

S 5292

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 3, 1984

the mom-and-apple-pie thing. You know, my father said to me before I left, 'go over there and earn some medals and be a man. . . .'

"But after a while, it began to occur to me how insane this all was. I began to see that the enemy was a human being. Pretty soon, I was in an immense state of confusion, so I began to—well—there were plenty of chemicals to numb yourself with and I poured them into the boiling cauldron of emotion and then things really got bad."

Bentley returned and spent six years wandering through 20 or more jobs from Minnesota to Maine, Nebraska to Florida.

"I couldn't stay in any one place. I couldn't get a grip. I was floundering. I was also drinking heavily and using other drugs . . . But if you spend a year killing people and having people trying to kill you and watching people around you die, that is going to have an effect on you on some level."

He finally stopped long enough to begin going to the U.S. Veterans Administration at Togus for group therapy and enrolled at USM seeking a master's degree in rehabilitation counseling.

"I think a lot of veterans could grow by group and by going through the process," noted Bentley, saying he has met many veterans who have yet to cope with their experiences.

"I run into (veterans who haven't talked about their feelings) all the time. I run into that at school and at meetings . . . Mostly what you get is, 'Yeah, I was there and I haven't really talked about it.'"

But after more than 11 years and many long miles on the road away from Vietnam, the veterans say they are beginning to talk about both their triumphs and remaining problems. What's more, they say society seems to be increasingly willing to listen.

"I think that from the time the war ended to now, the nation has had time to adjust," said Guay.

"I would say, at least at face value (the veterans' public image has gotten better) especially in the last few years," Morris added. "I think it's because the conscience of this country—of our parents' age group particularly—realized that Vietnam was a lot worse and a lot crazier for us than they ever gave us credit for when we first came back."

"I think they've matured," said Johnston, referring to the protesters of yesterday, "and realized that you're often in circumstances beyond your control."

"We don't blame the American people with being upset with the situation. After 10 years, given the best fighting machine ever developed in the world, the national treasury and 3 million young men, we lost. We didn't even have a stated clearly defined goal," said Vampatella.

"We can't blame the American people. And we can't blame them for blaming us. We symbolized all the things that were painful to them. But they were wrong about putting the blame on us. The blame was clearly on our civilian leaders in Washington," he said, saying his hope is that "people realize that hatred was misdirected."

"The most important thing to get across . . . is that the Vietnam veterans desire to have people understand they were doing a job just like all other veterans and they were doing a job for the American public," said Jim Wyatt, a decorated veteran who now works as a National Service Officer and veteran advocate at Togus.

"All they want is for that hand to be extended and people to say a silent thank you so that they're just like those people who didn't have to go," he added.

If the growing number of newspaper and magazine articles, television newscasts and programs and movies more favorably depicting the plight of the Vietnam veteran are an example, the hand is finally, hesitantly, being extended say veterans.

In addition, some say the government, long criticized by Vietnam veterans for its lack of support, seems to be making an effort.

Vampatella's Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program, Morris' Veteran Employment Training Service, Guay's involvement with the Veteran Affairs Committee of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies and the recently erected Vietnam Veterans memorial in Washington, D.C., indicate growing government awareness, some acknowledge.

But perhaps the most important change is occurring within the veterans themselves.

"The experience you had, had to sit there for a while, and now we're able to look at it a lot more rationally," said Guay.

"Many pretty much feel the time is right to come out of the closet. We have prospered despite the image," said Vampatella.

Vietnam veterans like Guay and Johnston are finding successful careers in the private and public sectors.

Vietnam veterans like Vampatella and Merrill are discovering satisfaction and success working in executive-level positions helping other Vietnam veterans.

Many Vietnam veterans are working to develop the mental stability and educational background needed to work in the public or private sectors.

Many others say they are now finding the courage and desire to voice their long-stilled emotions, considered one of the first steps in the healing process. "Many veterans still having difficulty have decided to come out for treatment," said Morris.

