

Contesting the Past in the Present

A critique of transitional justice scheme in Taiwan



Ling-Yu Hsiao
Newnham College

Department of Sociology
University of Cambridge

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
April 2018

Contesting the Past in the Present— A critique of transitional justice scheme in Taiwan

Ling-Yu Hsiao

Abstract

The White Terror in Taiwan was a 43-year period during which the Kuomintang (KMT) regime, with significant support from the United States during the Cold War era, persecuted its political opponents, imprisoning tens of thousands of people and executing some 1200. In the wake of democratisation since the 1980s, Taiwan has instituted a scheme of transitional justice to acknowledge and atone for the past political oppression and to promote national reconciliation. As this initiative was undertaken by the same regime that perpetrated the White Terror, questions of objectivity and transparency arise. Accordingly, this thesis aims to assess the progress of transitional justice in Taiwan by examining the official discourse on the subject and also analysing the non-official discourses amongst survivors of the White Terror in present-day Taiwan. Tensions between the different discourses are identified.

This thesis focuses on the construction of the past in the present, which refers to contestation of the past in the context of present-day society in Taiwan. Drawing on discursive analysis of Taiwan's transitional justice initiatives since the late 1990s, as well as in-depth interviews with 24 former political prisoners, it discerns how the official transitional justice discourse is circumscribed and limits our knowledge of the White Terror.

Since the implied fall of communism, the aim of reconciliation has not embraced the former socialists and communists at the global level, enabling the KMT government to elude accountability in its transitional justice efforts by rationalising the White Terror in the name of anti-communism. As a result, Taiwan's socialist dissidents remain stigmatised in the official discourse, which offers redress only to those individuals who disassociate themselves with subversion and identify as 'political victims'. This restriction in the official discourse suggests that the government wishes to reconcile only with those who were 'innocent' of treason. By the same token, the identity of White Terror victims is de-politicised, distorting the content of their trauma and shame and their survivorhood in present-day Taiwan.

Informants' non-official discourses, which point up the contradictions in the government discourse, reveal that survivors tend to feel profound shame owing to the failure of their political projects, viewing themselves as inept revolutionaries. Much of their interest in transitional justice lies in seeking opportunities to advocate for the causes to which they still adhere. Thus, their identity as survivors is focused less on persecution than on sustaining their political activism in the era of reconciliation. Thus, the tension between the official and non-official transitional justice discourses in Taiwan is not only a contestation of the past but, more profoundly, a contestation of the vision for the nation's future.

Keywords

transitional justice, White Terror, post-Cold War Taiwan, memory studies, reconciliation, survivorhood, political enemy

Declaration

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing that is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University of similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.

Ling-Yu Hsiao

Acknowledgment

I would like to extend thanks to the many people, in the UK, Taiwan, and Japan, who so generously contributed to the work presented in this thesis. I take this opportunity to extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation to all those who made this doctoral research possible.

First, my supervisor. Peggy, you have created the invaluable space for me to do this research and develop myself as a researcher in the best possible way. My Ph.D. has been an amazing experience and I thank you wholeheartedly, not only for your dedicated help, advice, inspiration, encouragement and continuous support, throughout my Ph.D., but also for showing me the beauty of knowledge. Your enthusiasm, integral view on research and your mission for providing high-quality work, has made a deep impression on me.

Similar, profound gratitude goes to my other committee members, Dr Juliet Foster and Dr Fang-Long Shih, who have been truly dedicated mentors. I am particularly indebted to Fang-Long, for your faith in my doctoral research.

I am also hugely appreciative to the twenty-four survivors who disinterestedly shared their stories with me. You show me the meaning of survival and witness. You prove the value of life.

Completing this work would have been all the more difficult were it not for the support and friendship provided by the other members of Newnham College, Department of Sociology, friends and research peers in Cambridge, London, and Tokyo. I must mention Jyr-Jong Lin, Fang-Yi Lee, William Hsiao, Yang Fu, Desmond Sham, Pei-Hua Huang, Jessamine Lai, and Yu-Chin Tseng. Looking back on our talks on every academic issue and times we spent together, I have very fond memories of my life in Cambridge.

Last, but by no means least, I must thank my parents and sister for believing in me and being there for practical support in all those things of life beyond doing a Ph.D., and finally, Ya-Hsun, you are my foundation. Please be there for me forever.

Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Official Name in Chinese or English
228 Act	228 Incident Disposition and Compensation Act 二二八事件處理補償 / 賠償委員會
228 Foundation	228 Memorial Foundation 二二八紀念基金會
228 IPP	228 Incident Peace Promotion 二二八和平日促進會
AAA	American Anthropological Association
AIT	American Institute in Taiwan 美國在台辦事處
Article 100	Article 100 Criminal Law 刑法一百條
CCP	Chinese Communist Party 中國共產黨
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
Compensation Act	Compensation Act for Wrongful Trials on Charges of Sedition and Espionage during the Martial Law Period 戒嚴時期不當叛亂暨匪諜審判案件補償條例
Compensation Foundation	Foundation for Compensation for Improper Verdicts on Sedition Cases during the Martial Law Period 財團法人戒嚴時期不當叛亂暨匪諜審判案件補償

	基金會
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party 民主進步黨
HDCP	Historical Data Collected on Political Cases during the 1950s Martial Law Period in Taiwan 臺灣地區戒嚴時期五〇年代政治案件史料彙編
Huzhuhui	台灣地區政治受難人互助會
ICTJ	International Centre for Transitional Justice
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
IGOs	Intergovernmental institutions
KMT	Kou-Min-Tong 中國國民黨
MAAG	Military Assistance Advisory Group 美軍顧問團
MSF	Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors without Borders)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
Persecution Victims Care Association	Taiwan Association for Care of Victims of Political Persecution during the Martial Law Period 五〇年代白色恐怖案件平反促進會
PTSD	Post-traumatic stress disorder
PRC	People's Republic of China 中華人民共和國
ROC	Republic of China (also known as Taiwan)

	中華民國
ROCMA	Republic of China Military Academy 黃埔軍校 / 中華民國陸軍官校
The Mutual Security Act of 1951	The Mutual Security Act of 1951 1951 年共同安全法
TMO	The Struggle between Memory and Oblivion: A report on transitional justice in Taiwan 記憶與遺忘的鬥爭：台灣轉型正義階段報告
TPA	Taiwan Party Affairs 台灣黨務
TRC	Truth and Reconciliation Commission
TPECR	Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion 動員戡亂時期臨時條款
TRA	Taiwan Relations Act 台灣關係法
TRCT	Taiwan Association for Truth and Reconciliation 台灣民間真相與和解促進會
Treason Reporting Act of 1946	懲治漢奸條例 (1946 年)
TVCA	Taiwanese Victims of the Martial Law Care Association 台灣戒嚴時期政治受難者關懷協會
TUT	The Undelivered Testimony: A memoir of those who fell in the age of terror 無法送達的遺書：記那些在恐怖年代失落的人
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UN	United Nations
UNAMA	UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan
UNHCHR	UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USIS	United States Information Service
USRR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WTVA	1950s White Terror Vindicated Association 五○年代白色恐怖案件平反促進會

Note on Chinese Words and Names

I have preserved Chinese name order throughout the thesis. Translation of most Chinese words and proper nouns follows the Wade-Giles system, except for the names of those well known in the West, such as Chiang Kai-Shek.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	1
DECLARATION.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	4
GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	6
NOTE ON CHINESE WORDS AND NAMES	10
TABLE OF CONTENTS	11
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	14
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	14
THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE RESEARCH	17
THE RISE OF THE COLD WAR AND ITS OPERATION IN TAIWAN	20
<i>US-KMT relations in the early 1950s.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Security of the KMT regime under the changing politics</i>	<i>24</i>
PROBLEMATISING THE COLD WAR STANDOFF.....	25
TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE IN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA.....	30
<i>Transitional justice is itself political.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Transitional justice is Western-centric.....</i>	<i>35</i>
CHAPTER 2 FRAMING THE THEORY AND RESEARCH METHODS	39
A STUDY ON THE POLITICS OF MEMORY	39
<i>Memory</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Memory and power: A Foucauldian perspective.....</i>	<i>45</i>
PUBLISHED STUDIES ON THE WHITE TERROR AND TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE IN TAIWAN	49
A TRIPARTITE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	54
RESEARCH METHODS AND MATERIALS.....	61
<i>Material for documentary analysis, and its access.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>The in-depth interviews undertaken with the 24 survivors</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>The significance of emotion</i>	<i>86</i>
ETHICAL ISSUES.....	90
CONCLUSION	93
CHAPTER 3 THE CULTURE OF CONTRITION IN TAIWAN	95
INTRODUCTION	95
THE INTRODUCTION OF 'POLITICAL VICTIMS': THE FORMOSA INCIDENT IN 1979	97
<i>Non-official remorse for the 228 Incident.....</i>	<i>100</i>
OFFICIAL REMORSE FOR THE 228 INCIDENT	101
REMORSE WITHOUT ACCOUNTABILITY: 1996–2000	103
<i>Compensation without accountability.....</i>	<i>103</i>
<i>The hurdle of truth-seeking</i>	<i>107</i>
THE MEMORY BOOM PERIOD: 2000–2008.....	109
<i>Unravel the past: The Archives Act.....</i>	<i>112</i>

<i>Reckoning with atrocities: Amendment to the 228 Act</i>	115
THE RETURN OF THE KMT: 2008–2016.....	117
<i>The official sponsored documentaries</i>	118
<i>Controversy over naming of the Human Rights Park</i>	121
<i>The dispute over returning testaments</i>	124
<i>Expiration of the Compensation Act and Foundation</i>	126
COMMEMORATION OF THE GUILTY PARTY OR GREAT MAN	129
DISCUSSION: THE DIVERGENT CULTURE OF CONTRITION	131
CONCLUSION	136
CHAPTER 4 BREAKING THE CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE— AN ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF SURVIVORS	138
INTRODUCTION	138
THE MEANING OF SURVIVAL	141
TRAUMA: COLLECTIVE VICTIMHOOD	148
<i>A sociological perspective on trauma</i>	148
<i>Regarding the pain of themselves and others</i>	150
<i>Collective trauma: A sense of isolation</i>	157
<i>The politically silenced trauma</i>	161
SHAME: HOLDING THE MIRROR TO A REVOLUTIONARY PAST	167
<i>A sociological perspective on shame</i>	169
<i>Shame complicates the meaning of survivorhood</i>	173
<i>Shame is itself political</i>	177
CONCLUSION	179
CHAPTER 5 DE-POLITICISED SURVIVORS— THE COMPETING TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE DISCOURSES	182
INTRODUCTION	182
RECONCILIATION WITH PAST ATROCITIES BUT NOT WITH PAST POLITICAL ENEMIES ..	184
DE-POLITICISATION AS A PERSPECTIVAL AND STRATEGIC TRUTH	187
MEMORY IS ITSELF A STRUGGLE	195
THE ENDURING RESISTANCE OF POLITICAL ACTIVISTS	202
<i>The nonofficial annual commemoration of the martyrs</i>	205
<i>The power of utterance in the official discourse matters</i>	209
<i>‘Certainly, I am a political dissident still’</i>	210
DISCUSSION: COMPETING TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE DISCOURSES.....	213
CONCLUSION	219
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION	221
RECONCILIATION IN THE ONGOING CONFLICTED ERA	222
SURVIVORS’ LAST RESISTANCE AND UNALLEVIATED WOUNDS.....	226
A STUDY OF SURVIVAL.....	230
BIBLIOGRAPHY	234
LITERATURE IN CHINESE	245
SEE APPENDIX II AND III FOR STATE-SPONSORED RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION.....	245
ARCHIVES	248
ARCHIVES/ VERDICTS OF THE WHITE TERROR	248
NEWSPAPER	249
ONLINE MATERIALS	249
APPENDIX I	251

APPENDIX II	255
APPENDIX III.....	258
APPENDIX IV	260
APPENDIX V	269
APPENDIX VI.....	274
APPENDIX VII.....	276
APPENDIX VIII	279

Chapter 1

Introduction

Memory is not an instrument for surveying the past but its theatre. It is the medium of past experience, just as the earth is the medium in which dead cities lie buried. He who seeks to approach his own buried past must conduct himself like a man digging.

—Walter Benjamin, *Berlin Childhood around 1900*

Research questions

Memory is always about the past. And the past can only be contemplated through the lens of the present. Thus, the meaning of the White Terror in Taiwan—a time of intense political repression under the Kuo-Min-Tong (hereafter, KMT) regime from 1948 to 1991—can only be unravelled in its aftermath. Since the end of the White Terror, Taiwan has experienced significant democratisation. One of the corollaries of this process is that survivors of the White Terror—former political prisoners—have mobilised to demand that the government come to terms with this shameful period in the nation's history. Among other things, they have formed various associations, calling for social rehabilitation and compensation for their injuries.¹ Accordingly, a Taiwanese society witnessed a gradually increasing demand for transitional justice.

On a practical level, the term 'transitional justice' refers to a range of measures—judicial and non-judicial—that may be implemented to deal with

¹ Ongoing debate over the timeframe of the White Terror continues in Taiwan to this day. As some would have it, the White Terror began when the ROC government officially relocated to Taiwan in 1949 and ended with the annulment of martial law in 1987. I have chosen in my research to define the duration of the White Terror as the statutory period during which the *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of National Mobilisation for the Suppression of the Communist Rebellion*, were in force: for 43 years, from 1948 to 1991. See further discussion in this chapter.

² Various associations were formed at various times by different factions of survivors. See discussion in chapter 5.

the legacy of large-scale human rights abuses committed in a previous political setting. (Roht-Arriaza et al. 2006; Stan 2009; Teitel 2000). As set forth by the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), these measures may include criminal prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations programmes, and various kinds of institutional reforms.³ The aim of transitional justice, as explained by the ICTJ, is to redress the past human rights violations and prevent further rights violations. Thus, transitional justice not only creates accountability for past atrocities but seeks to heal and stabilise the nation going forward.

From a perspective of global politics, the demand for transitional justice in Taiwan can be viewed as part of a global wave of transitional justice in post-conflict societies. As Teitel (2000) observes, in recent decades, societies throughout Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Africa have overthrown military dictatorships and totalitarian regimes for freedom and democracy. In the course of these democratic transitions, efforts to redress a repressive past and provide credibility for a newly democratic government have proved challenging. Amongst the emerging democracies, Taiwan's path was not typical, however, as it achieved democratisation without removing the KMT regime. Although the Republic of China (ROC) officially entered into its phase of political change in 1991, the KMT was able to prevail in the first democratic elections, held in 1996, and so continued to hold power until the 2000 election, when it lost to the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). Accordingly, the former perpetrator of abuse and repression, the KMT, was the same regime that initiated Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice. In 1998, the KMT government enacted the Act on Compensation for Wrongful Trials on Charges of Sedition and Espionage during Martial Law Period (in Chinese, 戒嚴時期不當叛亂暨匪諜審判補償條例, hereafter, Compensation Act) as the ever first institutional arrangement for accounting for the White Terror. Given the Act, the term 'wrongful trials' refers to former defendants, i.e., former political criminals, who had not been involved communists or any stance of anti-KMT regime, yet accused of treason during the White Terror. At this point, the *Compensation Act* defines the term 'political victim' as

³ See the introduction to transitional justice on the official web site of ICTJ: <https://www.ictj.org/about/transitional-justice>

former political criminals who had been wrongfully accused. The definition thus raises a question: will a former defendant be recognised as 'political victim' if he or she, in effect, had involved the conspiracy of anti-government and insurgence during the White Terror? In this awkward and paradoxical situation, there was inevitable tension between the regime and the survivors of the White Terror; in particular, the extent to which the formerly abused individuals could be vindicated in the scheme of transitional justice was problematic.

A critique of transitional justice scheme is Taiwan therefore forms a compelling approach in discerning the contestation of the past in the current political condition. Issues of the extent to which both past political vestiges and current political needs of the powerful come to limit or broaden the potential of revisiting past political wounds of one society shall be examined with the approach. To anchor the research, the following questions are raised:

1. To what extent have the political conditions described above constrained the implementation of transitional justice, including such aspects as vindication and compensation?
2. How did the KMT regime develop the official transitional justice discourse in Taiwan? Also, how do the current Taiwanese authorities reconcile the White Terror?
3. As Teitel (2000) and many other scholars argue (De Brito et al. 2001; Huyssen 2011; Lambourne 2009), transitional justice in the post-Cold War period aims at achieving reconciliation. How does this reconciliation proceed in Taiwan where the scheme was initiated by the former perpetrators?
4. How do the survivors consider the White Terror and why? That is to say, what are the non-official transitional justice discourses in Taiwan?
5. What versions of the past continue to be silenced in the scheme of transitional justice? To put it plainly, why is there no mention of political dissidence in the scheme of transitional justice?
6. What do the shifting roles of political victim and political dissident have to show us about the meaning of survivorhood?

Starting from these questions, this thesis aims to examine how those afflicted by the conflict view transitional justice in the context of peacebuilding after mass violence. By exploring the official and non-official transitional justice discourses, this thesis not only studies the discrepancy amongst different discourses in current Taiwan but, more profoundly, examines the tension among the varying viewpoints of the past maintained by the authorities and individual survivors. Here, I would like to clarify two points: First, I do not propose to show an explicit contradiction or opposition between different transitional justice discourses. To the contrary, I aim to explore potential tensions that may indicate discrepancies, inconsistencies, or contradictions among them. That is to say, while I acknowledge the possibility of conflict existing, I am staying open to all possibilities before developing my arguments. Second, I would like to emphasise that the survivors' viewpoints are the most important part of my research. By exploring their complicated perspectives on the past, I not only analyse how the meaning of the past is shaped by current political conditions but, even more intriguing, I explore how my interviewees have developed their interpretations of survivorhood. The way in which they conceive their lives at present, and how they position themselves in the scheme of transitional justice, reflects not only their response to the past but also their reaction to the current programme of transitional justice and their experiences in the wake of mass violence. Hence, it is a study of making the past in the present. Also, it is a study of the tension among different viewpoints of the White Terror in Taiwan unravels how different discourses, especially the official and non-official ones come to cooperate or compete over the power of defining the White Terror.

The architecture of the research

The structure of the thesis reflects the main phases and tension in the progress of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme since the 1990s. The following section of this chapter discusses Taiwan in the Cold War era and the afterwards with an interpretive approach, emphasizing the salience of US dominance in defining the image of primary political enemy and the identity

of political victim during Taiwan's political transition. Under the US political protection in the Cold War era, the KMT regime secured its authority by targeting socialists as the main enemy of the KMT-US alliance in Taiwan. The advent of the post-Cold War did not come with an embracement of socialist, yet with an overwhelmingly victory of US and the Western allies. The extent to which would transitional justice scheme break through the political legacy of the Cold War era, recognizing socialist as political victim needs further elaboration. The articulation shall fundamentally envisage how the global wave of transitional justice of the post-Cold War fashions Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice is conditionally in a more of political and conditional situation.

Chapter 2 focuses on theoretical framework and methodology, especially the details of my fieldwork with the survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan, including ethical issue. Hitherto transitional justice has been widely recognised as an approach in recounting past wrongdoings and securing a peaceful future. The approach thus inevitably touches on the tension of different versions of the past, referring to who were the perpetrators, who were the persecuted ones, the context of the persecution and so forth. By drawing attention to the tension or differences between the official and the survivors' discourses, suffice to say that the main theoretical attention draws to the politics of memory. That is, a study on transitional justice scheme is about how memory is emerged, grounded and then widely accepted in the power relations of one society. A Foucauldian approach on the politics of memory shall be elaborated and developed for the following analysis of the research.

Chapter 3, 4 and 5 form the central analysis of the research. Chapter 3 addresses Taiwan's official remorse of the White Terror in a chronological order from the late 1980s to 2016. As described in previous, Taiwan's transitional justice scheme was initiated without an alternation of the government. The logic and development of Taiwan's official transitional justice discourse is therefore substantial in examining the potential limit and challenge to the scheme and the objective of reconciliation between the formerly opposing sides under the KMT regime.

With person-centred approach, chapter 4 and 5 focus on how the survivors of the White Terror situate their own past, especially with respect to the episodes that would have been excised from the official narrative. Chapter 4 studies the survivors' memories by focusing on the hidden context of silence. By rejecting the stance of silence as a passive outcome, survivors' silence on their own past is seen as an ongoing political practice in response to the developing transitional justice scheme. The emotions of trauma and shame at the heart of survivors' silence at this point reflect how they define their past and their current lives. In the era of reconciliation and victimhood recognition, survivors' emotions assist in examining, in effect, what kind of past is haunting themselves or remains to be excluded from Taiwan's transitional justice scheme.

Chapter 5 turns to focus on survivors' way of engaging in the official discourse in striving for a space of utterance, and keeping developing their competing discourses in current Taiwan. The White Terror in Taiwan was a time of severe political oppression onto socialists under the KMT regime with respect to the global confrontation of the Cold War era. Survivors in this regard exist as the living evidence of the past conflict and atrocities. By studying survivors' engagement of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme both at individual and collective levels, the approach sheds light on the tension of defining the past and picturing of a certain future between the official and their competing discourses.

The last part, conclusive chapter, focuses on bringing theory and analysis back to a more of solid order. Survivors of the White Terror are of the most salience in this research. Through a close-up study on these individuals with respect to Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, a critique of the how memory locates and develops in a certain way in the face of the tension of different transitional justice discourses shall be spelled out. Memory has power, and survivors' words are weapons. If the post-Cold War refers to a peaceful political life, this research seeks to explore to what extent have the survivors been guaranteed a secure and democratic future by Taiwan's transitional justice scheme after the prolonged violent conflict, overcoming chasms of hatred and voicing out their true voices.

The rise of the Cold War and its operation in Taiwan

Let us back to the 1940s. Just prior to the end of the Second World War, the Allied powers convened a follow-up conference to Yalta, the Potsdam Conference, from 17 July to 2 August 1945, primarily to redraw the borders of Europe but also to demand the surrender of Japan. From this meeting emerged the Potsdam Declaration,⁴ which effectively released Taiwan from five decades of Japanese colonial rule and restored it to China. At first, people in Taiwan welcomed the retrocession and the rule of China's nationalist KMT regime with open arms.⁵ However, peace was not to be. On the mainland, a protracted ideological conflict between the KMT-led central government of the Republic of China (ROC) and the forces of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) had existed since the 1920s,⁶ leading to civil war from 1927 to 1937.⁷ Confronted with a Japanese invasion in 1937, the two factions had declared a ceasefire and unified in a coalition against Japan, as China officially became a participant in the Second World War in East Asia.⁸ Once Japan surrendered, however, the conflict between the ROC and CCP re-emerged and intensified. The civil war resumed in 1946, and nationalist KMT forces began using Taiwan as a defence base.

Intent on suppressing the growing presence of Chinese communists in Taiwan, the KMT administration in 1946 promulgated *Article 100 of Criminal*

⁴ The final document of the Potsdam Conference, entitled Proclamation Defining Terms for Japanese Surrender, issued on 26 July 1945 by President Truman (US), Prime Minister Churchill (UK), and Chairman Chiang Kai-Shek (China).

⁵ As part of Taiwan's retrocession after the end of the Second World War, the KMT sent its political elite to establish a temporary local government, named 'The Governing Council', on 1 September 1945, which lasted until 22 April 1947.

⁶ After the October Uprising in Russia of 1917, the wave of socialism spread from Russia to Eastern Europe and China. As the Russian Civil War resulted in the creation of the Soviet Union, the Chinese Communist Party was also founded in China, with Soviet Union support, in 1921. In addition, the CCP passed a resolution to join International Communism, guided by the Soviet Union, in July 1922. The CCP, in this sense, undoubtedly became a threat to the KMT.

⁷ When the founder of the KMT, Sun Yat-Sen, died in 1925, the tension between the KMT and the CCP greatly increased, leading to the outbreak of the first civil war in 1927. To cope with the exigencies of Japanese invasion, the civil war was suspended in 1937 through the formation of a temporary coalition between the opposing sides.

⁸ Generally speaking, the Pacific War was mainly fought between Japan and the US between 1941 and 1945, following the attack on Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1940. From the viewpoint of China, however, the Pacific War began with the invasion of Japan in 1937.

Law in Chinese: 刑法 100 條) and the *Treason Reporting Act of 1946* (in Chinese: 懲治漢奸條例). According to *Article 100*, citizens who were found to be attempting to subvert the government would be charged with treason and subject to imprisonment for a term of seven years to life. Meanwhile, the *Treason Reporting Act* required citizens to report potential political threats observed in their community. As a result, the whole of Taiwanese society became preoccupied with the search for potential traitors, especially communists. Thus, Taiwan not only became a base for armed KMT troops fighting communism on the mainland but its rulers were also at the front line of resistance against communists within the society. Anti-communism therefore emerged as a dominant feature of the political situation there.

Taiwan's citizens were disappointed to be dragged once more into war, and widespread corruption among the KMT administrators aroused profound resentment, especially as the civil war was damaging the local economy. This increasing resentment culminated in February 1947 in the anti-government uprising known as the 228 Incident.⁹ Between 28 February and 4 March, the uprising spread from Taipei along the west coast to Tai-chung, Chia-yi, and Kaoshiung¹⁰ and was violently suppressed by KMT troops. Thousands of people were killed or went missing.¹¹ The two legislative enactments described above, and the aftermath of the 228 Incident, thus marked the dawn of the KMT's brutal oppression, which sowed the seeds of resistance, especially the political cause of pro-independence among the Taiwanese (Fleischauer 2007). As a result, the 228 Incident was later known as the very first massive political oppression under the KMT regime

⁹ On 27 February 1947, the arrest of a Taipei cigarette vendor by an officer of the Tobacco Monopoly Bureau gave rise to a violent clash in which a bystander was shot and killed by the officer. This incident triggered several days of civil unrest, beginning the next day (28 February, hence '2-28'), spreading from Taipei towards southern Taiwan, mainly in the cities and towns. At the beginning of March, KMT troops marched into Taipei from Keelung in the north. Thousands were publicly executed, while scores of others went missing.

¹⁰ Confined by its geographical location, the west coast of Taiwan has enjoyed the majority of development since Japanese rule. In this sense, the cities of Tai-chung, Chia-yi and Kaoshiung are the major metropolitan areas on the west coast, where the uprising was at its strongest.

¹¹ The precise number of casualties of the 228 Incident remains disputed to this day.

in Taiwan, and was later known as the very first incident deserved to be remembered in Taiwan's transitional justice scheme.¹²

As the KMT lost ground in the civil war on the mainland, it attached increasing importance to Taiwan as a stronghold. Having begun its campaign of brutal oppression in 1947, the KMT promulgated *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion* (hereafter, TPECR; in Chinese, 動員戡亂時期臨時條款) for Taiwan on 10 May 1948, reflecting Chiang Kai-Shek's intention to drive out the communists once and for all. Operating essentially as a foreign dictatorship with an urgent desire to consolidate control over Taiwan, the KMT, under the leadership of Chiang Kai-Shek and his son, Chiang Ching-Kuo, imposed martial law on 19 May 1949. Seven months later, the Chiangs and their supporters fled the ruins of mainland China, relocating the ROC government to Taiwan in December 1949. This historic withdrawal left Taiwan in the grip of the KMT for nearly four decades, until the annulment of martial law in 1987, which is now seen as the starting point for democratisation in Taiwan. During the second longest period of martial law in the history of the world, Taiwan remained under KMT control as the ROC maintained its opposition to the so-called 'red force'¹³—the Chinese Communists—and, on that pretext, perpetrated systematic atrocities against the Taiwanese people.

US-KMT relations in the early 1950s

In the late 1940s, the political conditions outlined above were making it difficult for the KMT to govern Taiwan comprehensively. The KMT feared losing Taiwan as its last remaining territory. Accordingly, the regime counted on support from the US as the only competent authority that could restrain the Sino-Soviet bloc in East Asia. However, a secret report prepared by the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1949 and declassified in 1978 shows that the US administration hesitated. Perceptions of the inept governance and corruption of Chiang Kai-Shek's government resulted in military inaction on the part of US military authorities, even when the CCP

¹² See further discussion in chapter 3.

¹³ Taiwan's martial law period, for many years the world's longest, was subsequently surpassed by that of Syria (1963 to 2011).

claimed victory over the KMT in October 1949.¹⁴ Nonetheless, CIA reports from 1949 and 1950 indicate that the US authorities were keeping the situation in East Asia under close observation and had an agenda for Taiwan: 'We must conceal our wish to separate the island from mainland control', declared Secretary of State Acheson in private.¹⁵ The US thus assumed the position of 'a silent but sober lion' towards the thorny political situation in Taiwan (Roy 2003).

Meanwhile, the US continued to attempt to normalise relations with the Chinese Communists until February 1950 when China—that is, the People's Republic of China (hereafter, PRC)—and the Soviet Union signed the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance to resist the US alliance. Once Mao had made it clear that China was aligned with the Soviet Union, US President Truman was willing to set aside his mistrust of Chiang Kai-Shek and his cronies and consider military intervention in order to contain the Sino-Soviet influence in Pacific Asia.

The outbreak in 1950 of the Korean War dramatically altered the KMT's status in Taiwan. As Wallerstein (2010) puts it, the Korean War made the Cold War 'hot' in Asia. Confronted with this prospect, Truman immediately dispatched the Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Strait to forestall any military action on the part of the communists. Truman announced that 'the neutralisation of the Straits of Formosa (Taiwan)' was in the best interests of the US. For the time being, although mistrust persisted between Chiang Kai-Shek and Truman, the US authorities would effectively shore up the KMT regime's governance of Taiwan. The global confrontation thus secured the KMT authority in Taiwan.

¹⁴ For instance, Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson states in a personal memo: 'Mr. Little expressed his opinion that we were taking the worst of both possible courses by continuing to support Chiang Kai-shek, diplomatically and economically' (1950.02.17). After the outbreak of the Korean War on 25 June 1950, similar notes were discovered. Also, the CIA (1949) *Probable Developments in Taiwan* contains similar comments regarding the KMT in Taiwan. A detailed discussion can be found in D. Roy (2003), *Taiwan: A Political History*. Cornell University Press.

¹⁵ Dean. G. Acheson (17th February 1950) 66-5_38. The documentation can be found on the Truman Library and Museum's official web site: <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/hstpape/acheson.htm>. Acheson served as Secretary of State from 1949 to 1953.

Security of the KMT regime under the changing politics

An exhaustive historical review of how the KMT regime was sustained in Taiwan by the US during the Cold War lies outside the scope of this paper. However, the extent to which the US was responsible for maintaining the KMT regime for years as the sole legitimate representative of the Republic of China at the United Nations, and for its replacement by the PRC in the 1970s, bears examination.

The Cold War in East Asia was a time of changing geopolitics among the PRC, the ROC, and the US. The US enacted the *Mutual Security Act* in October 1951, committing to provide Taiwan with various types of assistance, both military and economic.¹⁶ The protection and support of the US in turn bolstered the KMT regime politically and economically. Taiwan became one of the most attractive developing countries in East Asia. Meanwhile, the PRC struggled in protracted ideological debates with the Soviet Union¹⁷ until a 1969 crisis in the Sino-Soviet bloc transformed the geopolitics of East Asia from a standoff between two superpowers into a triangular tension between the PRC, the USSR, and the US.¹⁸ This shift made it advantageous for the US to establish better relations with the PRC.

This dramatic shift gave rise to a siege mentality on the part of the ROC. The first blow it suffered was when the UN, while continuing to acknowledge China as a founding member of the world organisation and a Permanent Member of the Security Council, denied the authority of the ROC

¹⁶ When the *Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty* came into force in 1954, Taiwan became an official ally of the US in the Cold War framework, enabling it not only to purchase military equipment and weapons but also to receive technical guidance. For instance, by establishing the Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG), the USAID programme introduced training courses for conventional armed forces in Taiwan. In terms of the economy, the US funded the Military Construction Commission of the Ministry of National Defence (MCC) to cover most of the items envisaged by the USAID programme, from military assistance and development to economic reform. From 1951 to 1954, the US allocated some \$7.5 billion worth of assistance among 55 allied countries; \$400 millions of this went to Taiwan. See H.H. Chou (Ed.) (1995). *Documentary Collection on US Aid to ROC, 1948-1965* (Vol. I). Academia Historica, ROC.

¹⁷ The ideological conflicts were partly due to the PRC's tendency to consider the USSR as standing for imperialism rather than socialism, as the USSR demanded that the PRC accept its leadership in the Sino-Soviet alliance. Such issues led to Sino-Soviet border conflicts in 1969. For further discussion, please see L. M. Lüthi, (2010). *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World*. Princeton University Press.

¹⁸ The two most important border conflicts between the PRC and Soviet Union were the Zhenbao Island and Tielieketi Incidents. Due to these conflicts, border demarcation began in 1969, continuing into the 1990s, until a final agreement was signed by the PRC and Russia on 14 October 2004.

to represent China. In February 1971, US President Richard Nixon proposed the idea of two Chinas, with the hope of allowing the ROC to retain its seat at the UN while allowing the PRC to obtain its own. US Under-Secretary of State Robert Murphy was sent to Taiwan to persuade Chiang to accept this solution so that the ROC could retain its seat in the global body.¹⁹ But Chiang rejected the proposal. Despite the US's intention that bringing the PRC into the world organisation would not come about at the ROC's expense, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 2758 on 25 October 1971, recognising the PRC as the only lawful representative of China and expelling the ROC. Thus, the PRC was authorised to take over the ROC's UN membership.²⁰

The situation worsened for the KMT when the US yielded to the PRC's demand to be recognised as the sole legitimate representative of China. The US officially broke off diplomatic relations with the ROC in Taiwan on 1 January 1979, commencing relations with the PRC on the same day.

Despite the diplomatic policy shift and the ROC's loss of legitimacy, the US maintained its support for the ROC. In March 1979, the US Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), which entered into force on 10 April 1979.²¹ Under the TRA, although the ROC no longer enjoys official diplomatic relations with the US, economic and cultural ties, and the supply of military equipment, remain in place. Relations of the two political units have remained constant ever since. The changing politics of the Cold War continued to secure the KMT authority in Taiwan.

Problematizing the Cold War standoff

The Cold War, as an intense rivalry between the post-war allies of the US and Soviet Union respectively, seemed to be synonymous with the polarity between capitalism and communism. That is, it was a time of military competition and ideological conflict. However, from a post-structuralism perspective, Campbell (1992) invites us to rethink the Cold War. Regarding

¹⁹ <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/print/2007/11/01/2003385749>

²⁰ <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf>

²¹ A complete version of the Articles can be found at: <http://www.ait.org.tw/en/taiwan-relations-act.html>.

the US's identification of a threat posed by the Soviet Union, he claims that this threat was not an objective condition but, rather, relied on its interpretive basis. Interpretation, Campbell explains, is the way in which particular modes of representation crystallise around referents that are marked as dangers (ibid.: 1–15). Nothing is intrinsically dangerous to one political community. In this regard, US foreign policy during the Cold War served to demonstrate how the US differentiated the Soviets as 'alien others' that imperilled the American identity. The socialist nations of Eastern Europe did not constitute threats by their very nature, but emerged as such due to the process of differentiation that played down or stigmatised them from an ideological or national security perspective in order to consolidate the national identity and social order of the US.

Arguably, the Cold War was not exceptional, since the interpretive process of consolidating a political community's identity takes place continually with respect to such issues as gender, public health, or ethnicity. Hence, while we assume that the Cold War ended in the early 1990s, Campbell argues that, despite the collapse of communism and the fact that the dissolution of the Soviet Union removed it as a 'plausible candidate for enmity', the 'entailments of identity' that it served remained unchanged (ibid.: 195; Hurst 2005: 144). To reproduce and secure the American identity, the US is inclined to seek to produce further hostility, because the rivalry of international politics is indispensable for strengthening its national identity.

Suffice to say, Campbell rejects the assertion that the Cold War was based on the objective character of the Soviet Union. He infers his interpretive approach from reviewing how the US has defined its 'security' since the nineteenth century by 'reproducing' threats to evoke and consolidate so-called American values or American identity. That is, to Campbell, the political situation does not come about all of a sudden. Even though the building of the American empire had been underpinned by the economy of slavery, it was a nation that insisted on ascribing the characteristics of repression and exploitation to the Soviet Union. By the same token, as Campbell emphasises, the flashpoint was not the Soviet Union, but antipathy towards communism, whose existence predates and exceeds the existence of the former (1992: 159). For that matter, the antipathy

towards communism was not based on its objective character being inherently harmful to society. Rather, communism was interpreted as 'harmful' in order to secure the private ownership of property, that is, the private enterprise economy under capitalism and its social order (Campbell 1992).

Thus, the ROC under KMT direction was recognised during the Cold War period as a paradigm for US allies in respect of culture, economy, and politics. This not only promoted the formation of a cultural framework for consolidating American security in Taiwan. It also, in effect, enabled the prolonged political atrocities carried out by the KMT with the acquiescence of the US authorities. Campbell's interpretive approach explains how the Soviet Union came to occupy the position of 'primary threat' to the US and its allies, including the ROC, during the Cold War. It also shows how the Soviet Union was deprecated in accordance with the development of the American identity. From Campbell's perspective, how should we understand the meaning of the Cold War in Taiwan? Or, to frame it in his terms, how did the KMT government construct and reconstruct its security to satisfy the political needs of the US during the Cold War?

First of all, the process of defining national security and identity in Taiwan had an objective basis in respect of the military threat from the Sino-Soviet bloc. As historically articulated, the outbreak of the Korean War and the existence of the Sino-Soviet bloc placed the ROC in dire peril. The historic juncture at which the KMT in Taiwan was taken under the protection of the US may be seen as a process of reinforcing American identity but a more powerful reason was provided by the strength of the military threat posed by the Sino-Soviet alliance.

To adopt a geopolitical perspective, the Cold War in Taiwan was not merely associated with the ideological competition between communism and capitalism, or the consolidation of American identity. It was more a function of the military conflict between the US and its allies and the Sino-Soviet bloc, as the emergence of this conflict was the juncture at which the ROC was recruited as part of the front line for US allies in East Asia. However, for the KMT, the Cold War was a political situation that enabled it to retain control of Taiwan. Accordingly, during the Cold War, any political cause in Taiwan

that was defined and interpreted as a 'threat' by the KMT was designated as undesirable. Threats to the KMT overlapped to some extent with threats to the US; some threats to the KMT potentially contradicted the American identity, whereas others did not. In Taiwan, the Cold War was a time of evolution for both the American and the ROC identities, although the two might contradict one another at times.

Consider the independence movement in Taiwan during the Cold War. To the KMT regime, the focal point of this movement was to reject the assumption that Taiwan was part of China, regardless of whether China was ruled by the PRC or ROC. Unlike left-wing pro-unification advocates, the pro-independence cause did not violate the so-called American identity from a US perspective, because its supporters did not embrace socialism but shared more common viewpoints with capitalist democracy. During the immediate post-war period, the CIA (Moody 1977) even prepared papers on the possibility of Taiwan independence being beneficial to US interests. But once the Cold War was under way, any political cause in Taiwan that opposed the KMT would be labelled as a threat to those interests—even one that potentially replicated the American identity. While there was a tension between the two identities, it did not affect relations between the US and the KMT in Taiwan. After all, it was US support that underpinned the KMT's authority. Suffice to say, during the Cold War period, the alliance was designed not only to satisfy the need of the US to reproduce a national identity and social order but also to serve the KMT's need to eliminate any potential political threat to its authority.

Hence, US-ROC relations during the Cold War were defined primarily by the way in which the two political communities sought to develop and manage mutually-beneficial diplomatic relations. In that context, the significance of the Cold War was less about securing a specific political identity, and more about reinforcing the KMT's authority, which gave a unique significance to the Cold War in Taiwan. At the national security level, the Cold War hinged on the brinkmanship practiced by the PRC and the ROC, and the confrontation between the US and the Soviet Union. At the cultural level, this manifested as a project of developing and promoting American identity. The period was also defined by the ROC's insistence on

being seen by the world as the only spokesman for the one true China. Thus, the Cold War in Taiwan was a state of political tension and political and cultural establishment.

Accordingly, the Cold War was framed in Taiwan as a prolonged political conflict, not simply an ideological clash and a drive to wipe out the forces of communism. It was more about eliminating any political threat, regardless of ideology, to the KMT regime. Involvement in the ideological conflict between the US and Soviet Union was not the only factor sparking the prolonged conflict in Taiwan. The KMT's determination to consolidate its control over Taiwan broadened the range of political actors that were considered threats. While the Chinese communists posed the primary political threat to the KMT, the latter viewed pro-independence socialists and centre-left agitators as equally inimical to its rule. Reviewing the political verdicts under the KMT regime in Taiwan, one finds that, while most of the convictions during the late 1940s and early 1950s were associated with Chinese communism, the political criminals of the 1960s and 1970s were more diverse, as some were socialists who favoured independence, others were pro-independence but rejected socialism, and some were simply anti-KMT without adhering to a specific political ideology. Arguably, the Chinese communists in Taiwan bore the brunt of KMT oppression during the beginning of the Cold War but they were all but eliminated by 1955.²² By the late 1950s, the cause of independence had become the KMT's primary political enemy of the KMT. Out of a total of 16,132 individuals convicted of political crimes in the 1950s, 9,478, that is, 58% were convicted of treason in the 1950s. Of that number, more than half were identified as Chinese communists; the rest were mainly pro-independence socialists and KMT soldiers and officers charged with treason or desertion. Through the 1960s, independence was the single most prevalent cause espoused by those labelled as political criminals.²³ The diversity of ideologies posing political threats complicated the picture of the KMT's battle against political enemies,

²² See further information in 人權之路小組 (2008) 《人權之路 2008 年新版》頁 64。台北: 陳文成基金會。

²³ 人權之路小組 (2008) 《人權之路 2008 年新版》頁 70-71。台北: 陳文成基金會。

as the KMT's desire to secure its authority at all costs and against all comers formed the basis of the White Terror.

Thus, the KMT dictatorship did not approach the governance of Taiwan purely from an ideological perspective, as it terrorised socialists and communists indiscriminately during the 1950s. The need to beat back all challenges took precedence over the goal of cooperation with the US or the battle against Chinese communists. It was a campaign of all-pervasive governance that precluded threats from all possible sources, including socialism, the cause of independence, and any other anti-KMT factions.

Transitional justice in the post-Cold War Era

The post-Cold War is generally known as an era of post-conflict. Transitional justice then becomes the vital approach to pursue democracy and peace inside transitional countries. 'Transitional justice' is a broad term. Legal scholars use it to refer to a conception of justice which, during periods of political change, is characterised by legal responses to the wrongdoings of repressive predecessor regimes (Teitel 2003: 69). To Roht-Arriaza, transitional justice is a 'set of practices, mechanisms and concerns that arise following a period of conflict, civil strife or repression, and that are aimed directly at confronting and dealing with past violations of human rights and humanitarian law' (2006: 2). Despite variations of approach, it is sufficient to suggest that transitional justice refers to a set of institutional arrangements in post-conflict societies that are devised to remedy the effects of past repression, conflicts, or wars. Law plays an important role in transitional justice, whether the focus is on reconciliation and compensation (restorative justice) or accountability and punishment (retributive justice). Unlike traditional retributive justice, which seeks to impose punishment that is proportionate to the wrongfulness of the act committed, restorative justice emphasises redressing the harm caused by criminal behaviour and tends to come about through cooperative processes that include all stakeholders.²⁴ The

²⁴ According to the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2015), not all wrongdoing justifies a punitive response; the dimension of morality, the legal system, and the conditions and outcome of the wrongdoing must all be taken into account. However, this is a topic that lies outside the scope of this research. Suffice to say, at a practical level, the two types of justice

latter approach lends itself to reconciliation between the perpetrators of persecution and their victims.²⁵ Either way, according to the UN's definition in *What is Transitional Justice? A Backgrounder*:

Transitional justice is an approach to systematic or massive violations of human rights that both provides redress to victims and creates or enhances opportunities for the transformation of the political systems, conflicts, and other conditions that may have been at the root of the abuses. A transitional justice approach thus recognizes that there are two goals in dealing with a legacy of systematic or massive abuse. The first is to gain some level of justice for victims. The second is to reinforce the possibilities for peace, democracy, and reconciliation. To achieve these two ends, transitional justice measures often combine elements of criminal, restorative, and social justice (2008: 1).²⁶

In addition, according to the UN Secretary General's 2004 Report on the *Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies*, transitional justice is, in practical terms, an endeavour that 'may include both judicial and non-judicial mechanisms, with differing levels of international involvement (or none at all) and individual prosecutions, reparations, truth-seeking, institutional reform, vetting and dismissals, or a combination thereof'. As employed in this thesis, the term 'transitional justice' refers to steps taken by a transitional democracy to redress past human rights violations when faced with an express need to consolidate its authority.

