One China Is An Indisputable Fact

On August 1, the “Mainland Affairs Council” of the Taiwan authorities issued an explanation on Lee Teng-hui’s “special state-to-state relations”. The written explanation argued that the “two states” remark gave a definite explanation to the existing facts from political, historical and legal views. Then, what are the real facts relating to the Taiwan Straits with regard to history, reality and law since 1949? The press departments of the Taiwan Work Office of the Chinese communist Party (CPC) Central Committee and the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council refuted Lee’s comments and made a sat4ement. The following are excerpts of it.

There Is Only China, Both Sides of the Straits Are Not Two States.

Taiwan is part of China’s territory, and both sides of the Taiwan Straits belong to one country, not two. This is an indisputable fact that has been proved by history, reality, and law. The Taiwan issue is an aftermath of the civil war, therefore, the solution is entirely an internal affair of China.

Since ancient times, Taiwan has been part of China. From the Song Dynasty (960-1279) to the reign of Guangxu (1875-1908) of the Qing Dynasty, the Chinese Government had exercised sovereignty over Taiwan. In 1885, the Qing Government formally established Taiwan as an independent province. In 1895, Taiwan and the Penghu Archipelago were snatched away by the Japanese imperialists in the Sino–Japanese War (1894-95). However, the Chinese people never accepted the unequal treaties, including the Treaty of Shimonoseki, forced upon them, and fought relentlessly for their abolition.

In July 1937, Japanese imperialists launched a full invasion of China. In December 1941, the Chinese Government issued a Notice Delaying War Against Japan, which stated clearly to both Chinese and foreigners that all treaties, agreements and contracts covering Sino-Japanese relations would be null and void and solemnly declared that China would “recover Taiwan, the Penghu Archipelago and the four provinces in the northeast.” The Treaty of Shimonoseki was, of course, included in this announcement. In December 1973, China, the United States and Britain signed the Cairo Declaration. In July 1945, the three countries signed the Potsdam Proclamation, which was later joined by the Soviet Union. Both of the documents categorically stated that Japan should return all occupied Chinese territories such as the northeast provinces, Taiwan and the
Penghu Archipelago, to China. In August 1945, Japan surrendered unconditionally and accepted the Potsdam Proclamation. Two months later, Taiwan returned to the motherland and was again included within the sovereignty of China. Ever since then, Taiwan’s status as part of Chinese territory has never changed.

In October 1949, the Chinese people achieved a great victory in their revolution against imperialism and feudalism and overthrew the reactionary rule by the Republic of China (ROC). Ended the rule of the ROC over the country. This is the historical choice made by the Chinese people. The PRC became China’s sole legitimate government and the sole legitimate representative on the international stage. Naturally, it inherited the sovereignty over the whole China including Taiwan, which was formerly exercised by the ROC. With regard to international law, this is an example of government inheritance, which has already been internationally recognized. Though the Taiwan authorities still hold the banner of ROC after October 1949, the so-called ROC in Taiwan has lost all its legitimacy and is no longer a legitimate government representing China. It has never been a fact that two Chinese coexist internationally, as proclaimed by Lee Teng-hui. This is merely his fantasy.

In October 1971, the 26th Session of the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution No.2758, which stated clearly “the representative of the PRC Government is the sole legitimate representative at the UN, and that PRC is one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council”, It also declared an immediate expulsion of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from all UN organs. This demonstrates that the UM has accepted the fact that the PRC government is the sole legitimate representative of China. The issue about who is China’s legitimate representative in the UN has been decided once and for all. Over 160 countries worldwide have established diplomatic ties with the PRC. France, Japan and the United States established diplomatic ties with China respectively in 1964, 1972 and 1979. They, and all other countries having diplomatic ties with China respectively in 1964, 1972 and 1979. They, and all other countries having diplomatic ties with China, recognize and respect the fact that there is only one China, that Taiwan is part of China, and that the PRC is the sole legitimate government of all China. This is the inevitable outcome of the development of objective conditions and such a trend will continue.

The territory and sovereignty of a country are not allowed to be separated. It is the right of every country to safeguard its territorial integrity, and this is also the basic norm of international law. A country’s sovereignty belongs to the whole nation that allows no alteration by any region or any number of people. The fact that the two sides of the Straits have not been reunified does not affect in any way Taiwan’s status as part of China’s territory and Chinese sovereignty over the island. The lands on both sides of the Straits are really one China. Taiwan’s written explanation enumerated several “peculiarities” of the “special state—to—state relations”. On the fundamental issue that Chinese sovereignty and territory are not allowed to be separated, however, it obstinately insisted on Lee Teng-hui’s fallacy that the land across the Straits had split into two countries and the China’s sovereignty and territory had been separated. Therefore, in essence, this is still a “two states”remark.