Some have found an inner strength from their experiences. "Fortunately, the majority of us that went over are back in society now and would never want to go back, but would never trade in the experience," said Wyatt, who lost both his legs to a "bouncing Betty" land mine. "It showed me the value of life, loved ones and family."

And some veterans are even finding an inner strength—pride—from their experiences, particularly as the American public becomes more accepting of the Vietnam veterans' role in the war.

"I think history will certify that those of us who went to Vietnam are going to prove to be some of the greatest warriors and leaders of this country," said Wyatt.

Guay, talking quietly about the Bronze Star Medal he earned for his contribution to the war, commented, "It didn't mean that much to me when I first got it. At the time, I didn't feel I was decorated. Now, I feel kind of proud of it."

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S ANTITERRORISM PROPOSALS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I proudly join with my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to introduce, on behalf of the administration, four bills to address the growing problem of terrorism.

Mr. President, we are seeing a disturbing and alarming trend in the use of terrorism. It is the direct use of terror by a number of sovereign foreign states. We have seen several examples of that state-sponsored and state-executed terrorism during just the past year: The bombing of our Em-

bassies in Beirut and Kuwait, the bombing of the headquarters of the U.S. Marine peace-keeping unit in Beirut, and most recently the machinegun killing, by someone inside the Libyan Embassy in London, of a British policewoman and the wounding of 11 Libyans who were peacefully demonstrating against the Qadhafi regime. That act of terrorism was, according to recent press accounts, ordered by the Libyan Government.

In addition, state-provided training, financing, and logistical support for terrorists and terrorist groups is a profoundly serious and growing source of danger to the United States, and to our friends and allies abroad.

The legislative package proposed by the President complements and augments several pieces of antiterrorist legislation that I introduced earlier in this session: S. 2395, which would amend the Freedom of Information Act by providing an exemption for information relating to terrorism and foreign counterintelligence; S. 2469, the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1984, which would make terrorism a Federal crime and give the FBI primary investigative jurisdiction over the crime of terrorism; and S. 2470, the Anti-Nuclear Terrorism Act of 1984, which would give nuclear power reactor licensees access to the FBI's national criminal history files and thus enable licensees to check for criminal histories of potential employees who would have unescorted access to nuclear power facilities.

I want to outline the President's proposals:

ACT FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF HOSTAGE-TAKING

In September 1981, the President signed the instrument ratifying the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, which was adopted by the United Nations on December 17, 1979. The convention has not, however, been implemented domestically through enabling legislation. This bill would implement the 1979 convention by amending the Federal kidnaping statute to provide for Federal jurisdiction over any kidnaping in which a threat is made to kill, injure, or continue to detain a victim in order to compel a third party to do or to abstain from doing something. When the President signed the instrument of ratification, the Congress was informed that the instrument of ratification would not be deposited with the United Nations until enabling legislation had been enacted. To demonstrate to other governments and international organizations that the United States is serious about its efforts to deal with international terrorism, it is essential that the Congress approve the enabling legislation required for our full implementation of the Hostage-Taking Convention.

AIRCRAFT SABOTAGE ACT

The United States became a party in 1969 to the Tokyo Convention, which

57

May 3, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5291

(blowing) would send me flying on the floor—things like that. I (went to live in the woods) just to think. To have quiet. Peace. Not to escape from (people), but to escape from everything else. So I would have no responsibilities and I could deal with my own mind-set, which took a long period of time."

Slowly, over the next decade, Johnston would come out of the woods, get a degree in political science from the University of Maine at Presque Isle, begin working in Cohen's local office there and even get married. A year-and-a-half ago, he moved to take a job in Cohen's Lewiston office, specializing in veterans' issues.

Johnston cites the therapy, medication and treatment he received from the Veterans Administration during those last 10 years for helping him take control of his life and ridding him of his seizures.

"If you had talked to me six years ago," he says, "I would have been real down on the government, I think. It's hard now (to be critical) because my life is good. I'm happily married. I'm a homeowner, drive a fairly new vehicle. I have a motorcycle that's paid for. You know. Life's pretty easy . . . But it's all a matter of perspective. I have a lot of empathy for the veteran who's having a hard time. Particularly if they're unemployed (because) I can't think of anything worse."