To capture how the transitional justice discourse became Western-centric during the post-Cold War era, it must be traced back to its origins in the tribunals that took place immediately after World War II. Teitel (2000;

reflect the two main missions of contemporary transitional justice: punishing the wrongdoers and providing solace for those injured.

²⁵ See <http://restorativejustice.org/>.

²⁶ See full article online at: http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pdf/doc_wgll/justice_times_transition/26_02_2008_background_note.pdf.

2003) recalls that in this phase—of which the most widely recognised symbols are the Nuremberg and Tokyo war crimes tribunals run by the Allied Forces—retributive justice was the primary medium by which the desire for justice was actualised. It was only recently—since the 1980s, that the concept of justice was expanded to include ‘forgiveness and reconciliation’.

Transitional justice is itself political

Arguably, transitional justice is not only a legal process, but also a political one. Not only because it typically deals with political issues but, more essentially, because it is often undertaken in specific political situation. When the WWII war crimes trials were carried out under the aegis of international law, they derived their legitimacy from a particular transnational political alliance—the Allied forces—that provided the political basis for holding them (Teitel 2003: 70). The post-war punitive legal process was thus ‘victors’ justice’. However, the subsequent rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union obstructed the further application of transnational justice, as both sides focused on securing their political boundaries and consolidating their own interests. As a consequence, not every member of the Waffen-SS faced prosecution for the actions of his Nazi past (Plesch 2015). In fact, during the first two decades of the post-war period, more than half of the employees of the Ministry of the Interior of the Federal Republic of [West] Germany were former Nazis.²⁷

This political fact echoes Campbell’s argument (1992). As shown, the US continued to ground its diplomatic policies during the Cold War period in a connection between the ideal of democracy and its national identity. Securing West Germany, in which some Nazis were integrated, was part of the projection of a united front to withstand the Soviet bloc.

Politics continued to have an impact on the conduct of transnational justice in the post-Cold War period. However, it was the global political situation during that period that largely dictated nations’ various responses to their repressive legacies. It was the ideological triumph claimed by the

²⁷ For further information, see: <http://www.dw.com/en/the-nazi-legacy-of-the-german-interior-ministry/a-18829144>

West in the late 1980s that encouraged Eastern European countries to adopt lustration laws to impose accountability for objectionable aspects of their communist past and prevent their recurrence (Stan 2009: 247–270).²⁸ The desire to unravel the truth of past atrocities, many of which were committed in secret, was another feature of the fall of the socialist regimes. That is to say, global political conditions encouraged the projection of transitional justice in the post-socialist nations.

South Africa's celebrated Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), which operated from 1995 to 2002, offers telling evidence of the political nature of transitional justice. Through the institutionalised arrangement of the TRC, South Africa prioritised the need to reconcile the nation. It was a model that was followed in dozens of countries; thus, during this period, traditional justice was often waived in favour of peace and reconciliation (Teitel 2003: 73–83). As Nancy Scheper-Hughes characterises this approach:

Those seeking truth in South Africa today do not want the partial indeterminate, sifting truths of the postmodern... Instead, they desire the single, sweet, 'objective' truth of the moralist and, with it, a restored sense of wholeness and a taste of justice. Yet [quoting South African freedom fighter and Constitutional Court judge Albie Sachs] ...South Africans are willing to settle for an agreed-upon, a 'good enough' truth (1998: 127).

²⁸ Stan (2009) observes that lustration laws became the primary way for these countries to address the atrocities of their former communist regimes, especially with respect to the role of intelligence and state security forces, such as the secret police and other domestic repression branches. However, she remarks that the extent to which such laws were implemented depended upon how these countries shaped their transitions. For instance, Hungary and Bulgaria took the lead in making a transformation to democracy. The lustration law, aimed at preventing resurgence of past repression, failed to disclose its details. Stan adds that the enactment of such laws in the Baltic states may be the exception rather than the rule, as these states were the only ones to screen their post-communist political class for ties with the former communist intelligence services, whereas the other independent republics either did not consider lustration seriously or their parliaments failed to endorse it (Ibid.: 254–255).

Although South Africa's TRC was not entirely unprecedented,²⁹ its innovation cannot be underestimated. The call for justice reached from the illumination of individual cases to reconstructing a picture of the past that was accepted by the former victims, perpetrators, and perhaps the whole of society. It was not only about uncovering and denouncing past actions, but also about shaping an acceptable version of the past. As Sachs maintains, an agreed-upon and 'good enough' truth was the accepted outcome of transitional justice in South Africa. From such a process, a dichotomy between truth and justice emerges. Truth no longer exists as a monopoly; that is to say, there is no longer a truth that is absolutely objective beyond any perspective within a society. By contrast, truth exists as negotiated, as truth reflects the power relations in a society. The purpose of this truth is to provide an account of the past that can be shared by the majority of the population, which is especially desirable for building bridges between mutually hostile subgroups of a society. Thus, if the achievement of reconciliation must be based on a 'good enough' truth, then both justice and truth are political, in the interest of reconciliation.

By asserting that transitional justice is political, I mean that it does not operate outside a given nation's political context. Changing politics reshape the political relations of different nations. Recognising a need to secure a stable and prosperous Germany as they rallied to confront the threat posed by the Soviet Union, the US and UK prevailed on Greece to join the countries signing the London Debt Agreement of 1953, which cancelled 50 percent of Germany's debt. In so doing, Greece abandoned half of its claim for war reparations. Germany was enabled to embark on national reconstruction, while Greece, as a Nazi-occupied nation, was not able to claim its full measure of justice from Germany. Thus we see how transitional justice sometimes serves to satisfy particular political needs.

²⁹ Although Argentina and Chile were transitional democracies whose TRCs preceded South Africa's better known example, their work resulted only in condemnation of the former regimes rather than redressing the brutality of dictatorship. In this case, the TRC in South Africa is seen as exemplary for its determination to shine a light on the brutality of its apartheid period. See Acuna, C. H. (2006), 'Transitional Justice in Argentina and Chile: A Never-Ending Story'. In *Retribution and Reparation in the Transition to Democracy* (pp. 206–238). Cambridge University Press.

Transitional justice is Western-centric

Locally as well as globally, the deployment of transitional justice is both political and contextualised. When the Cold War ended, Western capitalism became the prevalent global political condition and, inevitably, this perspective would be reflected in the global transitional justice.

For instance, as noted above, various lustration laws were enacted in some Central and Eastern European countries (hereafter CEECs, in accordance with OECD terminology) at the time of their political transition. In that context, transitional justice served to hasten the embrace of capitalism and, as Lavinia Stan would have it, enhance the hegemony of the Western powers (Stan 2009). That is, the CEECs undertook their transitional justice projects in the context of rejecting their socialist past. In this case, the aim of transitional justice was not focused on rapprochement of former enemies and was distorted by the influence of the winner of the Cold War—the US and its allies. Hence, the CEECs were geared to compromise with the fact of US domination.

Understanding how the US and Western nations continue to exert dominance in defining justice in the aftermath of political repression or war-torn societies is of salience in studying the role of US and Western nations in the post-Cold War era. Atanasoski (2013) is keen to explore the issue. By analysing US military interventions in the former Yugoslavia and the Middle East, including Afghanistan and Iraq since the late 1980s, she deconstructs the global wave of humanitarianism to demonstrate how the US has positioned itself and its Western allies as the best arbiters of justice through the commission of what she calls ‘humanitarian violence’ (ibid.: 5–27). For instance, NATO bombings during the Kosovo war in 1998–1999 were conducted in the name of humanitarianism (ibid.). However, the failure of the International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia to investigate alleged violations of international humanitarian law committed by NATO during its bombing campaign in Kosovo (Nagy 2008) supports Nagy’s claim that victors’ justice prevails in the ICTY, due to Western dominance. While the nominal aim of transitional justice is to redress all past human rights abuses, it may nonetheless be subject to political conditions at the practical level.

Transitional justice is always conditional. As Teitel (2005: 860) argues, the trials of Milosevic and Saddam were not undertaken solely in the interest of restoring peace in their regions. Rather, 'there is a vivid, more complex role to these trials that goes to the broader problem of legitimacy and law's relationship to the use of force.' The civilian casualties of the NATO bombings during the Bosnian civil war show us that not every life lost due to political conflict has an unconditional claim on transitional justice. As long as a war is waged in the name of humanitarian intervention, some people's lives, especially the people who live in the zone of battle, are liable to be excluded from the realm of transitional justice.

Accordingly, the political conditions of the post-Cold War era imply how transitional justice could be skewed by Western dominance. As noted, the term 'transition' when used in the context of a so-called transition to democracy, not only refers to the situation of post-socialist nations after the end of the Cold War, but also describes an era in which Western political and economic discourse has become the norm. However, there were various US client nations in the Cold War era, including the ROC, that had practiced state-level terrorism against socialists and other political enemies with US acquiescence during the Cold War era. That is, systematic politically-based violence did not happen only in socialist nations. However, in the face of Western-centric transitional justice in the post-Cold War era, it becomes problematic for the ROC come to terms with the White Terror. After all, however susceptible transitional justice is to manipulation by Western political interests, its theoretical aim is to provide redress for victims of massive political repression, regardless of the political orientation of the oppressors. Strictly speaking, transitional justice is West-centric not only in its conceptual origins but in its susceptibility to influence by West-centric global politics, which have affected the way successive Taiwanese governments have confronted past wrongdoings that were committed during the Cold War era with US acquiescence.

Currently, Taiwan continues to enjoy 'special but not official diplomatic relations' with the US under the terms of the latter's Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (TRA). The TRA effectively prolongs the rivalry of the Cold War era: First, according to this text, the US commits to sell defensive

military equipment to Taiwan. Second, it commits the US to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan. Third, it sets forth the nature of the special military relations existing between the two countries:

3-1. In furtherance of the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act, the United States will make available to Taiwan such defence articles and defence services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defence capability.

3-2. The President and the Congress shall determine the nature and quantity of such defence articles and services based solely upon their judgment of the needs of Taiwan, in accordance with procedures established by law. Such determination of Taiwan's defence needs shall include review by United States military authorities in connection with recommendations to the President and the Congress.

3-3. The President is directed to inform the Congress promptly of any threat to the security or the social or economic system of the people on Taiwan and any danger to the interests of the United States arising therefrom. The President and the Congress shall determine, in accordance with constitutional processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger.³⁰

Arguably, the US continues to play a key role in Taiwan, especially in cross-strait affairs between the ROC and PRC. In political terms, the TRA formalises the continuation of the Cold War 'friendship' between the ROC and the US. By the same token, as long as tensions between the PRC and ROC persist, those persecuted under the KMT may find it difficult to challenge the premise of the White Terror. Because it was unleashed not only to secure the KMT regime but, as the TRA reveals, to sustain US dominance in East Asia.

³⁰ See TRA in complete version: <http://www.ait.org.tw/en/taiwan-relations-act.html>

Certainly, the KMT party-state in Taiwan was not the only right-wing dictatorship that was a client of the US during the Cold War era. The military dictatorships of Pinochet in Chile and Videla in Argentina are two noteworthy examples. Both of these countries, once their dictators had been ousted, resorted to TRCs to publicise the plight of victims and investigate individual crimes. The dissipation of the rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union in the post-Cold War did not negate the associations of evil and brutality that had been attached to communism since the end of WWII. Accordingly, nations such as Chile, Argentina, and Taiwan are predisposed to focus on individual atrocities rather than addressing the injustice at a collective or transnational level.

An examination of the transitional justice discourse in Taiwan reflects the extent to which, at the global level, transitional justice is under the dominance of Western powers, which places the victims of the White Terror at a disadvantage by offering them recognition with limited vindication. When socialists were not the only target under the KMT regime in Taiwan, the diverse stances of the victims potentially complicate Taiwan's scheme of reconciliation at certain level. An in-depth critique of the survivors' varying situation in the face of seemingly unsolved tension at the global and domestic levels shall envisage the case of Taiwan does not passively exist as an episode of the global trend of transitional justice. It sheds lights on how has the changing domestic politics helped to develop a unique scheme of transitional justice without thoroughly rejecting the past wrongdoings yet continuing to pursue a full reconciliation in Taiwan.

Chapter 2

Framing the theory and research methods

An examination of the application of transitional justice in Taiwan is of salience to the question of what has been transformed during democratisation, and what has not. As the transitional justice scheme is focused on developing a discourse to reconcile Taiwanese society with its repressive past, a study of the politics of memory in Taiwan helps to shed light on the process. As this is sociological research, this thesis does not investigate factual details of the past but, rather, addresses the way in which the past is presented and interpreted in the present, especially in the context of current power relations.

A study on the politics of memory

As observed earlier in this thesis, the past can only be studied in the present, and we only begin to develop the meaning of the past in its aftermath. To study the construction of the past in the present is to study the politics of memory, i.e., the role and construction of memory in power relations.

Memory

To study memory at the societal level, one is compelled to explore how memory is collectively developed, processed, and even contested. The current discourse on 'collective memory', a topic that has attracted wide attention in the fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and the social sciences in general, is largely traceable to Maurice Halbwachs's landmark study, *On Collective Memory* (1992), in which he argues that memory is itself both social and collective.

Halbwachs refuses to consider memory as an individual process of reflecting on the subjective mind (Bergson 2011).³¹ Rather, says Halbwachs,

³¹ Durkheim fails to discuss the notion of collective memory directly, but touches on the notion of collective consciousness in his insightful study *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1954), in which this phenomenon continues to influence how the members of a group or

'[i]t is in society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in society that they recall, recognise, and localise their memories'.³² To Halbwachs, remembering is a social practice that relies on the dynamics of groups. That is to say, it hinges on the way in which group members interact with each other. Here, the term 'group' is being used in a flexible sense, to include both face-to-face societies and societies most of whose members cannot know each other personally. In this regard, the collective nature of memory does not pertain only to the way a group of people, such as the members of a family, school, or organisation, share their common lived experiences. The significance of the 'collectiveness' of memory lies in the way in which it determines how a sense of belonging operates among the members of the group. As Halbwachs suggests, all memories are framed and organised within a collective context, which guides group members towards a specific way of remembering their past and constructing their self-identification.

Ostensibly, individuals cannot be viewed in isolation from society, as Durkheim states:

Of course, it is a self-evident truth that there is nothing in social life which is not in individual consciences. Everything that is found in the latter, however, comes from society. The major part of our states of consciousness would not have been produced among isolated beings and would have been produced quite otherwise among beings grouped in some other manner (Durkheim 2013: 342).

While I share Durkheim's stance, I am also drawn to explore the potential of individuals' practice of remembering in relation to memory at the societal level via the theory of Norbert Elias. Elias (1978) urges sociologists to view the individual not as a presence that is concise and isolated from society but, rather, as one who is continuously experiencing his/ her life within it. As

community confirm their belonging and continuity. This argument forms the basis for Halbwachs' discussion of the notion of collective memory.

³² Ibid.: 38.

Elias sees it, Durkheim is not simply saying that a person is self-transforming, with an emphasis on the perspective of process. On the contrary, Elias maintains, 'a person is constantly in movement, he not only goes through a process, he is a process (1978: 117–118)'. Further, Elias refers to sociological research as a study of 'people in the plural', imagining 'a multitude of people, each of them relatively open, interdependent processes' (1978: 120).

According to Durkheim and Elias, one's inner self-consciousness and external structure are interdependent. As such, a study of a group of people is not only a study of 'the informants with whom I had direct contact'. Rather, it is a study of pattern. The pattern with which this study is concerned is that of how and why the survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan choose to recall the past in a certain way. Hence, if we view people as ongoing processes and as interdependent with society, the study of 'collectivity' seeks to identify the patterns that such people are currently experiencing, as opposed, for example, to seeking to examine the largest possible number of interviewees. The method best suited here, in other words, is one of qualitative and not quantitative research

The adopted method is also, therefore, one which emphasises the interdependent relations between individual and society, rather than an individualistic approach. This is based on the working premise that collective memory is not an aggregated outcome of individual memory. Collective memory refers to how a certain socio-political framework comes to define the features of a shared memory of a group, and how a group of individuals continues to re-consolidate and secure the boundary and content of their group memory and sense of belonging (Assmann 2008; Halbwachs 1992; Olick 2007). It is not just that we remember as members of groups, but also that we constitute those groups and their members simultaneously in the act, thus 're-member-ing' (Olick 2007: 29). This dialectical relation between the individual and collective aspects of the formation of collective memory thus justifies the salience of individual narratives in the study of collective memory.

In fact, it is argued, such narratives are not only about an individual's personal life; they reference the socio-political framework by which the

individual's knowledge and perspective have been shaped and consolidated. As such, narratives can play a vital role in de-individualising that which is personal and private. Thus, narratives function not only as a means by which individuals breathe public life into personal experience, but also as one of the primary tools with which they recognise and affirm themselves as members of a group, thereby acting as a catalyst for the raising of political consciousness (Andrews 2007).

The salience of individual narratives further evinces that research on collective memory cannot rely solely on objective archival materials as such, for example, because these materials too are produced in a certain social context (LaCapra 2001). Thus even 'objective' materials are susceptible to the influence of individuals—artificially and socially produced, conveyed, and preserved as they are. Both objective materials and individual narratives are the media of memory. Yet, when it comes to the politics of constructing the recent past in the present, survivors are both witnesses to, and living evidence of it, with the potential to reinforce or challenge the dominant viewpoint of the past. While there is an extent to which collective memory has a life of its own and a degree of autonomy, which may in turn affect how those who hold memories think about and recollect the past, I would nonetheless argue that the existence of survivors and their narrations works to mirror the selection of remembering and forgetting in a given socio-political structure, as follows. The past is fluid, not fixed: both the narratives of events and the meanings given to them are in a constant state of transformation (Hodgkin and Radstone 2003: 28). Memory is itself an ongoing process of selecting past episodes; then individual narratives, especially those which are opposed to the version of the past that is shared inside a group, come to shed light on traces of the past, erasures, losses, and heterotopias. Suffice it to say, then, that memory implies the tendency of the past and present to conflict with one another. This tension and potential for conflict that memory implies is not only about the different perspectives that may arise; it also concerns how the past may be obscured, or narrated, and how this may become contentious in the context of the current political situation. We develop the meaning of the past in the present, but the present can never guarantee that the past will be represented faithfully (Walsh 1992).

In this regard, a piece of research such as this one, concerning the contested past of the White Terror in Taiwan, is also bound to explore the past 'against the present', that is to say, that version of the past which may be excluded from the current collective memory of Taiwan.

Certainly, the contestation of a political past often reveals how memory serves to satisfy specific political purposes in a given society. With a particular focus on the issue of 'whose memory is it', Alon Confino (1997) points out that the problem of defining memory in terms of politics or political use is that it is often constructed by leading agents such as intellectuals and politicians, and, as such, a form of memory that ignores the category of social (1997: 1393). This results in a form of collective memory that is a limited, largely public one; often official, and narrowly political. Here, two points of Confino's argument are illuminating for us, as follows. First, that memory that exists for a certain political purpose is predictable in its content, and that what is predictable about it is that while some part is set up to be remembered, another part is intentionally excluded and forgotten in its turn. Its logic of remembering and forgetting thus reveals the leading agents' hidden political desire. Such a collective memory of a political past thus foresees and tries to forestall by its 'burying' a potential contestation of that past.

Second, that a political memory narrated by politicians and intellectuals inevitably fails to provide a comprehensive picture of the past. It ignores the construction of popular memories of one political event and their links to the everyday level of experiences (Confino 1997: 1394-1395). This point arguably justifies the salience of a person-centred approach in collective memory studies. By looking into individuals' ways of constructing their perspectives on their pasts in terms of their day-to-day lives, we may come to capture the episodes and viewpoints which are excluded from the state-generated political memory. Such an emphasis on individual memory at the level of ordinary life not only reveals a discrepancy or tension between different levels and perspectives of the memory, but, more importantly, allows us to envisage the context of power relations in which different perspectives on a past come to interact with one another in the process of constructing that past.

The operation of remembering or forgetting is not an unconscious process (Connerton: 2008; 2009). Rather, it is based on deliberate selection—that is to say, we decide what to remember and what to forget—and it is dictated to a large extent by power relations. Tony Judt (1996) explicitly suggests that forgetting is, de facto, a political issue; he points to the memory of post-1945 Europe, as at once intertwined with the transnational interests that emerged from the Cold War, and with the desire to restore human rights that had been violated. In Judt's view, during the late 1940s, the rivalry of the Cold War aroused a respective desire, on the part of both Eastern socialist and Western governments, to forget the recent war and forge a new society. This demanded that some of the crimes of the Nazis be forgotten, as confirmed by the work of Dan Plesch (2015), who, in his recent examination of former secret archives disclosed by the United Nations War Crimes Commission, has found that some former Nazi officers who were accused of crimes against humanity were released by the UK under pressure from the US.³³ Although researchers have yet to clarify the logic by which some Nazis were released while others were convicted, it is clear to Plesch (2015) that the need to rebuild Germany—as an ally in the US effort to resist Soviet expansion—took priority over other missions, including that of prosecuting Nazi war crimes. Thus, the rivalry of the Cold War forced Western Europe, which was allied with the US, to opt for political and judicial amnesia: In the name of constructing 'liberal frontiers', these recent crimes had to be buried and forgotten.³⁴

³³ According to Plesch's research, 16 states, including the UK and US, worked together in London on the investigation of more than 36,000 international criminal cases between 1943 and 1948. Some of the detainees were released, according to Plesch, because of their potential contribution to rebuilding Germany, which was the priority at the time. There was Oskar Gröning, for instance, whose file 4771/P/G/139–137 shows that this former SS *Unterscharführer* and Auschwitz staff member was arrested by US troops at the end of WWII and subsequently sent to the UK, awaiting trial. In the end, however, Gröning was released despite fierce opposition by countries such as Polish and Yugoslavia. Plesch claims that rebuilding Germany in order to enlist its aid in resisting the communist threat became a mission that took priority over holding Nazi government actors accountable for crimes against humanity.

³⁴ Space does not allow for a full articulation of the way in which the US induced southern European countries to yield some of their rights to serve the project of German rehabilitation. The Marshall Plan conducted by the US in 1948 provided funds to rebuild Western Europe from the debris of wartime. However, in the interest of rebuilding the German economy, the US invited Greece to sign a treaty at London Conference of 1953 agreeing to cancel 50 per cent of Germany's debt. Meanwhile, although Greece had been one of the countries most

As for the memory of Taiwan's White Terror, when memory recalls a violent society, what is remembered inevitably poses a challenge to that society. Accordingly, researchers should scrutinise any silence that is seemingly tacitly shared across a society with an awareness of the potential influence of power politics. By taking an approach that focuses on the survivors' narratives and their competing transitional justice discourses, this research aims to bring to light the fundamental socio-political framework by which some voices or perspectives of the White Terror in Taiwan are ruled out from the state-sponsored transitional justice scheme. These individuals are the living evidence of this politics of memory.

Memory and power: A Foucauldian perspective

To study the politics of memory of this violent and complicated past, I have chosen to take up Foucault's distinctive insights on the issue of power.

In Foucault's view (2000a),³⁵ in order to study power, one has to study the power relation itself. Tracing a genealogy of the exercise of power in the Western world, Foucault examines the changing forms and techniques of power practiced in the West in one of his best known works, *Discipline and Punish* (1991). In this work, he argues that the exercise of power in recent times has shown a tendency towards individualisation, in which a new economy of power has emerged in line with investments in new modalities of power that are both far more efficient (1991; 2000: 120). Here, one should be aware that Foucault's use of the term 'individualisation' does not seek to emphasise the element of violence or repression. Rather, what Foucault emphasises is how individuals are made subjects in a process of objectification (2000: 326–327). If one were to focus only on the aspect of repression, one would likely conduct the analysis from a legal perspective, which could tend to define the exercise of power solely as a relationship of dominance-obedience—and this is precisely the aspect that Foucault would prefer us not to focus on.

ravaged by German aggression in WWII, Germany received four times the funds that Greece did from the Marshall Plan.

³⁵ Foucault (2000) 'Society Must Be Defended'. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984: Ethics* (pp. 59–66). London: Penguin Books.

For Foucault, 'the form of power that applies to everyday life in ways that categorise the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, and imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognise and others must recognise in him' (2000c: 331). The mechanisms of institutions, knowledge, language, legal systems and so forth are all embedded in power relations, in which we all act in accordance with 'individualised' techniques of governance. In this respect, the analysis of power considers not only repression and violence, but also the question of capacity (2000c: 337). The term 'capacity' concerns how one can exercise power over other individuals, which is not merely about structure or the mechanisms of power. Foucault emphasises that such structures or mechanisms merely touch on the fact of certain people exercising power over others. In his view, the exercise of power can be understood as a set of actions upon other actions (ibid.: 340–342), as a way in which certain actions may structure the scope of other possible actions (ibid.: 343).

In Foucault's view, structuring the scope of other possible actions is an issue of how individuals or groups may be directed. In short, it is a question of government. Here, 'government' not only refers to political institutions or to the management of nations but describes the action of controlling the possible field of action of others. Issues of violence or confrontation between two adversaries are thus less crucial to Foucault's analysis of power, which focuses on such power relations. For instance, Foucault's theory would suggest that the actions of a survivor of the White Terror in relation to their witnessing of the period, whether by verbalising or remaining silent, may be analysed as a subject of power relations, because it is power relations that implicitly and sometimes explicitly direct their actions in the power relations in the form of repression, negotiation, confrontation or so forth. We thus come to analyse the embedded power relations that determine the impact of a set of actions upon other actions in terms of defining the possibility of further actions, not only overt repression or constraint. Thus, a study of power and power relations is also about resistance against different forms of power. Foucault's approach is concerned with struggle, which is not limited to the borders of countries and disputes of governments, but is found in everyday life. This is a realm where individuals encounter conflicts over the

privileges associated with knowledge, and over representations that are imposed upon them. In other words, struggle unravels how individuals are categorised and stereotyped and thus become subject to others in the power relations of a given society. Such power relations can include the power that men exercise over women or the power that governments exercise over how people live. Hence, in Foucault's view, power relations are deeply rooted in the social nexus rather than being a supplementary structure of society. Power relations are intrinsically a social practice that is not confined to the operation of the state apparatus in the daily lives of citizens (2000c). Foucault's works inform this research in the following two respects:

First, his works justify my analysing the politics of memory based on the everyday political life of survivors, rather than merely studying policy-making, as, without a doubt, both society and memory are steeped in power relations. Memory, whether collective or individual, does not exist *per se*, but is, rather, a process of interaction among different forces, and never a representation of the pre-representational past (Olick 2007: 87–99). The logic of the mnemonic practices of remembering and forgetting thus reflects the kinds of knowledge of, and perspectives on the past that are generated by and operative in present-day political relations. Beyond the competition and even contestation between divergent views of the past with which this study is concerned, its further, Foucauldian viewpoint is that any privileged account of the past is produced in the course of negotiation, contestation, or repression in power relations. That is, there is no single truth of the past and, usually, many accounts of the past are produced. By the same token, conflicts over which discourse of the White Terror should be privileged are intrinsically rooted in power relations in Taiwan. Thus, to approach this from a Foucauldian viewpoint, we must ask: what kinds of power relations would cause the White Terror to be seen in a particular light? Put another way, what kind of power relations would cause a particular discourse of the White Terror to be privileged? Conversely, in order to address this politics of memory—that is, to study how power exerts its influence on the memory—the privileged discourse on the memory of the White Terror thus provides an analytic basis for scrutinising the relevant power relations, as it mirrors the very process of the exercise of power.

Second, the exercise of power concerns how human beings become subjects through the process of objectification. In the context of this study, this entails that the identity of 'the survivor' must be problematised, in the sense that no one is inherently a survivor. This identity must therefore be identified and constructed in the context of current political conditions. Also, a historical approach is required when one is to study how identity develops or shifts to a certain state. As explained earlier, those currently identified in Taiwan as political victims were in the past defined by the KMT party-state as political enemies, deemed to be 'unwanted' and 'outsiders'. Here, we observe a shift in the political identity attached to these individuals, from that of political criminal to that of victim, as they are transformed into subjects that demand vindication and justice. Regarding a shift of focus on a violent past, Andreas Huyssen (2003) observes that there was a global boom in memories of wartime,³⁶ especially the Holocaust, as the 1990s witnessed a shift from holding individuals accountable for war crimes to recounting survivors' traumatic experiences. The focus thus shifted from the commission of atrocities to the experience of persecution. Assmann also observes this shift from the punishment of perpetrators to appreciation of the perspective of Jewish victims (2012: 61). It was not a matter of forgetting the crimes of the Nazis but, rather, of embracing the perspective of victimhood.

For the Taiwanese transitional justice scheme mentioned in chapter 1, the memory of the White Terror is itself a site of power relations and the exercise of power. In addition, the former enemy of the state, i.e., the KMT regime, has subsequently been transformed into a subject of vindication. This drastic shift indicates the inevitable controversiality of the memory of the White Terror. The era of reconciliation is fraught with conflict, and the identity of survivors is inevitably political, especially in light of the fact that the identity of 'political victim' is seemingly limited, according to the rigid *Compensation Act* promulgated by the KMT authorities in 1998. Thus, it behoves us to explore how it is that, in the course of political change in

³⁶ Huyssen (2003) claims that the term 'Holocaust' has become a metaphor and universal trope for a traumatic past, especially with respect to political atrocities, in accordance with the transnational memory discursive movement of the 1980s. According to Huyssen, the term, in a sense, has lost its quality as a descriptor of the specific historical events of the Nazi death camps.

Taiwan, individuals who were previously imprisoned and labelled as 'political insurgents' have now become 'survivors' of victimisation.

Published studies on the White Terror and Transitional Justice in Taiwan

Since Taiwan underwent its democratic transition in the late 1980s, calls for redress of the wrongs committed during the White Terror have grown stronger, and literature on the subject has begun to proliferate. A survey of the White Terror literature reveals a number of studies and publications that fall into two categories: those that focus on depictions of persecution, and attempts to delineate the identity of the insurgents. Echoing Huyssen's observation (2003) on the global memory boom in accounts of trauma and victimisation, the former perspective prevails among publications.

Amongst the publications focused on past persecution and prosecution, the number of state-sponsored and local government-hosted oral history projects has increased since the late 1990s (Academia Historica: 1998; Academia Sinica: 1999; Kaohsiung County Government: 1997; Taipei Provincial Literature Council: 1998; 1999),³⁷ most of which focus on the life trajectories of persecuted political victims and details of state atrocities. In the case of those victims who perished during the White Terror, those bereaved by their deaths show up as the representatives of the deceased, sharing their episodes of suffering under the KMT regime (Hsiao 2009). For instance, Chang Yen-Hsien (1947-2014) was the pioneer in conducting official-sponsored oral histories with survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan (1998; 2000a; 2000b; 2002a; 2002b; 2003). With Chang's determined pro-independence stance, Chang's works mainly refer to cases of pro-independence and survivors who now support Taiwan independence (2000; 2002; 2003). Also, the perspective of victimhood pervades his works, but whoever testifies in these state-sponsored publications, readers encounter difficulties in exploring the episodes of insurgence therein. It seems that all of those who have testified were wrongly convicted, as barely even one of them

³⁷ See Appendix II for the details of publication.

claims to have had any connection with the conspiracy against the KMT regime. In chapter 3, I will decipher the hidden political configuration that has resulted in the seemingly singular perspective on the White Terror that is represented in the official discourse.

In a review of the following studies on memory of the White Terror and transitional justice in Taiwan, however, a slightly different perspective is revealed. In 2015, the most representative non-governmental organisation—the Taiwan Association for Truth and Reconciliation (in Chinese: 台灣民間真相與和解促進會; hereafter TRCT),⁸⁸ published a three-volume anthology critiquing the progress of transitional justice in Taiwan. Given the *Compensation Act*, TRCT (2015) argues that the White Terror has not yet been fully described, as many stories remain untold. This anthology also suggests that the past is more complicated than the public has been led to believe, and that the White Terror was not merely a period of state terror or ideological conflict. This supports my own observation that this period of state violence was also a time of intense conflict among ordinary people and between different political ideals. A perspective on the past conflict in which survivor-victims may be viewed as former insurgents therefore emerges. Feuchtwang (2011) and Shih (2011; 2014) share the stance held by the TCRT, and deliver an even stronger argument on the incomplete vindication of former political prisoners, especially communists, here in relation to their co-fieldwork on the Luku Incident (in Chinese: 鹿窟事件) and its aftermath.⁸⁹ As a survivor of the Nazi, Feuchtwang concerns how the political configuration comes to shape the content of trauma, i.e., survivors' persecuted mental life. By regarding Luku as a site of memory, Feuchtwang addresses the survivor-victims with whom he talked, showing their reluctance to recall the past as a proof of the existence of continuing anti-communism. In this regard, without full recognition of the victims, and taking into account the generation gap,

⁸⁸ The TRCT was founded in 2008 by a group of Taiwanese academics and independent researchers, including legal scholars, political scientists, sociologists, historians, and writers.

⁸⁹ The village formerly known as Luku has since been renamed as Kuan-Ming-Li (光明里) after the KMT regime brutally arrested more than 200 villagers and socialists who hid in the village and executed 35 individuals between late 1952 and 1953. The event was later known as the Luku Incident, which was one of the most serious episodes of the White Terror. See further discussion in 張炎憲、高淑媛 (1998) 鹿窟事件調查研究。台北：台北縣文化中心 and 張炎憲、陳鳳華 (2000) 寒村的哭泣：鹿窟事件。台北：台北縣文化中心

annual official commemorations are, effectively, a means of forgetting (2011: 119-121). In short, the transitional justice scheme in Taiwan is now pursuing justice with only partial truth and reconciliation (Shih 2011).

Lan Po-Chou, the most famous independent researcher on the White Terror in Taiwan, takes up both perspectives, that of persecution and that of conflict. Yet he emphasises the need of recognition of the past insurgence. As a pro-unification leftist,⁴⁰ Lan contributes to the discourse on the identity of insurgents by addressing the White Terror as part of a larger account of the communist revolution against the US-ROC alliance in the post-war era. Lan (1991; 1993; 2001a; 2001b; 2007; 2010; 2011; 2012; 2015) focuses on the life trajectories of the communists of Taiwan's past, especially those involved in resistance.⁴¹ Here, the reader must bear in mind that some of Lan's works are fictionalised (Lan 2001a; 2007; 2010; 2014; 2016), although arguably these may still claim equal footing with written history, since it too is "never a mirror but a construction, congeries of data pulled together or 'constructed' by some larger project or vision or theory that may not be articulated but is nonetheless embedded in the particular way history is practiced" (Lin 2004: 60).

Here, Lin Yi-Hsuan's study (2012) on the logic of Chinese communist recruitment in 1950s Taiwan supports Lan Po-Chou's assertion that his research participants were former political insurgents. However, a question arises as to how this discrepancy between the official and non-official oral histories of the White Terror is possible in present-day Taiwan?

In his own research, delving into the life trajectories of former socialist political prisoners under the Taiwanese KMT party-state over many years, Lin Chuan-Kai (2014) has interviewed hundreds of socialist survivors. Lin observes that the Cold War stand-off and the subsequent state terror of the

⁴⁰ It is not that Lan's works have a pro-unification theme, as he has emphasised (2007) that his goal is to unravel the formerly repressed past, that is, the still inconvenient history of Taiwan. Nonetheless, it is clear that Lan's own political convictions direct his concern towards the history of communism in Taiwan rather than that of any other movement or faction.

⁴¹ I can only touch briefly here on Lan's work by referring to his latest publication (2015), a detailed historical review of the student movement in Taiwan from 1945 to 1949. Drawing on his own in-depth interviews conducted over more than a decade, as well as collected documentation and archives, Lan investigates the historical context of how students and intellectuals emerged as the nucleus of communism in post-war Taiwan, and, over the next five years, proliferated from the capital to the rural areas. With this account, Lan has become the most prominent of the independent researchers on the White Terror in Taiwan.

KMT continue to haunt his informants, as evidenced by the fact that his informants, especially those who had been accused of being socialists or communists, only feel secure enough to narrate the aftermath of their imprisonment in public. Suffice to say that the survivors' silence has its roots in both state terror and past political contentions. Nonetheless, the power relations that channel survivors of the White Terror toward narrating their revolutionary and persecuted past in a singular and limited manner in present-day Taiwan require to be scrutinised further.

Thus, as we have seen, Feuchtwang, Lan, and Lin observe the impact of the legacy of the Cold War on the recounting of the White Terror in Taiwan. While a number of other researchers challenge the progress of transitional justice in Taiwan, most do so without deconstructing the politics of the process. For instance, Wu Nai-Teh (2005; 2006) emphasises the importance of truth-seeking, especially regarding the fact of atrocities and the identity of their perpetrators. Wu maintains that the current implementation of transitional justice in Taiwan does not heal the wounds of survivors, their families, or the society as a whole, but, rather, operates perfunctorily without acknowledging that atrocities were an inherent feature of the past for which there can be no excuse. Wu's viewpoint is widely accepted by others researching Taiwan's transitional justice process, such as Chiang (2007), Chen and Chung (2016), Hwang (2016), and Stolojan (2017). For his part, Chen Fang-Ming indicates that the major opposition party in Taiwan, the Democracy Progress Party (in Chinese: 民主進步黨; hereafter DPP), had little potential to introduce a full reconciliation into Taiwanese society, and instead merely carried on the project after they themselves came to power in 2000. Yet, Chen fails to elaborate the political configuration that has led to the consequence of the reconciliation process remaining seemingly unfinished. That is to say, despite the fact the scholars cited here approach the topic with an awareness that transitional justice is intrinsically political, their failure to invoke the geopolitical fact and salience of the Cold War in East Asia means that such studies necessarily non-challenging nature of the already limited transitional justice scheme during Taiwan's three-decade democratisation. In short, both the 'already limited scheme' and its potential challenge deserve a thorough examination.

In addition to addressing the salience of the Cold War stand-off in Taiwan, as articulated in Chapter 1, a number of the existent studies on the White Terror have addressed how the KMT party-state rallied the whole of society against not just the threat of Chinese communism, but also pro-independence activism and other political causes that were designated unwelcome by the government in the name of the Cold War (Chen 2008; Chiou 1997; Su 2013). Arguably, this too reflects the necessity of taking into account the Cold War legacy as well as the predominance of global transitional justice discourse whilst critiquing Taiwan's transitional justice scheme. As noted in Chapter 1, 'the end of the Cold War' refers to the victory of the Western powers, rather than any kind of reconciliation of the former stand-off. Thus, in comparison to those studies featured in the state-sponsored oral history volumes, whose research is overwhelmingly focused on the aspect of suffering (Lin 2007; Tsao 2011), and stories of wrong conviction and innocence, the work of researchers such as Lan Po-Chou, Lin Chuan-Kai (2014) and Lin Yi-Hsuan (2012) contributes evidence of the identity of insurgents to the discourse, thus introducing the very suggestion of the actual existence of episodes of insurgence, especially the socialist adversaries against the KMT regime in Taiwan.

In short, the perspective of victimhood has occupied the official-sponsored oral histories (Chang 1998; 2000a; 2000b; 2002a; 2002b; 2003), while a self-sponsored writer, Lan Po-Cho (2010; 2014) has continued to accumulate his publication, focusing on the perspective of insurgence. Amongst the two perspectives, Feuchtwang (2011) chooses to embrace both the perspectives, denoting the legacy of the Cold War remains its influence in present-day Taiwan. In this regard, Lan view the legacy of the Cold War merely as the evidence that attests to the long-lasting political tension of the Cold War. Feuchtwang steps forward, demonstrating the meaning of the legacy of the Cold War complicates meaning of survival as survivors are both insurgents and victims. In this regard, Feuchtwang (2011) echoes my stance as both viewpoints serve to scrutinise how the two perspectives have come to shape survivors' political identity in transitional Taiwan.

Confronting the fact that the current perspective of persecution obscures actual episodes of insurgence requires a reconsideration of the

hidden geopolitical configurations and domestic power relations that have at once informed the initiation of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, yet continue to delay the progress of reconciliation in Taiwan. This undertaking will enable us to unravel the politics of the reconciliation process in transitional Taiwan. Further, I will seek to explore how, in this complicated political circumstance, survivors of varying political stances deal with their identity as a former political enemy or insurgent and witness to the atrocities. Given research that mainly focus on the life trajectories of socialist insurgent survivors in post-war Taiwan, such as Lan Po-Cho (2010; 2011; 2014), Lin Yi-Hsuan (2012), the ways in which other survivors of pro-independence activism, etc. recount their past in terms of transitional justice is also explored in this research. Altogether, a thorough deconstruction of the memory of the White Terror shall be attempted here.

A tripartite discourse analysis

As noted at the beginning of this thesis, to examine the contested memory of the White Terror in Taiwan is to study the ways that different transitional justice discourses, both official and non-official, interact in the power relations of present-day Taiwan.

Regarding discourse analysis, Foucault seeks to trace the emergence of particular discourses, arguing for how particular discourses have become privileged and powerful at particular moments in history (1972; 1973; 2000d).⁴² Throughout Foucault's works, especially with respect to the issues of discipline and power, he remarks on how discourse is materialised, at the socio-political level, through various non-discursive practices, including via institutional arrangements and policies, and laws and institutions as a whole. As such, this aspect of Foucauldian discourse analysis thus focuses on the way in which specific discourses come to regulate individuals. One of Foucault's own main areas of focus is on the medical discourses that discipline the boundary between the normal and the abnormal (1973) via a

⁴² Foucault (1972) calls this the 'archaeological' method. In his later work, *Madness and Civilisation*, Foucault (1973) studies how the medical discourse governs the category of 'patient' and 'physician', 'normal' and 'abnormal', etc.

series of institutional arrangements, laws and so forth that are embedded within a specific socio-political context. In short, this work of Foucault's concerns how the ways in which a society is shaped by language sheds light on its existing power relations.

As elaborated in the previous chapter, the deployment of transitional justice is more of the Western-centrism that failed to bring about a reconciliation between the Western powers and former Soviet Union. In critiquing Taiwan's transitional justice scheme from a Foucauldian perspective, the main objective is to elucidate the way in which the dominance of the Western powers and Taiwan's domestic politics came together to shape Taiwan's reconciliation scheme. At the practical level, in considering already accomplished reconciliation schemes worldwide, such as those in former Central and Eastern European Countries (hereafter, CEECs) and South Africa (Kriesberg 2004: 83–86, 2007: 252–256; Lambourne 2009; Moon 2008), along with Taiwan's own transitional justice scheme, I have developed a tripartite analytic framework, as shown here in table 2-1:

Table 2-1: Analytic Framework

Aspect	Medium	Function
Justice	legislation, prosecution, amnesty, reparations, official	(governmental) legitimacy, (individual) rehabilitation,

	apologies, Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRCs)	(societal) reconciliation
Truth	archives, oral history, historical analysis	knowledge, consensus
Ethos	commemoration, exhibitions and museums, memorial sites	representation, solace, healing and regard, security

Justice connotes the juridical process employed in the pursuit of justice and reconciliation. Generally speaking, the juridical process is regarded as one of the most effective approaches to transitional justice. Legal proceedings provide a mechanism for transitional justice to enable a society to redress the atrocities of the previous era and consolidate democracy during its transition. The juridical process not only issues official apologies and assigns accountability for human rights abuses, but may also order financial compensation for victims and their families. As such, it may be used to effect both retributive and restorative justice. The term ‘retributive justice’ refers to the traditional model whereby those who have committed crimes or perpetrated acts of injustice are punished (Kriesberg 2007). Punishing individuals for past violations of human rights is a way of identifying individual responsibility and avoiding the attribution of collective guilt. However, no amount of punishment can restore past losses. Restorative justice, on the other hand, attempts to restore what was lost due to the bad acts that were committed and, in some situations, seeks to rehabilitate offenders. In the case of Taiwan, the *Compensation Act* of 1998 is viewed as the starting point of the pursuit of restorative justice, the emphasis of which has been on redress, including financial compensation to victims—that is, the victims of wrongful convictions.

