictatorship.

Except in the case of Taiwan.

-- With the Cold War over, -- the Soviet Union extinct, -- and Post-Tiananmen China tightening, not relaxing, its grip on the political, civil and religious rights of its people; I do not see that humoring China on the Taiwan issue serves America's interests any longer.

China is no longer a valued ally against the expansionary, totalitarian Soviet Empire. In fact, China itself is a totalitarian state. And by threatening war against a prosperous, dynamic and militarily potent democracy, China certainly gives the impression of being expansionistic.

Well -- some may ask -- what do you do if China goes to war over Taiwan?

I'd answer -- "whatever it takes" to defend a democracy against tyranny. I would do it for Korea, for Japan, for the Philippines. It cannot be in America's interests to cede Taiwan rhetorically or otherwise to dictatorial China.

Now -- do I want to abandon the "One China Policy"?

I answer -- "well, so long as 'One China' is NOT/NOT understood to mean that Taiwan is part of China, then I have no problem with it."

But if -- carelessness, or inattention to nuance, or force of habit leads America's political leaders to the mistaken conclusion that Taiwan is part of China -- then "One China" must be dumped! Done Away With!

And the United States must declare that while "WE DO NOT SUPPORT TAIWAN INDEPENDENCE - - NOR DO WE HAVE ANY PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEM WITH IT." It that is what the people of Taiwan want, they have every right to have it. After all the Sovereignty over Taiwan doesn't rest in Beijing, or in Taipei, but it rests with Taiwan's People."

Thank you.