Saying he considers himself extremely lucky, Johnston said his remaining problems involve talking about some of his experiences and an occasional "surge of emotion" that washes over him, recreating the fear he felt in Vietnam.

"Sometimes I'll get a surge of emotion . . . I don't know why. It used to precipitate seizures. Today, I go for a walk, I run, I have a beer, I'll talk to my wife, start wrestling, something, anything."

Johnston, who hesitated to talk about his experiences, fearful of making an example of myself, is just one of the estimated 16,000 Vietnam combat troops in Maine and 3 million nationally who returned to piece their lives back together.

His story of success is the rule, not the exception.

There are wonderful success stories and some horrible stories of failure. But basically speaking, people have been able to get on with their lives . . ." said Phil Vampatella, executive director of Maine's Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program headquartered in Portland.

Vampatella, a Vietnam veteran whose program is designed for successful veterans to help still-troubled ones, said only 15 to 20 percent of the veterans who returned from Vietnam still have serious problems psychologically or physically.

The other 80 to 85 percent, he said, have successfully merged into society with some rarely thinking about their experiences and others battling tough-but-manageable problems on a daily basis.

However, he said the public still has the perception that all the veterans returning from Vietnam are violent and unstable.

"The way I see it . . . we have been devalued as everything from a bunch of drug-addicted baby killers to pot heads," said Vampatella. "A lot of us have just hidden out so not to have to put up with the nonsense garbage that's been cast on us. But we're just like everybody else. We have our houses, and mortgages and kids with braces."

"I think there's a stigma out there about the Vietnam veteran," added Jon Guay of Lewiston, "as the guy with the Army fatigues, the ponytail, a ring in his ear and a chip on his shoulder. But most of the time, he's your neighbor or the local doctor or dentist or school teacher."

Guay, a former prisoner interrogator who served during the Tet offensive, is assistant director of the Marine Job Service in Augusta. Very few scars from Vietnam remain with Guay.

He can talk about his experiences—although he has only begun to talk about them in the past year or two. He is employed in a high-level job. He no longer suffers flashbacks or nervousness at night.

Guay says he was luckier than some. He came from Bingham, a small, still-patriotic town where many people knew him, wrote to him while in Vietnam and welcomed him home on his return.

Like Johnston, "I also had the advantage of spending some time by myself, getting reoriented to civilization. I have a log cabin on a stream in Somerset County and I spent about two-and-a-half months in that cabin by myself . . . mostly hunting. But I also needed that time to kind of rearrange myself. I think that time was very valuable for me . . . I think that was an adjustment many veterans missed."

"The other thing, too," said Guay, "is I didn't have any pressures on me when I came back. While I hadn't selected a career yet, I had many avenues open to me. And I also didn't have a girlfriend I was writing to or anything, or my own wife and children that I was coming back to. I think that would have added to the pressure of being over there . . ."

Guay added, "It's my feeling some of the veterans who have come back who haven't been able to adjust haven't had that break."

Even with the advantages he had, Guay says vivid memories remain with him, particularly about the week-long Tet offensive in his Central Highlands area.

"There were bullets flying overhead. There were flares going off. Nobody slept. Nobody ate."

"(When I first returned) I would wake up when I heard a noise like a car backfire. There are some residual things that to this day probably still stay with me."

"Even to this day," he continued, "when I go into a restaurant, I have to sit so I know where the door is and the exits are. That was something you always did there. You would sit strategically so that you wouldn't be caught with your back to the door because there were always people throwing in (small bombs) and blowing up places where Americans were. So even today, it's very important where I sit."

Guay said the transition back to life in the United States was not helped by the reception most veterans received from a war-weary, cynical America, wracked internally by protests.

"When I was over there in Vietnam and when I came back, if I ever ran into one of those (protesters) I was always looking forward to confronting one of them because I had physical plans for him," he said, with a quick laugh.