As Nobles (2008) suggests, although the exact form will vary according to the situation, all apologies ‘require judgments and reflection,

both ideational and moral, on what the apologies are being asked for and on what the expected consequences of the apologies are'. In other words, political apology is itself the most salient factor in constituting new moral orders (Moon 2008: 22). Hence, the extent to which the Taiwanese government has developed a culture of contrition attests to the depth of the roots of the transitional justice project in Taiwan.

The juridical approach thus defines the concepts of atrocity, human rights violations, victimhood, and the identity of political victim, which are the very basis of the deployment of a transitional justice project. As such, it functions to shed light on the official transitional justice discourse of a society, and the hidden power relations that underpin the discourse.

Truth, as it relates to past political repression, entails access to archives and documentation, which serve as evidence for forensic investigations by juridical tribunals or inquiries by Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (hereafter TRCs). In the pursuit of the truth, the ability to access formerly secret documents is fundamental for many transitional nations. In this light, truth consists, in the reconciliation context, of the recognition by members of the group that inflicted injury of those whom their actions hurt (Kriesberg 2007).

Truth, as such, is not constitutive of a group of facts. Unlike facts, such truth must be shareable, as formerly opposing sides reach understandings about who has suffered, or continues to suffer, by whose acts. Truths may vary in how widely they are shared within and between adversarial parties. Only certain groups within the opposing sides may know certain truths (Kriesberg 2004: 83). For Foucault, truth is not prevalent and universal but, rather, an instrument for achieving partisan victory. Foucault is adamant that the subject of truth is inextricably intertwined with power relations: The politics of truth is not about forms of power practice, such as domination or obedience. Rather, it is about how the power relations of one society formulate a series of rules, which individuals sometimes obey but sometimes manage to manipulate to serve their own ends. In the case of Taiwan, a Foucauldian approach would explore how survivors of the White Terror develop their truth while confronting unfriendly legal and political

arrangements. Truth, in this case, does not exist objectively, but is determined by how individuals cope with specific power relations.

According to Foucault (2000d; 2000e), the centrality of truth production is 'confession'. When exploring how truth has developed and emerged in one society, Foucault claims that the obligation to confess has been transformed from a moral requirement, which had no legal force, in Ancient Greece, into a general social requirement during the Christian period, due to the prevailing asceticism of the latter (2000b: 225–234). In the modern era, Foucault argues that although modern societies have discounted the force of the church, their heritage of obligation toward self-knowledge and truth-telling (confession, i.e.) has given rise to a process whereby the subject that is engaged in self-examination is objectified. For instance, the truths told to the prosecution by former perpetrators on the occasion of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa were designed to be forgiven and reconciled. Although the 'truth' that emerged from the TRC in South Africa has been hailed as a role model for transitional countries, all we really know about it is that it was 'good enough' to be accepted by the majority of people during the post-apartheid period (Scheper-Hughes 1998). The possibility remains that a number of people and their pasts in South Africa were not embraced or recognised by that truth (Moon 2008).

Arguably, truth is always to some extent contested and controversial. When a transitional society recounts its past, different societal members and organisations come to contribute what they know about that conflictual or repressive past. Negotiations and/or controversies occur during the process of truth-seeking. Where the aim of reconciliation is concerned, it is better that 'the truth' not trigger new controversies, contradictions, or tensions amongst individuals in a given society. Thus, while there may be more than one version of the truth of the past in a transitional society, among them will be one dominant truth that is supported by the new democratic authorities. Methodologically speaking, our concern with this truth-discerning process is not about the content of the materials, such as archives and testimonies, but, rather, with the ways that these materials are utilised, transcribed, and interpreted by different sides in the process of developing a shareable version of the past. Accordingly, we may expect oral history, understood as a

confessional approach, to yield a perspective on the past that is different to the versions promulgated by the authorities or even by academics or independent reporters in Taiwan. Competing discourses are thus to be expected from White Terror survivors in Taiwan. Taking all of the above into account, we must take care to problematise what is perceived as 'truth' in recognition of its genesis in the need to sustain a specific view of the past.

Ethos, in the literal sense, suggests the characteristic spirit of a culture, era, or community as manifested in its attitudes and aspirations. 'Ethos' refers to a set of rules, especially with respect to the social relations of one society in a specific era. Here, in relation to critiquing the general ideal of how post-conflict or war-torn societies might be reconciled that is most prevalent in the post-Cold War era, we can say that 'regard' and 'security' are the two most prominent dimensions of its ethos. 'Regard' refers to the consideration accorded by members of a community towards each other. This entails their recognition of their shared humanity and the human rights of former opponents (Fischer 2011; Kriesberg 2004; 2007). 'Security' means ensuring that former adversaries feel a minimum of trust and are given 'reason to believe they can look forward to living together without one side threatening the other' (Kriesberg 2007: 253). In short, the dimension of ethos is about projecting a future with new moral orders of security and regard as defined here, on the basis of the reconciliation of the past, with which the dimension of justice is focused on reckoning. In this context, state-provided museums and exhibitions of the past are not only about how authorities remember past atrocities and wounds, but also about projecting a future that is based on reconciliation. More importantly, a critique of state-projected museums and exhibitions may attest to what kinds of perspectives of the past are left out or obscured as overlain by the dominant perspective, inasmuch as specific perspectives and their advocates may not be embraced by the reconciliation project in question.

Andreas Huyssen (2003), for example, examines 'the meaning of Berlin' through the lens of the memory of its period of division. As a literary critic, he conceives of Berlin as a palimpsest that has been written and rewritten in the context of different power relations. This is more than just a

metaphor, in terms of the attachment of various meanings to the city itself, as both its historical background and the demands of the current political situation have a bearing on how Berlin is represented in the present day. Huyssen's finding is that the sites of memory in Berlin provide focal points for different political agents striving to find, and give voice to, their voices. Meanwhile, in Taiwan the era of democratisation has seen historic sites, such as ruins, former prisons, and execution grounds, feature as the palimpsest of the reconciliation process. Potentially contradictory voices compete for the power to interpret and represent the pasts of these sites to the public. In addition, all of these different voices are striving to arrive at a definition of reconciliation and the future that shall be truly accepted by the formerly opposing sides in their present day-to-day lives.

Certainly, the three aspects of the reconciliation-seeking process shown in table 2-1 are interrelated, although justice and truth seem to play the most important roles. To what extent a shared truth can be achieved among different individuals and groups in a society may depend on the degree to which expressions of regard and security are able to be consolidated. Reconciliation—understood as a process in which various groups of people engage in dialogue and compete for the power of utterance in order to reach a widely accepted consensus on the past, present, and future of a post-conflict society—is thus desirable.

As previously noted, a political discourse analysis is not a study which merely looks into statements or words that have been produced and delivered. It is an approach that encompasses all discursive and non-discursive practices, to unravel the socio-political context and hidden power relations that shape a specific discourse or perspective into a dominant form. Hence, as shown in table 2-1, institutional arrangements, such as juridical processes, state-projected researches, exhibitions, and museums, are included in the analysis. By the same token, non-official practices, both discursive and non-discursive, are also given major consideration in comparison with the official discourse. In this regard, discourse analysis is not only about the words that have been said; it is important also to scrutinize what kind of non-discursive practices exist in relation to the contested memory of the White Terror in Taiwan, so as to explore what has not yet been verbalised.

The following section thus articulates the details of this study's collection and coding of research materials, and its person-centred narrative approach to participant survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan.

Research methods and materials

In investigating the politics of memory of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme concerning the White Terror, based on the analytic framework set out in table 2-1, I have relied on two research methods: person-centred participant observation and documentary analysis.

As noted in chapter 1, the primary mission of this study is to delve into the ways in which survivors of the White Terror recall and define their own past, in the face of the official transitional justice scheme in Taiwan. To do so, I undertook in-depth individual interviews with 24 survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan, conducted between October 2012 and May 2013, and between October 2013 and December 2013, over a total period of 10 months.

Ostensibly, person-centred participant observation is more of an ethnographical approach. According to Clifford Geertz (1973), the importance of an ethnographic account in the study a culture or a group of people does not rest on its author's ability to capture 'primitive' facts in faraway places and carry them home like a mask or a carving, but on the degree to which he is able to clarify what goes on in such places, to reduce the puzzlement to which unfamiliar acts emerging out of unknown backgrounds naturally give rise— "what manner of men (sic) are these?" (1973: 16). For Geertz, culture is public because meaning is. This connotes that to study a flow of behaviour is to explore the socially established codes that are hidden behind social actions. At this point, as Geertz argues, it is impossible to develop an insightful perspective on the social actions that researchers have observed without a 'process of textualisation'. That is, for Geertz, a culture is a text that can be viewed as a collection of various symbols and the hidden meaning. The process of textualisation is an approach that seeks to unravel the hidden meaning of the research object with knowledge of ethnography and close-up participant observation. Hence, an ethnographic account as an approach is characterised by 'thick

description'. It is interpretive of the flow of social discourse, and the interpreting involved consists in trying to rescue the 'said' of such discourse from its 'perishing occasion's and fix it in 'perusable terms' (1973: 19-28).

To conduct a study via an interpretive approach, in-depth interviews are not only about recording the words verbalised. Participant observation is also imperative to analysing the 'text' or the 'socially established codes' embedded in an informants' life, for it takes time and space to develop an understanding of the socio-cultural framework shared by the informants.

Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis are strongly underpinned by this approach. As noted, a perspective of victimhood prevails among the research on survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan and their families. The silence of survivors is generally viewed, in this light, as an outcome of their past persecution (Chiu 2009). In this study, however, with an awareness of the possibility that survivors may also be former insurgents, I have attempted to rethink survivors' silences over their pasts, again via the techniques of in-depth interviews and close-up participant observation. In listening to their narratives, it became apparent that what had been left out was just as important as what had been verbalised, and further, as I will argue in this thesis, that the logic of my participants' silence and verbalisation of narratives each constitute evidence of the employment of specific power relations in Taiwan. This microscopic focus on interactions between individuals, as between individuals and more macro-political configurations of power, has proved indispensable to this research.

In addition to individual interviews with survivor-victims of the White Terror, during my field research in Taiwan, I also attended private gatherings of my research participants with other of their fellow victims, as a participant observer. Without a formal interview structure, this could sometimes take up a whole day at a time, yet the value of this strategy was that it allowed me to look into the ways in which these survivors interact with each other, and how they refer to their shared past together, using their own established social codes. This approach of participant observation thus allowed me to develop an understanding of their common codes, and so to unravel the 'text', i.e., the socio-political configuration, that shores up their ongoing silence over specific aspects of their past.

It should also be said here that while an ethnographical approach is microscopic in its attention to detail, this methodological feature does not preclude this approach for the purposes of undertaking an expansive scale or level of analysis, as small facts may speak to large issues. Further, in examining and contextualising the materials collected via the ethnographic approach undertaken in this study, I have also taken a documentary analysis approach to declassified official documentation and published statements and reports on the White Terror, and examined institutional arrangements, as follows.

Material for documentary analysis, and its access

This area of research touches on one of the most sensitive issues in present-day Taiwan, and as such as it is challenging to access documentation, for hitherto the documentation has not been fully declassified. Such material as I was able to access may be categorised as follows, and the degree of access I was able to achieve is also described below:

Declassified official archives: here, that which I was able to access mainly consisted of my research participants' indictments, verdicts, and imprisonment records. According to the Archives Act which came into force in 2002,⁴³ researchers can apply to the National Archives Administration, founded in 2000, for access to the archives mentioned here. However, according to the Archives Act, only the survivor, i.e., the criminal, and their immediate family members could access the record of interrogation. And only the families of the victims could access the photo of pre-execution and its aftermath. Researchers can only access the photos of pre-execution of the already executed ones. In addition, no applicant, including the victims themselves, can access the original, but only photocopied or scanned copies. During my field research, I applied for access to the indictments and verdicts of my participants from the National Archives Administration, and studied these before conducting formal interviews with them. Despite the fact that these verdicts are not fully reliable as sources, this documentation was the

⁴³ See detailed discussion on the political context and its implications of the act in Chapter 3.

very basis from which I embarked upon the conversations I had with them and investigations of their past. Readers may find the declassified verdicts and related archives to which this research refers in the bibliography of this thesis. See also the official publications of declassified verdicts and related documentation which are categorised case by case in Appendix III.

Official statements, oral histories, periodicals, and newspapers: these were the other main source for documentary analysis in the course of this research. To study the progress of the transitional justice scheme in Taiwan one must rely on official statements and the way in which they relate to the project. The official statements demonstrate how a democratic government comes to recount the atrocities committed by the former authorities, and it is done via a politics of remorse. I collected every official statement that has been made by the Taiwanese authorities since the mid 1990s on the occasion of commemorating either the 228 Incident or the White Terror. These statements are listed on the official website of the Office of the President (of the ROC). An examination of state-sponsored oral history publications has also been central to my exploration of the official transitional justice discourse, with particular attention to how those interviewed for these official oral history projects think back to their past persecution. Readers may find a detailed list of these in Appendix II.

Up until the early 1990s, the *United News* is recognised to have been the most KMT regime-friendly newspaper. During the early stage of the White Terror in Taiwan, the KMT authorities published political propaganda in the *United News* in forms of bulletins, prose and so forth, targeting and threatening individuals not to overthrow the government. In addition, the *United News* issued bulletins covering every political prisoner executed during the 1950s. Since the end of White Terror, the *United News* is no longer the official voice of the ROC, yet remains active in advocating for the cause of pro-unification. As such, it is imperative for its news coverage of everything about the White Terror and transitional justice to be included in this analysis. The Japanese newspaper *Taiwan Shin Sheng Daily News* was published weekly from 1895 onwards before being taken over by the KMT in 1949,

prior to the latter's retreat to Taiwan, and transformed into a bilingual Chinese/Japanese newspaper. During the 228 Incident, both the director and Japanese editor of that newspaper Juan Chao-Jih (in Chinese, 阮朝日) and Wu Chin-Lien (in Chinese, 吳金鍊) were arrested and executed by the KMT, as part of the new administration's first political purge. Once the ROC was established in Taiwan, *Taiwan Shin Sheng Daily News* became the official sponsored newspaper and remained so until it was privatised in the late 1990s. *Apple Daily* is another important example of print media in democratic Taiwan, because its comment forum has become one of the most mainstream platforms for readers to debate public affairs in Taiwan. Both members of the TRCT and those bereaved during the White Terror submit their opinions for publication to *Apple Daily*. This material has thus been selected for analysing the ongoing contestation of the understanding of the past in Taiwan. Another two periodicals, *Ren-Jian Magazine* and *Hai-Xia*, were established in the late 1980s by a group of left-wing, pro-unification survivor-victims of the White Terror. By far the best known left-wing survivors' association, named Huzhuhui (in Chinese, 互助會), was also established by these men, and these two publications became the most representative means for them to voice their political agenda. As such, an analysis of these two publications is salient to exploring how left-wing survivors contemplate the past in present. Then, last but not least, *Formosa*, a periodical that survived for less than a year in 1979, was the first periodical to recognise political prisoners under the KMT regime as 'political victims', i.e., the first to bear witness to the state-level atrocities. Thus, without precedent, *Formosa* was the first publication to introduce the idea of 'human rights' to Taiwan with respect to the political conflicts between the dictatorship and its people. I will discuss this periodical further at the beginning of Chapter 3, and a list of official documentation can be found in Appendix I.

Documentaries and films: these can be categorised into official and non-official kinds. Here, the term 'official documentaries' refers to state-sponsored videos of interviews, in which survivors are filmed recounting their own persecution to camera. For those of my research participants that had participated in these official video projects, the potential discrepancies

between my interviews with them and the narratives they had offered in these official documentaries offered a profound opportunity for analysis. Then there are the non-official documentaries, mainly produced by the left-wing survivor-victims' association Huzhuhui. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the famous writer Lan Po-Cho has also been cooperating with Huzhuhui to produce documentaries in which Huzhuhui members recount the past from a politically contentious perspective, completely different from the official discourse of persecution and victimhood. These materials will be discussed in Chapter 3, where I will explore the official transitional justice discourse, and in Chapter 5, where I discuss the competing discourses of survivors. a list of official documentation can be found in Appendix I.

The in-depth interviews undertaken with the 24 survivors

Having articulated the analytic framework and listed the materials collected for this research thus far, in framing the interviews conducted with research participants, let it be stated that this research concerns how Taiwan's transitional justice scheme turns 'survivors of political imprisonment' of the White Terror into 'surviving political victims', with no mention of the contentious politics to which they may have previously adhered. I focus on the extent to which their previous persecution might be recognised or eased by previous oral histories which mentioned in the section of literature review of this chapter. And, in effect, what kind of 'past episodes' that had been perpetrated upon my participants? In sum, this research draws attention to White Terror survivors' self-reflections; how they are narrated and constructed, and how they figure in the specific context of power relations of Taiwan. With this in mind, I employed an in-depth individual interview technique with close-up participant observation, as detailed in Appendix V.

I began my study of the memory of the White Terror in autumn 2008, when I was writing my master's thesis, which deals with the suffering of those bereaved by the White Terror in Taiwan. Before embarking on my doctoral research in Cambridge in 2012, I was engaged in the country's official oral history project in 2010 and 2011.⁴ Using the contacts I developed

during these years, I was thus able to identify and interview former political prisoners from the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s for this thesis. I approached potential participants according to the technique of snowball sampling, which connotes random selections, and with an emphasis on my own accumulated social capital.

To develop mutual understanding with participants, I chose not to make audio recordings during our first encounter with one another. Rather, I would introduce myself and have a relatively casual talk with them. I regard this as a necessary process in order to secure a more stable and smooth relationship, with my participants, leading to better interviews. To enhance the reliability of my interviews, I interviewed each participant three to four times at least.

Nonetheless, I did encounter some challenges and frustrations during my field research in Taiwan. As noted in chapter 1, underpinning the memory of the White Terror is a pervasive antipathy towards communists that has existed since the 1950s in Taiwan and, even after the end of the Cold War, continues to this day, given the current political tension between China and Taiwan. This manifests as mistrust between those who were formerly accused of communist sympathies, and Taiwanese society in general. This political situation affects the way in which survivors in Taiwan situate themselves in relation to both the official and non-official discourses in Taiwan, which is the main topic of chapter 5. As a researcher relying on fieldwork, I found that this political situation constrained me from approaching specific groups of survivors, such as pro-unification leftists. Many pro-unification survivors feel too uneasy to recount their past to someone with whom they do not share a common political cause, or of whom they do not know enough. Some of them consider that only those who share their political stance should be eligible to learn about the past from them. I also had only 10 months in which to conduct my field research in Taiwan.⁴⁵ Thus, while, a few communist survivors, especially those from the

⁴⁵ The Taiwanese researcher Lin Chuan-Kai's doctoral research (due to be completed in 2017) focuses on the communist resistance against the KMT from the late 1940s to the early 1950s. Over a period of eight years, Lin has interviewed some 200 communists who survived the White Terror in Taiwan. I was fortunate to have him to introduce me to potential interviewees; however, given my time constraints, I was able to meet with only four communists who had been accused of treason in the 1950s.

1950s, were willing to share their life stories with me,⁴⁶ the majority of my interviewees (18 out of 24) were advocates of Taiwanese independence, ranging from socialists to democrats. During the White Terror under the KMT regime, pro-unification communists and pro-independence socialists alike both equally fit the KMT regime's profile of its political enemies in Cold War Taiwan. Notwithstanding the KMT's significant success in eliminating Chinese communists in the 1950s, socialism was not wiped out in Taiwan, and, in time, came to realise a new potential in relation to the cause of independence, in the wake of the collapse of Chinese dream, i.e., to be united with Mainland China. The way in which my pro-independence socialist interviewees (16 out of 24) recounted their past insurgency and current political life thus assumes significance in this context. My field research in Taiwan yielded narratives by 25 informants, including one expert who has cooperated with an authority-sponsored transitional justice project since the late 1990s.

As noted in the introduction of chapter 1, the KMT regime has not been formally accused of committing political repression in any tribunal or related legal context. The political situation made the smooth conduct of interviews difficult in many ways: apart from the difficulty of approaching pro-unification leftist survivors, the other major challenge lay in the way in which my informants tended to view their past, which could affect the depth of the conversation between us. During my interviews, I often came to discover that they viewed their past more as a time of insurgence than a time of victimhood. In particular, the former socialists were most cautious about sharing their past, especially its insurgent aspect. Issues related to their organising and conspiring against the KMT remain sensitive to them.

As one of my informants, JC, expressed, *"I never want to betray my associates"*.⁴⁷ This forms a central issue of the thesis:⁴⁸ To what extent and why do my informants still feel insecure or uneasy about speaking of their

⁴⁶ The political repression of communists in Taiwan during the White Terror was most severe from 1949 to 1954. For further discussion, see Chapter 3.

⁴⁷ Transcript of JC 2013, 10.

⁴⁸ As I have stated, the ways in which the former political criminals of the White Terror conspired against the KMT lie outside the scope of this research. Nevertheless, I will briefly discuss how my informants conspired against the KMT in Chapters 4 and 5. For a detailed study of this topic, see Lan's works, as mentioned in the previous section of this chapter.

insurgent past? Why does the concern over betrayal, including being betrayed by former comrades and betraying others, remain an issue in the era of reconciliation, especially when the White Terror is over? These issues are salient to the analysis. To protect the privacy of my interviewees, their details and narratives are presented anonymously. A list of narrators cited is presented in table 2-2. The codes identifying them were produced randomly. To provide an in-depth profiling of my participants, readers may find a sketch of each of them below table 2-2.

Table 2-2 List of Individual Interviewees (including one non-political victim)

Year of Conviction	Year of Birth	Gender	Identifying code	Sentence (years)
1950	1929	M	DT	10
	1930	M	VT	10
	1927	M	VC	15
1953	1925	M	JC	life sentence (commuted after Chiang Kai-Shek passed away in 1975)
1957	1927	M	WL	10
	1927	M	JH	10
1958	1930	M	HC	7
1962	1926	M	SY	15
	1927	M	BY	7
	1931	M	SC	5
	1933	M	KY	10
	1936	M	JR	5
	1937	M	CH	7
	1938	M	RJ	5
1963	1939	M	WR	life sentence (commuted after Chiang Kai-Shek

				passed away in 1975)
	1940	M	JL	15
	1940	M	MO	15
	1941	M	FC	12
1965	1943	M	CP	6
1966	1947	M	AN	7
1968	1939	M	PH	10
1969	1937	M	TZ	8
1988				7 (commuted after Lee Teng-Hui promulgated amnesty in 1990)
1973	1954	M	KN	life sentence (commuted to 15 fifteen years after Chiang Kai-Shek passed away in 1975)
1974	1942	M	TJ	life sentence (commuted to fifteen years after Chiang Kai-Shek passed away in 1975)
	1955	M	Tsao (The expert)	

DT was born in Anhui, China, in 1929. Prior to his being accused of treason in 1950, he served as a Navy sergeant for the ROC in China. Unlike the general perception of a soldier, *DT* is small and always wearing black boxy-framed glasses. To me, he looks more like a writer than a sergeant. During *DT*'s naval service, he specialised in telecommunications which enabled him to enhance his foreign language abilities, especially in English. Within months of the army's retreat, to Taiwan in 1949, after which *DT* had been stationed at the Zou-Ying military base, he was arrested, under accusations of being involved in insurgent activities against the government, along with some of his army comrades. Upon his release in 1960 after 10 years in prison, *DT* came to Taipei, as a mainlander, without knowing anyone. He even became a vagrant during the first months of his stay in Taipei. Later, *DT* finally had a chance to establish a career as a translator, running his own

translation office in Taipei. He got married and had two beautiful children, whom he supported in their pursuit of a future in the US. And it was not until, having reached his adolescence, one of DT's children, discovered his father's past, that DT spoke of his past with his family at all. I have known DT since 2008. We have kept in contact for years, even though I have been living overseas. Until this day, DT insists on his innocence, claiming that he had nothing to do with the insurgence of which he was accused by the KMT party-state.

VT was born in Taichung, Taiwan, in 1930. Before the Japanese rule of Taiwan ended in 1945, VT had completed his junior high school education, and was about to embark on pursuing his senior high school. VT's father was a successful businessman. As the youngest child of the family, VT enjoyed a fortunate and advantageous childhood and adolescence while most of the Taiwanese were rather poor and unable to pursue higher education. Partly because of his well-protected childhood, VT has always kept his sense of humour and romantic view of life, even after his own subsequent and severe life experience. VT was accused of treason for supporting Chinese communism and propagating the political cause with his friends from his senior high school. He spent 10 years in jail on Green Island from 1950 to 1960. The very first time I met VT was in 2008. It was a public occasion upon which VT, as a convener, portrayed his past persecution to researchers and college students. VT stood there like a slender statue; he almost burst into tears while speaking of his father's death during his captivity. He continued to insist upon his innocence during his speech. However, when I approached VT in 2012 with my own question of, *"what, in fact, have you been ashamed of? A past of insurgence, or a past of persecution?"*⁴⁹ VT started to narrate his past from quite a different perspective. Again, he cried tears as he related this version; only this time, it was not only about his past persecution, but also an unspeakable episode of insurgence.

VC was born in Gigi, Nantou, in 1927, and moved to Xindian, Taipei, at the age of 7. As a man who has lived under colonial Japanese rule, VC has

⁴⁹ Transcript of VT 2012, 11.

sought for the meaning of what it is to be a Taiwanese and a liberal man. During wartime in 1944, VC was recruited to serve as a soldier on a defence base in southern Taiwan. In 1949, VC started to work at the Taipei Post Office, the largest branch of the postal service in Taiwan. In the year of 1950, VC was arrested for treason, accused of advocating communism, and sentenced to fifteen years. Amongst my participants, DT, VT, and VC were the very first group of political prisoners imprisoned on Green Island, the place where the KMT regime established its biggest ever political prison in the 1950s in Taiwan. VC said that life on Green Island was almost like life at a concentration camp. Prisoners had to build the cells and so imprison themselves. Prisoners had to cultivate crops for their own livelihood. After his release, VC settled down in Taipei and had a hard time, struggling under severe surveillance by the government for years. The first time I had a formal talk with VC was at his place, accompanied by JC, in 2012. During our conversation, VC shared many historical materials with me, especially declassified photos of executions of the victims of the 1950s. VC told me, *"it was to remember those [who were] sacrificed."*⁵⁰ However, when I attempted to inquire into VC's insurgent past, he held back. According to VC's verdict, his executed co-defendant was truly a communist, a member of the CCP in China. VC neither denied his involvement in the 'communist conspiracy', nor claimed his 'innocence' of attempting to overthrow the authorities in 1950, as he was accused of doing. Over the three times at which I interviewed him, VC only touched on the 'insurgence episodes' a few times. Despite the fact that he is currently a pro-independence advocate in his nineties, the reasons he held back from describing his communist past deserve in-depth contemplation in the following analysis.

JC is one of my informants who, while he is still positively engaged the in state-run transitional justice scheme in Taiwan, continues to maintain his silence on his revolutionary past. JC was born in Tainan, Taiwan, in 1925. His long-legged and serious appearance leads people to regard him as more like a sergeant than a small business owner, even in his early nineties. JC was accused of treason in 1953 for his (alleged) adherence to Chinese communism.

⁵⁰ Transcript of VC 2012,11.

Before his arrest, JC had visited China once in 1947, to learn about Communism. In the present day, however, JC regards himself as a pro-independence activist. The discrepancy of his political stance before and after his persecution puzzles me, especially as JC continues to deny his communist past in public. After our interactions had been ongoing for nearly 3 years since 2010, JC once showed me a photograph of himself with a former communist guerrilla in Vietnam, which was taken in the late 1990s. I was told by him that he visited the former communist guerrilla to learn some knowledge and skill of 'insurgence'. As of now, JC reiterates his ideal of building a nation with fairness and dignity, and even has become a columnist, writing of his past persecution in the Japanese magazine, *MOGU*, since 2012. For the Taiwanese authorities, JC has been a most cooperative survivor, helping strengthen the official transitional justice discourse. I will elaborate on how JC engages in the official transitional justice discourse in chapter 5. In addition, it is thus profoundly valuable to explore that of his perspective on the past which is left outside the official discourse and his public narratives.

WL may be the one among those I interviewed who had experienced the most complicated past. WL was born and raised in Hsinchu, Taiwan. Six months after the outbreak of the 228 Incident in 1947, WL applied for the Republic of China Military Academy (in Chinese: 黃埔軍校; hereafter, ROCMA), and enrolled in the autumn of the same year. He thus became a member of the only class of ROCMA which was ever recruited from Taiwan. WL got on board, and received intelligence training in Sichuan, China. It was during the time at which China was suffering the second civil war between the CCP and the KMT; however, the academy did not send WL and his comrades to the battlefield. On the contrary, WL stayed in the academy for a training programme which was convened by both the ROC army and US intelligence. After Chiang Kai-Shek retreated to Taipei in December 1949, WL too went back to Taiwan and was soon appointed as an intelligence officer of the ROC Security Department in 1950. That is, WL was himself a member of the party-state, the so-called authoritarian regime. Yet, he was later accused of treason for Taiwan independence, attempting to overthrow the KMT

government with his comrades in the army in 1957, and was imprisoned for 10 years in Taipei and Tai-yuan Jail in Taitung. After his release, WL lost his military status and became a small business man in Taipei. WL is now in his nineties. He always wears glen plaid tweed on public occasions, and only feels free to mention the details of his insurgent past when I visit him at his home. During my field research in Taiwan, the state-sponsored documentary producers filmed WL, asking him to depict the details of his intelligence work, and especially the management of the prison in which he was confined, i.e., the details of his persecution. Once, when I talked to WL about the experience, he apparently felt uneasy to mention his 'officer past'. Arguably, WL is still struggling over the complexities of his past life, even now that he is elderly.

JH was WL's comrade at ROCMA, but chose a completely different path during the Chinese civil war. When WL returned to Taiwan with ROCMA in December 1949, JH chose to drop out of the programme and planned to join the CCP army in the summer of 1949. Yet, after witnessing the CCP's brutalities on the battle front, JH changed his mind and returned to Taiwan at the end of the year. Despite the fact that JH chose to drop out, he and WL maintained a friendship. It is owing to this fact that JH was WL's co-defendant, and was sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment in 1957. After JH's release, he back to his hometown, Kaohsiung. Not finding a proper job opportunity himself, JH's wife became the breadwinner. This economic reality frustrated JH, but he never grew tired of fighting for independence. For the past years since his return to society, JH has co-organised local pro-independence groups and events, as well as victim associations and events seeking to vindicate political victims along with other fellow survivors, including WL. As of now, JH is suffering cancer, and managing his cancer treatment at home. As such, JH is now too weak to pursue his political ideals, but people still can perceive his passion from his narration.

HC was accused of being pro-independence during his military service in Kaohsiung in 1958, and sentenced to 7 years. Before his military service in the ROC army, HC was born and raised in a small village of Changhua. As

the eldest child of the family, HC was expected to be responsible for his own life and that of his family. Hence, HC told me that the reason he chose to join the army was for making a living. During HC's service, he secretly absorbed knowledge relating to Taiwanese independence from books provided by his comrades, and even conspired to hijack a warship in order to wage rebellion within the army. It was JC who introduced me to HC in 2012. We held every interview at his place, where just the two of us would talk in the common room. HC had failed to meet his financial responsibilities after returning to society during the 1970s. It was only in the late 1980s that HC was finally able to provide for his family's livelihood as a licensed pharmacist. As of now, HC enjoys his old age as he lives with his beloved wife and his daughter's family, including one beautiful grandchild.

SY was born in 1926 and was accused of army rebellion in the name of pro-independence during his military service in 1962. The case in which SY was involved, and which has become known as one of the most representative, involved 50 defendants in total, ranging from teachers, a local politician, civil servants, and servicemen, to self-employed persons, and small shopkeepers. Five of my other research participants, *BY*, *SC*, *JR*, *CH*, and *RJ*, were SY's co-defendants in this case. Although he walked with a crutch, SC stood tall and straight and always talked in a masculine tone. Yet, whenever we touched on his past insurgence, he lowered his voice as if something about it remained secret in this democratic era. Before SY passed away in 2013, we had several in-depth conversations, which will be depicted in the following chapters.

BY is still a local politician, at the time of writing, working for the local branch of the DPP party in Yunlin. Unlike the general perception of local politicians in Taiwan, however, BY always keeps a low profile. During a conversation in his office in a village of Yunlin county in 2013, BY told me that this was partly because his past persecution had left a scar in his life. BY had been a private in the ROC army air force when he was accused of treason. During our conversations, BY hesitated over spelling out his role in the conspiracy. Regarding his survivorhood, BY said that he had stayed rather low-profile during his captivity under the KMT regime. BY shared

evidence of his continuing passion after his release, such as photo records of his involvement of peasant movement and DPP election campaigns in the 1980s.

SC was born in Douliu City, a major town in Yunlin, in 1931. As a Taiwanese person educated under Japanese rule, SC cherishes that part of his cultural heritage, and always writes me letters in Japanese. Prior to SC's arrest in 1962, he was formerly a serviceman and then a high school teacher in Taichung. SC had a hard time after his release from prison in the late 1960s. He could not find a proper job which resulted in his wife's being the family breadwinner for years. Partly due of his past, SC lives in rather an insecure state, as I realised when he asked me to articulate my own thoughts about the 228 Incident and the White Terror when we had our first meeting at the 228 Memorial Park in Taipei. SC was also concerned with my audio recordings, and he often asked me not to put certain potentially sensitive parts of our interviews into my thesis. As a researcher, I respected his requests and invited him to review the transcripts of our interviews. Subsequently, we have developed a rather stable and trusting relationship, as he introduced me to my informants, CH and RJ, in 2012. I also joined their gatherings in Taipei or Yunlin during my field research in Taiwan. As of now, SC has retired from his business, and enjoys his life with his son and grandchildren.

KY was born in 1933 and pursued his higher education at Hitosubashi University (in Japanese, 一橋大学), Japan. During his stay in Tokyo, KY was approached by the Taiwanese overseas pro-independence campaign, Liao Wen-Yi's organisation; although KY claimed that while he had intended to join the campaign, he had failed to do so. After KY went back to Taiwan, he was accused of pro-independence affiliations. In 2012, KY was the president of a one of the main survivor-victims' associations, named Taiwanese Victims of the Martial Law Care Association (in Chinese, 台灣戒嚴時期政治受難者關懷協會; hereafter, TVCA). KY may thus be regarded as one of the main public representatives of the so-called 'survivor-victims' of the White Terror. As KY's fellow survivor, JC disdains KY for two reasons. First, when

KY had a hard time securing a livelihood, he had asked few of his former inmates, including JC, to help him found a trading company. KY's business failed, however, and had no money to repay the shareholders. Second, as the president of a survivors' association, KY became JC's competitor over what I will call 'the power of utterance' in Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, as I will further articulate in chapter 5. From what I have witnessed, KY is similarly aggressive toward JC, each jockeying for position and asserting their own importance in the official transitional justice scheme. This preliminary observation sheds light on the fact that the relationships amongst survivors of the White Terror is never merely about their own political stances; it is also about their engagement in the scheme of reconciliation.

JR, as previously mentioned, was a co-defendant with SY et al, in a pro-independence case in 1962. One of the youngest among his co-defendants, JR was born in 1938. Prior to his conviction, JR had served as Seaman First Class for two years in the ROC Navy in Yunlin. After JR was released from his five-year imprisonment, he went back to his hometown, Tainan, and later moved to Kaohsiung, southern Taiwan. As of now, JR works as the manager of a parking lot in Kaohsiung. We held our interviews at his place of work, during his working hours. He always puts some chairs out on the pavement outside the parking lot, welcoming nearby residents to come and talk or have tea with him. While JR never attempts to conceal his past from others, when he considers his persecution that had haunted his mother, he still feels regret over his past.

CH, another of JR's co-defendants, was sentenced to seven years of imprisonment at the age of 25 in 1962. Our interviews took place in 2013. Unlike other survivor-victims, CH was a good talker during interviews, especially when it came to politics in Taiwan. CH has been a determined supporter of independence since the late 1950s. Unlike other survivors, who tended to be more cautious about interviewers and researchers, once he had confirmed to his own satisfaction that the interviewer supported the same political cause that he did, CH spelled out his past persecution and persistent

political ideals. Suffice it to say that I passed the qualification, owing to the fact that I was introduced to him by SC, one of his former fellow inmates. However, interviewing with CH was also challenging, as he never stopped censuring my political stance. As he told me, *“my life is an enduring war for Taiwan’s independence. I only talk to people with whom I share common political ideals. It is all about my political ideals”*.⁵¹ Arguably, CH tends to regard himself as a political activist, as per the words cited here. With CH, as with the others interviewed in the course of this research, the issue of how they deal with, or balances the identities of ‘victim’ and ‘insurgent’ remains salient, and is addressed in chapters 4 and 5.

RJ is the youngest of the co-defendants in the pro-independence case of 1962. As a man who, at the age of 9, witnessed the scene of Taiwanese elites being executed in front of Chiayi’s railway station during the 228 Incident in 1947, the seeds of anti-KMT regime sentiment were sown in RJ’s mind from his childhood. RJ’s connection with insurgents began in 1960 when, at the age of 22, he was introduced to the secret project of insurgency by Chan Yi-Jen, then the owner of a photo studio in Yunlin, later one of his RJ’s co-defendants. RJ was very aggressive in conspiring to revolt. Nonetheless, when asked whether he had been concerned for his life’s safety whilst conspiring against the dictatorship, RJ stated, *“I have never escaped from the fear of being arrested again after I was imprisoned by the KMT regime in 1961”*.⁵² According to the verdict, RJ was sentenced to five years of imprisonment in Xindian Military Prison (in Chinese: 新店軍人監獄), which is now known as Jingmei Human Rights Park (in Chinese: 景美人權園區).⁵³ Owing to RJ’s cooperative attitude and behaviour, he was given the chance to labour outside of his cell as a laundry worker. After his release, RJ fought for years to make a livelihood, in the face of strict surveillance by the KMT regime during the White Terror. Finally, RJ settled down with his beloved family in his hometown, Yunlin, in the late 1980s. To this day, he is still very keen to

⁵¹ Transcript of CH 2013, 4.

⁵² Transcript of RJ 2013, 4.

⁵³ For a more detailed discussion of Jingmei Human Rights Park see Chapter 3.

participate in pro-independence events. As he told me, *"I will never be tired of fighting for my ideals"*⁵⁴.

WR was born in 1939, in Yilan, Taiwan. **WR** was accused of treason during his mandatory service as a seaman in 1963. According to **WR**, he insists that he had no concrete project to revolt against the KMT regime, despite the fact that he had been a supporter of independence, and had held intentions toward insurgency since his adolescence. **WR**, too, said that he regards the 228 Incident as the dark lesson which had enlightened his view of politics in Taiwan. According to **WR**'s own account, he and his fellows often criticised social inequality and soldiers' remuneration in Taiwan during his mandatory service. **WR** said he believed that this was the main reason that he and his fellow seamen, **JL**, **MO**, and **FC**, had been accused under the KMT party-state. During the trial proceedings, **WR** appealed twice for his trial of first instance as fifteen-year imprisonment that led to death penalty as his retrial adjudication. Finally, **WR** had his conviction affirmed as life sentence. After **WR** was released in 1975, he went back to Yilan, yet could not find a decent job to pay him enough to live on. Despite these frustrations, his strong will to pursue his political ideals of independence and revolt against the KMT did not falter. *"I have to admit that it was the KMT prosecution that inflamed my passion for pro-independence and insurgence"*,⁵⁵ he said. **WR** attributes his insurgent tendencies to the atrocities committed by the KMT regime. Hence, it is no surprise to learn that **WR** joined the DPP once the martial law was lifted in 1987, and has been re-elected as the township officer in Yilan since the 1990s. Our interviews were held in his office.

JL was also convicted of attempting to overthrow the government during his compulsory military service in 1963. As a man who was born in 1940 in one of the poorest areas of Yunlin county, **JL** recalled from his childhood the first dark episodes of his memories of the KMT regime, such as the outbreak of the 228 Incident and the severe economic crisis that resulted from the Chinese civil war of 1949. Raised in an orphanage, it was a struggle for **JL** to

⁵⁴ Transcript of RJ 2013,4.

⁵⁵ Transcript of WR 2013,12.

pursue an education. At the age of 15, JL moved to Taipei, working as an apprentice in an iron factory for two years. After saving enough money for his tuition fees, JL accomplished his dream as he was enrolled as a student of the best senior high school in Taiwan, Taipei Municipal Jianguo High School. During his three years at high school, JL started to read the news that was published in English by the United States Information Service (hereafter, USIS), the institution of the US news and cultural division that was based in Taipei during the Cold War. JL stated, *“Owing to the magazines and periodicals published by the USIS, I started to yearn for democracy”*.⁵⁶ The seed of insurgence had thus been sown. Restricted by his own economic plight, JL chose to serve in the army instead of pursuing higher education. It was just as he had almost completed his military service that JL was arrested, convicted of treason and imprisoned for 15 years. During JL’s imprisonment at Taiyuan and Green island, he had a chance to learn Japanese from JC. Hence, JL continued to pursue his dream of education, receiving a college diploma in Tokyo, Japan upon his release. As of now, JL has been settled in Taipei for nearly three decades. For him, it was both the political environment and his personal experiences that co-triggered his attempt at revolt, and more importantly, his pro-independence stance.

MO was also convicted alongside WR and JL during his military service. MO was born in Tanzi, Taichung in 1940. Unlike WR and JL, who often expressed their passion for their shared political cause, MO has a quiet personality and did not talk much about his past. At the very beginning of our first interview, MO did not feel like talking too much about his alleged crime. When speaking of his beloved mother, however, MO could not hold back his sorrow, and burst into tears. MO only started to talk about his political stance of pro-independence and his hatred of the KMT regime after we had begun our third interview. From our conversations, it was clear that MO had continued to hold the same firm political convictions as WR and JL. Unlike those of his former co-defendants, however, he had chosen not to play a leading role in politics out of obligation to his family, including his mother and wife. The strict surveillance they experienced had exhausted almost of

⁵⁶ Transcript of JL 2013, 12.

all of my participants, MO not excepted. As of now, MO lives with his child and his child's family in Tanzi. We held every one of our formal interviews at his place in Tanzi during my field research. As MO said, *"It's my hometown, I am glad I am still here after this difficult life"*.⁵⁷

FC is the quietest man amongst his former co-defendants. He was born in Kaohsiung in 1941, and had moved to Taipei for a job before he served in the army. For FC, the experience of the persecution had hollowed out part of his heart, as the outbreak of the Taiyuan Incident (in Chinese, 泰源事件) led to a man who was one of his best friends during his imprisonment being executed by the KMT regime. The Taiyuan Incident occurred on 8 February 1970. It was a prison mutiny organised by a group of pro-independence prisoners, five of whom ended up being executed as a result.⁵⁸ The incident was later identified as a landmark event of the independence movement in Taiwan. *"He (the executed one) was the most generous and honest man I have ever known in my life. His death always reminds me of the cruelty of Chiang Kai-Shek and his fellows"*,⁵⁹ said FC. The experience has also persuaded FC to keep a low profile, even after his release. Even now, when FC sometimes accepts invitations to speak in public, he always refuses to focus on his own experience. For him, the very reason he agrees to come to the fore is to speak for those who perished under the KMT regime. As he emphasised, *"I am not that special, but I can tell people how special those executed were. That is why I survive"*.⁶⁰

CP was born in China in 1942 and escaped to Taiwan in 1965, during the Cold War era, when the borders between Taiwan and China were closed.

⁵⁷ Transcript of MO 2013,11.

⁵⁸ Taiyuan Prison was founded in Tai-Tung, on the east coast of Taiwan, in the late 1960s, and was initially designed to house political prisoners. At the time, there was an influx of prisoners who were pro-independence and tension arose between these Taiwan separatists and pro-China left-wingers. The Taiyuan Incident was a mutiny that involved solely pro-Taiwan prisoners. It ultimately failed, and the Chiang Kai-Shek administration executed five prisoners who had escaped. For further details, see the oral history: 中央研究院近代史研究所《口述歷史》編輯委員會 (2002)《泰源事件專輯》。台北：中研院近代史研究所。Although portions of the cited narratives are open to challenge due to their tone of deference to the authorities, this remains a valuable reference.

⁵⁹ Transcript of FC 2013,12.

⁶⁰ Transcript of FC 2013,12.