One China Policy Is the Basis for Equal Dialogue and Talks Between the Two Sides.
It is widely known that the CPC and the Chinese Government have been practicing the basic policy of "peaceful reunification and one country, two systems" since 1979, and have always advocated that reunification should be achieved through peaceful negotiation on an equal footing. On September 30, 1981, Ye Jianying, former Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPC) proposed to "hold equal talks between the CPC and Chinese Kaman tang ". On June 26, 1983, Deng Xiaoping put it more clearly as "hold tides between the two parties on an equal footing to achieve a third round of Kuomintang-Communist cooperation, rather than talks between the central and local governments". Based on changes in the Taiwan Political situation, CPC General Secretary Jiang Zemin said on October 12, 1992 that under the premise of the one China Policy, every issue can be discussed, including an appropriate way for formal talks acceptable for both sides. On January 30, 1995, Jiang Zemin in his important Speech "To Continue to Fight for the Country's Reunification" pointed out clearly that under the principle of one China, "a solution acceptable to both sides on the name, place and method of political negotiations will be found only if equal consultations are conducted at an early date." All the above facts show, however, that the PRC Government is the sole legitimate government representing China. It has never negotiated with Taiwan in the name of "the central government to local one "and has never said Taiwan was a "renegade province."

In fact, the Association for Relations Across Taiwan Straits (APATS) and the Straits Exchange Foundation (SEF) have been conducting negotiations on an equal footing since they began consultations in 1992. Practice has proven that under the principle of one China, an appropriate way for equal negotiations across the Straits can be found. The mainland advocated abiding by the one China policy in dealing with affairs across the Straits, especially in negotiations before unification. That is to say, to abide by the principles that there is only one China in the world, that Taiwan is an inalienable part of China and that China's sovereignty and territory are not allowed to be separated.

The Taiwan authorities claimed the right to jump out of the "framework of political entity against a sovereign country and lay a foundation for equality across the Straits". In fact, they wanted to break away from the one China policy. To fix the relationship across the Straits as "special state-to-state relations" did not lay a foundation for negotiations between both sides, but for splitting China. This fully shows the Taiwan authorities used equal footing for negotiations only as an excuse, their real aim being to further curb cross-Strait dialogue and talks and separate Taiwan from China.

ARATAS and SEF Reached a Consensus in 1992 that "Both Sides Would Abide by One China Policy".

In 1990, the Taiwan authorities promoted the setting up of SEF, which defined itself as "of China, of a good will and of a good service". In February 1991, the National Unity Program drawn up by the Taiwan authorities stated that "the mainland and Taiwan are both territories of China" and accepted one China policy. Having noticed that Taiwan authorities and SEF had the consequently established ARATAS. The two organizations held consultations on the one the one China policy.

The ARATS, according to authorization, in routine consultations with SEF, clarified
that detailed problems in the compatriot exchanges across the Straits are internal affairs of China, which should be consulted and solved with regard to the one China policy. In routine consultations, if the basic attitude of one China policy is observed, the political implications of one China may not be discussed.

On November 16, 1992, ARATS and SEF reached a consensus in oral expression on the principle that “both sides abide by one China policy”. The exact expression of ARATS goes like this, “both sides across the Straits abide by the one China policy and strive for national unity, but in routine consultations across the Straits the political implications of one China will not be involved;” while the exact expression of SEF is “in the process of seeking national unity with mutual efforts across the Straits, both sides abide by the one China policy, but the have a different understanding of the Policy.”

Both ARATS and SEF made a clear commitment to each other that they would abide by the one China policy and strive for the national unity. However, the consensus between the two organizations did not get past the discussion stage, and they did not reach a concrete agreement on the political implications of one China at all. The ARATS said it would not touch upon the political implications of one China in routine consultations, while SEF said they had different explanations. To put it simply, both sides only reached a consensus on abiding by one China policy, but not on the political implications of one China.

Relevant departments of Taiwan have distorted facts in explaining the consensus into "one China, two expressions”. Its aim is to advocate their separatist stand. With the intensification of Lee Teng-hui’s splitting activities, such an aim becomes more apparent. Now the written explanation in the name of “two expressions” said they could have their own say on one China policy and publicly put forward “two states” remark, which is also” special state-to –state relations”. This exposed absolutely the Taiwan authorities’ real intention of distorting the 1992 meetings of ARATS and SEF.

"Special Two States” Statement Deliberately Sabotages Cross-Straits Relations and Peace and Stability in the Asia-Pacific Region

Taiwan’s written explanation presumptuously said the "special two states" statement advocated by Lee Teng-hui fully reflected the "wishes “of 22million Taiwanese people. This absolutely profaned the feelings of Taiwan compatriots. It is the greatest wish of, and of vital importance to, Taiwan compatriots to seek peace, security and development. The “special two states” statement deliberately provoked conflicts and confrontations across the Strait. This will surely lead to continued turbulence in Taiwan society and destroy the interests of Taiwan compatriots. Peace and stability across the Taiwan Straits will not be maintained unless the “special two states” statement is withdrawn.

For over a decade, with mutual efforts from all compatriots, the contacts and exchanges across the Straits have expanded and the circumstances for economic cooperation and mutual benefit are being formed. Under the one China policy, the dialogue in politics and economy across the Straits is being deepened. When compatriots on both sides were expecting a further development of their relations, Lee Teng-hui publicly announced out the “two states” remark, which absolutely
discarded the basis for the normal development of relations and destroyed the peaceful and safe situation across the Straits. In order to separate Taiwan from China, Lee Teng-hui pays no heed to the security, interests, or well being of Taiwanese citizens, and his attempt will lead to calamities for the 22 million Taiwanese people.

The "special two states" statement openly challenges the one China policy, which will not only greatly destroy cross-Strait relations, but also endanger the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific Region. No matter how the written explanation tries to exonerate Lee Teng-hui from responsibility, Lee is an international "trouble maker".