"This is very interesting for me," Guay added after a thoughtful pause. "All the time I didn't want to go over there because I was scared. All the time you're over there you can't wait to get back. All the time you were over there you hated it. But when you came back, there was a sense of pride you had that did not allow you to empathize with those people who were protesting the war. At least that was my own experience."

Guay's reaction was typical. Many of the men spoke of returning and hating the war for the physical and emotional toll it had taken; hating the South Vietnamese for often acting as if they did not care who won the war; hating the U.S. government for not taking the obvious steps needed to win the war; and often even disliking themselves for the actions they were forced to take.

They were confronted by a vocal segment of the population that often blamed the returning veteran for abetting the war.

The reception was a blow to the already reeling veterans, many of whom entered the war either because they had to or because they felt it was the right thing to do for their country.

Talking about their experiences quickly became a major problem for many veterans, either because they couldn't vocalize their feelings or because no one wanted to listen.

"One major problem I found was that I was not able to talk, even to fellow veterans, about Vietnam. I was angered . . . by the protests and what not," said Merrill Morris, organizer and program director of Maine's new Veteran Employment Training Service.

"When I came back, I just tried to forget about it, because people at home were tired of it and didn't want to hear any more about it," said Steve Bentley, a 37-year-old veteran who is seeking his master's degree in rehabilitation counseling at the University of Southern Maine.

"But," Bentley added, "you stuff things like that away and it's got to come out somewhere."

The pent-up frustrations and emotions held by many veterans did show themselves—often in the form of emotional instability, the inability to hold down a job, disrespect for authority, dependency on drugs, guilt, remorse, strained personal relationships and the need for support.

Relying on their own tenacity and internal strengths, the support of friends and family and the growing number of state and federal programs available during the past decade, 80 to 85 percent of the veterans now fit well into society. But manageable problems remain, they say.

Vampatella remarked, "There's probably something like that hiding in each of us. I think we all have that hidden thing in each of us that needs to be taken care of."

Such remnants of Vietnam depend on each man's experiences, the intensity and duration of those experiences, the period of war when those experiences occurred and each man's own internal strengths, veterans say.

Johnston occasionally has surges of emotion.

Guay is aware of where he sits in public places.

Morris will forever lack some of his innocence and his soul. "I quit caring and I had no anticipation of ever leaving (Vietnam)," he said. "To this day, I feel like a part of me died there. It's like you left a part of you there. Other veterans who were there say the same thing; that they seemed to leave a piece of their soul there. I believe it's true."

Bentley, while unmarried, says that because of the war he will never consider having children. "I feel the world is too crazy to bring children into it. In general, I feel the way living, breathing people treat each other is madness."

Bentley's high-risk job, which he volunteered for, was to operate a Rome Plow, a tractor-like machine used to clear the jungle of vegetation and eliminate enemy hiding places.

With only thin wire mesh around the driving compartment to protect him from vegetation, Bentley and other machine drivers would often be the targets of bombs and booby-traps. He survived. But he knew other drivers killed and maimed by snipers, 250-pound bombs planted under the ground and concussion bombs suspended by string between trees.

"I went over there for two tours. You know, I really bit into it. I was there for a Hemingway-experience kind of thing, plus

May 3, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 5293

covers certain offenses or acts committed aboard aircraft, and in 1971 to the Hague Convention, which concerns the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft. The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation was adopted at Montreal in 1971 and ratified by the United States in November 1972. It requires that all states party to it establish jurisdiction over certain offenses affecting the safety of civil aviation.

The Congress has approved enabling legislation for the first two conventions, but not for the Montreal Convention. In consequence, certain criminal acts related to aircraft sabotage or hijacking are not adequately covered by U.S. law. The gap in the law sends a false signal to terrorists. It also indicates to other governments that we may not be as serious as we should be, and as in fact we are, in our efforts to combat international terrorism. Action by the Congress now would provide the basis for the long-overdue implementation of the Montreal Convention.

ACT FOR REWARDS FOR INFORMATION
CONCERNING TERRORIST ACTS

Current law authorizes the payment of rewards for information concerning domestic crimes, but it is outdated. The maximum rewards are inadequate, and terrorism is not specifically included as a basis for paying a reward. Moreover, there is no authority for the payment of rewards for information about acts of terrorism abroad.