Having grown up in Communist China and joined the Communist Youth League, he was soon charged with treason and sentenced to five years in prison. After his release, CP settled down in Taipei and, after 1990, occasionally returned to China to visit family. The very first time I met CP was in 2010, in Jingmei Human Rights Park. As a man who had escaped from the dictatorship of the PRC to pursue the cause of 'Free China' in Taiwan, CP is still finding his way of delineating his emotions toward the KMT regime. During our conversations, CP emphasised the importance of his having been granted vindication by the Taiwanese authorities. That is, he is now officially a survivor-victim in the eyes of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme. However, the wounds of the past continue to haunt him in many ways, as articulated in the following chapters.

AN was born in Nantou, in 1947, the same year in which the 228 Incident happened. Aged 20, he was convicted of treason for advocating independence. I was introduced to AN by JC in the autumn of 2013. AN currently lives in Yuanlin Town, Changhua County. We sometimes held our interviews at AN's place in Yuanlin, and held two other interviews in Jingmei Human Rights Museum when he came to Taipei to meet up with other fellow survivors, such as JC and HC. Compared to other of my research participants, AN is very humble and more open to talking about his past with researchers. He said, *"I did not suffer too much; in effect, it was the KMT regime that made me get to know these real insurgents"*.⁶¹ He said he was still learning about Taiwanese independence from them. After seven years of imprisonment, AN returned to society in 1973 and worked as a coach driver until his retirement in the late 1990s. He too had also experienced serious surveillance after his release.

As of now, AN is very cooperative with the state-sponsored transitional justice scheme. Nonetheless, however, he still has some opinions on his role as victim of the White Terror which differ from the official discourse, as discussed in chapter 5.

⁶¹ Transcript of AN 2013,12.

PH was born into a farming family in Chiayi County in 1939. After completing his high school education in 1960, *PH* initially joined the police academy, but within one year had left for a teacher training programme at the National Taipei Normal Academy (in Chinese, 台北師專, 現國立台北教育大學; hereafter, NTNA). *PH* then became a teacher at a primary school in Taipei for a few years. During that period, *PH* started to learn about anti-KMT party-state politics along with his friends from NTNA. By his 20s, *PH* was convinced that the pursuit of well-planned social reforms, such as social equality and economic reform, was a necessary mission for the young generation in the Taiwan of the 1960s. However, *PH*'s political thought was too radical for the authorities. With his own left-wing stance, *PH* was alleged of attempting to revolt against the government. Following his conviction, *PH* was sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment in 1968. During his imprisonment, *PH* kept a low profile and, hitherto, has continued to keep silent on his political past. The very first time I got in touch with *PH* was in 2013, and he refused my invitation for an interview. Thanks to *PH*'s wife, I finally got the chance to approach *PH* and to learn about his past from his own perspective. As of now, *PH* is still concerned with politics in Taiwan. As he stated, "*I cannot trust any government, I shall keep my eye on it without saying a word*".⁶² To this seventy-eight-year-old man who has survived serious political conflict and persecution, democracy is no guarantee of the end of political oppression.

TZ was born in 1937 in Keelung, the biggest port of northern Taiwan. *TZ* had held strong political ideals of revolt against the KMT since his childhood, as he had witnessed the massacre that happened in Keelung during the 228 Incident. Keelung was one of the cities deluged by KMT atrocities during the Incident in 1947. With strong political intentions, *TZ* enrolled as a college student and majored in political science at National Taiwan University in the mid 1950s. It was a time when communists were targeted as the primary political enemies of the KMT regime in Taiwan. Still, *TZ* gained knowledge of left-wing and other political thought. Of these different political stances,

⁶² Transcript of *PH* 2013,12.

TZ found pro-independence most compelling and chose to make it his own political cause, regarding it as the most urgent matter for Taiwan to be freed from the KMT party-state. TZ began his political career as an activist and secretly got in touch with an overseas pro-independence organisation which was based in Tokyo, Japan. The secret was discovered by the government in 1969, when TZ was convicted of treason and sentenced to an eight-year prison term. After TZ was released in 1975, he continued to advocate for his political stance and maintained his intention to organise with other pro-independence survivor-victims. Eventually, in 1988, TZ established a survivor-victim association named Taiwanese Victims of the Martial Law Care Association (in Chinese: 台灣戒嚴時期政治受難者關懷協會 also known as 台灣戒嚴時期政治受難者聯誼總會; hereafter: TCVA) that claimed Taiwanese independence as the association's central value. Two points concerning this political action: first, it was the very first political survivor association to regard its members as "survivor-victims". Second, its introduction of the persecution perspective did not restrict the space for giving voice to the insurgent past. However, TZ's support for Taiwanese independence was not accepted under martial law. His "unbearable action" led to TZ's second term of imprisonment, from 1988 to 1990. I have known TZ since 2011, when we travelled to Green Island together to help him recollect his life of imprisonment. From this researcher's perspective, TZ has been working very hard to try to balance his past life with his present. Just like my other research participants, there are certainly times when he cannot hold himself back from crying out for those who perished or were tortured. Yet, like my other participants, TZ rarely expresses this kind of reflection on his own experience. He is still passionate about politics, as he is currently writing a book of his own political thought. As in his own words, "*I was a survivor [and a] political activist before I was persecuted*".⁶³

KN is the youngest participant in my research. He was born in Chiayi in 1954. It was only after KN moved to Taipei for work at the age of 16, that he began to learn the true colours of the KMT regime from people who he met in

⁶³ Transcript of TZ 2013,12.

Taipei. At the age of 17, KN joined a left-wing pro-independence group named the Taiwan Independence Party which was established by Cheng Ping in 1970. Since then, KN has viewed himself as a lifetime pro-independence activist. During our interviews at his place in Taichung City, KN always started our conversations from the perspective of insurgence. *"There is nothing wrong with Taiwanese independence; I was imprisoned for the cause, but Ching Kai-Shek had not failed me",*⁶⁴ said KN. Certainly KN was persecuted and imprisoned by Chiang Kai-Shek's government, yet he claimed that his mentality has remained strong. At the age of 19, KN was convicted of treason and began his lifetime sentence in 1973. Two years later, following Ching Kai-Shek's death, his sentence was commuted to fifteen years, and he was released from the prison on Green Island in 1987, also the year in which Chiang Ching-Kuo lifted martial law in Taiwan. As KN asserted, he continued to advocate for Taiwan's independence after returning to society. From late 1987 until the mid 1990s, KN engaged himself in every social and political event of the movement, and its preparation. He never put himself on the stage, however, but chose to stand behind the scenes. Instead, he supported "political stars" such as the later president, Chen Shui-Bian. KN emphasised it was best to let those activists with were most skilled at public speaking do so. At this point, KN spent much time in recollecting those "stars" he had once worked with to me. However, when I attempted to delve into the details of his own revolutionary past, he remained silent. It was only when we started to talk about the sense of frustration at being persecuted and the pride of being a political activist that KN started to drop his guard.

TJ was born in Pingtung County in 1937. Before he was arrested, he was a professional saxophone player. At the beginning of the 1970s, TJ had the chance to join an orchestra that made a concert tour to the US, from east to west. During the US concert tour, TJ was approached by an overseas pro-independence organisation, and was enthused by their compelling ideal of building a nation with dignity, equality and democracy. TJ promised to join the organisation and conducted membership recruitment after returning to

⁶⁴ Transcript of KN 2013,5.

Taiwan. However, TJ failed to recruit enough members and his project was discovered by the authorities. As a result, he was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1974. The very first time I met TJ was at the Green Island Human Rights Park in 2010. After narrating the episodes of his persecution, he asked me, “Do you believe me?”⁶⁵ At that moment, TJ hesitated over narrating his past persecution in public. After years had passed, however, when I revisited TJ in 2013, he was more confident, yet was still uncertain whether to publicise his insurgent past or not. Thus while, during our interviews at his place in Kaohsiung, TJ narrated those insurgent episodes in a very detailed way, he nonetheless requested me not to publish those parts before he had passed away, stating, “I don’t want to hurt people who escaped from the atrocities in past years”,⁶⁶ I thus promised not to expose those ‘unlisted’ names. The past persecution continues to haunt TJ, though on the face of it he appears optimistic, determined, and remains very active in local politics in Kaohsiung.

The significance of emotion

Memory is private, especially those memories that are never spoken of. Memory is also common to a group of carriers, for its hidden socio-political content shapes our understanding of our past, present, and future.

According to the basic depict of my 24 participants, as stated, most of them tend to hold back whilst touching on the issue of the accusation. Some of them denied at the first moment, others started to recollect memories in terms of narrating their fellow victims’ life experiences. At first place, researcher may readily attribute survivors’ hesitation in recollecting the past accusation to the past persecution. After all, the White Terror in Taiwan was indeed a prolonged time of state-level atrocities. However, as I have indicated, my participants such as VT, VC, JC, and so forth have shown their ‘convictions’ were not fabricated out of nothing. That is, these men had once stood up as enemies of the KMT regime in Taiwan. That is, given the regulations promulgated by the *Compensation Act* of 1998, my participants may not be able to be recognised as ‘victims’ and receive financial

⁶⁵ Field research note 2010,9

⁶⁶ Transcript of TJ 2013,12.

compensation. However, each of them have been recognised as victim of the White Terror by the *Compensation Act*. A discrepancy thus emerges between their narratives with me and their role in the official transitional justice scheme. This forms the very central part for this research to explore. Hence, my participants' silence and hesitation over explicating their past becomes imperative in this analysis. In this regard, their emotions may form an approach for researchers to study their silence and their memory in the present-day.

Suffice it to say, the emotional content of the survivors' memories enables researchers to discover how they recount their past, because emotions represent a juncture between society and the most personal realms of an individual's experiences (Freund 1990: 453). That is, emotions serve to unravel the veiled competing discourses of the past among survivors in Taiwan. An exhaustive examination of emotions would be beyond the scope of this study,⁶⁷ which focuses on the relationship between emotion and memory as a methodological issue.

In the field of sociology, it is generally accepted that emotions are socially constructed (Gordon 1990; Scheff 1983; Thoits 1989). What concerns sociologists is how a cultural framework forms a specific bundle of beliefs, rules, norms, and values in a society, and how the members of that society interpret their subjective experiences so as to identify and describe them. In sociological terms, this seemingly purely cognitive process is underpinned in every society by a particular socio-cultural framework, and this structural background serves not only to reinforce how individuals practice their subjective emotional lives but also guides their accounts of others in their social life. At this point, Erving Goffman's (1968) dramaturgical perspective, which views our everyday emotional life as an ongoing performance of repertoires that rely to a great extent on a framework of cultural scripts, echoes the definition articulated here. Gordon (1990) shares a similar viewpoint as he observes that the ways in which we identify and express our subjective experiences are bounded by the given cultural framework. That is

⁶⁷ Since the 1970s, the subject of emotion has been increasingly discussed in the fields of neurology, psychology, and, later, sociology. For a detailed review of the sociological understanding of emotion, see Turner, J. H., & Stets, J. E. (2005). *The Sociology of Emotions*. Cambridge University Press; Thoits, P. A. (1989). 'The Sociology of Emotions'. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15(1), 317–342.

to say, what captures sociologists' focus is not the individual's personality so much as the unique structure surrounding, guiding, and constraining the individual, which means that the substance of emotions will inevitably vary across differing societies.

Hence, emotions are significant to this research because they are not merely psychological reactions to specific events or situations but more often appear as a medium through which the power relations are unearthed. At an individual level, emotions are triggered as feedback that pervade one's social life, whereby one can adjust, modify, and develop a logic for social interactions. At a collective level, emotions contribute towards the consolidation of the existing structure and context that shape how the emotions are perceived, recognised, and expressed.

Similarly, emotion sheds light on the way in which memory is created and continues to evolve in a given society. Emotion reflects how the past is being constructed in the present. In this regard, this study is not confined to the individual level, for it concerns the historico-political situation that causes the survivors of the White Terror to remain in the continuous grip of certain emotions even as political change comes about in Taiwan. In other words, the core of this study's analysis is the way in which emotion factors into the field of transitional justice.

Emotions are also apropos to the study of transitional justice, according to Elster (2004: 216–244) who proposes that emotions shape such legal proceedings through a specific socio-political mechanism. Here, the term 'mechanism' implies a cultural framework that includes beliefs and the social relations previously existing between the perpetrators or victims of abuse (*ibid.*). Emotion is itself a prominent element in the politics of memory. The polarisation of the Cold War enabled the KMT regime to consolidate a collective antipathy in Taiwan towards the Chinese communists. As we unravel how the legacy of the Cold War has affected the operation of transitional justice in Taiwan, the issue of how the past political conflict shaped the White Terror survivors' emotions is central to the analysis. In other words, the antipathy across society would not have disappeared all of a sudden, and the survivors' emotions shape their conception of the 'justice' they desire in their current political life. Emotion in this case not only

supplies a connection to the past in contemporary Taiwanese society in a temporal sense,⁶⁸ but justifies the prominence of the past in the socio-political analysis of transitional justice

A methodological issue arises here: Emotions can be overtly expressed, but may be concealed at some point. During my field research in Taiwan, I frequently encountered survivors who preferred to remain silent about their past. While their discourse may have competed with the official one, their reticence made this hard to capture during interviews. However, as discussed in chapter 5, silence is not necessarily an impediment to our understanding of the non-official discourse. On the contrary, silence offers its own clues to unravelling that discourse.

What we can confirm in this phase is that many researchers have been informed by survivors that they were innocent political prisoners, having entertained no explicit intention to subvert the KMT regime. It assumes that these survivors are experiencing trauma and shame as a response to their past suffering.⁶⁹ However, this research aims to explore the complexity of their trauma and shame, which have been oversimplified in current scholarship. For instance, Lin (2007) views the emotions of former political prisoners of the White Terror as responses to repression, without considering the state of conflict between these individuals and the KMT authorities.

The political conflicts existing during the Cold War era could generate a different picture of the White Terror survivors' silence, for they were the KMT regime's political enemies, and not just its victims, although society has been hesitant to embrace them as such. Furthermore, the current political situation needs to be problematised, for the ways in which survivors are guided by their emotions offer a clue for understanding their attitudes towards the current situation devised by the Taiwanese authorities.

⁶⁸Regarding the awareness of changing political conditions, Peterson (2002: 17–39) applies an emotion-based approach to the study of ethnic violence in the Balkans. He posits that structural change would produce tension among the groups, or perceived threats from other groups, giving rise to specific emotions that would generate associated desires and behaviour, just as the fear of an animal attack triggers a desire for safety and the attempt to find it (Ibid.: 22–23). Peterson calls this process 'belief-formation', whereby the generated emotion reinforces beliefs that have already adapted in accordance with the structural change. Again, we observe the dynamic of emotion as a feature of sociological analysis.

⁶⁹ For a thorough analysis, see chapter 4.

Emotions felt by the survivors interviewed in my field research do not merely reflect their individual experiences, but also reflect a kind of social practice that implicates how the survivors present themselves and describe their past to the public. That is to say, their emotions mirror the society's sense of 'change' during this transitional period, reflecting the wishes of the transitional authorities and survivors respectively, and the tension between the two. In Elster's words, emotion is not only about one's inner mental activities, emotion could shape the proceeding of justice, works of history, and cultural works. Also, emotions constitute a reaction to given socio-political conditions. In this era of reconciliation, as one voice is heard, another voice remains silent, and this ingrained tension is the object of the study of the politics of memory.

Ethical issues

In accordance with the rules promulgated by the *Cambridge Social Science Research Ethics Committee* and the *British Sociology Association*, each interview undertaken in the course of this research was conducted only after obtaining the respondent's prior agreement. In addition, I was obliged to describe my doctoral research to my interviewees before seeking their agreement. As I made an audio recording of all interviews, I was further required to obtain their agreement before recording commenced, to conduct the transcript of the recordings myself, and to allow them to review the transcripts before citing them in this research. Also, followed by my participants' requests, the transcripts cited in the thesis are listed in anonymous.

After agreeing to be interviewed, each of them narrated their life story to me in at least three separate sessions. Our conversations, in Taiwanese or Mandarin, typically lasted from two to four hours. The venues were their homes, offices, human rights parks, restaurant, café and so forth. Interviews always started during the day time, while some of which lasted until evenings.

However, there were occasions, such as survivors' dinners, or film screenings, that were not appropriate for audio recording; in those circumstances, I took handwritten notes instead. These are cited in the thesis

as 'field research notes', to differentiate them from the transcripts of audio recordings.

Although I aim to understand the tension between the respective discourses of the survivors and authorities in the field of transitional justice, the life-story narrative structure matters, for this helps researchers to comprehend how the narrators recognise and express their past experiences. Person-centred narratives have the potential to bring to light the subtext that supports their narrative style. In this case, I minimised my role as a researcher in the preliminary stages of the interviews. As Thompson states, a good interview requires a researcher who is willing to sit quietly and listen (2000: 222, originally published in 1978). While I began by forming a rapport or relationship of trust with my informants, I then took a more active role as a participant observer during the interviews and at a subsequent informal gathering of survivors. At this stage, I often raised more specific and direct questions, such as: *Did you think of yourself as a political dissident? How would you define yourself now?* Such questions may appear too simple or even superfluous, yet they can draw out potential paradoxes or tensions that are rooted in the survivors' memories. Listeners need to be aware of the extent to which their role constitutes an intervention of sorts in a conversation, and avoid 'seducing' narrators into giving answers that are tailored to the listener's expectations. As Rosenthal (1993: 62) states:

The narrator does not simply reproduce pre-fabricated stories from her or his life regardless of the interactional situation, but rather creates his or her story within the social process of mutual orientation according to his or her definition of the interview situation. [...] Life stories, taken as constructs, are inseparable from these interactional processes; they themselves evolve out of the genetic process of interaction, just as their presentation in the biographical research interviews a product of the interaction between narrator and listener.

Following Rosenthal's argument, neither narrators nor listeners adopt an absolutely passive or active role during interviews, for they are in a

constantly interactive relationship with one another—a relationship that is underpinned by a particular socio-political context. We are all in constant interaction with our context in ways that circumscribe how we narrate ourselves, but as individuals, we seek to identify ourselves and our life experiences as unique. While, at the normative level, researchers must refrain from leading their subjects to produce storylines that fit their expectations, at the methodological level, they should be aware of the wider context in which we continuously operate, which frames the way we narrate our past experiences in the present.

Certain inherent risks of field research—especially as they pertain to my respondents—were a matter of great concern throughout this research. The White Terror in Taiwan constituted both a prolonged political conflict and an era of extreme state repression. Interviews may lead narrators to recall unbearable episodes that were too private and painful for them to expose to others, even those closest to them. Such recollections may cause them to fall silent or change the subject. I learned to home in on what was said just before or after such an interruption, when the narrators were presumably drawn to relive the past once again. In Gordon's words, it can be understood as 'haunting':

Haunting was the language and the experiential modality by which I tried to reach an understanding of the meeting of force and meaning, because haunting is one way in which abusive systems of power make themselves known and their impacts felt in everyday life, especially when they are supposedly over and done with (slavery, for instance) or when their oppressive nature is denied (as in free labour or national security). Haunting is not the same as being exploited, traumatised, or oppressed, although it usually involves these experiences or is produced by them. What's distinctive about haunting is that it is an animated state in which a repressed or unresolved social violence is making itself known, sometimes very directly, sometimes more obliquely. I used the term *haunting* to describe those singular yet repetitive instances when home becomes

unfamiliar, when your bearings on the world lose direction, when the over-and-done-with comes alive, when what's been in your blind spot comes into view (2008: xvi, originally published in 1997).

With this in mind, as a researcher, one can promise to avoid deliberately inciting uncomfortable emotions that will return to haunt the narrator, while recognising silences as a form of narration transcends the traditional approach that views only verbalised narrative as reliable evidence for analysis. In contrast, as explained in chapter 4, silence is itself a language, a practice that is adopted by narrators during interviews.

Conclusion

This research focuses on the ways in which the past political situation in Taiwan continues to shape current Taiwanese society and how, conversely, the present situation shapes the retrospective view of Cold War Taiwan. Taiwan's transitional justice project provides a vital means for examining the politics of memory, on which the survivors of past political repression offer a unique perspective.

To study the politics of memory is to study memory in terms of power relations. The Foucauldian perspective views power relations as a process of production, in which individuals are not merely passive. The extent to which the survivors' transitional justice discourses confirm or contradict the official transitional justice discourse is an indication of how past and current political conditions have mobilised the production of particular discourses by survivors and by the Taiwanese authorities.

With the proposed analytic framework, the first task of studying Taiwan's transitional justice scheme is to examine how have the current power relations established its official discourse on defining the identity of political victim and the idea of persecution in Taiwan. Given the introduction of my 24 respondents, it is sufficient to deduce that the official discourse is limited yet dominant, by which my participants have not been embraced by a full recognition of their past in Taiwan. Context of the "dominance" that

lies behind expects a further elaboration. In particular, as researches (Wu 2005; Hwang 2016) have argued the flaw of Taiwan's transitional justice as it fails to make the KMT regime accountable for the past atrocities. Also, a tension between perspective of political conflict and persecution is discovered amongst researches, as some focus on facts of persecution without justifying the importance of the perspective of political conflict, when other researches emphasise the insurgent part, yet merely view the flaw of reconciliation scheme as the outcome of the prolonged political struggle between pro-unification and pro-independence. In short, without rethinking the legacy of the Cold War in the present-day Taiwan, already published critiques fail to elaborate how Taiwan's transitional justice becomes this limited and biased.

At this point, chapter 3 draws attention to the formation of the official transitional justice discourse, in terms of the listed archives, materials for documentary analysis and my field research with the survivors. As discussed, transitional justice has been fashion as an enterprise of reconciliation with respect to human rights, victimhood and democracy since the advent of the post-Cold War era. Official transitional justice discourse in this light expounds on the way in which an authority comes to terms with the past atrocities delivers its remorse, to achieve reconciliation with the formerly abused ones, insomuch the whole of society. Hence, I will start the discussion from reviewing Taiwan's historic incidents that called for vindication of the "political prisoners" happened in the late 1970 and the 1980s, to offer a thorough critique of how had the KMT regime during the White Terror been forced to re-identify its already convicted political enemies, and how a specific contrition discourse is grounded and consolidated through the KMT regime in the early 1990s and the later three elected governments from 1996 to 2016.

Chapter 3

The culture of contrition in Taiwan

When all are guilty, no one is; confessions of collective guilt are the best possible safeguard against the discovery of culprits, and the very magnitude of the crime the best excuse for doing nothing.

—Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*

You think that just because it's already happened, the past is unfinished and unchangeable? Oh, no, the past is clocked in multi-coloured taffeta and every time we look at it we see a different hue.

—Milan Kundera, *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*

Introduction

Previous chapters emphasise the need to understand the scheme of transitional justice in Taiwan as a response to the politics of the post-Cold War era. The Cold War played out in Taiwan not only as a prolonged ideological battle and an epic global confrontation but also as a polarisation of Taiwanese society, effectively marginalising dissidents who ostensibly posed a danger to the KMT regime. The White Terror in Taiwan was a state of war that turned the whole of Taiwanese society into a battleground at the grassroots level (Hajimu 2015: 283). The *Treason Reporting Act*, promulgated in 1946, resulted in many citizens being recruited as informants to report potential traitors in their communities to the KMT regime. Also, according to the *Mutual Security Act* of 1951 and the TRA of 1979,⁷⁰ the White Terror took place with significant support from the US against the backdrop of the Cold War, which lasted from the late 1940s to the early 1990s. By utilising the Cold

⁷⁰ See further articulation in chapter 1.

War paradigm of socialism versus capitalism, the KMT regime persuaded citizens that there was an urgent political need to eliminate communists within Taiwan.⁷¹ The term 'political need' denotes how the KMT regime rallied society to combat supposed political threats, including the left wing unification and pro-independence causes. The government persuaded its citizens that it was incumbent on the ROC to repel the threat of the Soviet Union in East Asia.⁷² As a result, the majority of Taiwanese people accepted the excesses of the KMT authorities as necessary in order to sustain the KMT regime and secure protection from the US. Thus, the White Terror was a time of political repression but, seen from another perspective, it was a time of appropriate vigilance.

When the end of the Cold War brought to an end the antagonism between the United States and the Soviet Union at the global level, did political conflicts between the Taiwanese government and Taiwanese dissidents similarly cease? To answer this effectively, we must scrutinise how society in the present reckons with the past. As Taiwan has been engaged in a democratic transition since the late 1980s, studying its transitional justice programme, i.e., the transitional justice discourse, should provide answers to the question.

Taiwan's transitional justice programme extends to various events and sites, including commemorations, monuments, museums, oral history, and documentaries, as well as legal arrangements. The official discourse, in this context, applies to a series of institutional arrangements. Given the three-aspect analytic framework developed in chapter 2, the construction of the past is analysed in terms of justice, truth, and ethos aspects.

The justice aspect of the programme is expressed in the legal restoration of the human rights that were previously violated. The truth aspect focuses on the accumulation of knowledge about the White Terror

⁷¹ Chapter 1 discusses how the Truman administration and the KMT joined forces in a series of institutional arrangements, including military cooperation (MAAG), financial support, and an information service (USIS) under the framework of the Mutual Security Act in 1951. Although the US and ROC terminated formal diplomatic relations in 1979, the KMT continued to enjoy the benefits of US cooperation under the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA).

⁷² As discussed in chapter 1, the Cold War in Taiwan signified not only a war against the threat of the Eastern bloc, but also a war against diverse internal threats to the authority of the KMT regime. However, the bipolar framing of the Cold War in East Asia enabled the KMT to enlist the support of the US.

through archives, documentation, oral history and other works, which shape how this episode in the nation's past has been defined and developed its meaning in the present. The ethos aspect gives an account of the representation and imagination of the White Terror through the sites of memory, including monuments, museums, and historic sites in Taiwan, as well as art, crafts and objects, such as letters, photos and films.

By reviewing the evolution of the official discourse since the early 1990s, this chapter highlights the statements, events, and institutional arrangements related to the three-aspect analytic framework, examining the context of transitional justice scheme, i.e., the official transitional justice discourse, by which survivors learn to narrate their past in a certain way. In this regard, this chapter aims to explore the extent to which have survivors' narratives been restricted or liberated in the state-sponsored transitional justice scheme.

The introduction of 'political victims': The Formosa Incident in 1979

As stated, the White Terror had been perceived as a time of severe political conflict between the KMT regime and their enemy in Taiwan during the time. Those accused and convicted ones were in this light a group of political enemy, i.e., political prisoners under the KMT party-state. However, under this serious political control, Taiwanese society slightly changed its perception of these 'political prisoner', for a group of political advocates named these men 'political victim' as they were persecuted under the dictatorship. That is, it was the advocates outside the reign of authority introduced the identity of political victim to Taiwan, and resulted in a serious political oppression which was known as the Formosa Incident.

The story has to be traced back to the 1970s. In the wake of the ROC's loss of UN membership in 1971, the KMT regime faced a series of challenges within Taiwan.⁷³ When Chiang Kai-Shek died in 1975, the KMT announced

⁷³ Hsiau (2003) investigates the social movement of the 1970s in Taiwan through the emergence of Taiwanese Nationalism, especially in the cultural aspect, during the White Terror.

the commutation of life imprisonment for those who had been convicted of treason. Nonetheless, although political control in Taiwan seemed to loosen after that, the government still loomed large in people's lives and citizens who had been imprisoned were still designated as 'political enemies'.

Despite the slightly changing situation under martial law, it was illegal to publish a periodical in the ROC without the permission of the government. Nonetheless, determined to be involved in electoral politics, intellectuals and candidates took the risk of issuing unauthorised publications.⁷⁴ Among these, *Formosa* magazine was the most famous, publishing its first issue in August 1979. With some 61 editorial committee members, it set up local editorial offices in cities and rural areas all over Taiwan. *Formosa* operated as a political party, not only publishing a journal but also organising public speaking events. Although the KMT's presence loomed over *Formosa*, monitoring its various forbidden activities,⁷⁵ the people of Taiwan were not intimidated; the circulation increased steadily—100,000 for the first issue, 90,000 for the next; then 110,000, reaching 140,000 by its fourth and final issue.

As the magazine gathered support within Taiwan, *Formosa's* publishers decided to organise a commemoration on International Human Rights Day 1979 in honour of the Taiwanese citizens who had been subjected to human rights abuses. It planned public demonstrations and speeches to take place in Kaohsiung City. In addition, *Formosa* was planning to announce the launch of a 'human rights' section of the magazine on this occasion. As *Formosa* held a public demonstration on 10 December 1979 without obtaining an official permit as prescribed by law, the event resulted in a violent clash between citizens and police in the streets. The government accused eight individuals of treason, with 31 others tried on other charges. To obtain the

⁷⁴ During the White Terror in Taiwan, the first political periodical 《自由中國》 (*Liberal China*) was released in November 1949 by a group of mainlanders who championed liberalism. This periodical ceased publication in 1960 as its chief member, Lei Chen, managed to organise a political group that offended the KMT regime. However, political dissent in Taiwan was never completely deterred during the White Terror. Before martial law was annulled in 1987, some 10 political periodicals, each of which stood for different political leanings, were published, including 《臺灣政論》, 《夏潮》, 《八十年代》, 《美麗島》 and so forth.

⁷⁵ According to published oral history, the KMT often sent its police or secret agents to observe or disrupt these events. For further details, see: 張炎憲、溫秋芬編 (2006) 見證關鍵時刻高雄事件：「台灣之音」錄音紀錄選輯。台北：吳三連史料基金會。

release of the eight defendants, 15 lawyers, including the future president of Taiwan, Chen Shui-Bian, organised the defence. The incident later became known as the 'Formosa Incident' or 'Kaohsiung Incident', capturing international attention.

At the time, activists from the US reported the incident and managed to obtain the release of those arrested by publishing on-going reports that drew international scrutiny to the situation. Among such activists, Lynn Miles (1943–2015) campaigned for the release of political prisoners in the late 1960s, having learned Mandarin in Taiwan in 1965. Due to these activities, Miles was forcibly deported by the KMT and subsequently relocated to Osaka, Japan, where he acted as a link between Taiwanese activists, overseas Chinese based in the US, and US journalists.²⁶ Prior to the Formosa Incident, there had been foreign activists in Taiwan who had obtained the release of political prisoners, starting in the late 1960s;²⁷ Lynn Miles was one of them. To attain this goal, human rights organisations such as Amnesty International worked with Taiwanese expatriates based in Japan and the US to publicise the oppression occurring in Taiwan. With this support, the Formosa Incident immediately focused attention on Taiwan from overseas; accordingly, the Formosa Incident enjoyed the highest visibility amongst political cases during the White Terror.

Amongst all the political prosecutions undertaken during the White Terror in Taiwan, the 'Formosa Incident' was the first to give rise to a public assertion of the concept of 'human rights'. Since then, Taiwanese society has tended to perceive individuals accused of treason not as political 'criminals' or enemies of the state so much as political 'victims' of human rights

²⁶ 張炎憲，沈亮編 (2010) 梅心怡人權相關書信集：跨國人權救援的開端 1968-1974。台北：吳三連台灣史料基金會

²⁷ In 1964, political activist Hsieh Tsung-Min drafted the Declaration of the Self-help Movement of the People of Taiwan (in Chinese, 台灣人民自救宣言) and was subsequently convicted of treason. While in prison, Hsieh made a list of political prisoners and sent it to an associate on the outside, Peng Ming-Min, in 1967. Peng passed it to the US government later that year, yet that list has only recently been revealed. Similar actions were taken several times between 1967 and 75. Amnesty International and expatriates in Japan published part of the list in 1972. The expatriates in question belonged to the Taiwan independence movement. Throughout the White Terror, the movement in Japan constituted the majority of international support for Taiwanese independence. For further details, see 陳嘉宏 (2006) 台灣獨立運動史。台北：玉山社。

violations.⁷⁸ In this regard, by introducing the perspective of suffering, a recognition of former political prisoners as testaments to the existence of persecution has gradually emerged and been consolidated in Taiwan. And it was the starting point of the unofficial transitional justice discourse of the White Terror in Taiwan.

Non-official remorse for the 228 Incident

Only until the 1990s, did Taiwanese authorities come to terms with the past political oppression under the KMT regime. After the Formosa Incident, Taiwanese advocates continued to propagate the idea of political victim in spite of their political agitation remained risky and could even have lethal consequences for individuals as long as martial law and the *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion* remained in force. This uncertain situation sparked political protest in various forms, including the publishing of banned periodicals.

Amongst the advocates, Cheng Nan-Jung (in Chinese, 鄭南榕) was one of the most representative activist for he was the first one who publicly defined 228 Incident as the result of the KMT atrocities.⁷⁹

On 4 February 1987, Cheng Nan-Jung and his associates founded the 228 Incident Peace Promotion (hereafter, 228 IPP), an organisation whose

⁷⁸ It was believed that the attention Taiwan's contentious politics garnered overseas concentrated mainly on human rights issues. That is, an occurrence such as the Formosa Incident was seen as evidence of 'political oppression' rather than 'political struggle'.

⁷⁹ Before discussing how the 228 Incident has been remembered by successive governments, it is useful to examine further Cheng's role in 1980s Taiwan, for his story illustrates the winding and bumpy path of democratisation. Cheng Nan-Jung (12 September 1947–7 April 1989) was a journalist, writer, and intellectual. Although he was the son of immigrants from the mainland, he did not promote unification with mainland China, but advocated Taiwanese independence throughout his life. Taking a stand for political rights and freedom of speech in Taiwan, Cheng refused to be arrested by the KMT, preferring instead to commit suicide by setting fire to himself as heavily-armed police came for him on the morning of 7 April 1989. Martial law had been lifted in 1987, but the TPECR were still in force at the time. As I have remarked, various social and political movements have flourished in post-war Taiwan. But no one has acted as Cheng did. On the day of Cheng's self-immolation, the United Evening News (In Chinese, 聯合晚報) broadcast that Cheng had not been in his right mind when he set himself on fire.⁸⁰ An officer told the United Evening News that it was frightening to confront such a madman.⁸¹ In the days following Cheng's death, news reports continued to feature a story of Cheng suffering from mental illness, as the government sought to define Cheng's self-immolation as an aberrant individual act rather than a manifestation of revolution or a blow being struck for democracy. Nonetheless, there was a group of Cheng's associates and supporters who mourned his death as a painful but inspiring milestone in the fight for democracy.

first act was to issue a manifesto directing five requests to the KMT regime: 1) Disclose the historical truth about the 228 Incident; 2) Redress the grievances of the victims; 3) Apologise to the victims, their bereaved, and the Taiwanese people; 4) Embark on research and investigation of the events, as well as erecting monuments and museums; and 5) Declare 28 February the National Day of Remembrance of the 228 Incident.⁸⁰

Following the manifesto, Cheng embarked on a speaking tour across Taiwan, leading 23 parades between 15 February and 17 March 1987. Cheng and his supporters often encountered obstruction from the KMT during their public events; nonetheless, he hosted the first public commemoration of the victims of the 228 Incident on its 40th anniversary in 1987. This was also the year when the White Terror officially ended, as Chiang Chin-Kuo revoked martial law on 15 July 1987.

While Cheng and his fellows' plea for historical disclosure appear to be the first wave in the process of reconstructing this portion of Taiwan's past, there had in fact been a limited amount of research and some materials already published concerning the 228 Incident published, including a so-called 'truth report' published by the Taiwan Provincial Government in 1966.⁸¹ In that report, a few formerly classified documents were disclosed to the public, although only a fragmented picture of the 228 Incident emerged and it remained a taboo topic in Taiwanese society until the late 1980s.

Nonetheless, Cheng still reached a milestone of inciting a wave of remembering the past political wounds, in the face of the absence of the KMT in the 1980s. Since then, Taiwanese society, including the later developed official discourse regard 228 Incident as the starting point of the KMT past atrocities in Taiwan. This forms the very basis for the later government account for the past White Terror.

Official remorse for the 228 Incident

⁸⁰ 張富忠、邱萬興 (2005) 綠色年代---台灣民主運動 25 年，1975-2000 上冊 pp. 248-250. 台北：印刻中文。

⁸¹ According to the collection from the National Taiwan Library, the first publication was: 台灣省文獻會 (1966) 台灣省二二八事件之真相。臺灣：台灣省政府

In 1989, the government published its first account ever of the 228 Incident.⁸² In 1995, it went on to issue its first official apology, on the 48th anniversary of the 228 Incident, when the president of Taiwan, Lee Teng-Hui, made the following statement at the unveiling of a monument in Taipei 228 Memorial Park:

Today, those bereaved by the 228 Incident can behold the monument, which stands for the historical justice and ethnic harmony achieved in our beloved land. Also, they can hear Teng-Hui admit the offences committed by the government in the past, and solemnly apologise to the bereaved on behalf of the government. I believe that, by offering forgiveness, you will warm every heart in Taiwan. It is unfortunate timing that the monument was not erected earlier so that some of the bereaved who have now passed away would have been able to bear witness today.⁸³

This was the first official KMT account of the 228 Incident that made reference to political atrocities. However, none of the victims and bereaved of the White Terror were addressed specifically by the apology. The government acknowledged the oppressive nature of its actions, but failed to recognise any of those it had persecuted.

The identity of the political victims of the 228 Incident soon emerged, however, when the government promulgated *The 228 Incident Disposition and Compensation Act* (二二八事件處理與補償條例, hereafter, the 228 Act) on 7 April 1995. This was the first legal enactment dealing with the KMT regime's past political repression in Taiwan. The government also set up the 228 Memorial Foundation (hereafter, 228 Foundation) to deal with compensation and commemoration matters.

While official remorse for the 228 Incident saw significant progress in the 1990s, survivors of the White Terror failed to receive any official apology

⁸² 行政院新聞局 (1989) 二二八事件專案報告。臺灣：行政院新聞局

⁸³ The complete speech, read by the President of the Canada Taiwanese Society, Chung Ya-Tze, is available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N8vwyYMNpj4>.

during that time. Progress in that regard occurred only at a non-official level. In 1993, a survivor of the White Terror, Tseng Mei-Lan, discovered the remains of her executed brother, Hsu Ching-Lan, in the Liuzhangli cemetery (in Chinese, 六張犁), in Taipei City, following a 30-year search.⁸⁴ Prior to this discovery, Liuzhangli had been presumed, since the Japanese colonial period, to be an ordinary public cemetery. Following this dramatic revelation, the remains of 200 political prisoners who had been executed by the KMT regime during the early 1950s were discovered and identified.⁸⁵ Liuzhangli was then revealed to be a site of mass graves, which provided vivid evidence of the extent of political oppression carried out by the KMT regime. It was the first ever memory site of the White Terror. Another survivor, Chen Ying-Tai, observes that this revelation initiated a wave of reconsideration of the history of the White Terror in Taiwan.⁸⁶ That is, the survivors rather than the authorities initiated the wave of remembrance of both the 228 Incident and the White Terror.

Remorse without accountability: 1996–2000

Almost a decade after the dawn of democratisation, in March 1996, Taiwan held its first democratic presidential election, which resulted in President Lee Teng-Hui retaining authority in the name of the KMT for four more years. While this election has been universally hailed as a milestone for democratisation, this section looks at how the result limited the contrition discourse in Taiwan, leading to a state of public remorse without legal sanctions.

Compensation without accountability

During Lee Teng-Hui's presidency, the first phase of institutional arrangements for revisiting the White Terror was initiated by the enactment

⁸⁴ Both Tseng Mei-Lan and Hsu Ching-Lan were communists who were convicted of treason in 1950. Tseng was sentenced to 10 years in prison, while Hsu was executed in August 1952.

⁸⁵ The investigation concluded that most of the tombstones were identified as belonging to persons who had been executed between 1950 and 1954. Further information can be found at: <http://goo.gl/957df7>.

⁸⁶ See Chen Ying-Tai's personal web site: <http://goo.gl/MUaJn9>.

on 17 June 1998 of the *Act on Compensation for Wrongful Trials on Charges of Sedition and Espionage during the Martial Law Period* (戒嚴時期不當叛亂暨匪諜審判案件補償條例, hereafter, Compensation Act). It called for the establishment of the Foundation for Compensation for Improper Verdicts on Sedition Cases during the Martial Law Period (hereafter, Compensation Foundation), which was accomplished later that year. Fifteen years later, on 9 September 2014, in accordance with the mandate prescribed by the Act and an extension made in 2012, the Foundation was officially dissolved.⁸⁷ At that time, it released the following statement:

Taiwan was under martial law from 20 May 1950 to 14 July 1987. Notwithstanding the historical background, this period would prove to be a time of heart-breaking and unforgettable agony to those *innocent ones* accused of treason. After the lifting of martial law, in the light of foreign cases and considering the current political and social milieu in Taiwan, the Taiwanese government is attempting to face history and elaborate an ordinance that is both reasonable and just, to compensate the *falsely convicted* appropriately.⁸⁸

In this statement, the terms *innocent ones* and *falsely convicted* presumably apply to every political victim. However, according to the language of the *Compensation Act*, the ROC government seemed to have adopted a particular approach to the victims of the White Terror. According to Article VIII of the Act:

One may not apply for compensation in any of the following circumstances:

1. One has already received compensation according to the Wrongful Imprisonment Compensation or Compensation for the 228 Incident based on the same facts.

⁸⁷ For the context of the extension, see the next section of this chapter.

⁸⁸ Translation is my own. Emphasis added.

2. The conviction for sedition or treason survives reviews according to current laws or current rules of evidence.

The review mentioned in the second subparagraph of the preceding paragraph shall be done on a case-by-case basis by a review committee set up by the Foundation.⁸⁹

To ensure conformity with the second subparagraph, the Foundation was authorised to organise a 15-member review committee comprising academics, socially prominent citizens, and government representatives. Every past conviction had to be cleared by the committee in order for an application for compensation to be granted.

As yet the Foundation has not published any documentation about the findings of the review committee.⁹⁰ It is only known that the Compensation Foundation rejected 96 of the 10,065 cases—a rejection rate of 0.95% (Wu 2015: 39)—and that most of these rejections were based on a finding that the person for whom the application was made had possessed weapons during the White Terror.

Under this dispensation, the rationale of the atrocities carried out by the KMT regime during the White Terror faced no substantive challenge, and the rights that had been violated were not vindicated by the *Compensation Act*. As the legislation was written, only political victims who were verified as ‘identified as innocent without any subversive intention’ were eligible to reclaim their reputations and receive financial compensation. The scope of Taiwan’s scheme of vindication in this sense is limited to those who are recognised as having been falsely accused. Such persons would be identified as ‘political victims’ rather than ‘political threats’. The unspoken implication was that if they had actually committed the ‘offences’ with which they were charged, the treatment they received during the White Terror could be rationalised.

Shortly after the promulgation of the *Compensation Act* in 1998, a White Terror survivor, Wu Shu-Pei (in Chinese: 吳樹培), commented that,

⁸⁹ See complete text in Appendix V.

⁹⁰ At least by May 2016.

although the *Compensation Act* marked a major step in the government's acknowledgment that it indeed had 'political victims',⁹¹ the *Compensation Act's* provisions nevertheless disappointed him. Apart from the its limited understanding of innocence, only the victims' immediate family members—spouses, children, and parents—were eligible to claim financial compensation. Since most of the victims were too young to have had children before being arrested, most had only parents and siblings. Only the latter were likely to be still alive, and they were excluded from compensation. Furthermore, the *Compensation Act* allowed only for compensation with respect to a victim's real property that had been confiscated. Financial assets could not be recovered under the *Compensation Act*.

Wu Shu-Pei condemns the 15-member review committee for failing to consult the surviving victims and their families in the course of their investigations. The Act was disparaged not only by survivors but also by political science scholar Wu Nai-Te (2005), who argues that the financial compensation envisaged under the Act constitutes not 'compensation' (賠償 *Pei-Chan*) but 'reparations' (補償 *Bu-Chan*).⁹²

The distinction may seem difficult to comprehend in English, as both versions would probably be translated as '*Compensation Act*'. The difference between 補償 (*Bu-Chan*) and 賠償 (*Pei-Chan*) is such that the first tends to be understood as a payment made when one's actions, however cruel, were not wrongful or unjustifiable, whereas *Pei-Chan* implies that the deed for which one is making amends was unequivocally wrong. From Wu's perspective, the fact that the KMT government did not apologise for the actions of its agents shows that it reserves the right to claim that its political repression

⁹¹ Wu Shu-Pei was born and grew up in Taiwan under Japanese rule, joining the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in 1948. Following the KMT regime's retreat to Taiwan in 1949, Wu was arrested in 1950 and sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. Following his release, Wu endeavoured to facilitate China's reunification with Taiwan as a left-wing political cause. In addition, to differentiate the political cause of Chinese reunification survivors from that of other political survivors who supported Taiwanese independence, Wu and his associates founded the Political Victims Fraternity in Taiwan (台灣地區政治受難人互助會, hereafter Huzhuhui) in 1988. When Wu commented on the Act, he was also President of Huzhuhui. Further details on Huzhuhui can be found in chapter 5. The full text of the article can be found at: <http://www.haixiainfo.com.tw/95-2402.html>.

