

Chu needs to honestly define ‘1992 consensus’

Written by James Wang 王健

Sunday, 27 December 2015 07:29

Young master Eric Chu (朱立倫), the Chinese Nationalist Party's (KMT) chairman, who also became the party's presidential candidate by putting an end to the candidacy of Deputy Legislative Speaker Hung Hsiu-chu (洪秀柱), has begun to issue threats, saying, absurdly, that it would be “provocative” if Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) presidential candidate Tsai Ing-wen (蔡英文) decided not to recognize the so-called “1992 consensus.”

However, the real provocation — and betrayal — of the people of Taiwan is the fact that Chu does not offer a clear and unambiguous explanation of the meaning of the “1992 consensus,” which former KMT chairman Lien Chan (連戰) and President Ma Ying-jeou (馬英九) have built in collusion with the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

The inside story that Lien and Ma revealed to the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) confirms that the “1992 consensus” is nothing more than an illegal secret agreement between the KMT and the CCP.

On Feb. 12, 2007, Lien told Stephen Young, who at the time was serving as AIT director, that if the KMT's candidate were to win the presidential election the following year, their most important task would be stabilizing cross-strait relations.

Lien also said that although cross-strait dialogue was based on the “1992 consensus,” Beijing understood that a majority of Taiwanese wanted to maintain the “status quo.”

When Young asked Lien whether the KMT was concerned that Beijing might redefine the “1992 consensus” and that this could prove disadvantageous for Taiwan, Lien responded by saying that Beijing trusted the KMT, adding that the two sides had already secretly agreed on a definition that was acceptable to both sides and that would not change.

On Nov. 30 the same year, Ma told Young that the concept that there is “one China, different interpretations” was very close to Beijing's “1992 consensus” and could be used as the foundation for quickly initiating cross-strait talks.

Chu needs to honestly define '1992 consensus'

Written by James Wang 王景

Sunday, 27 December 2015 07:29

In a leaked cable, Young quoted former National Security Council secretary-general Su Chi (蘇起) as saying that, when making public statements, Ma deliberately mixed up the use of "1992 consensus" and "one China, different interpretations" in order to blur the differences and build a bridge for dialogue.

When AIT Chairman Raymond Burghardt met with Ma on Dec. 9 that year, Ma said that the view that there is "one China, different interpretations" and the "1992 consensus" are crucial factors to any cross-strait dialogue.

When Burghardt pointed out that China might think that "different interpretations" could mean that Taiwan would move toward independence, Ma claimed that the KMT would provide China with guarantees that its representation of the "1992 consensus" was firmly opposed to independence.

Chu considers himself to sit at the very core of the KMT leadership, and he has secretly divulged many secrets to the US regarding the power struggles inside the KMT's upper echelons.

Could it really be that he does not understand that the KMT's "1992 consensus" is such a shady piece of work that it cannot be revealed to the public?

He must honestly explain the definition that has been agreed during opaque negotiations that have been going on between the KMT and the CCP, and stop dreaming that he will be able to force the public into accepting the two parties' conspiracy to sell out Taiwan.

James Wang is a media commentator.

Translated by Perry Svensson

Source: Taipei Times - Editorials 2015/12/27