The proposed legislation, which is modeled on an existing statute that allows payment of rewards for information concerning the unauthorized manufacture of atomic weapons, recognizes that payment of a reward in connection with acts of domestic terrorism raises a matter of law enforcement that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, but that the payment of a reward in connection with an act of terrorism abroad poses a political and foreign relations problem within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. By increasing the amounts of rewards that may be paid, and by authorizing rewards for information about terrorist acts committed abroad, the bill would markedly improve the ability of the Departments of Justice and State to obtain information leading to the freeing of hostages or the capture of the perpetrators of acts of terrorism. By passing this legislation, the Congress can further underscore the intent of the United States to take every appropriate and necessary step to protect its citizens and property from terrorist acts.

PROHIBITION AGAINST THE TRAINING AND SUPPORT OF TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS ACT OF 1984

The training and support of terrorist

groups and activities by a number of countries has reached alarming proportions. In addition, the increase in the number of states now using terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy is highly disturbing. Activities by U.S. nationals to provide assistance to countries that support terrorism and use terrorism as a foreign policy tool has thus become a matter of grave concern to our national security. This bill, together with revised and strengthened regulations that the Department of State intends to issue shortly, would enhance the ability of the Department of Justice to prosecute persons involved in the support of terrorist activities and of states using terrorism. Enactment of the legislation would be a strong contribution to the effort to combat terrorism.

The time has come, Mr. President, for the Congress to take forceful and effective measures against terrorism by passing the four legislative proposals as soon as humanly possible. In an effort to expedite that effort, the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, which I chair, has already scheduled a series of hearings on the bills. The first hearing will be held on June 5.

I believe it vital, Mr. President, that at those hearings we have a full and fair airing of the pros and cons of the legislation and make sure that we hear views from every responsible quarter. We certainly should not rush to judgment as the Washington Post did in its lead editorial on May 1 in which, without benefit of any hearings on the issues, it termed the President's package "Bad legislation" and an effort "to fight terrorism with hysteria."

One of the problems with the Washington Post editorial, Mr. President, is that it only addresses one of the four bills in the President's Legislative package—the Prohibition Against the Training or Support of Terrorist Organization Act of 1984. The Post editorial completely ignores the three other bills in the package, two of which are enabling legislation for treaties to which the United States is already a signatory.

Instead of hasty and ill-considered reactions, like those manifested by the Post, the country deserves a dispassionate, objective review of the President's proposals. An editorial that appeared on April 24 in the Florence Times Daily in my home State of Alabama reaches the heart of the problem that we face by pointing out that, like other terrorists, Colonel Qadhafi of Libya—

Must be taught that the more civilized nations of the world will not tolerate his militaristic tactics. His threats must be countered with adequate protections. His actions must be reprimanded. His use of Embassies to carry out intimidation of his exiles must stop. His lawlessness must end or at least be confined within the borders of Libya.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Times Daily editorial, entitled "Get Tough With Libyans," be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

I believe it vital, Mr. President, that after full and fair hearings we move the bills through committee and on the floor for action.

I urge all of my colleagues to lend their support to the four bills in an effort to weaken, if not eliminate, the growing threat posed by international terrorism.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GET TOUGH WITH LIBYANS

Britain has rightfully decided to end diplomatic relations with Libya.

Last week, an occupant of the Libyan Embassy in London poked a machine gun out the window and fired on a group of protesters. A policewoman monitoring the protest was killed. Ten other people were wounded.

British police surrounded the embassy. The killer remained inside, protected from justice by diplomatic immunity. The British government could not storm the embassy, because under international law permission of Libya is required before entry to the embassy is allowed.

At the same time, the Libya government put troops around the British Embassy in Tripoli. Later, those troops were removed. The police around the Libyan Embassy in London remained.

Libyan leader Moammar Khadafy continued to refuse permission for British police to enter the embassy. The British wanted to question the occupants and look for weapons.