⁹² Wu himself asserts the difference between the two English terms 'compensation' and 'reparations' on a practical level. However, to remain close to the context posed here, I choose to explain the difference between these two terms in Chinese.

was defensible, albeit misapplied or over-zealous. That is to say, the regime's atrocities during the Cold War have remained justified to some extent in the name of anti-communism and the need to counter other potential political enemies in Taiwan. To the KMT, the White Terror marked a series of political struggles, with repression as an 'inevitable' corollary. However, the high success rate of applications for compensation enables the regime to congratulate itself, while encouraging the official discourse to avoid scrutinising the justification of the past atrocities.

The hurdle of truth-seeking

Without any attempt to hold individuals accountable for their roles in perpetuating it, President Lee Teng-Hui issued the first ever public apology for the White Terror, on the occasion of the erection of the monument to the White Terror on Green Island on Human Rights Day 1999. He stated:

Thanks to our forefathers' contribution to democracy, we can now enjoy a life of freedom, and practise democratic ideals in a liberal society. Therefore, I am here as a representative of the government to express the sincerest tribute to those who fought for democracy and, furthermore, to express the deepest apologies to those who were oppressed for pursuing human rights.⁹³

Still, the reason for these individuals' oppression remains unspoken, with the consequence that the image of the perpetrator remains blurred. For instance, Sung Chu-Yu, a former governor of Taiwan province,⁹⁴ issued the following preface to the publication in 1998 of a five-volume work entitled *Historical Data Collected on Political Cases during the 1950s Martial Law Period in Taiwan* (in Chinese: 台灣戒嚴時期五〇年代政治案件史料彙編; hereafter, HDCP).⁹⁵

⁹³ The complete version can be found at: <http://goo.gl/b8W2ln>

⁹⁴ Taiwan Province was part of the administrative division of the ROC under the KMT regime, which claimed to rule all the provinces on the mainland as well. Only when it abandoned that fiction in 1998 did Taiwan cease having a separate provincial government; Sung Chu-Yu therefore became its last governor.

⁹⁵ According to these volumes, the Provincial Documentation Committee conducted the investigation between 1995 and 1998, during which time 621 survivors of 1950s' political

[...] As a government body, we play an observer role, merely recording without judgment the past that happened on our territory. [...] Political cases which happened during the 1950s resulted from the specific conditions of that time and place, while the PRC regime was engaged in a plot of 'domestic revolution' in Taiwan under slogans such as 'Emancipate Taiwan', 'Wage massacre in Taiwan', and so on. It was not merely verbal intimidation, but a series of concrete armed military provocations designed to promote infiltration, subversion, and divisiveness. The government in this sense had no choice but to adopt the tactics of the Treason Act in order to cope with these thorny issues and threats (Sung 1998: 1–2).⁹⁶

Throughout the preface, Sung Chu-Yu appears to have an attitude identical to that of President Lee Teng-Hui, as Sung echoes Lee's 'limited remorse'. Only citizens who were proven not to have harboured subversive intentions or committed subversive deeds could be recognised as 'victims' under the *Compensation Act*, and both Lee Teng-Hui and Sung Chu-Yu failed to censure past abuses. Taiwanese society was thus coming to terms with the White Terror without pointing the finger at any perpetrators (Wu 2005).

When I asked my interviews about their thoughts on the official sponsored work, none of my participants express their satisfaction with the works such as HDCP. Instead, they show their doubt and disappointment whilst speaking of the publication under Lee's presidency.

I don't remember how did I reach the volume, yet I am sure I completely disagree with the assertion made by Sung. [...] It was not my fault for my past insurgency, but their (the KMT regime) fault. They have to take responsibility for the past wrongdoings, rather than escaping from it (transcript of VC 2012.12)!

oppression were interviewed; 312 of them agreed to the publication of their narratives, although this did not occur all at once.

* My own translation.

Yes, I did receive the compensation. But it doesn't mean that I agreed with the rationale of the Act. I just thought I deserve the compensation! [...] I am not happy with the rationale of the Act and the volume, but what can I say, I am nobody. I am only an elderly who is about to die (transcript of JH 2013.12).

Arguably the narratives cited here indicate an inconsistency of the expectation of the 'political apology' made by the government between the so-called perpetrators and persecuted ones. During Taiwan's political transition, political apologies are a favoured technique for reckoning with past atrocities in order to constitute 'new moral orders'.⁹⁷ However, the contrition discourse that developed during Lee's presidency under the *Compensation Act* created a situation of 'apology in the absence of accountability', and Taiwan did not constitute a new moral order. Accordingly, a restricted contrition discourse developed and was reinforced. It was the government that identified who was deserving of official remorse.

The memory boom period: 2000–2008

When the DPP ended the KMT's 55-year rule by winning the elections in 2000, the new government immediately asserted its ambition to make Taiwan a new model for human rights. With this ambition, Chen Shui-Bian made the following statement in his inauguration speech:

[...] Moreover, we are also willing to make a more active contribution towards safeguarding international human rights. The Republic of China cannot and will not remain aloof from global human rights trends. We will abide by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, and the Vienna Declaration and

⁹⁷ Moon, C. (2008). *Narrating Political Reconciliation* (p.22). Lexington Books.

Programme of Action [adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in 1993]. We will bring the Republic of China back into the international human rights system.⁹⁸

With these stated priorities, the DPP government officially introduced international human rights norms into Taiwan. It was the first time that Taiwan's official transitional justice discourse had the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) as a benchmark, after the unofficial discourse firstly introduce UDHR in accordance with the outbreak of the Formosa Incident in 1979.

During Chen Shui-Bian's two-term presidency (2000–2008), nine state-sponsored oral history projects were carried out and published.⁹⁹ Also, there were 19 official publications issued, including an anthology of academic research, and formerly classified documents were partially released.¹⁰⁰ In a vein of commemoration, two former political prisons located in Jingmei (in Chinese: 景美) and on Green Island (in Chinese: 綠島; 火燒島) were designated as part of the National Human Rights Museum Project, supervised by the Council of Cultural Affairs (in Chinese: 文建會). Various monuments proliferated throughout Taiwan. Annual commemorations were instituted regularly on 10 December each year. Human rights was thus the central value in the eye of DPP administration from 2000 to 2008. In this initial reconsideration of the White Terror, various narratives of the past centred on a generic phenomenon of victimhood, while survivors continued to be required to prove their innocence before being awarded recognition. During Chen's presidency, apart from CP, my other participants joined the official discourse as they accept official sponsored interviews, attending annual commemorations. Despite some of them share identical political stance with Chen Shui-Bian and the DPP, my participant hesitated to voice their revolutionary past, choosing perspective of victimhood, recollecting their past. As they explain:

⁹⁸ The complete text of the speech in English is available at <http://english.president.gov.tw/>.

⁹⁹ See appendix II.

¹⁰⁰ See appendix III for details of the volumes. The formerly classified documents were released and published case by case.

Before A-Bian won the presidential election, I dared not speak about my experience. It was too difficult for me to talk of those scenes under the KMT regime. A-Bian's victory not only encouraged me, but also heartened my co-defendants. ... [I] was a really hard time for me, can you really understand? (Transcript of SC 2013, 10)¹⁰¹

The atmosphere was still slightly fraught. I think that was why I didn't talk too much during our [previous] interview (Transcript of RJ 2013, 3).¹⁰²

I am not afraid of those secret agents, but I can understand those who are scared of being imprisoned again. After all, it was a nightmare. You will not understand it unless you had been through it (Transcript of HC 2013, 3).

Despite CP had not joined official sponsored oral histories during Chen's Presidency, he joined later in 2008. When I asked why, he merely stated, "*I was fear of another political oppression.*"¹⁰³ As a mainlander who stowed away from China in the 1960s, CP witnessed both the atrocities under the PRC and the KMR regime. It is not difficult to contemplate his past as a time of political repression. Although CP finally joined the official oral histories in 2008, the past has left a scar upon his facial expression. I rarely saw his smile during our conversations.

Ostensibly, both the past persecution and the political condition restrain these men from voicing out their past, both insurgent and persecuted parts. Although the promotion of human rights has fashioned Taiwan's official transitional justice discourse into a focus on past suffering, the institutional hurdle set up by the *Compensation Act* continues to silence their political insurgence in past Taiwan. In addition, democratisation does not guarantee solace from the enduring emotional burdens that White Terror

¹⁰¹ In Taiwan, citizens often call Chen Shui-Bian A-Bian.

¹⁰² RJ was interviewed by academic researchers in 2000.

¹⁰³ Transcript of CP 2013, 10.

survivors have continuously borne.¹⁰⁴ In addition, finding a voice is just the first hurdle to surmount in the process of examining the complexity of political struggle during the White Terror. At the moment, the past is still too murky to be fully comprehended.

Unravel the past: The Archives Act

Regarding the aspect of justice, *Compensation Act* was set to define the idea of victimhood and the identity of political victim, the *Archives Act* is then the second justice arrangement to shed light on the obscured past since 2002.¹⁰⁵ In the interim, the National Archives Administration was founded on 1 March 2000. With these two institutional arrangements, formerly classified archives relating to political cases became accessible to the public. To put the truth-seeking project into practice, Chen Shui-Bian once again asserted the DPP government's determination on the occasion of a human rights memorial concert at Green Island Human Rights Memorial Park in 2005:

We should continue to adopt an aggressive attitude towards tackling the issue of transitional justice in regard to the 38-year martial law period. While the government has begun programmes aimed at 'material compensation' and 'mental comfort' to repair and rectify the wrongful legacy of the past, we know that such political cases happened, and that the social and political impacts on the victims were widespread and remain unclear. Put precisely, questions such as 'How many cases were there?' and 'What was the truth of the past?' remain unsettled.¹⁰⁶

In 2006, the Academia Historica received hundreds of formerly classified treason crime files from the Defence Department. Under the *Archives Act*, collected files were inventoried by the National Archives Administration in

¹⁰⁴ See further discussion of emotional aspects in chapter 4.

¹⁰⁵ The *Archives Act* was enacted in December 1999, during Lee Teng-Hui's presidency.

¹⁰⁶ A complete text of this speech, which was delivered on 17 May 2005, is available in Chinese at: <http://goo.gl/fjqQ5e>.

2008. That same year, the Academia Historica published a 15-volume compilation based on these files, *Political Cases in Post-war Taiwan*. This was the first time that the government had systematically published formerly classified files, case by case.

One thing is worth noting that in spite of the enforcement of the *Archives Act*, declassified archives collection has not been conducting smoothly. The White Terror was a time that the KMT regime marshalled the whole of society under its surveillance, related documents were not only preserved in the Defence Department, but were preserved in many public sectors, such as the Ministry of Interior. The political transition did not happen with a party alternation in the 1990s. Taiwan's transitional justice scheme was delayed to a certain extent under Lee Teng-Hui's presidency, especially the documents inventory. In consequence, hitherto documentary inventory and analysis remains unfinished.

Further, the secrecy that surrounded the White Terror for decades has not simply faded, as the privacy of survivors, especially those still living, must be protected. Under the *Archives Act*, only victims, co-defendants, and relatives of victims are eligible to apply for documentation about confessions, evidence, and interrogation records. Researchers and non-relatives can only access indictments, verdicts, and prison records. From a historical perspective, the *Archives Act*, in effect, facilitates fact-finding about the White Terror in Taiwan; however, the progress of public disclosure has not led to censure of the atrocities that were carried out with the acquiescence of the United States.¹⁰⁷

Although we continue to learn more about the details of interrogation, torture, and ill-treatment, the precise context of the prolonged political struggle between those arrested and the KMT remains secret. Survivors have no incentive to expose their past conspiracies to the public; thus, the identities of 'political dissidents', and their rationales, remain blurred.

¹⁰⁷ Not all archives were made public simultaneously and formerly classified documents continue to be released; nor did the National Archive Administration actively inform the bereaved of the content of the archives. Until one of my interviewees, the granddaughter of a victim who was executed in 1953, applied to see the documentation in December 2008, no one in her family had been aware that her grandfather had left five testaments relating to them.

While the fact-finding project has witnessed slow progress, the cultural aspect of the transitional justice has also been limited in scope. For instance, the human rights museums on Green Island and in Jingmei mainly focus on recreating the features of imprisonment. Documentation relating to prison life was released for that purpose, offering a picture of imprisonment and victimhood that includes a waxworks museum depicting scenes from the inmates' lives, and a photo wall displaying pictures of victims of the White Terror. Such initiatives are progressing smoothly but the transitional justice scheme continues to gloss over the context of an adversarial past. As one survivor, JC, admits:

We still managed to plot against the KMT while imprisoned on Green Island. We collected news and sent messages secretly. [...] This is, of course, not imparted to the public in the Human Rights Museum. There, we are victims; we are not political dissidents (transcript of JC 2013, 10).

JC's account is not unusual among interviewees. JR, my another participant who has been persecuted in the 1960s, firstly accepted official sponsored oral history interviews in 2000,¹⁰⁸ stating his persecution throughout the published transcript without a delicate recollection of his adversary past. My other participants, CH, SC, and RJ had also been interviewed by the same project in 2000, moderating their adversary past without providing further details of their past conspiracy. At the moment, the mission of their engagement of the official discourse was not to tell the 'truth', but to secure the power of utterance.

My words cannot go beyond the public perception of us. The only part I could spell out was my political stance but without concrete plan (Transcript of JR: 2013, 12).

¹⁰⁸ 中研院近史所口述歷史編委會 (2000) 蘇東啟政治案件專輯。台北：中央研究院近代歷史研究所

As I have said, I have been fear of another political oppression. I received the compensation, and I do not want to break the rule (Transcript of SC 2013, 3).

We have been appealing for recognition, both our persecution and past adversaries. At least I have had my first step. I didn't trust the government in 2000. The political condition was unstable, and I had to protect myself. [...] At least my persecution was recognised (Transcript of RJ 2013, 11).

Together with the cases posed above, as long as survivors' past as political agitators remains hidden from the public, the survivors suffer from a fragmented identity, for the narrative of persecution continues to pervade the official discourse that has developed since the 1990s.

Reckoning with atrocities: Amendment to the 228 Act

Before Chen Shui-Bian left office, he amended the *228 Incident Disposition and Compensation Act* by renaming it in Chinese from 二二八事件處理與補償條例 (transliteration, ER-ER-Ba-Shih-Jian-Chu-Li-Yu-Bu-Chan-Tiao-Li) to 二二八事件處理與賠償條例 (transliteration, ER-ER-Ba-Shih-Jian-Chu-Li-Yu-Pei-Chan-Tiao-Li) without revising its English name. According to Wu's articulation of the distinction between Bu-Chan and Pei-Chan (2005), the amendment from 補償 (*Bu-Chan*, or reparations) to 賠償 (*Pei-Chan*, compensation) implicates a change in the way in which the official discourse was defining the past atrocities, suggesting an official recognition that the KMT regime must take full responsibility for the 228 Incident. Meanwhile, however, the evolution of legal responsibility for the White Terror remains stagnant.

Chen Shui-Bian also modified the mandate of the 228 Foundation to make it the permanent organisation charged with commemorations, management of the 228 museum, and a future 228 Incident education project. In this sense, the remembrance of the 228 Incident has become a permanent project for the Taiwanese authorities. Given the alternation, the difficulty of remembering the White Terror is much more evident than remembering the 228 Incident. First, unlike the 228 Incident as an intense political repression in

a short-term, the White Terror was a prolonged and coercive political control with martial law and support from the US given by the bipolar configuration during the Cold War, as discussed in chapter 1. This political background thus resulted in a complicated picture of political victims in Taiwan. A task of defining the idea of persecution and the identity of political victim is thus more challenging than that of the 228 Incident. Second, without a proper political alternation during Taiwan's democratisation, Taiwanese society continued to fail its scheme on addressing fact-finding project, including issues of past wrongdoings, persecution, responsibilities, and so forth. Confronted challenges from the feature of the political control of the White Terror and the condition of Taiwan's political transition, review of the White Terror thus remained controversial during Chen's presidency.

To sum up, the DPP, for all that it ushered in an era of greater democracy, added little to the contrition discourse set by Lee Teng-Hui's government. From the perspective of fact-finding, the recollection of the past during Chen's presidency is sustainable to be viewed as a 'memory boom' for its proliferation of related activities. In 2005, the DPP mounted an unprecedented exhibition entitled, *Painful Period: Martial Law during the Political Trials*, displaying excerpts from the formerly confidential archives, including lists of victims, verdicts, and files relevant to the public. The tension between the release of the archives and the posture of denial adopted by the KMT escalated. Many family members of political victims were particularly shocked to learn that Chiang Kai-Shek had wielded the power to amend the verdicts. For instance, there was a document on display that showed how the sentence of one political prisoner, Huang Wen-Kung, had been amended from 15 years' imprisonment to death in 1953; this was in Chiang Kai-Shek's handwriting. The exhibition shed light on the architects of the White Terror in Taiwan and, as such, was considered as a major leap forward in truth-seeking. Whereas the political and juridical hurdles have discussed in the previous paragraphs made the DPP government pursue a course of 'neutralisation' of the past during its eight-year governance. As a result, the KMT government was able, even during the period of DPP governance, to continue to deny its past atrocities and human rights violations while returning to power in 2008.

The return of the KMT: 2008–2016

The KMT in Taiwan might be the first political party worldwide to have been returned to power in a democratic process without being called to account for five decades of violent dictatorship. As Ma Ying-Jeou was elected to the presidency as the KMT candidate in 2008 and again in 2012, the contrition discourse of ‘thousands of victims without a single perpetrator’ was validated by the Taiwanese people’s continued acceptance of KMT leadership.

When the KMT returned to power in May 2008, it triggered a worry of the progression of transitional justice scheme amongst survivors. Confronted the situation, a group of scholars, historians, and lawyers, seeking to further the process of transitional justice, founded a non-governmental organisation, *The Taiwan Association for Truth and Reconciliation* (hereafter TRCT) in Taiwan. While other transitional justice regimes in such countries as Chile, South Africa, and Germany, even those organised by governments, have included such features as truth commissions, criminal trials, purges of former officials, and other manifestations of accountability, the non-governmental TRCT has confined itself to operating as a victims’ assistance foundation, appealing for reparations and investigating abuses on behalf of White Terror survivors.¹⁰⁹ Nonetheless, along the lines defined by the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ),¹¹⁰ the TRCT claims on its web site to have four missions—namely, to:

1. Assist the government to recollect and release archives from the martial law period;

¹⁰⁹ <http://www.taiwantrc.org/about.php>.

¹¹⁰ The ICTJ is an international non-governmental organisation that works to help societies in transition address legacies of massive human rights violations and build civic trust in state institutions as protectors of human rights. The organisation refers on its web site to the following categories of transitional justice activities: 1. Establishing the truth about the past. 2. Prosecution of the perpetrators. 3. Reparation of the victims. 4. Memory and memorials. 5. Reconciliation initiatives. 6. Reforming initiatives. 7. Vetting and removing abusive public employees. See <https://www.ictj.org/>

2. Provide an impetus to the research, recording and preservation of human rights abuses in academia and nongovernmental fields;
3. Recollect, compare and study the processes and accomplishments of the 'Truth and Reconciliation Committees' across various countries;
4. Promote and conduct educational work on the ideals of transitional justice via conferences, publications and online resources.

By engaging actively since 2008 in transitional justice work, including hosting oral history projects, research workshops, and an annual conference, the TRCT has become the most representative NGO in Taiwan, apart from the victims' associations.¹¹¹ For example, the three-volume critique of Taiwan's transitional justice published by the TRCT (2015) insightfully points out the need of truth-seeking and full vindication for the past persecution. However, Ma Ying-Jeou's government continued disappointing their demands.

The official sponsored documentaries

The official documentaries are one of the most compelling evidence. Since 2009, the government has started its annual documentary project of the survivors' oral history as shown in appendix I. In 2012, the Council of Cultural Affairs was upgraded to the Ministry of Culture (in Chinese: 文化部). The National Human Rights Museum Project, including the documentary project were upgraded in accord with the administrative order. Since then, the amount of documentary has proliferated to at least five films per year. Given the project, survivors and their narratives offer evidence that attest to the past. Each 30-minute film features a survivor's life story.¹¹² Each of them follows a formula as the narrators introduce themselves, recite their origins, and then explain they were dragged into the abyss of prosecution. Each film ends with an encouraging account of how they overcame their seemingly unbearable plight. For instance, one of the survivors, JC joined official documentary project in 2013. In his rather long 58-minute film, JC

¹¹¹ See chapter 5 for further information on victims' associations.

¹¹² Available online with English subtitles at: <http://www.nhrm.gov.tw/movielist?uid=938>.

only spent 8 minutes discussing his past political idea, without exposing any detail of his past communist insurgence; yet spending over 30 minutes narrating the persecuted episodes. In the end of the film, JC stated,

We must go our own way. We shall courageously and wisely use our human rights. The road shall be wide and grand.¹¹³

During our interviews in the Human Rights Park, I asked JC why not spelling out his past insurgence. JC emphasised he was not lying to Taiwanese society.

To me, the most important mission is to build democratic country with dignity. And I am pursuing my ideal. [...] It is true that I am not satisfied with the film, as it overemphasises the persecution. Not only human rights violations matters. Nonetheless, for me, the salience is about the nature of the KMT regime the past of the White Terror (Transcript of JC 2012, 12).

However, conditioned by the *Compensation Act* and the government's agenda, survivor such as JC has limited space elaborating his past insurgence. In consequence, he has to conceal and compromise.

JC's dilemma is not in isolation. In fact, my participants who have joined the state-sponsored documentaries project are in the same plight. Another survivor, WL, recounts his past in accordance with the released text about his sentencing. In his documentary, he devotes only two minutes to the conspiracy for which he was arrested. However, in 2013, in his interviews with me, WL told me far more details than were contained in the verdicts:

Yes, He knew about our plan, but I didn't betray anyone during the investigation. [...] Oh yes, this guy also knew about our conspiracy; he was one of our secret contacts in southern Taiwan. [...] And this guy was a kind person; he was too kind to join this political resistance movement. [...]

¹¹³ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f5M_oXqEPYc

The only way to save our lives and that of others was not to give any details to the secret agents, and to conceal the list of our associates as best we could.¹¹⁴

To WL, protecting the anonymity of his secret associates is a lifelong task, for no one is confident that the dark era will not return. It is a lifetime of struggle, even in the aftermath of the White Terror. Confronting the KMT's return to power in 2008, both JC and WL remained silent about their past as dissidents, not to mention the secret identities of their associates. Survivors cannot find a voice as agitators in the official discourse. No narratives of past political dissent have revealed any further information about the conspiracies for which they were convicted. Only the narratives preferred by the state could be presented in the official discourse. Not only do the interviewed survivors conform in their narratives, but the published volumes of official oral history also seem to acquiesce to the state's version of the past.

Survivor SC, for example, seems to defer to the narrative published by the Human Rights Museum's Preparatory Office in 2012 even though, since 2000, he has been far more forthcoming than other survivors about his persistent political cause. In the documentary released by the government, SC offers no further information than what was revealed by his verdict of treason, rendered in 1962.¹¹⁵ Conversely, during our conversations, SC states:

Dong-Chi was expecting me to recruit peers while at the military academy, to see if there were any competent people with whom to cooperate. After all, this project would benefit from having more people join it. However, I should have recruited more before being arrested. [...] Yes, from Dong-Chi's perspective, the associates from Douliou were positioned as the centre of strategy planning. I suppose this was the position that Dong-Chi had designed for me.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Transcript of WL 2013, 2 and 2013,3.

¹¹⁵ 陳世鑑 (2012) 我所捲入的政治黑牢。見陳銘城主編。秋蟬的悲鳴：白色恐怖受難文集第一輯。頁 320-321。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處。For the verdict, see (51) 警審更字第 15 號，(51) 警審特字第 67 號。

¹¹⁶ Transcript of SC, 2013.3 and 2013.10.

This intricate interpretation of SC's role in a decades-old conspiracy was completely absent from the state-sponsored interviews in which he participated. While historical works such as oral history implies that a memory state must accord not only with objective reality but also with one's immediate perception of reality,¹¹⁷ that is not to say that the state-sponsored narratives are pure fabrication. Rather, what is salient here is that the current official discourse, including the institutional arrangements relating to justice, truth and ethos aspects of traditional justice, powerfully affects the way in which the White Terror survivors behave and how they recount their past to the public. The disclosure of the verdicts has stimulated survivors to speak more freely of past political activism and intrigue. Yet we also observe a blurred sphere that has been formulated and consolidated by the government, from which we are still unable to discern the full truth of the antagonisms of the past.

As a result, survivors keep repeating themselves in the official discourse. They continue to tell their stories in the same way as if reading from a script. What is unmentioned remains that way. In the official transitional justice discourse, these survivors were seriously persecuted, apparently due to 'bad luck', as they are not able to speak of their past activities. The grounds for their imprisonment now makes them silent in terms of the *Compensation Act*, the Foundation, and the state-sponsored oral histories. In consequence, the authentication of the past White Terror develops along officially sanctioned lines with the cooperation of the survivors themselves.

Controversy over naming of the Human Rights Park

A controversy that arose during the establishment of the Human Rights Park during Ma Ying-Jeou's presidency reveals the deep engagement of the TRCT in Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice. This event also revealed the extent to which Ma Ying-Jeou's administration remained wedded to the limited official discourse on the subject. Although the controversy sparked in 2009, it dates back to the time, under DPP governance, when the two former political

¹¹⁷ S. Bernecker, (2009), *Memory: A Philosophical Study*, Oxford University Press.

prisons in Jingmei and on Green Island were designated as part of the National Human Rights Museum Project.

The Green Island prison was designated as 'The Green Island Human Rights Memorial Park' in 2002 and renamed 'The Green Island Human Rights Culture Park' following the transfer of jurisdiction to the Council for Cultural Affairs in 2006. However, the park was immediately renamed after Ma Ying-Jeou came to power in 2008. Absurdly, the term 'human rights' was removed and it became 'The Green Island Culture Park'. The Jingmei prison was only addressed as part of the project in 2002 and in turn renamed the 'Jingmei Human Rights Memorial Park' in 2007.¹¹⁸ The term 'human rights' was also removed in April 2009, leaving it as 'Jingmei Culture Park', without any prior consultation with the survivors of the White Terror or NGOs, including the TRCT. This insensitive action generated strong condemnation of the actions of Ma Ying-Jeou and his government, as reported here:

The DPP congressional caucus argues that Jingmei Human Rights Memorial Park is to commemorate the once oppressed human rights fighters. The government's renaming of the park as Jingmei Culture Park serves to wipe out our people's memories. However, the KMT argues that the decision is to enhance the cultural connotations – people are over-reacting (CAN News: 17 April 2009).

While the DPP condemned the decision, the TRCT and three victims' associations—the 1950s White Terror Vindicated Association (WTVA), Taiwanese Victims of the Martial Law Care Association (TVCA),¹¹⁹ and Taiwan Association for Elderly Political Victims—also issued a joint statement censuring the deletion of the term *human rights* as a vicious suppression of the history of the White Terror. With the slogan, '*We want human rights! We want history! We want human rights parks!*', the statement

¹¹⁸ The Presidential Human Rights Advisory Panel decided to position the former prison in Jingmei as part of the memorial park in July 2002.

¹¹⁹ See further discussion of the emergence of victim associations in chapter 5.

appealed for official recognition of the national human rights parks in Taiwan.¹²⁰

Table 3-1 Chronology of name alteration of memory sites

Year	Ruling party	Green Island	Jingmei
2002–2005	DPP	Green Island Human Rights Memorial Park	Designated as memorial park without an official name
2006–2007	DPP	Green Island Human Rights Culture Park	Jingmei Human Rights Memorial Park
2008–2009	KMT	Green Island Culture Park	Jingmei Culture Park
2009–2014	KMT	Green Island Human Rights and Cultural Park	Jingmei Human Rights and Cultural Park

Consequently, under overwhelming pressure from NGOs and the survivors of the White Terror, the Ma Ying-Jeou administration reversed its decision on both prison parks in 2009. Two years later, the government launched the Preparatory Office of the National Human Rights Museum, supervised by the Ministry of Culture, formerly known as the Council for Cultural Affairs. Green Island Human Rights Culture Park and Jingmei Human Rights Culture Park were thereby officially registered as part of the National Human Rights Museum. Nonetheless, for my participants who argued the inappropriation of the name alternation, KY, the president of TVCA, and its member, CH argue,

‘Human rights’ is currently the very basis for we survivors to tell our stories in public. We cannot compromise. We must not (Transcript of KY 2012, 12).

Without (the term) human rights, we still have our political stance! But we were seriously persecuted, no one

¹²⁰ Announced by TRCT in April 2009.

could deny it. It had happened! Even Ma Ying-Jeou cannot deny it in front me (Transcript of CH 2013, 4)!

This polemic revealed the ambivalence of the KMT's attitude towards the White Terror. Although it was impossible for the KMT, as the regime in power when the atrocities were committed, to sidestep responsibility completely, it was clearly not about to embark on any exploration of its accountability. Ma Ying-Jeou's attempt to 'neutralise' and 'de-politicise' the two historic sites by wiping out the term 'human right' from the name arguably serve to envisage the political intention.

Apart from the polemic described above, we can also observe the Ma government's reluctance to assume any blame from the two examples discussed below.

The dispute over returning testaments

In 2008, Yi-Rong, granddaughter of Huang Wen-Kung who was executed in the 1950s, discovered quite by accident that her grandfather's name appeared on the verdict that had been changed to a death sentence by Chiang Kai-Shek, as displayed in the 2007 exhibition entitled '*Farewell to Chiang Kai-Shek: Anticommunism, Democracy, The Road for Taiwan*' (再見 蔣總統！反共，民主，台灣路).¹²¹ This discovery spurred her to investigate her grandfather's execution. In accordance with the *Archives Act*, Yi-Rong applied to the government to access the relevant documentation in November 2008 and was surprised to discover that her grandfather had left bequests to five family members, including Yi-Rong's mother, who was not yet born at the time of

¹²¹ Huang Wen-Kung was born in Lujhu District, Kaohsiung, in 1920. He trained as a dentist in Japan and subsequently joined the Japanese army as a medical officer based in China during WWII. After the war, Huang returned to Taiwan to work as an independent dentist in Pingtung, Taiwan. In 1952, he was accused of being involved in 中共臺灣省山作委員會燕巢支部案, and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. Chiang, however, who reviewed each verdict before sentencing, changed the original sentence to the death penalty. The exhibition displayed the verdict containing the modification in Chiang's hand-writing; Yi-Rong thereby discovered the secret about her grandfather's death.

his death. By this time, Yi-Rong's mother was a 56-year-old professor in Taiwan.¹²²

According to the provisions of the Archives Act, applicants, including the bereaved, were only eligible to receive a photocopy of the documentation, rather than the original manuscripts. Yi-Rong and her family pleaded several times to the National Archives Administration for return of the original testaments, but were rejected on the grounds that their request lacked a legal basis. Subsequently, with assistance from the TRCT in negotiating with the government, in the summer of 2010, the National Archives announced the return of the original documents to Yi-Rong and her family.

When President Ma returned the testaments to her on 15 July 2011, Yi-Rong launched a media campaign containing three requests to the government: 1. Take the initiative in returning relevant documents to the bereaved. 2. Collect and review all documents relevant to the White Terror from every branch of the government, and make the list of perpetrators public. 3. Apologise sincerely and make the 'reparations' originally referred to in the Act in the form of actual compensation.

In addition, I would like publicly to tell President Ma: please, when speaking of the political achievements under his rule do not ignore the fact of the dictatorship and criminality for which Chiang Kai-Shek was responsible while so many families, including mine, were destroyed owing to him! [...] I hope that President Ma will face history sincerely, for he should not circumvent the intolerable guilt of Chiang Kai-Shek.¹²³

Following the success of Yi-Rong's case, those bereaved by the White Terror began to receive long delayed testaments. Since Lee Teng-Hui delivered the first ever apology on behalf of the KMT regime in 1999, archival disclosure has not satisfied the survivors and bereaved of the White

¹²² For a detailed sociological discussion of the lives of the bereaved, please see 蕭伶仔 (2009) 走進白色家庭：一九五〇年代政治受難者家屬生命歷程探究。新竹：清華大學社會學所碩士論文。

¹²³ 張旂容(2011.07.15) 我們需要真正的轉型正義。蘋果日報(Apple Daily News)，論壇。

Terror, who have continued to voice their appeals. As Yi-Rong. Kuo, the daughter of another victim who was executed in the 1950s, states:

I want not just a testament but a thorough disclosure from the National Archives Administration, as I want to know why things like this happened during that time. [...] My son's generation no longer cares what happened to their grandfathers. If my generation doesn't take action, it will be ancient history.¹²⁴

In response to demands by Yi-Rong and the TRCT, the KMT subsequently embarked on a review of all of the testaments. At the end of 2011, President Ma Ying-Jeou announced that 112 testaments had been left to the bereaved among 177 private letters.¹²⁵ Paradoxically, when the TRCT offered to contact the survivors and bereaved, the government decisively rejected this proposal, insisting instead on classifying the list and consigning the task to the Compensation Foundation, which was slated for dissolution that year. Consequently, by the summer of 2012, with the extension of the Foundation's mandate, the government had merely received a third of the applications. The TRCT lodged a strong protest, insisting that the 'National Archives Administration should not become an obstacle to transitional justice'.¹²⁶

Expiration of the Compensation Act and Foundation

Another instance that illustrates the passive attitude of the Ma Ying-Jeou administration was the expiration of the *Compensation Act* and the termination of the work of the Compensation Foundation.

According to the terms of the Act, the deadline for survivors and bereaved to submit claims for financial compensation was December 2010.

¹²⁴ 壹週刊(The Next Magazine) No. 284: 2012.8.2.

¹²⁵ 國家人權博物館籌備處(2013)遲來的愛：白色恐怖時期政治受難者遺書，頁 74。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處。After starting to return the testaments to the bereaved, the PR organised an exhibition about testaments and testimony that ran from December 2013 to April 2015 in Jingmei Human Rights Park. For further information, please visit: <http://chiao.tw/testament/index.html>.

¹²⁶ 陳俊宏，葉虹靈(2012.07.19)。檔案局不應成為轉型正義的絆腳石。蘋果日報 (Apple News Daily)，論壇。

That is, as the executor of the Act's programme, the Foundation was scheduled to conclude operation at that time. However, President Ma having assigned it the task of reviewing private documentation, the mandate of the Foundation was extended to September 2014. According to figures provided by the Foundation, in the 15-year period ending on 13 July 2014, 20.22 per cent of the applications were denied, while the remaining 79.78 per cent were accepted. The amount of reparations was 197,000,000 TWD in total.

Table 3-2 Outcome of applications to the Compensation Foundation¹²⁷

	Decision	Number	Percentage
1.	Found to contain ineligible element(s)	1,940	19.27%
2.	Rejected altogether	96	0.95%
3.	Accepted	8,030	79.78%
		10,066	100.00%

Based on the cases from the martial law period that were published by the DPP government, the number of known cases reached 806, with 15,912 individuals listed as known victims.¹²⁸ From the number of applications for financial compensation, it seems that nearly 5,000 individuals (or their families) failed to apply. Furthermore, the number of victims identified continues to rise as the task of archival discovery progresses.

In addition, international human rights experts came to Taiwan in February 2013 to investigate the state of implementation of the International Bill of Human Rights:

Expert: *Financial Compensation cannot cover every aspect of*

¹²⁷ Source: http://www.cf.org.tw/data.php?list=statistics_list.

¹²⁸ 人權之路小組 (2008) 《人權之路 2008 年新版》頁 79。台北: 陳文成基金會。

transitional justice. It is important to encourage society to get to know what happened in the past and to face the historical truth. Yet your report mentions little on this, which makes me underscore its importance here.

Government representative: We have already established two compensation foundations and enacted laws relating to the 228 Incident and the White Terror, through which tasks of compensation, commemoration and memorial, museums have been undertaken and publicised so that our people may learn the lessons.

Expert: Did the government ever consider establishing 'truth and reconciliation commissions' or other mechanisms for tackling transitional justice and historical issues?

*Government representative: The two foundations have worked smoothly for 20 years. We have not received such a suggestion from outside Taiwan.*¹²⁹

According to this conversation disclosed by the TRCT, it is evident that the KMT government considers the *Compensation Act* and the Foundation as the two main transitional justice mechanisms for dealing with the White Terror. This inevitably leads to the question: how should Taiwan sustain momentum in its recollection of the White Terror after the dismantling of these institutions?

Given the expected expiration and content of the Act, it seems untenable for the KMT to assert that its contrition amounts to genuine accountability. With the investigation and archival disclosures still not complete, the deadline for applying for compensation was approaching and, as noted, only those who professed no opposition to the government were eligible. Thus, it remains uncertain what steps Taiwan will take in the pursuit of transitional justice once the FOC has been abolished.

¹²⁹ 葉虹靈(2013.03.23) 以機密知名埋藏真相。蘋果日報 (Apple Daily News) , 論壇。

Commemoration of the guilty party or Great Man

Immediately after Chiang Kai-Shek's death on 5 April 1975, the KMT regime declared the date as Taiwan's official Memorial Day, on which the government and people would worship and commemorate him ever after. Until the DPP won the presidential election in 2000, each successive president hosted a commemoration event and eulogised Chiang Kai-Shek as the hero of the Chinese people from 1945 onward. The commemoration was cancelled, however, once the DPP took over and, in 2007, the new administration took a further step: It declared that 5 April and 31 October, Chiang's birthday, were no longer national holidays, and the government and citizens no longer had a responsibility to commemorate Chiang. It even closed the Cihu Mausoleum where Chiang Kai-Shek was buried. An official statement issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs stated:

Secretary of the Interior Lee Yi-Yan (in Chinese, 李逸洋) announces that National Memorial Day entails a specific meaning that is worth remembering by the country and its people, as the two memorial days in commemoration of the former President Lord Chiang were the product of the authoritarian regime with its specific historical background. We shall not deny the mixed reactions to the role of Lord Chiang in the history of national development. We should not in effect pay tribute to him by promulgating Memorial Day while pursuing transitional justice, endeavouring to eliminate the effects of his authoritarian system. Furthermore, those bereaved by the 228 Incident have strongly appealed to the Ministry of Home Affairs to revoke these two Memorial days.¹³⁰

Nevertheless, in 2007, in his capacity as leader of the KMT, Ma Ying-Jeou visited the Cihu Mausoleum (in Chinese, 慈湖) to pay his respects, and emphasised that while Chiang Kai-Shek had undoubtedly issued orders that brought about the 228 Incident and the White Terror, he was nonetheless

¹³⁰ Statement released by the Ministry of Home Affairs on 29 August 2007.

worth venerating in the light of his three-decade record of governance as a whole,¹³¹ since it was Chiang Kai-Shek who had protected Taiwan from the threat of the PRC. Once again, we find the KMT rationalising the brutal atrocities carried out in Taiwan in the name of the Cold War. Ma Ying-Jeou went on to reopen the Cihu Mausoleum during his first term as president in 2008. After that, he made an official presidential visit to Cihu on 5 April each year, notwithstanding the public resentment this caused.

My interviews with survivors were conducted under Ma's second term of his presidency. During my interviews, each of my participant expresses his disappointment even anger toward Ma's commemoration of Chiang Kai-Shek. Words such as "*Chiang Kai-Shek? He was a sinner!*"¹³², "*I am not surprised at Ma's deeds, what I surprised is why it could happen in my late eighties? It's ridiculous!*"¹³³ pervade my participants' narratives.

Although it is axiomatic that Chiang Kai-Shek was the key person who carried out the White Terror against his political opponents during the Cold War era, it is also true that the economic support he obtained from the United States assisted his government in bringing about 'Taiwan's economic miracle'. Against this background, any disenchantment of the KMT with Chiang becomes tricky. Despite the increasing number of narratives of survivors, and archival records that ascribe blame to Chiang Kai-Shek, President Ma annually apologises to Chiang's victims annually on the one hand, while celebrating Chiang's greatness on the other. Meanwhile, the KMT has maintained its inflexible contrition discourse, seemingly unaffected by the introduction of the UDHR, and Taiwan's transitional justice agenda continues to focus on 'persecution'—a narrative that has yet to capture the brutality or culpability of the KMT.

¹³¹ 陳志平報導 (2007.10.31) 馬英九談蔣介石：功大於過！聯合晚報 (United Evening News).

¹³² Transcript of JC 2012, 12.

¹³³ Transcript of VC 2012, 12.

Discussion: the divergent culture of contrition

Taiwan's efforts to come to terms with the White Terror have been challenged by international human rights experts for diverging from the generally accepted principles outlined by the ICTJ.¹³⁴ Absent the resolution afforded by a truth commission, or criminal trials, or any process that would require the former perpetrators of abuse to be identified and held responsible for their actions, and given the expiration of the financial compensation programme, it seems that transitional justice for the White Terror in Taiwan has stalled.

Throughout the almost two-decade transitional justice scheme in Taiwan, 'human rights', especially the UDHR has been the polemic value in the official discourse. As it was also embraced by the advocates of the Formosa Incident in 1979. Nonetheless the UDHR is subscribed to the political condition of the Cold War even in the post-Cold War era.

For some scholars, Western-centrism not only implicates the understanding of transitional justice, but also dictates how people define the content of human rights. Concern over the UDHR emerged during its preparation in 1947. The American Anthropological Association (AAA) published a *Statement on Human Rights*, suggesting that the concept of universal human rights should embrace a variety of ways for individuals to define and pursue the term 'human rights' in their own societies and cultures. Based on the *Statement* (1947), the AAA suggested that the UDHR was a statement of rights conceived only in terms of the values prevalent in the countries of Western Europe and America (ibid.: 539). According to the AAA (1947), a society cannot freely develop its own human rights culture while featuring something transnational as a superior culture. However, this research is not concerned with cultural differences among nations in the context of a universal human rights discourse, or investigating the extent to which a nation follows the UDHR. Rather, it looks at how post-Cold War

¹³⁴ Amnesty International visited Taiwan and commented that the ROC government should have addressed the political repression during the White Terror in a more determined way, especially with regard to those political criminals who had been executed by the KMT regime. For more discussion in Chinese: <https://www.amnesty.tw/news/936>.

politics affect the ability of Taiwanese governments to come to terms with the country's past.

Didier Fassin (2007) questions the use of human rights discourse by discussing how, in 1999, Allied forces and civilians in the Kosovo conflict were categorised in terms of lives to be protected versus lives that it was acceptable to risk. By investigating the process of decision making on the board of Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF; Doctors without Borders), Fassin observes that humanitarianism and politics are continuing to merge. He bases this on the fact that the staff of MSF—an NGO—began to work for the government. He finds that 'in Kosovo, sacrificing the life of several hundred is the condition of preserving the life of one individual of Allied force [sic]' (ibid.), underscoring the proposition that the lives of the two groups are not valued equally. The notion that there is always, at a policy level, some prioritisation of the lives of some over the lives of others gives rise to both Atanasoski and Fassin's critiques of inequality in contemporary society. Thus, it is to be expected that not every persecuted individual could retrieve their lost human rights and dignity to an equal extent in Taiwan. Both scholars' arguments raise a question: On a practical level, are so-called universal human rights truly guaranteed to everyone to an equal extent? Savic's (1999) formulation offers a clue to the answer:

Generally speaking, for liberal democracies, guaranteeing human rights meant advocating values related to ideas about the dignity of the individual; for authoritarian states, who oppressed their citizens, guaranteeing human rights meant acquiring legitimacy with regard to the outside world. Also, human rights to an extent represented moral trump cards in the ideological game that was, in the middle of the Cold War, played for the hearts and souls of people throughout the world (ibid.: 6).

The current globalisation of human rights is a phenomenon of 'moral integration' that parallels the processes of economic integration, as normative and moral aspirations converge (Evans 2005: 4). Thus, the era immediately

following WWII saw the articulation of legal standards for universal human rights, and the later politico-economic phenomenon of globalisation encouraged the establishment of a universal human rights regime. As argued in chapter 1 that transitional justice in the post-Cold War era is more of western-centric, by problematising the universal human rights discourse as a 'normative value', Savic argues that human rights at the global level have been the subject of diplomatic competition and ideological propaganda since the Cold War era.¹³⁵ Richard Rorty (1999: 67–83) also suggests that a society seeking to develop its own human rights culture can never free itself of Western cultural imperialism by featuring something transnational as superior. At this point, the post-Cold War political situation is a continuation of the Cold War, as the former rivals are still expecting a genuine reconciliation.

While the global human rights discourse aims at securing basic human rights in political life, there is tension among the various political interests and movements in Taiwan. The system of transitional justice in Taiwan is based on a human rights discourse that does not fully empower survivors with freedom in voicing their past persecution and struggles, due to the tension among conflicting political ideologies. When the official discourse in Taiwan defines the identity of political victims, it attests to the fact that survivors of the White Terror are still subject to those tensions, causing them to struggle to make their past and present political views heard in the official discourse.

In this regard, governments have the power to define what kind of justice is sought in a scheme of transitional justice. By studying relations between nations and global human rights discourse, Huyssen (2011) suggests that nations produce their own human rights discourses under the influence of hegemonic Western powers. Contemporary society is still engaged in a process of ideological battle, as political enemies from the Cold War remain stigmatised in the present day. The official transitional justice discourse in Taiwan illustrates how White Terror survivors' power to recount the past remains constrained, even in an era of liberalism, as they are required to

¹³⁵ Ibid.

present themselves as neutralised and innocent ones in the official transitional justice discourse.

Certainly, Taiwan is subject to the global human rights regime. In fact, the ROC signed both the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* and the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* in 1967, but these had yet to enter into force when the ROC left the UN in 1971. As noted, the notion of universal human rights was only introduced in Taiwanese society in 1979, with the outbreak of the Formosa incident. Later, in 2000, President Chen Shui-Bian claimed to follow the principles of the UDHR in developing the scheme of transitional justice in Taiwan. Nonetheless, the official discourse remains limited with regard to acknowledgement of the past in Taiwan, and this condition did not improve after the Taiwanese parliament ratified both Covenants in 2009. While the global human rights discourse has undoubtedly assisted Taiwanese society in initiating a scheme of transitional justice and according a measure of recognition to the victims of the White Terror, the global human rights discourse has not afforded Taiwanese society complete emancipation from its conflicted past. On the contrary, the continued hegemonic influence of Western nations enables the Taiwanese authorities to continue excluding former political enemies from the sphere of reconciliation. Communists continue to suffer accusations and discrimination.

Having argued that Cold War politics persist in the present day around the world, including Taiwan. Even though Taiwan is not in a state of armed conflict, the system of transitional justice there illustrates that, under the protection of global human rights discourse, the prioritisation of some lives over others still happens. My interviewees, the survivors of the White Terror, have yet to be fully embraced by the transitional justice system. Not only their suffering but also their political activism deserves full respect from the authorities. The limited contrition discourse initiated in Taiwan in the 1990s drew structural support from the legacy of the Cold War era. Because it was the fall of the socialist nations that marked the end of the Cold War, the post-Cold War era did not allow for rehabilitation of the formerly stigmatised ideologies of socialism and communism. Rather, it has seen the continued dominance of capitalism and democracy. Socialists continue to be

viewed as 'undesirable' political elements worldwide, including in Taiwan, while the non-socialist who were pro-independence political dissidents persecuted by the KMT regime have gained more sympathy and focus in Taiwan's transitional justice scheme since the DPP came to power in 2000. In its pursuit of transitional justice, the government therefore confronts an issue as to whether it should 'destigmatise' the socialists among its former political criminals.

This political challenge profoundly leads the remorse for 228 Incident and the White Terror to completely different directions. The 228 Incident has been widely defined as serious political violence that aimed to silence the rebel happened on 27 February 1947 in Taipei. The rather uncomplicated nature of the conflict paves the way for the later democratic authorities, especially the DPP to reach a full vindication for the formerly persecuted ones. The remorse of the 228 Incident is in this regard not profoundly affected by the political legacy of the Cold War. However, as having discussed in the previous chapters, the White Terror was a prolonged time of political conflict between the KMT regimes and its enemy of socialists, pro-independence, anarchism, and so forth. The space of uttering their past varies with their different political causes.

And the term 'human rights' has inevitably been neutralised in Taiwan as if it is a taboo for people to explore the reason that had led to these former political prisoners' suffering. All the documentaries, de-classified archives, and oral histories point out the fact of human rights violation. Yet in the face of the *Compensation Act* and the political condition, Taiwanese society barely advances to hold the KMT regime accountable. During Ma Ying-Jeou's presidency, Chiang Kai-Shek was almost partially vindicated for the proposition that his governance secured Taiwan from the threat of socialism during the Cold War, in spite of the governance was all-out state violence. The plight of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme is itself a mirror of the legacy of the Cold War in present-day Taiwan.

As a result, Taiwan's recollection of the White Terror has tended to focus on the aspect of ethos and neglect the truth and justice aspect; its perfunctory museums, monuments, and public apologies show a lack of political will. Because neither the global politics nor the contrition discourse

create a climate of compulsory accountability, the proliferation of cultural works has served to reinforce a situation in which only those survivors who insist they had no subversive intention are eligible to benefit from the culture of contrition. That is, no one can connect the past systematic abuse of human rights with the reality of popular resistance during the White Terror. The survivors of the White Terror thus in a sense co-operate in the construction of the culture of contrition by taking on the neutral role of innocent victims in the KMT's characterisation of the Cold War. As long as the characterisation of 'innocence' prevails, Taiwan's culture of contrition remains at a standstill.

Conclusion

Taiwan's official transitional justice discourse is characterised by a culture of contrition that has gradually become prevalent in post-Cold War Taiwan. As Elster explains, in practical terms, transitional justice is always context-dependent (2004: 79). Conditioned by a universal human rights discourse that is Western-centric, Taiwan's transitional justice discourse enables it to continue justifying the political oppression in which the government engaged in order to exterminate political threats to the KMT regime and US interests in Taiwan. In addition, because it was the United States that prevailed and brought an end to the Cold War, the culture of contrition has been developed under a paradigm of anti-socialism that has endured since the Cold War era. That is to say, the survivors of the White Terror have yet to be truly de-stigmatised as long as their rehabilitation requires them to disguise their past as political dissidents.

Thus, as the violent past is revisited, 'justice' is meant to be expressed in a series of institutional arrangements and strategies for preventing any further oppression by the government of its former adversaries. However, as Taiwanese society searches for the meaning of the White Terror, it is presented with an account of oppression against seemingly random individuals with no specific political agenda. Domestic institutional arrangements allow White Terror survivors to give voice to their past provided they confine their narratives to the framework offered by the government. The authorities' perfunctory approach prevents the political

conflict aspect of the White Terror from coming to light, as survivors are inhibited from referring to it and, by conforming their stories to the official discourse, contribute to the deficit in Taiwan's transitional justice discourse.

Since the suspension of the compensation machinery in September 2014, the project of national remembrance of the White Terror remains uncertain. In the absence of any legal arrangements or institutions, the culture of contrition continues to address only those who have not opposed the KMT. Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice is stalled, for it excludes those who do not fit the current contrition discourse. Progress will require the emergence of a powerful competing discourse outside the official sphere. That is, while only permitted voices are given a platform by the authorities, where have the elusive voices of survivors gone? Further, how do survivors who cooperated in the formation of the official version of the White Terror memory currently perceive themselves? These questions form the themes of this study on how survivors revisit their past in their public and private lives. Namely, the competing non-official discourse among survivors is the central issue in the chapters that follow. Chapter 4 focuses on the survivors' silence in the official discourse. Their silence offers clues as to how the survivors locate their unspeakable past in their private life, which is a major impetus to their development of a competing discourse in Taiwan and also sheds light on what survivorhood means to them.

Chapter 4

Breaking the conspiracy of silence— an ethnographic analysis of survivors

Introduction

While confronting the legacy of the White Terror, the issue of how survivors situate their past, especially the undisclosed episodes, in their present-day lives becomes vital. When it comes to the hidden portions of the past, it is important to be aware of the salience of silence (Felman and Laub 1992) in understanding the past of survivors of human rights abuse. During my field research in Taiwan, I noticed my informants often were silent about aspects of their past. Publicly, they were inclined to maintain silence about details of their past persecution, and also about their personal histories of insurgency. For instance, VT, a man who was convicted in the 1950s of being a communist and served a 10-year prison sentence. Although VT is more communicative than most of my interviewees, he still finds it difficult to talk about the political activities that brought about his persecution. And he is reticent about some elements of his prison experience—particularly about the inhumane treatment and killing of fellow inmates that he witnessed. As this behaviour is not unique to VT in my field research, it seems that silence sheds light on the survivors' experience of persecution and of resistance and, accordingly, informs the study of my informants' survivorhood. Exploring their silence provides insight into how they relate to their past in contemporary Taiwan.

To psychologists and sociologists, silence does not imply merely an absence of verbal communication. Rather, as Block de Behar (1995: 7) explains, 'silence remains subject to the interpretations of the receiver to whom its message is addressed'. Although silence cannot be comprehended in verbal terms, it is capable of conveying diverse meanings, which, in the political context, include conformity, resistance, denial, depression, and so forth (Aminzade et al. 2001; Ferguson 2003). Silence is not merely a lack of response but can be a political practice whereby actors engage in the public

realm. From the perspective of power relations, Bassett (2013) points to silence as a common tactic of the powerful. However, while the analysis of Taiwan's official transitional justice discourse presented here points to the authorities' silencing of survivors by means of a series of institutional arrangements, Bassett emphasises that silence has also been a tactic adopted by subjugated groups, and affords a certain freedom (*ibid.*). Here, the sense of freedom refers to the one whose silence is a strategy employed in response to the powerful. In the case of Taiwan, the pervasiveness of silence among survivors has been remarked frequently in the literature, but researchers have assumed that it was a side effect of their painful experiences, without considering silence from a perspective of political struggle. Bassett's approach invites us to reconsider why, in the official discourse, survivors do not speak up about their history of resistance. Having shown how that discourse inhibits my informants from speaking freely of their past political activities, I turn in this chapter to their own perspective on their silence. In so doing, I examine the power relations currently operating between the authorities and survivors in present-day Taiwan. Does the latter's silence signify passivity in the face of past persecution or a deliberate resistance to the prescribed official discourse?

Individual responses to traumatic experiences of political oppression are not uniform. People suffer in different ways (Levi 1990; Agamben 1999); their stories are varied and their responses unique. But the official discourse in Taiwan does not recognise this diversity; rather, it creates a single trajectory of persecution under the KMT regime. In the state-sponsored oral history, a model of persecution is established that is rooted in the political needs of present-day Taiwan. There are nuanced but nonetheless notable differences between the picture of victimhood that emerges from my field research and that which is portrayed in the government publication. Certainly, they have facts in common, such as the historical conviction and imprisonment practices of the KMT regime. However, their perspectives on their experiences vary according to such factors as extent of persecution and political viewpoint, and this diversity is the focus of this chapter. In this regard, the discrepancy between the authority-driven research and my

findings suggest that the understanding of silence, and of survivor trauma, is problematic.

One of the limitations of the official discourse concerning survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan is its description of such people as uniformly ‘innocent’ of subversion. In our interviews, my informants frequently report that they feel shame about their past, not because they were victims but because they were ineffectual opponents of the government—failed enemies of the state. This invites us to consider the White Terror as not merely a period of monolithic state oppression but, rather, a time of complex political struggle. Because it seems that the silence of many survivors is a function not only of their victimhood but of their continued identification with political resistance and intrigue.

Once survivors speak out about their painful past, they serve as witnesses to history. Their narratives provide perspective on the extent to which that past was a time of persecution by the government but also a time of political conflict across the society. According to Taiwan’s brand of transitional justice, the regime that perpetrated the oppression of its citizens now writes their obituaries. National mourning displaces private grief. Tens of thousands of stories have been presented to bear witness to the persecution under the KMT regime. Although the culture of contrition has vindicated the right of survivors to give voice to the trauma and shame of their persecution, it does not equally empower them to express their political convictions. My findings indicate that my informants perceive themselves not only as witnesses to state terrorism but as witnesses to a history of political unrest that lies outside the official discourse.

As some scholars would have it, ‘silence is for [survivors] a fated exile, yet also a home, a destination, and a binding oath’ (Felman and Laub 1992:58)¹³⁶; however, silence provides clues to the individual’s understanding of survival. Silence is about one’s attitude towards past and present, for it is not only a feature of how one retells one’s past but, in this case, also a reflection of how the current political condition encourages or inhibits certain perspectives on the past. The limitations placed on Taiwan’s official discourse on the White Terror has proven to be the most significant obstacle

¹³⁶ Here, Felman and Laub refer to traumatised people such as victims of the Nazi Holocaust.

to the survivors' narrative experiences. Much of the complexity of survivorhood is about the degree of traumatisation experienced and how one's past is reflected in present-day power relations—whether they still feel traumatised or ashamed and why. Thus, only by exploring the silence will researchers be able to comprehend fully the emotions that grip survivors and compel them to relive the past.

Given the difficulty that White Terror survivors have in confronting the past, an ethnographic analysis can illuminate how they reconcile the past and present and provide insight into the nature of their subjectivity. This entails approaching their emotions from a sociological perspective, rather than undertaking a psychoanalytical approach at the individual level. Traumatisation and shame are thus not analysed as features of their psychological makeup, but addressed as social phenomena in a specific socio-political context. In exploring how my informants are re-living their past, we gain insight into the complexity of society's memory of the White Terror.

Having argued that Taiwan's official transitional justice discourse circumscribes the way in which survivors can recount their memories, I would suggest their silence is a function of current power relations between the authorities and survivors. Silence reflects the discrepancy between the viewpoints of the two sides. A tension in the contestation of the past is thus exposed.

The meaning of survival

In autumn of 2013, I was invited to a private screening of a documentary about a survivor, VT, who was imprisoned for 10 years during the 1950s. The documentary mainly focused on how VT survived under the KMT regime and continues to live his life afterwards. VT also attended the private screening, as it was his first opportunity to preview the documentary before it was released. Just before the closing credits, a list of political criminals executed during the 1950s appeared on screen, which bothered VT:

I survived the White Terror. Yet I do not speak for those who

were executed; I can only express my own views (Field research note: 2012, 10).¹³⁷

VT grew quite agitated on this point. He explained to the director and the audience that some of the individuals named on the list had been his friends or associates during his imprisonment and he felt it would be presumptuous if he were to appear to be testifying in this film about their situations, which he had not experienced directly: 'I could never understand what he was faced with, what kind of agony he was feeling as the threat of death grew nearer or when it arrived', he said, recalling one of his departed comrades on the list.¹³⁸

VT found it impossible to bear witness to the experience of death, although he, like most survivors, especially those incarcerated during the 1950s, witnessed the execution of others.¹³⁹ For instance, JL, imprisoned in the 1960s, recalls two warders dragging a condemned political prisoner down the prison corridor in shackles.¹⁴⁰ Survivor Huang Chiu-Shuan (in Chinese, 黃秋爽), arrested along with her father and five other family members, recalls witnessing her father similarly dragged along the prison corridor to his death after being interrogated under torture.¹⁴¹ Both survivors share VT's reticence on the subject out of respect for the departed and a sense that it is not their place to interpret another person's subjective experience of death.

Certainly, during the KMT regime, many survivors knew of inhumane treatment or witnessed it directly. Although there was a period in their lives when the threat of death was omnipresent, it is difficult for them to talk

¹³⁷ It was the occasion I was not allowed to take audio record; I thus present the scene in terms of my field research note.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ As noted, of all the casualties attributable to the White Terror, nearly 50 per cent occurred during the 1950s.

¹⁴⁰ Field research note 2012.10. On this occasion I was not allowed to make an audio recording; I thus present the scene on the basis of my field research note.

¹⁴¹ Huang Chiu-Shuan was born in 1930, a daughter of the famous Taiwanese insurgent Huang Tien (in Chinese, 黃天). Owing to her father's insurgent actions, Huang Chiu-Shuan and other family members, including her mother and siblings, were arrested by the KMT regime. Ultimately, Huang Tien was executed but Huang Chiu-Shuan and other family members were released. For further details, see 曹欽榮, 鄭南榕基金會 (2012) 流麻溝十五號: 綠島女生分隊及其他。台北: 書林。

about death. Almost every of my participants adhere to Adorno's dictum, "[t]o write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric", finding it impossible for survivors to interpret or testify to extreme, inhuman experiences, such as death, in later years. Accordingly, witness remains a lapse in the subjective experience of death.

But Felman and Laub (1992) offer a more radical argument, asserting that it is not only impossible to bear witness to death from the inside, but also from the outside. The outsider is, by definition, excluded from the event (Felman and Laub 1992: 231–232; Agamben 1999: 35). Meanwhile Primo Levi (1990) recalls the phenomenon of *Muselmann*, the slang at Auschwitz for those prisoners who seemed to have lost all will to live.¹⁴² To Levi, *Muselmann* became the witness of the inhuman condition. *Muselmann* simply attests to the inhuman condition by his appearance. To articulate this, Levi describes an inmate at Auschwitz called Hurbinek, an emaciated three-year-old child with no parents. Hurbinek spoke only babble, and persisted in repeatedly sounding out a single word or phrase that no one could understand, until he died in early March 1945. 'He bears witness through these words of mine,' says Levi (ibid.).

Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben (1999) elaborates on Levi's work, remarking that, lacking language, Hurbinek could not bear witness (1999: 39). While Levi claims that it is his own language through which Hurbinek bears witness, Agamben carefully adds that 'not even the survivor can bear witness completely, can speak his own lacuna' (ibid.). The *Muselmann* expresses the limit of human endurance under political torture, and the term 'lacuna' refers to what Agamben calls 'non-language' in identifying the sounds made by Hurbinek. The non-language, which one may speak when one is alone, and may be merely a sound, or a word that conveys no

¹⁴² Primo Levi (1919–1987) survived the Auschwitz concentration camp. After liberation in 1945, he immediately began a book about his time there, which was published under the title, *If This is A Man* (1947). Recounting his own experiences and his observations of fellow inmates, Levi describes a category of prisoner who, in the final stages of hunger, disease, exhaustion, and despair, had all but shut down. They were called *Muselmann* (German for Muslim), possibly because they were inclined to squat on the ground in what was regarded as an 'Oriental' fashion, or because some had reached a stage where they seemed to have lost the power of language, uttering only guttural sounds that were faintly reminiscent of Arabic. Regardless of its origins, Levi adopted the term to refer to the phenomenon of living as if one is already dead.

information or interpretation of the human condition. Nonetheless, it attests to the existence of *Muselmann*, the extremely inhuman condition.

Agamben's view potentially undermines the proposition that survivors may not bear witness to the death of others. The dividing line between inside and outside seems to be crossed. Pointing to the existence of *Muselmann*—the living dead¹⁴³—Agamben seeks to transcend the traditional assumption of political philosophy that the border between survival and death is fixed. *Muselmann* suggests that the borders between language and non-language, human and inhuman are permeable, making the distinction between survival and death in Auschwitz ambiguous. Accordingly, testimony does not necessitate the use of language. As Agamben argues:

Perhaps every word, every writing is born, in this sense, as testimony. This is why what is borne witness to cannot already be language or writing. It can only be something to which no one has borne witness. And this is the sound that arises from the lacuna, the non-language that one speaks when one is alone, the non-language to which language answers, in which language is born. It is necessary to reflect on the nature of that to which no one has borne witness, on this non-language (2002: 38).

Suffice to say that *Muselmann* opens a window for Agamben to decipher the extreme conditions at Auschwitz. Agamben's work focuses on what it means for language to exist and, in this context, on the boundaries of testimony. As the phenomenon of *Muselmann* blurs the disjunction between survival and death for Agamben, the non-language in survivor testimony. In this regard, silence can be understood as a way of testifying.

Many survivors of the White Terror experienced inhuman conditions under political torture, such as brutal interrogation, terrible prison conditions, and the omnipresent threat of death and further torture. For instance,

¹⁴³ Here, Agamben elaborates on the term *Muselmann* by introducing the account of another survivor of Auschwitz, Jean Améry (1912–1978), who uses *Muselmann* to describe a prisoner who was giving up and given up on by his comrades, who was no longer able to distinguish between good or bad, intellectual or unintellectual. They were like mummy-men, the living dead (Améry 1980; Agamben 1999: 41).

survivor and famous artist Ou Yang-Wen (in Chinese, 歐陽文; 1924–2012) painted the scene of a surgery that he was forced to undergo in the name of a ‘medical demonstration’ in the course of his imprisonment during the White Terror. During the surgery, the medical officers cut open Ou’s belly without providing anaesthetic, and pulled out his intestines to show the doctors for teaching. The painting below depicts the horrible past that Ou has suffered.



Illustration 4-1: Ou Yang-Wen’s painting of the inhuman treatment he suffered during the White Terror. Provided by Ou Yang-Wen’s family.

For now, the White Terror has now been officially recognised as a time of systematic state atrocities. Society had been propelled into a state of conflict whereby any individual who opposed the KMT regime would be targeted as a political enemy, and subject to arrest and imprisonment. While most survivors refuse to recall or are perhaps unable to verbalise the worst of their experiences, none seems to find peace in silence. Here, Agamben’s understanding of silence as a lacuna in survivors’ testimony is helpful. It suggests that witnessing others’ deterioration and death is part of one’s

survival, and the meaning of silence not only touches on one's own subjective experiences, but also implicates how one deals with others' experiences, including their loss of humanity.

While my participant, VT expresses a similar reluctance to attest to others' experiences, CP's narrative echoes VT's reaction to the witnessing of death:

It makes me cry when I think back to the time when I was imprisoned with Guo and Hsu. I heard them planning their appeal for a retrial, but the High Military Court sentenced both Guo and Hsu to death, and both were executed within three months. [...] During those days, I cannot imagine how anyone could hold back tears. Everyone was crying. When the warders called their names to be executed at midnight that night, we were all speechless, we had known this was going to happen (transcript with CP: 2010,10).

CP offered this recollection when we visited the prison where he had been deprived of six years of his youth. During the interview, he kept breaking down into sobs, so we had to pause the interview. As CP recalled the scene at midnight, words seemed to fail him. He kept repeating every detail of Guo and Hsu's last few minutes on the ward, subsiding into agitated gasps from time to time. Clearly, he found it extremely difficult to recount this episode.

Amongst my informants, the agony that haunts CP is not unique. SC was convicted of treason during the 1960s and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. While awaiting trial, SC was taken from his cell late one night driven to a thicket outside the prison. An agent of the secret police forced him to dig a hole for several hours, and he was told that this would be his grave if he did not give up the names of his associates. SC recalls:

I was frightened and exhausted. The secret agents were afraid that potential traitors had not been reported. I know, but [long pause] I don't want to recall that night again (Transcript of SC 2013, 3).

Not only SC, PH, a survivor of the 1960s, also finds difficulty in recalling his past persecution, merely stated,

My past cannot be cured. Never (Transcript of PH 2013, 12).

Compare with PH's silence, SC is able to describe his unbearable and dehumanising experiences only in fragments, with frequent pauses, silence attesting to the persistence of his wounds. Silence stores their unspoken past and emotions; it is a way of witnessing.

Arguably my participants' different levels of silence attests to that silence constitutes a space in which to store testimony that the speaker cannot bear to verbalise or that lies beyond the limit of language. Survivors do not deny the existence of the unbearable past. Sometimes they seem unable to convey the past to an audience, for they are profoundly self-conscious. They only revisit the unspoken parts in private. Yet silence also lets the listeners know that there is more testimony. In the context of victimhood or suffering, silence implies being unable to speak out about unbearable events and a refusal to recall them.

However, silence need not be read as signifying passivity and denial, for it can stem from a sense of loyalty or defiance. VT, for example, is silent with regard to the past of others not only because there are limits to his knowledge but, more profoundly, because he declines to seek recognition for himself on account of their persecution,¹⁴⁴ or to manipulate his comrades' reputations. Also, he has grown tired of describing himself as an innocent survivor according to the role ascribed to him in the official discourse. VT had always seen himself as a political objector and a threat to the KMT regime until he was invited to come forward as a victim. Silence in this context complicates VT's view of himself, offers clues to his unbearable sorrow, and also suggests his resistance to the programmed official discourse. By silencing part of his own past and that of others, VT asserts his independence: He may be dominated by the official transitional justice discourse but silence is his mode of resistance against that domination.

¹⁴⁴ Field research note 2012.10.

Hence, the manifestation of silence is key to an understanding of the implications of survivorhood. Bearing witness to others' unbearable conditions constructs the meaning of survival, especially when silence implicates such issues as agony, trauma, loyalty, and resistance. Silence offers insights into how the experience of persecution, and of participation in political struggle, both work to construct survivors' memory of the White Terror. That is, silence not only reflects the shame and trauma of painful experience but also the suppressed perspective on the White Terror in contemporary Taiwanese society.

Trauma: collective victimhood

There is wide acceptance of the notion that silence is a symptom of traumatic response to painful experience (Butalia 1998; De Brito et al. 2001). We are inclined to accept the causal relation without hesitation, all the more so in Taiwan where the official discourse provides a model of persecution and victimhood. However, given the various dimensions of silence discussed above, a question is raised: Is my informants' trauma associated with their persecution or is it linked also to their experience of political struggle?

A sociological perspective on trauma

The notion of psychic trauma as a phenomenon—a way of articulating emotional response to a shattering event—has emerged only recently. During the First World War, patriotism was the primary tool used by armies to rouse their soldiers' fighting spirit. However, in the day-to-day reality of battle, fear was more pervasive than fighting spirit. This fear—of being attacked, wounded, or killed—was ever present. As a result, some of them suffered psychological damage. Unlike the soldiers whose physical scars were recognised as evidence of heroism, those who were psychologically scarred were isolated from their comrades in arms by a diagnosis of 'trauma insanity' (Fassin and Rechtman 2009: 41–42). Although the mentally wounded soldiers were eligible for financial compensation, they were stigmatised by the perception of cowardice. Their injuries were met with scepticism until the post-WWII period, when the trauma of survivors of the Nazi concentration

camps was recognised and studied. It was only in the 1980s, when post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) was included as a new clinical entry in diagnostic manuals, that these survivors were seen as victims of trauma. (Fassin and Rechtman 2009: 76–97). In psychoanalysis, as Freud suggests in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, trauma is understood as a wound inflicted on the mind. When an upsetting event is experienced too suddenly, too unexpectedly, it may be unavailable to the consciousness until it imposes itself again, repeatedly, in the nightmares and repetitive actions of the survivor (Caruth 1996: 4; 2001). Caruth found that, as a response to a catastrophic event, trauma can manifest in the often delayed and uncontrolled repetitive appearance of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena (1996: 11). In other words, trauma often occurs belatedly, returning to haunt the individual. Reviews of psychoanalytical works that analyse the notion of trauma (Hollander-Goldfein et al. 2012; Caruth 1996; Hunt 2010) show that scholars tend to focus on the internal mental process of the individual, which does not address the significance of trauma in power relations at the collective level.

Finding the psychoanalytic approach limited, Jeffrey Alexander (2012) suggests ‘cultural trauma’ as an approach to studying trauma from a more sociological perspective, arguing that events are not inherently traumatic, but that trauma is a socially mediated attribution (ibid.: 13). Events are one thing, and their interpretation is another. Alexander suggests that this attribution is not necessarily simultaneous with the occurrence of the event, but may be made before the event occurs, as an adumbration, or in its aftermath, as post-hoc reconstruction. To Alexander, imagination is intrinsic to the very process of representation (ibid.: 14). However, he does not see trauma simply as an ‘innovative process’ within the individual’s internal mental process. The notion of cultural trauma emphasises that trauma exists also in the socio-political context and suggests that exploration of an individual’s mental reaction to a particular event should include an examination at the societal level of such influences as mass media, state bureaucracy, and the legal setting. In this regard, trauma is subject to the power relations of a society and should not be ascribed solely to the inner psychic activity of the individual.

Furthermore, trauma is a process rather than an outcome. It is true that trauma is an emotional response that stems from one's past. But this emotional response also implicates one's present and future. Hence, trauma does not exist as a fixed effect, but continuously mirrors the socio-political situation that influences one's interpretation of a particular time or event. Trauma in this light can be viewed as malleable, for once the socio-political situation ceases its influence, one's emotional response nonetheless continues to develop.

Certainly, survivors offer the most compelling representation of past state persecution in Taiwan. It is reasonable to deduce that they are silent on the overwhelming feelings that have haunted them for a long time. However, we have seen how political power relations come to silence survivors' accounts of trauma, and this influence is almost certainly operating as well. Hence, my analysis is conducted in two steps: first, re-locating the emotion of trauma with regard to various experiences of persecution; and second, apart from the torment inflicted on them, scrutinising how other aspects of the White Terror—such as the antagonism between the government and its people—traumatised them.

Regarding the pain of themselves and others

I first met HC in Jingmei Human Rights Park in December 2012, when I was invited to attend an informal meeting hosted by several survivors of the White Terror. At the time, this 82-year-old man kindly agreed to be interviewed. Over the next few months, we met several times in his flat and talked about his past.

In 1958, HC was convicted of treason for promoting the cause of Taiwanese independence during his military service. Prior to his arrest, HC had served in the navy for two years. According to the charges against him, he had planned to steal a fishing boat and flee to Okinawa, Japan, to seek political asylum from the US, which had a military base there. HC confirmed that this was true during his interview with Professor Chang Yen-Hsien (張炎憲: 2000). As he observed, the U.S. had been friendly towards Taiwan during his military service in the 1950s, so he believed that the U.S. would

help those who fought against China, either Nationalist China or Communist China.

The KMT, of course, represents China. [...] I understand the US had assisted in developing Taiwan's military force during the White Terror. Yet, the KMT was not a worthy ally. We Taiwanese deserved better. (Transcript of HC 2013, 3).

How unworthy was the KMT? HC explained that the corruption he observed in the army and the coercive measures being carried out by the KMT regime were what had led him to 'betray' the nation—that is, to revolt against the KMT authority. Hence, he embarked on his course of political activism by assisting in translating from Japanese to Taiwanese a famous book about the ideal of independence by Thomas Wen-I Liao, who led the Tokyo-based Taiwanese independence campaign between the 1940s and 1960s.¹⁴⁵ To HC, Japan was the last hope for the anti-KMT movement. Japan was home not only to one of the largest US military bases in East Asia but also to the most active overseas pro-independence organisation. Suffice to say that HC hoped to harness the hegemonic position of the US in support of his campaign for independence. Although he did not refer directly to the influence of the Cold War during our talks, it was clear that the Cold War framing affected his political judgment.

Accordingly, HC was found guilty of treason and sentenced to seven years in prison. After his release in 1965, he was unable to resume his military service. He took various jobs and started two ventures, both of which failed. Life was far tougher than he had anticipated. Eventually he was

¹⁴⁵ Thomas Wen-I Liao (廖文毅 1910–1986) was born in Yunlin, Taiwan. At the age of 22, he pursued a master's degree in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Michigan, US; and completed his doctorate in Chemical Engineering in 1935. Before the end of the Second World War, he was appointed professor at the University of Zhejiang, China. When the KMT took over Taiwan in 1945, Liao returned home and was appointed a senior civil servant. However, following the 228 Incident in 1947, Liao and his brother were blacklisted by the KMT regime. They fled first to China, then to Hong Kong, and finally to Japan, where they settled in 1948. There they founded the Taiwan Democratic Independence Party (台灣民主獨立黨) along with other Taiwanese expatriates. In 1956, Liao officially claimed to have founded the Taiwan Republic Provisional Government (台灣共和國臨時政府) in Tokyo, which was known during the 1960s as the primary Taiwanese independence movement overseas.

able to open a pharmacy based on his experience as an army medic, and thus managed to support his family. Now he is retired.

At first glance, HC looks cheerful, giving no outward sign of having been persecuted in the past or traumatised by his experiences. But there is trauma beneath the surface, and it has been there for a long time. During our conversations in HC's flat, his wife usually stays in her room rather than joining us. Speaking of his past persecution, HC tends to describe events calmly. Only when he tells how his wife managed to survive that difficult time and raise their child on their own, does HC start to sob and halt the conversation:

We had enjoyed only five months of married life before I was arrested. I heard that Mrs Hsu was very upset as her husband was also arrested and she took this out on my wife: 'My husband is the only breadwinner in my family and it is because your husband has implicated him in his treason!' (Transcript of HC 2013, 3)

To HC, the agony of his imprisonment and disgrace is the cloud his wife has been under for such a long time. When I ask whether he has ever justified his 'treason' to his wife, he shakes his head. From HC's viewpoint, his political activities need to remain a secret even now, in spite of the repercussions for many individuals, including members of his own family. To HC, avoiding discussing his past with family members is to protect them from further hurt. He admits he feels distanced from his beloved wife when he ponders his past intrigues.¹⁴⁶ HC's silence conveys the horror of the state's atrocities against him, which traumatised him and his family. But it also conceals his subversive activities, which were psychologically damaging to the couple. Both experiences—persecution and political struggle—construct HC's current silence.

HC's sense of persecution is more intense than that of his wife, for he was the one who was interrogated under torture. Before the trial, he was

¹⁴⁶ Field research note of HC 2013.3. The occasion was a private dinner gathering, I thus collected materials with immediate handwriting notes.

kept in solitary confinement at Fengshan Military Detention Centre (in Chinese, 鳳山招待所) for 16 months. HC recalls the details with a clenched fist:

That period was hard. [...] While preparing our plot, I was ready to sacrifice my life. When I was arrested, I did not resist, but behaved as a secret agent is supposed to. I had violated military law. I deserved to die. [...] They threatened me with instruments of torture [here, a pause of nearly two minutes, with an anguished facial expression]. The same happened with Mr Hsu: The interrogators tortured him for hours to force him to reveal the identity of his accomplices (Transcript of HC 2013, 3).

Recounting the scene triggers HC's deep trauma. While the suffering he recalls so vividly was his own, he feels that his family were also victims. Although he did not witness his wife's experiences during his persecution, he still feels a sense of 'collectivity' with her. He was not the only interviewee to express agony for a loved ones' suffering, as in the case of WL and SC:

One night, at midnight, my wife was sobbing and went out. My mother-in-law was very worried about her, and followed her. At that time, I was in prison and my family lived in Mon-cha. My wife just walked along the road towards the Xindian river, and it looked as if she were going to drown herself. Suddenly, my mother-in-law ran after her, crying, 'Come back! Don't leave us!' My wife looked back at her mother and, in the end, they both broke down in tears (Transcript of WL 2013, 3).¹⁴⁷

I have never spoken of my experiences to my wife even though we have been so close. [...] It was too hard for me to describe to her what I had undergone, especially since I know how much she suffered, all because of my deeds (Transcript of

¹⁴⁷ As outlined in chapter 1 and 3, WL was an intelligence officer of the KMT regime during the 1950s, and was subsequently convicted of treason in 1957 for advocating independence.

SC 2013, 10).

Both WL and SC appeared agitated and SC wept when they described the suffering of others. The difference between the experience of former political prisoners and that of their families does not impede them from sharing a sense of collective trauma. In other words, collective trauma does not emanate only from shared direct experiences of the same event, as interpretation and imagination are inherent to it. While only the individuals who experience such things directly can bear witness to excruciating experiences and death under torture, there is a collective trauma based on the interpretation of an event, irrespective of personal experience. The collectivity of this trauma develops through a specific socio-political process rather than arising from empathy with loved ones. The meaning of the 'collectivity' of trauma is about how power relations operate on one's memory.

For instance, JL is a former political prisoner who was convicted of treason for allegedly conspiring to hijack a ship during his compulsory military service in 1963. JL insists that he did no such thing. *'The indictment was completely fabricated'*, he says, although he admits that, from adolescence onwards, he was determined to subvert the KMT. After two appeals, his conviction was lengthened from a 15-year sentence to life imprisonment, but he ended up serving 15 years in prison. Looking back, JL expresses anger and sorrow, for one of his co-accused, Chiu, had been sentenced to death after the first appeal.

Chiu was so angry and frustrated when he realised that he had been sentenced to death. I felt the same way. We felt helpless; no one believed that we had ever conspired to do anything [silence for nearly a minute]. The KMT regime persecuted us, before we had a chance to subvert them. (Transcript of JL 2013, 11)

Here, the experience that traumatised JL was not only about 'persecution', but also related to the contentious politics under the KMT party-state. Both

the state-level atrocities and intensive political conflicts came to formulate these survivors' trauma and the way in which they interpret others' pain. Hence, for JL, Chiu's condition was not merely an episode of persecution. Rather, it was a series of political oppressions that happened to a political activist.

In the eyes of the KMT party-state, all of my informants were a group of political criminals being punished by the state apparatus, although their political causes varied at the time. Here, the idea of collective trauma sheds light on how past political conditions came to influence a group of people to co-formulate a trauma, regardless of the different degrees and dimensions of their individual experiences.

Everyone was frightened after being arrested. We had been conscious of the risk and consequences all along but still, life in captivity was tough and worse than you anticipated.
(Transcript of RJ 2013, 11)

RJ was born in 1938 and, during the 1960s, was convicted of the crime of treason for his pro-independence activism under the KMT regime. From RJ's perspective, the White Terror was a time of severe hardship, to which a traumatic reaction is understandable. While each of my informants was on the brink of emotional collapse during our interviews, the focus here is on how trauma has gradually become a means whereby society recognises survivors as 'traumatised'—or, to put it another way, how the current political situation makes room for survivors to formulate their traumatised discourse in a similar way.

Like other cases discussed in this section, HC, SC, WL, JL, and RJ spoke of their past suffering by keeping the trauma bottled up inside themselves. Certainly, for them, the past was too painful to be disclosed. Moreover, the current political conditions in Taiwan continue to silence their identity as political insurgents. As stated in Chapter 3, many of my participants have joined the authority-sponsored oral histories, yet none of them has referred to their sufferings or their emotion of trauma as being due to past political insurgence.

It's better not to talk too much about my past conspiracy, let alone my sorrow for the insurgent past. (Transcript of SC 2013, 3)

I shall spell it out if I can live long enough to witness the collapse of the KMT party. The past has haunted me for too long, it's been too long for me. (Transcript of HC 2013, 4)

As Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice came to focus on victimhood, my informants became recognised as 'survivor victims' and their trauma acknowledged, regardless of whether their emotions were expressible or not. But the current power relations reveal how profoundly trauma can be silenced in public. HC, for example, describes his past as a frustrating experience of defeat only to me, but not before society in general. Meanwhile, as a survivor of the 1960s, JL articulates his victimhood by emphasising his innocence in the official discourse.¹⁴⁸ The extent of survivors' trauma has not been fully recognised in the scheme of transitional justice. Two focal points thus emerge: First, the trauma is silenced not only as a response to past persecution, but also as a reflection of the expectations of Taiwan's transitional justice project. Second, even when trauma is acknowledged through a specific socio-political process, this validation does not necessarily render the trauma shareable. On the contrary, some elements of trauma are bound to be subjective and exclusive to the subject. The focus here is not on the phenomenon of trauma-induced isolation from a psychoanalytical perspective but, rather, on how the political relations in Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice generate a similar content of trauma amongst White Terror survivors that is related to their past political struggles. It is the political context of the scheme of transitional justice that deliberately silences their trauma in the official discourse. The isolation that survivors experience in the present day is a function of their trauma.

¹⁴⁸ JL was born in 1940 and was convicted of treason during his military service in 1963. Initially, JL was sentenced to life imprisonment; upon appeal, he was sentenced to death. But he did not give up, and a second appeal ended in his receiving a 15-year sentence. During his captivity, he witnessed the 1972 prison uprising known as the 'Taiyuan Incident', which is discussed in Chapter 5. Since JL's release, he has continued advocating the cause for which he was imprisoned: Taiwan's independence.

Collective trauma: A sense of isolation

Silence should not be a block to investigating the emotion of trauma. Silence reflects the limits and restrictions set up by current power relations, which may limit the range of traumatic experiences that are expressible in the scheme of transitional justice.

No, I have never mentioned my persecution publicly. It was too hard for me to explain. (Transcript of JH 2013, 12)

I wrote poems during my captivity in Taiyuan Prison in Taitung. It was hard to express my anguish, so I wrote poems to calm myself. (Transcript of WL 2013, 2)

If we looked no further, we might infer merely that mental agony silences their trauma. Objectively speaking, both JH and WL were traumatised by their past persecution. They are surviving political victims who continue to endure the trauma in their current lives. But what aspect of their past traumatised them? Was it the persecution, or the political struggle? Both JH and WL acknowledge that both their failed political ventures and their persecution continue to haunt them.¹⁴⁹ So, why do most survivors, including my informants, tend to emphasise the perspective of persecution? Arguably, the main reason is the political situation, which deliberately silences part of the trauma at the collective level. That is, even if the trauma were not unspeakable, my informants would still be facing a political situation that prevents them from earning full recognition of the multiple dimensions of their past.

Collective trauma does not need to be based on a sense of sharing but, rather, can be a ubiquitous status among a group of isolated, traumatised people. On the one hand, trauma is a mental state experienced by a subject. To the extent that it is based on an individual's past experiences, it is fair to say that no one suffers in quite the same way. Thus, a sense of the uniqueness of one's victimhood can justify mental isolation in respect to catastrophic experiences such as political persecution (Fierke 2004: 487; Ben-

¹⁴⁹ Field research note of JH 2013, 12; transcript of WL 2013, 4.

Ze'ev et al. 2010). On the other hand, trauma is a social phenomenon, casting a shadow over a group of people or even a society. For instance, each of my informants may be categorised as a group of traumatised individuals, but they rarely discuss their trauma with others, not even their associates. They are isolated from their own interpretation of their own past. Apart from JH and WL noted above, BY also continues to experience a sense of isolation with respect to his traumatised past. BY was persecuted for his pro-independence stance during his military service in the 1960s. Unlike my other participants, such as JC, BY always remains low-profile and hesitates over publicising his past insurgence, including his persecution-related emotions. During our first two interviews, it was not difficult to discover that 'some episodes', or 'a certain part of the past' has disturbed him, as he was extremely reticent about 'his feelings' about the time of imprisonment.

There is nothing worth noting in my past persecution. I chose to be a staunch activist for my political beliefs [Taiwan's independence]. People must have been frustrated and felt let down by their fate. So did I. I have accepted my fate. That's all.
(Transcript of BY 2013, 4)

But BY's refusal to elaborate upon his past persecution does not stop him from resonating with others' painful experiences. When we spoke of people he knew during his captivity, BY not only recognised those prisoners as 'frustrated activists' but he also showed empathy for those who suffered under the KMT during and after their imprisonment.

I won't say that I almost feel the same things as they [BY's fellow prisoners] experienced, but if you were me, I bet you could not ignore those scenes that happened to 'us'.
(Transcript of BY 2013, 4)

BY cannot deny the fact that he was one of those who had been politically abused under the KMT regime, despite the fact that he has been controlling himself from delving into the scene of persecution. For him, the term 'us'

confirms the fact that persecution did exist in his life. But, hitherto, he is still isolated from sharing the emotion of trauma or relating to his comrades and fellow prisoners, let alone with researchers or citizens in Taiwan. In consequence, as a survivor who has been recognised by the Taiwanese authorities, BY repeats himself in narrating the details of his arrest, interrogation, conviction and so forth, i.e., the picture of persecution during the White Terror, in the official transitional justice discourse. But he has never expressed his reflection on his or others' persecution in the officially sponsored oral histories, or with his fellow survivors.

No, I don't think we [survivors] need to talk about our feelings of persecution. I don't even know how to start the conversation.
(Transcript of BY 2013, 4)

The imperative for transitional justice is not for survivors to decide whether or not they are willing to narrate their reflections on their past. Quite the contrary, the salience of transitional justice is to provide secure conditions, granting these traumatised men dignity (Kriesberg 2004). Without this premise, a study of survivors' isolated emotional state would remain at the level of psychological analysis, instead of advancing to unravelling the persistent political conditions that have restrained and haunted their narratives, both in private and in public.

The sense of isolation is not only based on their particular experiences of persecution but derives, more profoundly, from the way in which, currently, the scheme of transitional justice in Taiwan defines them as 'traumatised survivors with innocence'.