Some reports said that just before the deadly shots an American spy satellite picked up a message from Libya to the embassy. The message instructed the embassy staff to use force in response to the taunts from the protesters outside.

By Sunday, British diplomats in Libya will return home and Libyan diplomats in Britain are supposed to go home. The standoff will be over. Until then, however, the police will continue to surround the embassy.

When the Libyan diplomats come out of the embassy, a killer will be walking with them. It seems unfair to the family of the slain policewoman. She was protecting the Libyans and now she is dead at the hands of a Libyan.

However, we must praise Britain's decision to cut diplomatic relations. It is tough action. It may not match the crime, but it puts the radical Khadafy regime on notice.

Khadafy must be taught that the more civilized nations of the world will not tolerate his militaristic tactics. His threats must be countered with adequate protections. His actions must be reprimanded. His use of embassies to carry out intimidation of his exiles must stop. His lawlessness must end or at least be confined within the borders of Libya.

Our prayers go to the 8,000 British citizens living in Libya. We hope that they will be unharmed.

S 5294

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 3, 1984

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be placed in the permanent RECORD of May 2, 1984, immediately following the statement of Senator THURMOND relative to the four bills of the President's antiterrorism package, that is S. 2623, S. 2624, S. 2625, and S. 2626.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FUTURE OF TAIWAN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to call to your attention an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 24, entitled, "The U.S. Should Encourage a 'Republic of Taiwan.'" The article, written by Trong R. Chai, professor of political science at the City University of New York, questions the wisdom of trusting China to keep its promises regarding Taiwan's future status. As you know, China repeatedly insists that the people on Taiwan have nothing to fear from reunification with the People's Republic. Professor Chai quotes Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang's assertion that:

After the country is unified, Taiwan, as a special administrative region of China, can retain much of its own character and keep its social systems and life style unchanged. The existing party, government and military setups in Taiwan can also remain unchanged.

But Professor Chai also correctly points out that China made similar promises in a 1951 written agreement with Tibet only to break its word a few years later in a brutal invasion. I believe the question Professor Chai poses deserves our careful consideration because the wrong decision on Taiwan's part could result in a repeat of Tibet's fate.

Professor Chai, after posing the difficulties associated with reunification, argues that the better choice for the United States is to encourage the formation of a Republic of Taiwan. Being a native-born Taiwanese, he prefers that any new republic formed be democratic and established by and for the benefit of all the people on Taiwan. But he would also favor a republic controlled by the present KMT government rather than accept the imposition of a Communist system by China.

His recommendations may strike some as being provocative. I frankly am saddened by reactions of this sort. Fearing to speak out for democracy and freedom of choice for the 18 million people on Taiwan runs counter to everything we as a people stand for. I urge my colleagues to judge for themselves by reading this article in its entirety.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD Professor Chai's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 1984]

THE U.S. SHOULD ENCOURAGE A "REPUBLIC OF TAIWAN"

(By Trong R. Chai)

During his visit to the U.S. in January, Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang asserted that "the Taiwan question is the main obstacle in the growth of Sino-U.S. relations." The prime minister's solution to this problem? "After the country is unified, Taiwan, as a special administrative region of China, can retain much of its own character and keep its social systems and life style unchanged. The existing party, government and military setups in Taiwan can also remain unchanged."

Would the Chinese keep their promise and allow Taiwan to maintain its own social and political systems if they took over the island? The current status of Tibet provides an answer.

In 1951, China and Tibet signed an agreement governing relations between them. Article 4 stated that "the central authorities will not alter the existing political system in Tibet. The central authorities also will not alter the established status, functions and powers of the Dalai Lama." Article 7 promised that "the religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected." The Chinese even pledged that "in matters related to various reforms in Tibet, there will be no compulsion on the part of the central authorities; the local government of Tibet shall carry out reform of its own accord."

Less than eight years later, China invaded Tibet. This touched off massive uprisings, and the Dalai Lama fled to India. Since that time, killings by the Chinese and the wholesale destruction of Tibetan culture have been well documented.