Not only BY, all of my participants have a bone in their throats when it comes to their trauma. Like JC, who emphasises that he has never talked about his reflections on his experiences of persecution with his associates or even with other survivors, *'Unmentionable, it is unmentionable. I don't even know how to describe it.'* In accordance with the analysis above, it seems that both the persecution and the political struggle have traumatised JC. After engaging with the official transitional justice discourse for two decades, JC still hesitates over spelling out his reflections on his persecution. As one of

the most aggressive survivor victims in the official discourse, JC is isolated from himself, narrating his reflections on his own traumatised experiences. Nonetheless he continues to devote himself to narrating scenes of persecution in the official oral history:

They [intelligence agents] tried to force me to confess, but I refused. And I was tortured. They covered my head with a sack. Two men. When the car stopped. Two or three men placed me in a sack and put me on this [a bridge guardrail in Tainan]. I knew I was not on the ground, but I didn't know where I was. A few minutes later, the man who gave my name was pushed into the canal. He asked me, 'hear something?' I heard flogs, and I knew we were by the canal. He asked me if I would confess, and if I didn't I would be thrown into the canal. I didn't answer. He said, 'your last chance.' And I didn't answer. He boosted me into the canal.¹⁵⁰

Given JC's experience is not isolate but common amongst my participants, suffice it to say that the silenced trauma is not only about one's experiences that are too painful to be verbalised. The official transitional justice discourse, which awaits liberalisation, fails to provide survivors with a secure and stable space for narrating their past, including their reflections. These men have suffered from a confluence of these perspectives, silenced both by the horrors of their past and the sanitising of Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice. When the official discourse consolidates the identity of 'qualified' political victims as those people who did not plot any subversion against the KMT regime but were somehow brutally repressed during the White Terror, this not only silences survivors' revolutionary attitudes but also limits society's understanding of their trauma. In this regard, what makes survivors feel isolated derives not only from the horrors they experienced but also from the limits of the state-sponsored traumatic discourse, which does not allow

¹⁵⁰ Translation by the Taiwanese government:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f5M_oXqEPYc&list=PLm_5EfdMTx2fmgvM2Gpzier9jYyGB4TJA&index=19

their trauma and persecution to be fully recognised or embraced by Taiwanese society. And a sense of isolation continues to hover around their trauma in the era of reconciliation.

The politically silenced trauma

Given previous discussion, it is ostensibly to observe the trauma that has been silenced by the current political condition in Taiwan. According to the *Compensation Act*, only those whose innocence was legally recognised were entitled to base claims on their past sufferings in the scheme of transitional justice. In this regard, not only survivors' narratives but also the nature of their trauma has become fixed in the official discourse.

To clarify what is meant by the term '*fixed*', I would first recall that state-sponsored oral histories of the White Terror have been published by successive Taiwanese governments since the project of reckoning with the distasteful past began in the 1990s. Against this background, those of my informants who had been interviewed previously in connection with that exercise all seemed to narrate their past along the same lines, seen below:

I was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1954. [...] I would be lying if I said that being in prison was easy. It was always tough. During that period, I saw people suffering from mental illness, without any psychiatric care. IF a prisoner went insane and seemed to annoy and harass others, the prison would put him in solitary confinement. To avoid this, you had to force yourself to think, read, or do anything else to distract you from your situation (Transcript of JC 2012, 11).

My life got even tougher after I was released, for the secret agents followed me for two years afterwards. Every time I got a job, an agent of the secret police would visit the company and warn them of the danger of hiring me. [Sobs] ... I just could not make a proper life for my wife and children (Transcript of MO 2013, 11).

What can I say? My life was completely ruined by the KMT. They were always there watching me, even though I was

innocent! (Transcript of RJ: 2013, 3)

Although these narrators were incarcerated in different periods, ranging from the 1950s to the 1970s, they profess a similar perspective on their persecution by the KMT regime. JC's statement above echoes most of my informants' accounts; their experiences were all very similar. For instance, MO and RJ both experienced surveillance, even though they were imprisoned and released in different eras. The omnipresent themes in my informants' narratives are arrest, trial, imprisonment, and subsequent monitoring and harassment by KMT agents after their release, until martial law was lifted.

Aside from this similar trajectory of persecution, there is another point that my informants have in common, as illustrated by RJ above—namely, the power to claim their innocence. Each of them emphasises his innocence at the start of the interview, possibly because most have been granted financial compensation by the Taiwanese authorities, on condition that they assert their innocence of the offences for which they were convicted.¹⁵¹ Those awarded compensation have now been accorded official recognition as political victims in the scheme of transitional justice. They are identified as worthy of official apology and vindication. However, the identity of political victim also connotes a tacit agreement not to bring up the facts of their past resistance to the government. The ability to silence the survivors is a prerogative of the powerful side.

As long as the official transitional justice discourse remains prevalent, survivors will be unable to recount publicly the truth of their revolutionary past. They are not free to speak from any perspective other than that of victims of seemingly random persecution.

The state atrocities carried out during the White Terror were institutionalised as governing tactics by the KMT party-state. That is to say, the pattern of persecution was relatively consistent throughout the White Terror. Nevertheless, it is worth exploring the victimhood that underlies the narratives quoted above, especially to the extent that it departs from the content of the official discourse.

¹⁵¹ For details of this financial compensation, see chapter 3.

The following story indicates how survivors in Taiwan continue to be silenced by power. In 1954, a prison rebellion allegedly occurred at Green Island Prison (in Chinese, 新生訓導處), after which more than 100 political prisoners were sent to Taipei for retrial; 12 of them were subsequently executed. Of these 12, only one was female, 23-year-old Ru-Zhi, who was accused of secretly receiving a 'love letter' from another convicted traitor, containing details about the rebellion.¹⁵² When Ru-Zhi's close friend, Mei, recalls the situation, she offers another scenario, indicating that Ru-Zhi was transcribing the news of the political situation under the KMT regime for circulation among the prisoners in Green Island (林世煜 & 胡慧玲 2003). Either way, it seems that Ru-Zhi was indeed conspiring to cause a prison riot. Mei describes her as a political victim, someone who hated the KMT regime, but was nonetheless innocent of the specific charge for which she was sentenced to death.

Meanwhile, VT was imprisoned on Green Island in the early 1950s, and had been close to some of those executed, including Ru-Zhi.¹⁵³ He informs me in a private conversation that he often joined Ru-Zhi in transcribing news from the newspapers while in prison: 'The mission was to keep monitoring the political situation in Taiwan and to seize any potential chance to rebel', he says, becoming agitated, his hands shaking.¹⁵⁴

Prior to this conversation, nothing similar had featured in any of the other narratives I had encountered; in particular, the prison riot case was widely assumed to have been fabricated by the KMT to strike terror among the prisoners and suppress any potential conspiracies among them. As far as we knew, the KMT regime had been keen during the White Terror to confirm that death sentences were being carried out; every political prisoner sentenced to death was photographed before and after being executed. The photograph shown here is of Ru-Zhi immediately prior to her execution; in it, she appears to face death with a brave smile. I ask VT why Ru-Zhi was

¹⁵² File number: B3750187701=0043=1571=40736010=154=019=0000217500001, and B3750187701=0043=1571=40736010=154=019=0000217500002.

¹⁵³ VT was imprisoned for treason crime from 1950 to 1960 under the KMT regime. For his story and introduction, see the beginning of this chapter.

¹⁵⁴ Notes on field research 2011.4.

smiling, and he nearly breaks down in tears: ‘She welcomed death for her political ideals. She was proud to die.’



Illustration 4-2: The photo shows Ru-Zhi smiling just before her execution. The blank space contained a photograph taken immediately after; it is held in the National Archives, where only her family may apply to see it. Courtesy of National Archives, Taiwan.

VT's narrative tells the story of a political dissident proudly sacrificing her life to resist the dictatorship. However, the official narrative is fixed, allowing only for an innocent victim who succumbed to unwarranted political persecution.

Asked about his time in prison, JC observes that some prisoners surrendered while incarcerated but others, such as himself, VT, and Ru-Zhi, never let go of their desire to conspire against the KMT while in custody:

I am not saying we were rushing to rebel, but we did not lose hope of overthrowing Chiang Kai-Shek (Transcript of JC 2012, 11).

To explain his reluctance to admit his radical past as such, JC explains his current situation:

As long as the KMT has not collapsed, it would be dangerous for me to detail all of the episodes that occurred during our captivity (Transcript of JC 2012, 11).

Arguably, survivors are still silenced in Taiwan, because neither their history of persecution nor their history of political struggle has been fully recognised in the scheme of transitional justice. VT, for example, started out as a pro-unification communist but came around to the cause of independence later, whereas others mentioned here have been consistently pro-independence. Despite the variations in their political orientation, the silence of these survivors reveals that trauma is evoked not only by one's past sufferings, but also by witnessing the inhumane treatment of others. Furthermore, trauma can also arise from one's own past insurgence. VT recalls his past activism as a time of '*self-awakening*'¹⁵⁵ whereas RJ views the comparable period in his own life as a time of '*nation-building*'.¹⁵⁶ Former communist JC refers to the project of '*fighting for a fair society*'.¹⁵⁷ They may define their politics in different terms and they may espouse different causes, but their silences are nonetheless informative with respect to their past and present political lives¹⁵⁸ due to their having been muzzled by the current transitional justice scheme.

As Jay Winter suggests, silence is 'socially constructed space in which and about which subjects and words normally used in everyday life are not spoken', as well as an active and deliberate response to past trauma (Winter 2010: 4). VT's deliberate silence reveals the discrepancy between the perspective of the authorities and that of survivors in Taiwan. The KMT regime's policies in Taiwan sparked a state of civil conflict and political insurrection from the 1950s to the 1990s, which is officially portrayed as a period of excessive state brutality that was not entirely without justification. In pursuit of recognition, survivors of the White Terror conceal their insurgent activities from the authorities, and in so doing conceal much of the

¹⁵⁵ Transcript of VT 2011, 5.

¹⁵⁶ Transcript of RJ 2013, 12.

¹⁵⁷ Transcript of JC 2014, 7.

¹⁵⁸ As one may logically wonder what these survivors' political pursuits are in contemporary Taiwan, this forms the main topic of chapter 5, which includes an examination of how survivors currently work for their varied political goals and define their politics today.

trauma that is attributed to this past. Victimhood is thus presented in a static and limited context.

From Foucault's perspective, the term 'power relations' refers to power not merely in terms of institutionalised oppression of the powerless. Rather, he envisages power as it operates in everyday life, and always entailing an element of resistance (Foucault 2000d: 120–123). It is true that VT and JC are silenced by the dominant official transitional justice discourse, yet their silence also becomes a mode of resistance against the authorities. VT emphasises that he will not speak of Ru-Zhi in public, since it is both his duty to protect her reputation and privacy, and his right to refuse to recount his and Ru-Zhi's past suffering publicly. As JC says, *'I am the one who decides whether or not to share my past, not the government'*.¹⁵⁹ Survivors find the restrictive official discourse pervading their daily lives, as they must compromise and cope with it on a daily basis. They suffered in the past, and continue to suffer in the context of the scheme of transitional justice in Taiwan; meanwhile, their silence is not only about repression, as it also entails resistance.

The identity of political victims is politically constructed in Taiwan. By the same token, trauma is also politically constructed as it functions as an approach to enable survivors to narrate their past persecution in the official discourse. Accordingly, survivors remain limited in their ability to voice their trauma and victimhood. Only trauma that is validated by a claim of innocence is addressed in the scheme of transitional justice. That is, the official discourse excludes from consideration any trauma that is connected to the experience of engaging in resistance against the government, whether this trauma takes the form of sorrow over the 'inhuman conditions' suffered by other insurgents or the KMT regime's crushing of one's own rebellion. The narratives that are incompatible with the official discourse are suppressed by the KMT regime as it continues to evade legal responsibility for its past atrocities. In this context, silence becomes strategic for survivors because it secures their right to recognition in Taiwanese society. By accepting the constraints on their narrative of trauma, survivors retain access to the platform accorded them in the scheme of transitional justice. Without

¹⁵⁹ Transcript of JC 2013.1.

such recognition, survivors lose the right to claim even the limited and conditional trauma delineated by the official discourse.

Shame: holding the mirror to a revolutionary past

Conditioned by Taiwan's official discourse, survivors' shame, like trauma, is also recognised as one of the negative emotions associated with political condemnation and repression during the White Terror. All of my informants openly admit to feeling ashamed of their past persecution.

Political repression was brought to bear throughout Taiwanese society, as everyone was called on to root out and suppress the political criminals. However, according to my field research, the shame that has haunted my informants does not merely present as the remnants of stigma, but also flows from a sense of having been an unsuccessful subversive.

I don't feel as though there is anything worth mentioning. I am ashamed of being imprisoned. (Transcript of HC 2013, 2)

If we understand shame only in its literal sense, we risk missing the more complex psychological context of HC's case. To most of my informants, the term 'shame' signifies a feeling of having been demeaned (in Taiwanese, '*Giensiao*' 見笑), because the subject has failed to meet the standards set by the community to which he or she belongs. As SC, JR, and MO put it more straightforwardly:

Giensiao... (speaking in a weak tone). I was not a capable insurgent. I failed to overthrow the KMT government. [...] Miss Hsiao, I don't want to talk about it, it's not worth mentioning. (Transcript of SC 2013, 3)

Umm...I feel *Giensiao* to tell you things [about his past] as such. People don't like to share their shameful past with others, nor do I (Transcript of JR 2013, 12).

It's too difficult to speak of the past. It's too *Giensiao* to talk about it. (Transcript of MO 2013, 11)

From a perspective of pure victimisation, it is reasonable to understand survivors' shame as a reaction to the overbearing political control that continued to embarrass and belittle them even after their release from prison. Faced with this coercive and hostile force, the narratives cited here are understandable. My participants are ashamed of their identity of political criminal. However, aside from this unmentionable shame, I discovered there is another form of shame that the official discourse declines to recognise during my interviews with them. As JR and MO elaborated during our interviews:

Certainly I feel ashamed of my persecution. My conviction not only persecuted myself, but also my family. [...] The whole of society rejected a person like me. They [Taiwanese citizens] were taught to be fearful of people like me. [...] I had lived under this tremendous stress because of Chiang Kai-Shek and his KMT regime. [...] It's shameful to be arrested by Chiang Kai-Shek. It means that I lost. I failed in my attempt to revolt against Chiang Kai-Shek's authority. I failed. *Giensiao*. (Transcript of JR 2013, 12)

Although I have insisted on my enduring pro-independence stance, I have to assert that my verdict was completely fabricated. I admit that my intention of revolting against the government had been grounded and developed prior to my accusation. But it was shameful to be discovered before I put my ideas into practice. I failed even before I took any action for the insurgency. (Transcript of MO 2013, 11)

Just as this discourse has silenced part of the White Terror survivors' trauma, it seems that the content of their shame that is associated with their past insurgency is likewise silenced. But the silenced part of the trauma and the shame related to my informants' insurgent past are quite different. The trauma of being a failed insurgent is interwoven with the fear of further persecution, along with sorrow, which includes having witnessed the deaths

of friends and comrades at the hands of the KMT regime. That is, the silenced trauma is about their own experiences and their reaction to those of others, especially of those to whom they were close. But the silenced shame is purely individual, from having failed in their political projects. And this part forms the key issue in the following section.

A sociological perspective on shame

In the field of psychology, shame is an emotional state that requires self-awareness and self-evaluation (Gilbert and Andrews 1998; Kaufman 1993). As Michael Lewis (1995) suggests, shame is not a primary emotion but a self-conscious one, for it develops through a process of self-reflection. Lewis underscores the role of 'self' in his analysis, as any emotional state requires a self, both to produce the state and to experience it (ibid.: 29). In this context, shame is an emotional state evoked by comparing one's actions to some standard—be it moral, cultural, social, or political—that one imposes upon oneself. While psychology often focuses on the individual's inner mental activities without adopting a more structured viewpoint that would locate the self in a socio-political process, shame is nonetheless recognised by psychologists as an emotional state that emerges from a mental interaction between a subjective self and an array of objective external factors. That is, individuals' responses to events and situations are specific to their unique history of experiences, expectations, desires, and needs. Based on this description, Lewis argues that shame reflects intense pain, discomfort and anger on the mental level, which is different from embarrassment or shyness, both of which are less intense. Arguably, shame concerns a process of self-criticism with respect to one's own actions. In Lewis's words, shame is in a sense an emotion of which individuals become an object as well as a subject (ibid.: 34). That is, the process reflects not only one's actions but also one's self. Self-reflection subsequently takes a step further towards 're-defining' the self.

Lewis's study of shame emphasises that it can only be understood by addressing the individual's social conditions as well as her mental state. While accepting that shame is an intense emotional experience of self-re-evaluation, this research is concerned with the mental process of shame at

the collective level. Using this approach, we can comprehend how Taiwan's official discourse silences survivors' shame, and how survivors use silence to challenge that discourse.

Sociologist Erving Goffman, in his study of stigma, also emphasises the importance of the self,¹⁶⁰ but focuses on how social interaction makes people value themselves more. Goffman (1968) discusses shame as an emotional response to stigmatisation, a social interaction that leads actors to define and evaluate their behaviour and their very being on the basis of perceived societal norms.¹⁶¹ In this context, shame refers to how we present ourselves to others, and how our self-concept is constructed from the viewpoints of others in our social life. In Goffman's words (1959), the emergence of shame must be studied through social relations, because people tend to act with the perceptions of others in mind. Individuals attempt to be accepted or, at least, to avoid rejection, as members of a tribe (Scheff 2013: 119). Seen in this light, shame engenders in them a sense of panic at being excluded from their community. Shame is thus a hidden and unwanted emotion, a sign that our interactions with others are not proceeding smoothly.

Social constraints also have a role to play in triggering shame. Norbert Elias (1982) points to a profound relationship between shame and civilisation. In particular, he observes that the ability to reject feelings of shame has developed along with the process of civilisation, as social controls have evolved from physical punishment to self-control (*ibid.*; Scheff 1997; 2000). For Elias, shame functions to caution people that some actions might exceed the bounds set by the consensus of society. It can be triggered suddenly if people break the explicit rules or the hidden consensus that underpin the operation of their community. Shame does not come out of nowhere, but derives from a systematic arrangement that includes certain values and expectations, and places demands on a society's members.

¹⁶⁰ Goffman developed his theory of emotion in terms of Cooley's description of the 'looking-glass self', which suggests that the self is a product of continuing interactions between individuals. In this case, Goffman addresses the self as a social product rather than a purely mental one.

¹⁶¹ Goffman is concerned with embarrassment more than shame in his study of stigma (1968), but this does not affect his argument that shame is a type of feedback on one's social performance, which emerges from social interactions at the micro level.

Arguably, social boundaries play a crucial role in modern life. Goffman focuses on shame at the micro level, while Elias offers a more general, macro view on how shame is triggered within a certain socio-political process. Meanwhile, both point to the importance of social relations in analysing the concept of shame in two respects. First, each individual, at a minimum, secures a sense of belonging to a community, which makes the avoidance of shame a central element in her social life. Second, with shame potentially directing the individual's social and political behaviour, the operation of social boundaries mirrors how a society or a government defines its content.

Nonetheless, for Foucault, self-evaluation such as the definition of shame in one society also progresses in the power relations. From the perspective of power relations,¹⁶² Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice, when viewed in the context of this discussion on shame, has not allowed my informants the freedom to construct their own narratives of their persecution or their activism. It has silenced them to a certain extent. As my participant JR stated:

JR: I really don't want to talk about it [past conspiracy]. I feel insecure about spelling it out either with the government or with researchers, including you. I am sorry. [...] Taiwanese governments do not welcome our insurgent stories.

I: Why do you think they do not welcome your stories?

JR: Partly because of their oral history project. They only want to know the details of our persecution without inquiring into the reason. [Silence for almost one minute.] As you can imagine, of course I think of myself as a political activist, but I find it difficult to expose my past frustration. And I know that Taiwanese governments do not welcome our [insurgent] stories. (Transcript of JR 2013, 12)

JR is not alone in his perception of the 'pressure of silence' created by the official discourse, as my other participants also echo his narrative.

¹⁶² See discussions in chapter 2.

We are here to claim the importance of advocating the idea of human rights. We are the evidence of past atrocities. It is true that we rarely talk about our feelings about the past revolution. Miss Hsiao, it's hard to verbalise. It is the past that has continued to haunt us. I am proud but also ashamed of it. No one could spell it out without hesitation. [...] It is true that the government never invites us to talk about our past insurgence or our feelings about it. But it's fine. At least we are here, we, the evidence of past atrocities. (Transcript of KY 2012, 12)

I felt completely ashamed of being arrested and accused of treason. [...] [wept] I was not guilty! But I failed [to revolt]. They [the oral history organisers] don't welcome our political beliefs. I sometimes think that perhaps the whole of society rejects our existence. (Transcript of CH 2013, 4)

Shame does not spring from nowhere. Speaking in an agitated tone, CH expressed stress about the silencing of his revolutionary past and his negative emotions, such as shame, in the official transitional justice discourse. For CH, his silence is the product of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme. But KY's narrative shows that the silence of shame is not merely an outcome, but more of a strategy. KY is the president of the political victim association, TVCA, apparently the position that restrains him in his narrative from elaborating upon the 'limit' of spelling out his reflections on the official transitional justice discourse. Still, KY cannot deny the 'reluctance' of the official transitional justice discourse to embrace their past insurgence and their own related reflections. For him, the first priority is to seize the power to stay in the official discourse, regardless of the fact that this power is limited and restrictive.

The government has outlined an appropriate identity for an acceptable political victim: someone who has not conspired against the KMT or, possibly, did engage in some form of conspiracy but now regrets that error. However, as articulated in chapter 3, the latter would not be eligible for the official recognition and compensation accorded to the 'innocent' political criminal, although a 'sense of regret' is welcomed in the official

discourse. In this regard, Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice has not fully legitimised the victims, and continues to over-simplify the definition of political victim. JC, for example, knows that he could have expressed remorse for his past subversion in order to claim more space for his utterances, but he refuses to do so. '*I did nothing wrong*', says JC. How my informants choose to describe themselves indicates the extent to which they are circumscribed by social boundaries and the power relations of a given society. That is, with Taiwan's official discourse having defined trauma and shame as expected reactions to the abuses suffered under KMT repression, a nuanced study of the shame of White Terror survivors can show the extent to which the official discourse has influenced the terms in which they conceive their own survivorhood.

Shame complicates the meaning of survivorhood

As mentioned previously, informant JH was a political prisoner during the 1950s. The informer who denounced him and his associates was one of his relatives. When I interview one of the associates, he tells me there was no reason to blame JH. '*It was a matter of sedition, and this often makes people become scared*', says WT.¹⁶³ Nonetheless, JH himself still struggles with this memory:

The informer was my relative, and that is why they [JH's associates] still misjudge me, but it is fine. I once said that you can think of me as a good or bad person, but I am not the kind of person who would betray my friends. I do not betray people.
(Transcript of JH 2013, 12)

Although WT displays an understanding attitude, some of his other associates were less generous in their assessment of JH prior to their passing away a few years ago, and JH still suffers from the knowledge that they blamed him. It seems as though JH wishes to convince me that he was not a betrayer; as we talk, he continues to justify himself. Yet, while referring to

¹⁶³ Field research note of WT 2013.3. This was said at a private gathering held by some survivors of the 1960s White Terror, which I recorded by means of handwritten notes.

himself as a political victim within the official definition, JH gives his story a different twist when he tells it to me:

I consider myself a revolutionary. But I was arrested, I failed... Only others can rationalise whether I am a political victim or not. I consider myself a person who fought for Taiwanese independence... I am willing to devote my life to this movement. Of course, I was ashamed to be arrested and reluctant to be imprisoned, but I deserved it since I was not clever enough to elude the KMT authorities. (Transcript of JH 2014, 1)

Shame is continuously interwoven with guilt as JH recounts his past. Unlike shame, guilt is not a function of how individuals value their global selves but, rather, of how they value their actions towards others (Lewis 1995; Teroni and Deonna 2008). Feelings of guilt tend to be less overwhelming than feelings of shame. As JH's account shows, trauma, shame, and guilt all come into play when White Terror survivors contemplate their survivorhood. But shame is a particular index of the prominent role that political struggle continues to play in their outlook on life; the fact that their efforts to overthrow the dictatorship resulted in failure remains a source of humiliation.

Suffice it to say, JH seldom thinks of himself from a standpoint of victimhood as much as one of participation in political struggle. Another survivor, HC, shares a similar attitude. He says that there is nothing worth discussing about his past because he feels ashamed of having been imprisoned. But, while we might expect shame to be a consequence of state oppression and abuse such as occurred during the White Terror, my questions elicit a different perspective from HC:

What can I say? I was defeated. (Transcript of HC 2013, 3)

Another telling example is FC. As a former political prisoner during the 1970s, FC is haunted by the Taiyuan Incident, a prison mutiny organised by a

group of pro-independence prisoners for which five of his fellow inmates were executed, one of whom was his best friend in Taiyuan.¹⁶⁴ FC rarely mentions his best friend to others, not only because the memory of his death is painful but also, as he explains:

I feel I did not protect him. We were that close. I should have told him not to join the conspiracy. Miss Hsiao, I know nothing about the past. [...] I have no words to speak. (Transcript of FC 2013, 12)

FC was reticent during our conversations, partly because of an overwhelming sorrow. FC views himself and his fellows as political dissidents but also as victims of political oppression. The two perspectives are not entirely separable, for it was the political struggle that gave rise to the KMT regime's campaign of repression and, inevitably, the ongoing repression that inspired more and more people to oppose the government. Thus, both viewpoints define the White Terror in Taiwan. By the same token, the twin experiences of persecution and political struggle complicate the survivors' silence and their emotions of trauma and shame. Like HC and FC, one may feel ashamed of surviving when one's fellows were executed. One may also feel traumatised because one's past experiences were too horrific to be understood. Survivors may be silenced due to the perspective of viewing themselves and their associates as 'dissidents', rather than helpless political victims. The White Terror was not only about repression but also about the antagonism between the KMT and those whom it imprisoned. The act of opposing the KMT during the White Terror created a common bond among survivors who espoused different political causes but suffered similar consequences. Further complicating the picture is the silence borne of shame at the failure of their efforts to overthrow the government.

¹⁶⁴ Taiyuan Prison was built in Tai-Tung, on the east coast of Taiwan, in the late 1960s, specifically to house political prisoners. The struggle between the pro-Taiwan and left-wing pro-China activists is reflected in the proliferation of political prisoners during the late 1960s who were pro-Taiwan. The Taiyuan Incident was a failed mutiny staged solely by pro-Taiwan prisoners. The Chiang Kai-Shek administration executed five prisoners who escaped but were subsequently recaptured. See Chapter 5 for further discussion.

Hence, I would not suggest that the shame my informants admit to feeling is unrelated to the atrocities they suffered at the hands of the state; however, their discomfiture at the ineffectiveness of their political projects seems to be more salient. Among my 24 participants, TZ may be another compelling case:

One cannot say I am not a victim for I suffered and survived.
[...] I know the persecution that happened to me was attributed to my conspiracy against the KMT. I do not regret this, but it is unfortunate that I failed. (Transcript of TZ 2013, 11)

TZ was born in 1937 in Keelung, Taiwan. Owing to his strong pro-independence stance, he was convicted in 1969 of the crime of treason and sentenced to eight years in prison. TZ's narrative has widespread resonance amongst my informants. The most unmentionable content of shame is not the status of victim but the status of failed subversive. Their identity of political dissidents posing a threat to Taiwanese society was formed by the KMT during the Cold War. The stigma of being a political threat has haunted this group since they were targeted, convicted and imprisoned, and the shame has yet to be alleviated because Taiwan's transitional justice programme has not fully recognised or vindicated their past. Meanwhile, another aspect of shame has also haunted my interviewees since their arrest: shame at being a failed political dissident. At this point, two social boundaries shape the survivors' shame: (1) the KMT's widely accepted discourse, which continues to stigmatise socialism; and (2) the forces of opposition, which stigmatise ineffective activism. Although my informants' causes were diverse, their shared determination to displace the regime formed the basis for categorising them and for their subsequent shame.

Moreover, the scheme of transitional justice continues to silence the content of shame, because only survivors who claim their innocence can be recognised as political victims. Without it, neither their persecution and past struggles, nor the emotions of trauma and shame, can be acknowledged.

In sum, shame complicates the meaning of survivorhood. A view of the White Terror as a period of atrocities committed by the state cannot

address all of the elements that its survivors hold in memory. While survivors reveal another perspective on their past as an ongoing state of political struggle, shame in turn reveals that they address their survivorhood as a consequence of their defeat. Confronting the official discourse, survivors continue to conceal their past struggles from the government. Shame is thus a mirror, which directly casts light on the untold episodes and pictures of the memory of the White Terror.

Shame is itself political

Of course, we don't speak of this. It is too shameful. But I believe we all feel the same way. (Transcript of SC 2013, 10)

It's all because of you, Miss Hsiao, we [with RJ] are here to talk about it. Without your invitation, I would not know we feel the same way [sobbed]. (Transcript of CH 2013, 4)

My life has been an adventure. [...] Yes, yes I failed, but I stood up. My failure left a scar here [pointed to his chest]. I think I will live with it until my death. It's *Giensiao*, but it's fine [with tears and smile]. (Transcript of JR 2013, 12)

The emotion of shame is multi-layered in my survivors' past and present-day lives. Some may overcome the mental disturbance, some may not. Nonetheless, the shame that has haunted all of my participants is politically constructed by the perspectives of both political suffering and political struggle. More precisely, shame is an alarm clock that continues to remind my participants of the very fact of their past suffering and frustration. They are haunted by the past, yet silenced by both past and present-day political configurations. However, in the case of my two most aggressive participants in Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, JC and KY, their silence of shame is not merely a reaction of mental disturbance. Their reticence about this shame is a tactic in the face of this restrictive scheme. And all of my participants have shown identical interpretation of their reticence.

Sakana, it is that I choose not to talk about it. They [Taiwan's

transitional justice scheme] silenced me, but I also choose not to talk. It's my own fight. (Transcript of JC 2012, 12)

Regarding JC's narratives throughout this chapter, suffice it to say that he is a man who was traumatised and persecuted by the powerful. However, there is a convincing argument that his silence is also a tactic in response to the powerful figures in his past and present-day life.

While the multiple dimensions of shame felt by survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan tell us that their identity as survivors is not merely about victimhood, the emotion likewise complicates the significance of silence. Trauma provides an approach that validates their status as victims, which fits into the scheme of transitional justice. Nevertheless, the narrative of victimisation that survivors disclose is incomplete insofar as the missing parts implicate their revolutionary past. Here, silence is not only about the psychological wounds that lie hidden beneath the surface of survivors' minds. It is, on the one hand, a means by which the powerful can control the discourse and, on the other, a means by which the survivors can withhold their consent to the dominant discourse.

While silence and shame are often studied from the perspective of violence, suffering, and humiliation (Duffy 2005; Hartling et al. 2000), this chapter has shown that silence also sheds light on the shame that arises from survivors' frustration at their defeat, and their perceived failure to fulfil their duty (Gilbert and Andrews 1998: 9). The more we discern the multiple meanings of survivors' silence, the more precisely we can explore their memories. Survivors' silence in the official discourse implies the rejection of memory on the one hand while protecting them from the scrutiny of those who may be unsympathetic on the other. Thus, silence may be perceived as passive but also, to some degree, aggressive. Survivorhood is not only about bearing witness to persecution, but also about exercising caution in recounting the past while they continue to face challenges from the Taiwanese authorities. In the wake of controversial events, survivorhood is inevitably politicised.

Most of my interviewees seemed uncomfortable discussing their shame with others and struggled to verbalise it. Silence manifests as a sign of

intense emotion. By re-locating shame in Taiwan's current political conditions, survivors' shame can be understood as always political and contextualised within power relations.

Conclusion

For survivors of the White Terror, the complex elements of their survivorhood exceed what the official culture of contrition can encompass, for this culture narrows the meaning of the term 'political victim' in such a way that the content of their suffering is not fully represented.

Ferguson (2003: 51) suggests that the use of silence in response to questions that are morally or personally difficult to answer constitutes a kind of response, but ultimately remains avoidance. Whether silence is seen as withholding participation or avoiding a subject, it is nonetheless a political practice. My informants' silence in relation to victimhood and trauma is tantamount to a strategic practice for coping with their identity as political victims, as defined by the authorities. As demonstrated in VT's case, survivors choose not to speak of their persecution as a matter of resistance to the current scheme of transitional justice.

Among my informants, feelings of shame arise mainly from the prevalent unspoken perspective of participation in political struggle. Their silence implicates a collectivity in which these survivors tend to discern themselves less as victims of the government and more as its adversaries. This perspective underpins their interpretation of their past and their approach to the scheme of transitional justice. While the government authorises them to speak of the past, the culture of contrition circumscribes the perception of the past, so that survivors are compelled to echo the official discourse in order to retain a space in which to earn recognition. Thus, even in this era of reconciliation, the antagonistic relationship between the authorities and the survivors endures. As described above, past political conflicts surface in the ways that survivors continue to struggle with shame and trauma, and in their deliberate silence about their political activism,

while striving for recognition in present-day Taiwan.¹⁶⁵ The fixed definition ascribed to a 'survivor of the White Terror' propels survivors into a new war—a war on memory, which forms the central issue of chapter 5.

Thus, for White Terror survivors, silence exists on a spectrum ranging from the perspective of victimisation to that of participation in political struggle. The terms of their survivorhood are not cast as binary opposites. Along with the analysis of trauma and shame, multiple aspects of survivorhood persist in their lives. The nature and extent of the individual's suffering during the White Terror shapes that individual's personal trauma. However, when the whole of society is induced to identify these people as 'innocent individuals who were wrongly persecuted', the political content of their trauma and shame is at odds with what the public recognises. Trauma is thus an individual emotional reaction that also encompasses a collective approach by which abuse survivors recount their past to the public. Likewise, shame reinforces survivors' continued victimisation and offers clues to experiences that remain unmentioned. Taiwan's transitional justice programme challenges the memory of White Terror survivors to varying degrees.

Jay Winter elaborates on the notion of silence in the aftermath of political atrocities or a state of war. He is concerned with 'focused, directed and purposeful silence, not conceived of as the absence of sound, but as the absence of conventional verbal exchanges' (2010: 4). From this standpoint, I argue that we may be unable fully to comprehend the White Terror until we scrutinise the silence of its survivors. Trauma and shame are two primary indicators that the silence of White Terror survivors is related to the inadequacy of the 'innocent victim' model to convey the nature of their experience. Survivors' emotions and memories more precisely reflect that the White Terror comprised a series of episodes of political repression and violence set against a backdrop of political conflict during the Cold War.

The political transition that has been taking place in Taiwan since the 1980s has engendered a public concern for truth and transparency and, as a consequence, the question of how to describe and interpret the White Terror has become a point of contestation between the KMT authorities and the

¹⁶⁵ See further discussion in chapter 5.

survivors. The 'war on memory' to which I refer has two aspects: (1) the political conflict that framed the White Terror has not dissipated; and (2) the official memory project continues to pit the government against the survivors. To consolidate this argument, in chapter 5, I forefront a competing transitional justice discourse that has been gradually developing amongst survivors in present-day Taiwan, thus problematising the identity of political victims, of which survivors are the primary representatives. My contention is that the survivors have never surrendered their identity as political activists. If, indeed, the main task of transitional justice in Taiwan is reconciliation, an examination of the competing discourse sheds light on what would constitute a meaningful reconciliation for survivors—one that would accurately reflect their experience.

Chapter 5

De-politicised survivors—the competing transitional justice discourses

The concept of reconciliation suggests that the enemies of yesterday will give up and let go of their hatred, animosity or wish for revenge, as well as their identity that had been constructed around the conflict. One expects that a new identity construction will develop together with a new relationship between former enemies that will address the roots of the conflict, not only its unfortunate outcomes. But how can we create such a deep process of change in people who have been committed to the conflict, in some places for generations, in others for a substantial part of their lives? Are these expectations realistic or is it wishful thinking and talking that has little substance in intractable conflicts?

—Dan Bar-On, *Darkness at Noon*
War Crimes, Genocide and Memories, 2007

Introduction

The politics of memory is usually not about fact—that is, what actually happened in the past. It is about how truth is conveyed in the present. As Hodgkin and Radstone suggest (2003), contesting the past involves, of course, posing questions about the present, and what the past means in the present, which means that truth is not objective, but perspectival. Present conflicts over representation become central to analysing the meaning of the past. And different viewpoints of the past serve to unravel the contestation.

Given analysis in the previous chapter, survivors' silence is complicated by trauma and shame, reflecting their perspectives on the experience of the White Terror. Both the viewpoints of the period have

constructed their knowledge of their past. For these men, silence is not merely a consequence of the past and the present-day political configuration. More precisely, silence is also their tactic in the face of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme. Having stated that most of my participants have joined the official transitional justice discourse in Taiwan, yet many of them remain reticent about part of their past, especially their adversarial past. Given that, the ways that my participant consider their role in the official discourse, especially their reflection on their engagement and silence forms the imperative to be studied regarding the contestation of the past.

In short, this chapter studies the survivor victims' non-official transitional justice discourse, which seeks to explore the discrepancy between the survivors' perspective on the White Terror and that of the authorities. Survivors' views are still rarely shared, and remain highly controversial. According to Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, the government authorises survivors to share only their memories of innocence and mistaken persecution in the transitional justice programme, while their memories of political opposition are silenced. Here, one point remains unclear: *how do these men perceive their involvement in the transitional justice system? Is it possible for them to develop their competing discourses either within or outside the scheme of transitional justice? If so, how? The questions form the central issue in this chapter.*

Non-official discourses—competing discourses—are referenced in plural because not every survivor perceives his past in the same way. While this chapter seeks to develop a model for the construction of non-official discourses by my informants, the content of these discourses and the degree of their variation from the official discourse is bound to vary.

At present, those once labelled as political criminals are recognised in the official discourse as 'innocent' victims whose past has no connection to conspiracy against the KMT regime. Because White Terror survivors are the best source of non-official discourses, the way they represent themselves to citizens in Taiwan forms the approach for the study. Having observed in chapter 4 that White Terror survivors tend to identify more as political activists than as victims in both their past and present lives, we may now turn to their current public engagement, especially with regard to the

officially-sponsored memory project. By studying their political life in detail, this chapter aims to reveal how, in the democratic era, these men continue to fight for their lost dignity and seek to advance their long-standing political causes. Accordingly, the competing transitional justice discourses come to reveal how their articulations of the past remain limited in the era of liberalism and democracy.

Reconciliation with past atrocities but not with past political enemies

In post-conflict situations, reconciliation has been identified as an indispensable process for healing societies torn apart by civil war or brutal regimes. Peace activists in particular see reconciliation—referring to a process by which a society moves from a divided past to a shared future—as a requisite condition for lasting peace (Fischer 2011: 415). Transitional justice having been initiated in Taiwan by the KMT regime, the perpetrator of the White Terror, the reconciliation process has bypassed the full disclosure of the extent of atrocities committed and identification of the perpetrators. Moreover, the end of the Cold War did not bring an end to anti-communist sentiment in Taiwan; it continues to exist, focused especially on mainland China. In the wake of the KMT's return to power in 2008, an elite group of pro-independence scholars and politicians, including Taiwan's current president, Dr Tsai Ing-Wen (in Chinese, 蔡英文; who was elected in January 2016), founded the Taiwan Youth Anti-Communist National Salvation Corps (in Chinese, 台灣反共青年救國團). The impetus for this group came from President Ma's diplomatic overtures to China, so the group found itself in the ironic position of charging the KMT with not being sufficiently tough on communism.

The two survivors who had been accused of treason for communism in the 1950s, VT and VC are illustrative to the argument. Both VT and VC had secretly joined Chinese communist party in the late 1940s. However, confronted the definition of 'political victim' in the official transitional justice discourse, neither VT nor VC have prepared well enough to account for their

past political struggles in public. As discussed, VT is still haunted by the trauma of his comrades and fellow prisoner's deaths.¹⁶⁶ He has been deeply suffering in his mental life. For VT, the moment of full vindication has not arrived, as he has been in denial of his communist past. Under the circumstance, all he can do is to cooperate with the successive governments on the scheme of reconciliation, though socialism and communism remain stigmatised.

It's nothing, Miss Hsiao. I am happy to do it (join the scheme), and will continue to devote myself in it until I am no longer a man that you (the society and the citizens) need me (Transcript of VT 2012, 11).

Hitherto VT remains active in Taiwan's transitional justice scheme. By joining the committee board of curations which exhibited in the Green Island and Jingmei human rights park, VT collaborate with the government in stabilising the official transitional justice discourse. Ironically, VT merely secures his position in the scheme yet seems to failed in challenging the discourse.

VT's mindset is shared by VC. VC has been participating in the scheme for nearly two decades. For now, as he confessed, '*Nothing has changed. I am still repeating myself about the perpetration.*'¹⁶⁷ But VC never gives up delivering his will to researchers whom he met. According to the *Archives Act*, only the bereavements can apply for the already execution photo of the executed ones under the KMT party-state. Yet, VC has spent years collecting the execution photos from the bereaved families all over Taiwan. He showed me the photo once when I visited him at his place in Taipei. We just sat shoulder to shoulder, seeing the photos carefully, without much talk. On that day, VC said:

See their smile? It is the evidence that attest to their identity. They were not executed for no reason. They sacrificed their lives for their political beliefs! The photos have proved it (Transcript of VC 2012, 12).

¹⁶⁶ See discussion in chapter 4.

¹⁶⁷ Transcript of VC 2012, 12.

These men on the one hand cooperate with the successive governments for their power of utterance in the official discourse, secretly preparing for welcoming the full vindication on the other. The cooperation on the superficial strikingly envisages the yet-to-be-accomplished reconciliation in Taiwan.

In any case, citizens in Taiwan are disinclined to censure the excesses committed by the government in the name of anti-communism. Without political alternation or fundamental reform of the KMT regime, democratisation in Taiwan has not encouraged, much less compelled, the KMT to come to terms with its past human rights abuses. Without a proper truth-telling mechanism, neither the persecutors nor the persecuted have a proper space in which to narrate the truths that should be shared by the various groups, including former adversaries, in Taiwan. Neither side trusts in its ability to challenge the already established viewpoint of the past. The whole of Taiwanese society has been invited to pardon both the past atrocities and their anonymous perpetrators without being allowed full knowledge of the White Terror.

Suffice to say, the Taiwanese authorities have established a political sphere in which reconciliation is a 'romance with remorse and with reparation, memory and healing' (Scheper-Hughes 1998: 26). Without probing the facts of past repression by, and resistance to, the ROC government, the official discourse is not concerned with reconciling with former 'political enemies', but only with receiving absolution for its untold abuses and their nameless perpetrators. As a result, my informants' status as convicted criminals has not been fully de-stigmatised. Taiwan's official discourse merely apologises in general terms for the occurrence of the White Terror, and this apology, in a sense, preserves the moral order that existed when the White Terror began: those who favour socialism or communism continue to be regarded in Taiwan as a threat to society.

If we value reconciliation as a process rather than as a way to achieve a particular outcome, as Dan Bar-On suggests, storytelling is, in a sense, central to that process. It provides the basis for developing a shareable truth as well as expressions of regard and security. In the dominant culture of contrition in Taiwan, the justice dimension is circumscribed by the notion of

what truths are permissible. Based on VT and VC's stories, an advanced review of my subjects' contributions to the official and non-official discourses offers insight into the emergence of reconciliation as a watchword for both the government and survivors of the White Terror as they compete over how to represent the past, and shows how reconciliation is central to my informants' current political life.

De-politicisation as a perspectival and strategic truth

In reconciliation processes, truth refers to the recognition of past injuries and violations of human rights. To bring formerly divided and often opposing groups of people to unite and develop an understanding of the past that they all find shareable and acceptable, truth may have more to do with harmony and reconciliation than with actual fact. Accordingly, truth can be perspectival and strategic in reconciliatory processes. It is the very approach for exploring how my participants deal with the seemingly decisive power relations, as my field research demonstrates.

The first time I encountered JC was during a summer course on the White Terror in 2010, where he was billed as a survivor, lecturing on his incarceration by the KMT during the 1950s.¹⁶⁸ Throughout the programme, JC recounted his life in prison in terms of his suffering. He described how the political prisoners were forced to build the prison in which they were incarcerated on Green Island, and the abuses that he and his fellow inmates endured during their captivity. Without any reference to his conviction as a traitor for his adherence to socialism, the storyline that JC narrated is totally consistent with the official transitional justice discourse. In this regard, JC is both a survivor of persecution and a witness to human rights violations.