The case of Tibet demonstrates China's failure to translate its words into deeds. Premier Zhao's formula for Taiwan should thus be seen as nothing more than an empty promise.

The people of Taiwan have more than the heavy hand of Chinese rule to fear, however. For the past 35 years, they have been living under Kuomintang martial law. Basic human rights, such as freedom of speech, assembly and association, have been denied. Native Taiwanese, who constitute 85% of Taiwan's total population, occupy less than 10% of the seats on national legislative bodies. The president and the governor of Taiwan, along with the mayors of the two largest cities, aren't elected by the people.

In its 90-year separation from China, first under the Japanese and then the KMT, Taiwan has developed its own distinctive character. For example, the Taiwanese illiteracy rate is less than 5%, compared with more than 30% in China. Taiwan's per capita income is five times higher than China's.

The difference between the two societies is so great that the Taiwanese people wish to establish a new nation independent of China. Evidence came in a supplementary congressional election last December in which the joint platform of the non-KMT candidates stressed that "the future of Taiwan should be determined by the people on Taiwan." Self-determination is a code word for Taiwanese independence—discussion of which is prohibited by the KMT.

Instead, the Taiwanese people suffer from international isolation. Only about 20 countries maintain diplomatic relations with Taiwan.

When a nation establishes formal ties with Peking, it invariably agrees to the Chinese demand that Taiwan be recognized as part of China. Consequently, the Taiwanese

people fear that China will eventually try to annex the island by force.

This fear has precipitated a growing flow of wealth from Taiwan. In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last November, Lo Fu-Chen, a visiting professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania, stated: "Already a so-called Hong Kong phenomenon is experienced in Taiwan. Based on a banker's estimates, some \$3 billion in capital, equivalent to 7% of [the] GNP of Taiwan, has flown into Los Angeles alone. In the last three years, the investment index has experienced a steady decline for the first time in three decades of rapid growth."

The U.S. was deeply concerned about Taiwan's security until 1972, when President Richard Nixon and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai issued the Shanghai Communique, in which Washington acknowledged that there is "but one China and . . . Taiwan is a part of China." Since then, the U.S. has cut its formal ties with Taipei and pledged to reduce its arms sales to Taiwan over time "to a final resolution."

It is vital that the U.S. continue to protect the independence of Taiwan. President Reagan should keep in mind the following points during his visit to China this week:

First, as the U.S. has been involved with Taiwan for four decades and champions freedom and democracy everywhere in the world, it has a moral obligation to prevent the mainland Chinese from imposing their communist system upon the island's 19 million people.

Second, American corporations have invested over \$12 billion in Taiwan, and a Chinese takeover would threaten their investments.

Third, by taking over Taiwan, China's submarines would pose a threat to peace and security in the Pacific region.

Clearly, it is necessary to create a Taiwan that is independent of Peking's rule. How can the U.S. help this aim?

One alternative would be for the U.S. to help the Taiwanese people overthrow the KMT, which represents neither China nor Taiwan.

Another alternative would be to encourage the KMT to declare Taiwan a new political entity, separate and independent from China. In this regard, the Reagan administration sent a positive signal to Taipei at the November Senate hearing. Asked by a senator whether the U.S. expected China to apply military force to Taiwan if independence is declared, a State Department spokesman said that "a decision to use force would have an impact on U.S. policy." Citing a provision in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the official added that "the president and the Congress shall determine, in accordance with constitutional processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger."

The third alternative would be for the U.S. to urge the KMT to release all political prisoners, lift martial law and call for free elections. Only when the Taiwanese people have political freedom will they have sufficient power to change the Republic of China into the Republic of Taiwan.

In light of current U.S. involvements in Central America and the Middle East, it is unlikely that the Reagan administration would take the first alternative. The KMT would oppose the second alternative simply because it is afraid of losing power to the Taiwanese people after independence.

Therefore, the third alternative appears to be the most feasible. The KMT would certainly resist American pressure for democracy in Taiwan, but the U.S. could still use arms sales, foreign trade and cultural