Apart from the course in which we met, JC has also worked as a docent for the National Jingmei Human Rights Park since 2010. For most of the time in Jingmei, JC conducts tours of government-sponsored exhibitions and gives talks to local and foreign visitors concerning his past suffering at the hands of the KMT regime. Most of the time, JC conforms to the storyline

¹⁶⁸ The summer course was sponsored and supervised by the Taiwanese government, and organised by a private organisation. I was employed to assist with its administration.

set up by the official discourse. He delivers a truth that conveys a sense of how an individual could be brutally persecuted by a dictatorship without having committed subversion. From a human rights perspective, JC's narrative is reasonable and sustainable; no one should be persecuted for his political beliefs. However, after closely observing JC for six months, I concluded that he adopts this posture not only to further his vindication and reconciliation but, more important, to maintain a space in the official discourse to give voice to his still indistinct past and still unpopular political cause:

I am continuing to fight. As long as the KMT has not been toppled, I will stay and fight (Transcript of JC 2014, 7).

Speaking in an uncompromising tone, JC views his participation in the official discourse as a means of ongoing subversion against the KMT. In fact, the KMT was no longer in power, although it continued to compete for influence with other factions—primarily the DPP—through democratic processes. Nonetheless, JC and my other informants—such as CH and WR, whom the KMT convicted of treason in the 1960s for supporting independence—will remain politically engaged unless and until the KMT disbands and disappears from the political landscape.

You never know whether you would be oppressed again if the KMT were to seize power in the future (Transcript of JC 2014, 7).

Hsiao, I will fight to the very end unless the KMT collapses. But for now, I am a political victim; this is the easiest way to get people to accept me (Transcript of CH 2013, 4).

Even now, I cannot find any reason to compromise myself before the KMT. [...] But what can I say? We survivors must accept the reality. We need a platform. And this [the officially-sponsored project] is our only chance to be heard (Transcript of WR 2013, 12).

By CH's own account, he did not despise the KMT to such an extreme degree before he was convicted of treason for advocating independence. As he explains, he only meant to pursue a future in which the Taiwanese people could have their own nation.¹⁶⁹ However, after being brutalised by the KMT in the 1960s, his antipathy for the KMT grew dramatically. CH reiterates emphatically his reluctance to cooperate with the government but, as he says, he is keenly aware that this is his only opportunity for recognition.

WR shares the mindset of CH. As a pro-independence activist, WR was more aggressive in his youth, and more determined to subvert the KMT, which led to him being sentenced to death, although this sentence was subsequently commuted. To increase his political engagement, WR has joined the DPP party and become a local politician, serving since 2000 as mayor of a rural area. He sees this a way to have a voice in the political realm, even though it is hard for a rural mayor to influence national policy or have an impact on the transitional justice scheme; WR thus continues to confront the reality of his de-politicisation. Both CH and WR choose to align themselves with the official discourse but also develop other strategies to deal with that reality.

Unlike WR, who chooses to be a local politician in Taiwan, JC seeks a broader audience, he even writes a column about his imprisonment in the Japanese periodical, *MOKU*.¹⁷⁰ Furthermore, he assertively interacts with the foreign visitors whom he personally escorts on tours of Jingmei Human Rights Park. JC is fully aware of the importance of framing himself as a political victim before advocating his politics to the public. It is unequivocally true that he suffered from persecution under Chiang's government. But there is another truth concerning JC's opposition to the government that endures, albeit in a different way. To JC, subverting the KMT and pursuing vindication are equally important.

In this democratic era, it is irreproachable for JC, CH, WR or anyone to voice a personal political opinion, even if this includes hatred of a particular

¹⁶⁹ Transcript of CH 2013, 4.

¹⁷⁰ The articles published by JC are mainly derived from his autobiography 《耕甘薯園的人》, published in Chinese in Taiwan. *MOKU* is a monthly Japanese magazine that focuses on socio-political and literary issues in Japan and East Asia. The magazine's official web site (in Japanese) may be found at: <http://www.moku-pub.com/saishin.html>.

political group or party. However, JC has more at stake than freedom of expression. Rather, he views himself as an adversary of the state with a specific political agenda. His will to subvert the KMT has never diminished, notwithstanding the fact that the KMT party no longer constitutes an authoritarian regime. Truth in this context is manipulated by JC when he poses as an aged White Terror survivor who is no longer capable of fomenting rebellion. It must be recalled that JC became a socialist in the 1940s due to his anger over the 228 Incident, which happened in 1947. The brutal political repression in the wake of the 228 Incident led him to the CCP, which clandestinely recruited him. However, JC is no longer so idealistic:

Sakana, who could have known that the Chinese communists were also brutal by that time? After all, I had dreamed of a just nation without repression or lies. I thought that Chinese communism could fulfil my dream. But now, I am sure that communist China is not an option for me anymore. (Transcript of JC 2012,12).

It is reasonable for JC to continue concealing his insurgent past. Secrecy remains important to him due to his experience of the collective antipathy of Taiwanese society for his left-wing socialist orientation.

For all of my informants, the assertion of personal truth is not only about defining the past but also about their current political lives. KY's story offers another telling instance and illustrates the variety of subversive intentions entertained by this group.

KY is a survivor from the 1960s who also participates actively in the transitional justice programme. When I interviewed him at the end of 2012, he had been serving for several years on the TVCA committee, which is one of the three major political victim associations in Taiwan.¹⁷¹ As a TVCA representative, KY has co-operated with the Taiwanese authorities in different respects, including publishing the survivors' autobiography

¹⁷¹ See further discussion below.

corpus¹⁷² and oral history,¹⁷³ and expediting the building of the Taiyuan Incident (in Chinese, 泰源事件) monument.

The Taiyuan Incident was a prison mutiny organised by a group of pro-independence prisoners, five of whom ended up being executed as a result in 1970. When the monument was proposed, Ma Ying-Jeou's government was hesitant because the themes of subversion and resistance were all too evident, and not in keeping with the official discourse which held that only those who had not intentionally subverted the regime deserved to be memorialised.

As a result, KY and his fellows did not succeed in erecting the monument at any of the National Human Rights Museums. Eventually, in the summer of 2014, they were able to place one in the Taiwan Sacred Ecological Education Park (in Chinese, 台灣聖山生態教育園區), which is operated by the pro-independence Taiwan Ta-Ti Foundation (in Chinese, 台灣大地基金會). This illustrates the unresolved tension between the authorities and the survivors of the White Terror:

I have to complete this mission; otherwise, I am afraid that people will forget this unrealised ambition and the five sacrificed heroes (Transcript of KY 2013, 1).

KY never expresses any further intention of subverting the KMT during our conversations. To him, a primary mission is to remind people that the White Terror was a time of political conflict, and persuade them that these men who sacrificed for the cause of independence were heroes rather than criminals. Thus, we see my informants committed to advocating their respective causes in present day Taiwan. To both of them, transitional justice is not only about shedding light on past violations of human rights but is a

¹⁷² From 2012 to 2014, the TVCA published 《秋蟬的悲鳴》 and 《看到陽光的時候》, the two autobiographical corpuses in 2012 and 2014 respectively, both with government sponsorship.

¹⁷³ To date, the TVCA still cooperates actively with the government on an oral history project on behalf of its members. For further discussion of the cooperation between the government and the various victim associations, see below.

process that affords them the opportunity to advocate their political convictions.

Given Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, my subjects' status as surviving political victims provides them a platform to gain wider recognition for their beliefs than has been available hitherto in Taiwan. Certainly, their suffering attests to the past atrocities, and their interest in redefining the past as a period of political conflict is not at odds with the reality of their victimisation. The focal point is their dissident political opinions were the basis for their unjust persecution under the KMT regime. They desire a recognition that their devotion to their political causes did not merit such harsh repression. But Taiwan's transitional justice scheme lead them to a consequence of de-politicisation. Both their past insurgence and oppression remain de-politicised. whatever the variations in their politics and the extent to which their opposition was actualised, the *Compensation Act* clearly specifies that former political criminals are not eligible to receive compensation if their conviction of sedition or treason survives reviews according to current laws or rules of evidence.¹⁷⁴ Thus, only those who cooperate in this exercise can engage in reconciliation; the truth asserted by the official discourse is strategic and perspectival.

Given stories stated above, de-politicisation is not merely a consequence of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme. Rather, it forms an approach for survivors in voicing out their political desire in the transitional justice scheme. Like JC's role of docent and KY's contribution to the erection of monument. For my participants, de-politicisation opens an approach of cooperation between survivors and the government. Despite de-politicisation is itself a hurdle for survivor in winning a full recognition of their past, to my participants, contesting the past not only means exposing the extent to which they were brutally repressed by the dictatorship. It also means that the persecuted ones, including those who had explicit subversive intentions, deserve vindication and recognition. In Taiwan my informants who join the official discourse cooperate with the government in various settings where they are requested to reveal their past persecution. Without their involvement—namely, their testimony, the official transitional justice

¹⁷⁴ See detailed discussion in chapter 3.

programme could not be established and consolidated. They are aware of the de-politicisation imposed on them by the limits of their narrative in the scheme of transitional justice but they are also developing strategies to address this perspectival truth. To them, their testimony does not constitute surrender but, rather, claims a space for their utterance in the official discourse. Thus, the tension between the official and non-official discourses rests on how the truth of the past is produced and developed in present-day Taiwan.

Arguably my informants are dissatisfied with the official discourse of Taiwan's transitional justice system, for their assigned role in that discourse as innocent victims leaves them de-politicised. Although the account of their persecution is true, all of them opposed the KMT government and thus were not 'innocent' of the political crime charged. There is a spectrum of involvement: While some committed subversive actions, others were still in the planning or discussion stages when arrested, and some merely criticised the government without hatching a plan to undermine it.

Thus, the situation of de-politicisation is more complicated than it may appear on the surface. For example, since the pro-independence cause has gained more space for advocacy since the DPP came to power in 2000, White Terror survivors who espoused that cause have gained more space in the official discourse in which to give voice to their dissident past than have others whose causes were different.

Most of my participants stay determined with their political ideal of different political causes, in spite of the plight of de-politicisation. Although JC is now pro-independence, he was accused of treason because he joined the Chinese communists in the early 1950s. Nowadays, he speaks openly of his current political ideals and pro-independence principles, which developed during his captivity, but rarely mentions having been a communist. I asked JC once, in private, why he did not discuss his communist phase with people in Taiwan. He paused for a few seconds, then said:

Sakana, that was the past. I am fighting for my current political cause. [...] Maybe, one day, they will understand and fully accept my past but not now (Transcript of JC 2013, 12).

JC is fully aware that revealing his communist roots would jeopardise his current position in the official discourse. For him, the system of transitional justice does not represent an opportunity for 'reconciliation' between persecutors and their victims so much as the chance for him to reconcile with society, the people of Taiwan. Although disclosure of his communist past remains all but impossible, JC still clings to the prospect of a full acknowledgment of his past struggles and persecution. The stance which is shared by all of my participants.

In the context of transitional justice, Wendy Lambourne (2009) argues that the use of the word 'truth' can be misleading, as it tends to be interpreted as the finding of a single truth about what happened, who was responsible and why. She argues that truth in this context is based on some kind of agreed-upon record that can be used for redressing past crimes and identifying suffering. This can be termed 'knowledge', as it might include various truths or interpretations held by various participants in a conflict (ibid.: 39). Hence, our focus here is not so much on an objective truth of the White Terror as on the process by which a shareable truth is developed and accepted by multiple groups, some of which are former adversaries.

Transitional justice in Taiwan is itself in conflict regarding two aspects—the characterisation of the past, and the continuing power struggle among factions. Foucault considers whether conflict offers an effective analyser of power relations (2000a: 59–61). In *Society Must Be Defended* (2000a), he examines power relations from the standpoint of a historico-political discourse that points to conflict as the permanent basis for all institutions of power. While the philosophico-juridical discourse identifies conflict as the professional and technical prerogative of a carefully-defined and controlled military apparatus (ibid: 60), Foucault rejects this analysis; he suggests that conflict does not operate exclusively in the military context but, rather, exists in all sectors of society. Conflict, according to Foucault, is the driving force of every social order, inducing us to believe in a natural order, or a functionally required order. In this regard, we are bound to re-encounter conflict, for it is the cipher of peace (ibid: 61). Politics itself is thus for the individual an extension of war, as Foucault explains below:

In that general struggle of which he speaks, [the individual] is necessarily on one side or on the other; he is in the battle, he has adversaries, he fights for a victory. [...] And if he also speaks of truth, it is that perspectival and strategic truth that enables him to win the victory. So, in this case, we have a political and historical discourse that lays claim to truth and right, while explicitly excluding itself from juridico-philosophical universality (Foucault 2000a: 61).¹⁷⁵

While power relations often restrict the discourses that actors develop, they do not prevent the development of discourses. Even within the confines of the official discourse, my informants have availed themselves surreptitiously of opportunities to advocate different political causes. The de-politicised identity of political victims may be constructed and restricted in the official discourse but has nevertheless become one of the weapons in the arsenal he uses to contest the past. The White Terror survivors may engage in various challenges and to a varying extent but, as a group, they seem to share a common recognition that acquiescing to the role of de-politicised victim gives them an opening to claim the power of utterance in Taiwan's transitional justice system.

Memory is itself a struggle

As we have seen, the de-politicisation of Taiwan's political victims attests to the perspectival and strategic nature of the account of the White Terror that is offered in the official discourse. Based on a legal arrangement—namely, the promulgation of the *Compensation Act* and the establishment of the Compensation Foundation—the official discourse creates an identity for

¹⁷⁵ Foucault maintains that one must abandon the legal notion of sovereignty while studying the notion of power. As this model aims to account for the ideal genesis of the state, it makes law the fundamental manifestation of power (2000). However, Foucault suggests that the study of power should focus on the power relation itself; also, he rejects the study of power merely at the level of the state. His recommended approach, i.e., historico-political discourse, seeks to unravel the fundamental logic of power relations that exist in all sorts of societies, in which the state is merely one of the aspects of socio-political practices.

political victims that is de-politicised. Accordingly, the legal arrangement underpins the cultural and truth aspects of transitional justice and the picture of de-politicised political victims comprises the dominant understanding of the White Terror in Taiwan.

Nonetheless, this mandated de-politicisation merely impedes survivors from developing their own non-official discourses in the context of transitional justice, but it does not stop them altogether. As a contestation of truth arises between the survivors and the government, the memory of the White Terror becomes a zone of conflict.

It is a conflict about what account of the past is acknowledged by the official discourse, which always reflects the government's current needs. Survivors of political persecution may feel compelled to develop tactics for dealing with the dominant discourse if it conflicts with their own accounts. VC, VT and JC find in transitional justice an opportunity to advocate their political goals, which include eliminating the KMT party that was in power during the White Terror. KY sees his own role more as an advocate for the vindication of his associates who were executed by the KMT regime. Apart from these survivors, there are others who have elected to cooperate with the official discourse and who share their attitudes or approaches to some extent. Under the umbrella of their de-politicisation, one may observe a range of attitudes as well as varying degrees of activism.

For instance, AN was born in 1947 in Nantou, Taiwan and, at the age of 20, was accused of treason for advocating Taiwanese independence. For the time being, AN is plainly cooperating with the official discourse, as he willingly participates in state-sponsored interviews as well as those with independent researchers. He readily accepted my invitation to be interviewed and I soon learned that AN has no intention of concealing his commitment to the pro-independence cause. While he does not articulate his political convictions while being interviewed for state-sponsored projects, he was very open with me:

Because I read some pro-independence articles, I was convicted of treason for promoting independence. [...] However, it was when I encountered Chan Yi-Jen in prison that my political

commitment to Taiwan independence developed through our discussions. [...] Yi-Jen is a very clever person. He usually explains things simply and clearly. [...] Had I not met people like Yi-Jen, my politics would have been less enlightened, and I would not have thought as deeply as I do now (Transcript of AN 2013, 12).¹⁷⁶

AN recounts his past in an excited tone. He does not consider advocating independence to be more important than recounting his past persecution in the official discourse; nonetheless, he is not satisfied with his current de-politicised status and feels resentment. AN showed me a video he had filmed in December 2012 during the official annual commemoration of the White Terror, at which he had appeared as a guest of the government. It showed a small group of pro-independence survivors throwing shoes at the podium, shouting '*Step down! Ma Ying-Jeou,*' (in Chinese, 馬英九下台) and '*Taiwanese Independence!*' (in Chinese, 台灣獨立) while President Ma was delivering a speech. As we watched the film, AN told me that his political views were similar to those of the protestors but that he would never act in such a manner. To AN, the smooth conclusion of the ceremony was also important:

The ceremony was at least a commemoration of the past suffering (Transcript of AN 2013, 12).

Apparently, AN is willing to accept the status quo of de-politicisation because he considers recognition by the official discourse to be equally important as his commitment to the independence cause. AN sees himself having two roles at present. On the one hand, he performs as de-politicised survivor in accordance with the official discourse; on the other, departing from that discourse, he plays independence advocate. Thus, his competing transitional justice discourse gradually emerges:

¹⁷⁶ Chan Yi-Jen was born in 1925, in Yunlin, Taiwan. He was accused of treason in 1962 due to supporting Taiwan independence, a charge known as 蘇東啟叛亂案. This became known as the most famous political trial relating to Taiwan independence, and led to other interviewees such as SC and RJ being accused of treason.

I suffered, and I continue to support Taiwan independence. [...] The point is I am genuinely a political victim, but I am also a pro-independence advocate. I talked about my past suffering when people view me as a victim, but I also would like to share my political cause with them. Because this is what I also care about (Transcript of AN 2013, 12).

TJ's story offers a starker illustration of the contestation of memory. As a pro-independence survivor who was accused of treason during the 1970s, TJ never conceals his political convictions in public. Like AN, he is a fervent proponent of the pro-independence campaign. Recently TJ has started to reveal the extent of his past involvement in anti-KMT conspiracy, although he never goes beyond what was stated in his conviction. That is, as a political victim, TJ deliberately echoes the requirement of official discourse:

It was when I joined the Lee Tang-Hua Orchestra as a saxophonist and toured the U.S. that I encountered the Chen brothers and subsequently joined *World United Formosans for Independence* (hereafter WUFI).¹⁷⁷ While Chen Rong-Chi and Chen Rong-Fong promoted their ideal of Taiwanese independence in our conversations, they also gave me a WUFI stamp, encouraging me to advocate independence as well.¹⁷⁸

The interview was conducted in 2012 by a state-sponsored oral history project. It may seem that the proscriptions against referring to the revolutionary past are loosening in the official discourse but, as a matter of fact, they remain as firm as before. As TJ expressed, he always feels insecure in recounting past subversive past in state-sponsored oral history projects. 'I

¹⁷⁷ World United Formosans for Independence was a pro-Taiwanese independence organisation, secretly organised by a group of Taiwanese migrants and students in Japan and America. The WUFI had hubs in both countries. The organisation still exists although it no longer actively opposes the government; it works mainly overseas to promote the ideal of Taiwanese independence.

¹⁷⁸ Chen Ron-Chi and Chen Rong-Fong are siblings who lived in the U.S. during the 1970s as a foreign student and migrant worker, respectively.

do not trust the government, I know what I can do is to share my past suffering as much as possible,' says TJ.¹⁷⁹

Once Taiwan independence become more accepted by Taiwanese society, White Terror survivors who espoused that cause were welcomed by the pro-independence DPP government to join the transitional justice projects that it sponsored from 2000 to 2008. More and more pro-independence survivors have come forward to have their stories of past persecution included in the official discourse. Although that discourse continues to gloss over their past 'subversive intentions', still, a grey area may exist for political victims to mention their 'subversive' intentions in the official discourse, but it does not extend to allowing them to go into further detail. Thus, throughout our lengthy interview, this brief reference is the only instance in which TJ touches on his revolutionary past. The remainder of the narrative focuses on how he survived 'seemingly unbearable repression' and continues to live as a de-politicised survivor. Restricted by the official discourse, TJ says little about his revolutionary past, and spends most of our interview describing his persecution under the KMT regime.

But my later interview with TJ shows that he is willing to give details of his past activism:

During my time in America, Chen Rong-Chi gave me books and magazines, and asked me about my thoughts.¹⁸⁰ I said, as I told you before, I support Taiwanese independence. He replied, 'I cannot return to Taiwan at the moment. Think about to what extent you can contribute to Taiwan, but keep safe'. He expected me to recruit several people who were trustworthy and create a secret organisation. At that time, we performed a secret ritual in which I vowed my loyalty to the organisation. Both the Chen brothers and someone whose surname was Liu—I cannot recall his full name now—and Chang Tsan-Hung.

¹⁷⁹ Transcript of TJ: 2014, 1.

¹⁸⁰ The publications that TJ mentions were *Taiwanese Youth* (in Chinese, 台灣青年), published by the Tokyo office of WUFI in 1960, which inspired Taiwanese students, scholars, and immigrants to rally in Japan around the cause of Taiwan independence.

Tsan-Hung reminded me that the principle of the secret organisation was unilinear leadership. I needed only to obey my leader, and did not even know the identity of the other members who were at the same level as myself. It would be risky if you knew more members or were known to too many of them. Chen Rong-Fong directed me. I did not need to contact the others (Transcript of TJ 2013, 12).

This is the very first time that TJ has talked about his subversive activities—offering a new perspective on his past. We spend more than six hours talking about the conspiracy in which he was engaged and the process by which he had become an adversary of the KMT during the White Terror. However, he asks me not to reveal the details of his past to my readers; his facts and quotations are included here only with his express permission.¹⁸¹ Like other survivors, he is uncertain about politics in Taiwan and worries that the KMT could return to power.¹⁸² In the eyes of the government, TJ is one of the most co-operative survivors; he never brings up politics on official occasions such as the exhibition on Green Island where I first encountered him in 2010. Speaking to visitors, TJ describes the harsh conditions to which political prisoners were subjected, but keeps silent about how he came to be imprisoned. He engages judiciously in the official discourse, keeping his oppositional past and ongoing political commitment separate from that discourse.

Certainly some spectres from the Cold War are deemed more threatening than others today in Taiwan. During democratisation, supporting independence was fully recognised and welcomed by citizens as a legitimate political alternative. However, the neutralisation to which White Terror survivors have acquiesced as they compromise with the official discourse has pervaded all aspects of their lives, including their current political identity. For instance, in May 2016 I encountered the survivor of

¹⁸¹ A major reason for his discretion is that his story involves others whose identities were not discovered by the KMT regime during the White Terror. To this day, TJ still wants to protect these individuals.

¹⁸² Transcript of TJ 2014,1.

1960s, HC in Taipei at an academic conference on transitional justice in Taiwan, hosted by the Taiwan Historical Association (in Chinese, 台灣歷史學會) and a well-known pro-independence organisation, Wu Sian-Lien Foundation (in Chinese, 吳三連史料基金會). Although HC remained silent during the discussions sessions, he told me privately that he was coming to learn and to support Taiwan independence.¹⁸³ His attendance was a way of asserting his political ideal of reforming Taiwan's transitional justice system and supporting the cause of independence. For HC and others like him, contesting the government's version of the past is a struggle not only for the power to define the past, but for the present right to advocate freely their formerly suppressed political causes, a goal that has become vital in their current lives. Suffice to say, for my informants, memory is inherently contentious.

In the various cases described above, my interviewees all find it impossible to discuss their past activism freely. Some dissemble about it as they engage in the official discourse, while others choose to raise it delicately and to a very limited extent. The extent to which White Terror survivors feel able to reveal their subversive past in the official discourse is a function of the contestation of memory. Or, more precisely, the extent to which some may be more outspoken than others is a function not of individual temperament but of the offence for which they were convicted. For instance, PH is a survivor who was convicted of the crime of treason in the 1960s for advocating socialism and received a 10-year sentence. However, PH refuses to speak of his insurgent past to interviewers, including me.

It is meaningless to speak of my past, for no one is truly listening. People only care about how I was beaten and terrorised by the regime. [...] Unless the government acknowledges my past, I shall not talk about it (Transcript of PH 2013, 12).

¹⁸³ Field research note of HC 2016, 5. We encountered each other by chance; after our brief conversation, I immediately jotted down notes. HC was born in 1930 in Changhua, Taiwan. He was convicted of treason in 1958 for advocating Taiwan independence. See a more detailed account of his story in chapter 4.

Thus far, PH has not said a word about his insurgent past to any researcher in Taiwan. Nonetheless he is cooperative in presenting himself as a 'political survivor' who has undergone atrocities. Accordingly, survivors of different convictions may compromise, circumvent, or struggle with the authorities. Accepting the identity of de-politicised victims enables them to undermine the official discourse.

Certainly, some survivors were falsely accused of treason, as they did not plot against the KMT regime at all. While it is true that there are those who are innocent as defined by the *Compensation Act*, the fact remains that the White Terror was perpetrated at a time of great political conflict in Taiwan. The memory of the White Terror remains controversial to this day, and the official de-politicisation of its survivors attests to the contested nature of memory and the endurance of political beliefs.

Thus, survivors' approach to the memory of the White Terror is conditioned by the official discourse, as their de-politicisation reflects the politics of truth. Underpinning the seemingly cooperative relationship between the survivors and the authorities is a conflict in which truth, political causes, and memory itself are at stake. Consequently, their de-politicisation reflects the extent to which the essential identity of these victims is political. However, not all of the dissidents of the White Terror were pro-independence like AN and TJ. What about the communists, whose cause has not been rendered more palatable with the passage of time? With no leeway even to hint at their political demands in the official transitional justice discourse, how do they react to this discourse in the process of revisiting the past? The phenomenon of de-politicisation reveals competing discourses across the spectrum of survivors who engage in the official discourse. Based on this analysis, the following section examines how survivors act and develop their own transitional justice discourses to compete the official discourse.

The enduring resistance of political activists

Since the late 1980s, the White Terror's survivors have often acted collectively in public in the name of their victims' associations, which were

founded during democratisation. Of the multiple associations, there are three that appear to be the most representative in terms of the number of their members and the degree to which they engage in the public sphere: the Taiwanese Victims of the Martial Law Care Association (in Chinese, 台灣戒嚴時期政治受難者關懷協會; TVCA), the 1950s White Terror Vindicated Association (in Chinese, 五零年代白色恐怖案件平反促進會; hereafter, WTVVA) and Huzhuhui (in Chinese, 互助會). The first two associations are made up of pro-independence survivors, whereas the latter's members are left wing pro-unification. The cause of Huzhuhui is closer to pro-PRC than anything else. There are other associations, such as the Elderly Political Victims' Association mentioned in chapter 3. But these associations are subgroups of the TVCA and WTVVA, and their membership overlaps with those of the larger groups, inasmuch as they share a common political cause.

Different political stances fundamentally influence the logic of organising survivors' associations, which attests to Taiwan's political condition, especially the tension between pro-independence and pro-unification leftists, continues to be imperative in survivors' present-day life. With the democratisation in Taiwan since the late 1980s, survivors of the White Terror began to consider the possibility of organising associations for themselves and the bereaved to engage in political networking and rehabilitation activities. From this initiative, the three associations above were founded, corresponding to respective political causes and periods of imprisonment. Huzhuhui, most of whose members are survivors and bereaved relatives representing the left wing pro-unification movement of the 1950s—that is, those accused of communism—is the major association of left-wing political victims. Meanwhile, WTVVA and TVCA members, even those who may have been communists under the KMT, are now grouped under the banner of independence. Political affiliation is a primary indicator of the origin and differentiation of these associations and survivors often act collectively under their aegis in the official discourse and outside it.

Each of my participants acts under his different aegis. For instance, VT, JC, VC, and the survivors of the 1960s mentioned above, including KY, AN, SC, WR, and CH are members of TVCA. Despite their varying degrees of engagement with the official discourse, all of them attend the official annual

commemoration, and participate in state-sponsored exhibitions and other official events as representatives of TVCA, which is the association that is most engaged with the official discourse. One of the most distinct instance is, KY, as the representative of the TVCA, has attended the annual official commemoration on 10 December each year since 2005, despite the DPP or the KMT party is in power.

We (survivors) need to cooperate with the government, we demand for our recognition (transcript of KY 2012, 12).

This is in part a function of how much the survivors desire such engagement, but has even more to do with how the authorities define a 'qualified' political victim. Once the political cause of pro-independence was no longer taboo after the DPP came to power in 2000, TVCA members qualified as political victims, as long as they continued to claim their past innocence in the official discourse. JC, for example, was a former communist, yet opted to remain silent about this aspect of his past. Owing to this gesture of 'cooperation' with the authorities, JC is eligible to speak out about his past persecution and discreetly advocate his current political cause, Taiwan independence, in the scheme of transitional justice. Thus, not only one's past political activism matter but one's current political affiliations are at stake when one is a victim striving for the power of utterance within the official discourse.

To the authorities, not only survivors' past subversion but also their continuing political activism can exclude them from the official discourse, especially when survivors are vocal in support of their political causes. To Huzhuhui with their determined political stance of pro-unification leftism, the task of advancing their cause is equally important as the goal of being fully acknowledged by Taiwanese society. A left-wing agenda that includes unification with the mainland has been their enduring political ideal since the 1950s. Because their cause remains anathema to the Taiwanese government, and because they decline to compromise, Huzhuhui has adopted a completely different approach to that of the TVCA. Remaining outside of the official discourse, Huzhuhui has developed its own

transitional justice discourse. In the following section, we shall discuss how different political causes are silenced to varying degrees by scrutinising different political victim associations.

The nonofficial annual commemoration of the martyrs

As stated, Huzhuhui is one of the most unwelcome associations for the official discourse, for their determined leftist stance. To develop an alternative discourse of the memory of the White Terror, Huzhuhui has hosted an annual commemoration since 1991, known as the Autumn Worship (in Chinese, 秋祭 Chiu Chi). Huzhuhui members recount and honour the deceased Chinese communists of the 1950s every autumn at the Ba-ba Cho Memorial Park (in Chinese, 馬場町紀念公園).¹⁸⁴ Before it was officially designated as a memorial park, Ba-ba Cho was a place where political prisoners were executed during the 1950s.

In the official discourse, only the innocent victims deserve commemoration. But the Autumn Worship organised by Huzhuhui describes those who died under the KMT regime as ‘martyrs’ (In Chinese, 烈士); these deaths attest to the intensity of the political struggle between their comrades and the government. Reviewing the content of speeches made at Huzhuhui commemorations, one discerns that they not only pay tribute to the fallen but also promote the political ideal of unification. For Huzhuhui, the Autumn Worship not only recalls former political clashes but also serves to strengthen survivors’ commitment to the present cause:

This year is the sixtieth anniversary of the establishment of the New China, but also the sixtieth year of the Cross-Strait confrontation, recalling the historic scene of 60 years ago, at the historic turning point, which was interwoven with war, revolution, darkness and light. You carried on the glorious patriotic tradition of the martyrs who pursued anti-imperialism and national liberation under Japanese rule. You

¹⁸⁴ The name of the place was initially translated from the Japanese, which appears the same as the Chinese name but is pronounced differently.

wholeheartedly accepted the mission of national liberation of the Chinese people. As a result, you gave your precious life to the historic wave of new democracy without hesitation, solely to achieve the goal of ending the civil war and unifying the nation [Autumn Worship address 2009].¹⁸⁵

Today, we stand here solemnly; yet we no longer feel sorrow and even embrace some joy. Nevertheless, we would not be here without our martyrs' devotion and sacrifice. Your solid skeletons and impassioned blood crushed the old world as you ignited the fire of youth with your bodies. A single spark is sufficient to start a prairie fire. We will continue to struggle, to go forward, so that your ideals may come to fruition. Rest in peace, dear martyrs! Do not worry, people's comrades! We will walk on the road you guide us along, to continue the unaccomplished path of peaceful unification with our tears, our songs, and our steps! May your souls always stay with us! [Autumn Worship address 2012]¹⁸⁶

Suffice to say, Huzhuhui's commemoration publicly defines the past as a time of political struggle. They celebrate the deceased as individuals who 'sacrificed themselves' for their political cause. They make it clear that the persecution was unjust, for no one, even if they opposed the authorities, should be treated thus. While acknowledging the persecution, the speeches focus on carrying on the political struggle. For Huzhuhui, the conflict between socialism and capitalism remained unreconciled when the Cold War ended. The rise of the PRC in East Asia and the tension between the PRC and ROC in Taiwan have encouraged these survivors to continue advocating their cause, as some of them still look forward to the day when the PRC and the ROC will unify under a socialist regime. As claimed in a documentary film produced by Huzhuhui, *Red Youth, White Terror* (in Chinese, 紅色青春，白色恐怖),¹⁸⁷ their past persecution has paved the way for the coming

¹⁸⁵ See complete text in Chinese in appendix VI.

¹⁸⁶ See complete text in Chinese in appendix VII.

¹⁸⁷ The documentary is available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XEOHBq5gUg>

revolution. As the founding member, Lin Shu-Yan (1926–2012), states in the documentary:

What kind of death will not be perceived as wasting one's life?
There is a viewpoint, perhaps I speak presumptuously, that has
led us to pay the price for the development of our society. We
had no alternative but to sacrifice ourselves.

Lin's tone in the film is very confident. As a former political prisoner who was imprisoned for 34 years and seven months, he is authoritative, for he has been the mentor for the Taiwanese socialists. Huzhuhui has developed a discourse that encourages White Terror survivors to view their present-day life as a continuation of the past struggle.

The competing discourse developed by left-wing pro-unification survivors is complicated. For them, the past was a time of political struggle and persecution, which leads them to define themselves as surviving political dissidents and witnesses to past atrocities. Both perspectives are irreducible. Meanwhile, through their commemorations and cultural products, they situate their present-day lives as a continuation of their struggle under the KMT regime.

While Huzhuhui publicly characterises the past as a time of political struggle, the pro-independence associations, TVCA and WTVA also host a non-official annual memorial service to commemorate the Taiyuan Incident discussed in the previous section, although they focus specifically on this incident rather than honouring all pro-independence victims of the White Terror. The latter two associations also refer to those they are commemorating as 'martyrs', evoking a revolutionary spirit. As survivors of the Taiyuan Incident recall:

Of course, they sacrificed themselves in the name of
independence. (Transcript of JL 2013, 12).¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁸ JL was convicted of treason in 1963 for pro-independence activities. He claims to have participated in the Taiyuan rebellion, and witnessed all the proceedings that followed. For further details see 高金郎 (1991) 泰源風雲-政治汙濫監獄革命事件。台北：前衛出版。

I do not want to talk about this, for too many people have reviewed the incident. [...] It was a revolution, yet it failed. Those who sacrificed themselves were martyrs for Taiwanese independence. Apart from this, I do not want to say anything further (Transcript of JC 2012, 12).

In fact, at the moment, I thought the chance of success was uncertain. It was too difficult to plot a revolution during our imprisonment. You see, it was not enough merely to rely on us political prisoners. We did not have a reliable backup force outside the prison. We had nothing. As we conspired and rehearsed our rebellion, the KMT troops and government gathered all of a sudden, so how could we fight against that? We did think we had to do it even if we had no chance. No one feared death. We all prepared our wills (Transcript of MO 2013, 11).¹⁸⁹

Hitherto, the Taiyuan Incident has been perceived as a failed conspiracy since it was first publicly mentioned in the late 1990s, but the authorities have never officially recognised the five executed individuals, and rarely mention the incident within the official discourse. The five who were executed did not fit the definition of 'political victim' according to that discourse. Rather, they were classified as enemies of the state, for they conspired and carried out a rebellion. As stated, the TVCA failed to erect the monument for Taiyuan Incident at any National Human Rights park, but at the land funded by pro-independence organisation. On the one hand, we see the authorities continuing to apologise to, and commemorate, generic 'victims' of the White Terror. On the other, we see Huzhuhui, TVCA, and WTVA commemorating their fallen comrades in ways that acknowledge the political struggle of the time and recognise them as martyrs for their resistance to the government. The pro-independence TVCA and WTVA have

¹⁸⁹ MO was born in 1940 and was a co-defendant with JL in 1963. Unlike JL, who has been aggressive in advocating independence after their release in the 1980s, MO has kept a low profile. He is strongly committed to the independence cause. Only after the DPP came to power in 2000 did MO begin to appear in public and advocate independence public.

in effect gained more space for commemorating their past comrades in the official discourse while pro-unification leftist Huzhuhui continues to be ignored by the official discourse for their political stances.

To sustain the dominance of the official transitional justice discourse, the Taiwanese authorities continue to ignore the significant number of socialists who died in the White Terror, as well as those who survived. This political condition consolidates the collective hatred of socialists in present-day Taiwan, and underpins the official discourse's avoidance of legal responsibility for the past atrocities against them, in terms of the *Compensation Act* and Foundation. The non-official events organised by the survivors show that Taiwan's transitional justice discourse does not tally with the survivors' perspective on their past: a past defined by resistance to the KMT regime.

The power of utterance in the official discourse matters

From a political perspective, Huzhuhui may be the association that is least welcomed by the official discourse due to its insistence on characterising Taiwan's pre-democracy past as a period of 'political struggle'. The Autumn Worship makes it clear that Huzhuhui does not accept the government discourse and has substituted a discourse of its own.

Nonetheless, while confronting the dominant official discourse, Huzhuhui appreciates the importance of cooperating with the government, as this is the primary path for achieving recognition from Taiwanese society. Its cooperation has extended to providing historical materials that conform to the perspective of persecution and suffering.¹⁹⁰ For that matter, some of its members have applied for compensation under the *Compensation Act* and Foundation, and received it without difficulty.¹⁹¹ Nonetheless, such co-operation does not negate the requirement that officially recognised

¹⁹⁰ In 2010, Huzhuhui assisted the Jingmei Human Rights Park in curating an annual exhibition on the history of the Jingmei Prison under the White Terror. In 2014, Huzhuhui allowed the Taiwanese government to conduct interviews with its 30 members; their narratives focus on conditions of suffering.

¹⁹¹ The exact number and names of those compensated are still unknown for the Foundation has not revealed the information; however, I am able to confirm that some of my informants and their associates did apply for compensation and received it without incident.

survivors be de-politicised. The official discourse retains its dominant position in the scheme of transitional justice. As BY and RJ stated,

I fell much more secure to tell you my past is because I am pretty sure that it is okay for me to speak of those insurgent episodes at this moment (democracy). However, I still hesitate over speaking of these scene with those people (official-sponsored oral history projects interviewers) about these issues you asked (Transcript of BY 2013, 4).

I am still angry with the governments (both DPP and the KMT after the 1990s) about their passive policies with respect to our memory and our rights. But what can I do? [...] I need to seize the opportunity of speaking of my past with the government. Even though I am only able to speak of my life of imprisonment. I still need to fight for it (transcript of RJ 2013, 4).

Each of survivors with whom I talked shared similar reflection stated here. Democracy does not guarantee the advent of ideal transitional justice. Although victim associations such as Huzhuhui compromises to a certain extent in the official discourse, the confrontational nature of its relationship with the authorities remains apparent. We are living in a time of relative liberalism, as the ROC government claims to safeguard each citizen's basic human rights. Although there is still political repression, the fundamental democracy in Taiwan guarantees freedom of speech to its citizens, which affords the non-official discourses an opportunity to develop and promote an alternate point of view. Without overt repression of survivors, a basic ideological confrontation persists, and remains central to the contestation of the past by political victims and the government.

'Certainly, I am a political dissident still'

As noted above, the three associations were founded on the basis of explicit political causes and continue to influence survivors' current political activities. Transitional justice has become one of the primary fields in which

survivors from different associations compete for the power to define the past and advocate their enduring political causes. White Terror survivors are the strongest representatives of the pro-unification and pro-independence causes in post-Cold War Taiwan.

For instance, in 1989, Huzhuhui worked with other pro-unification forces in Taiwan, such as the China Tide Association (in Chinese, 夏潮聯合會), to establish the Labour Party (in Chinese, 勞動黨), which is now the primary leftist pro-unification party in Taiwan. Meanwhile, pro-independence survivors pursue their political aims by supporting pro-independence candidates in parliamentary and presidential elections. In the democratic era, these actors retain their identity as members of the political opposition by actively engaging in political affairs. As JL describes it, *"I am still an adversary as I am fighting for Taiwanese independence"*.¹⁹²

For survivors of the White Terror, political ideal is intertwined with the demand for political recognition and their different political causes. JC considers his political ideal as Taiwan independence and a full recognition of his past, members of Huzhuhui consider their political ideal as a left-wing pro-unification and a full recognition. At this point, we observe a rather apparent of tension exists in the relations of different victim associations, for the different national identities and right or left political stances. Nonetheless, it is also irrefutable that a request for a full recognition and vindication of the formerly politically abused individuals has now been the very common platform shared by survivors from different associations. Transitional justice and a desire for reconciliation encourage these elderly continue to take a stance of advocate. Their political identity of 'political dissident' is therefore complicated by the past and the current political condition. That is, Taiwan's limited transitional justice scheme motivates survivors continue to occupy the position of 'political advocate' or 'political dissident'. As JC and HC emphasised,

I will not surrender to the obstacle in front of me. I am old, but I am not a fool (Transcript of JC 2013, 11).

¹⁹² Transcript of JL 2013, 12.

I... [sob]... I have to take care of myself, I have to live longer to welcome the day I have dreamed for years. I am a man persecuted by the KMT regime and Chiang Kai-Shek. I am a man who have fought for Taiwan independence since my early twenties (Transcript of HC 2013, 3).

In any society emerging from a transformation of power relations, discrepancies among viewpoints of the past are typically encountered. In this regard, the official discourse concerning a nation's past tends to be privileged but also controversial. As Huyssen states (2011: 615), 'just as the nation once was, and still provides, the framework for rights, it also served as the privileged space for collective memory'. National or regional institutions retain their ability to articulate human rights standards and the content of the collective memory. The case of Taiwan corresponds to Huyssen's observation. At the domestic level, it is the former perpetrators who initiated the scheme of transitional justice, which constrains the official discourse and precludes the KMT from being held legally responsible for its past atrocities. At the global level, as discussed in chapter 2, the continued hegemony of the Western powers in the post-Cold War era makes it difficult for their client nations to come to terms with government atrocities that took place with U.S. support. Accordingly, survivors of the White Terror in Taiwan are struggling for their own reconciliation with society, as transitional justice is not only about reconciliation between government and survivors of injustice. For survivors, the latter task may be the fundamental premise of the scheme in Taiwan, but earning recognition from present-day Taiwanese society is more crucial. And advocating their enduring political causes is a way of claiming for survivors an identity as political actors, or even as a political opposition.

While the post-Cold War era has not been able to guarantee the universality of human rights, it has also seen the perpetuation of the Cold War's ideological clashes. To my interviewees, the discourse on the past matters because it affects the extent to which a society will admit to past atrocities. They are concerned with what W. James Booth describes as 'the intimacy of memory's bond with justice, not as obsessional or as a syndrome, but as a face of justice itself' (Booth, 2001). Thus, as socialists continue to be

viewed as a political threat in Taiwan, these persecuted elder socialists struggle over the debate around the past, and their determined political involvement reveals their current lives as a perpetuation of the past political conflict.

Discussion: competing transitional justice discourses

The identity of victim is developed within a specific social context. As Richard Quinney argues (1972: 314–23), a victim represents a conception of reality as well as an object of events, which means that the concept of a victim is a matter of social construction. During the White Terror, the government aimed to incite a pervasive antipathy towards the Chinese communists, inasmuch as the latter posed the primary threat to the KMT regime in that era:

We who are conscientious patriots should firm up our will and thoughts and be vigilant in combatting the traitors of Chinese communism. Everyone should be aware of the outcome of being beguiled by these traitors, as they not only jeopardise individuals but also endanger the country. Hence, people who are unaware of the existence of traitors can be said to commit suicide. In addition, we should notice that: the measures of anti-communism are not exclusive to Taiwan, but exist as emergency tools for all democracies. Our people should fearlessly report any potential traitors to protect our own interests and happiness, and the peace and safety of the world.¹⁹³

The statement above is the text of a bulletin issued in 1951 by the *Taiwan Garrison Command*, the primary institution in charge of the practice of the White Terror in Taiwan. The political threat of socialism was artificially manipulated by the KMT regime. As time passes, people may perceive that we are living in an era of emancipation, which, in Joan Scott's words, denotes

¹⁹³ 台灣省保安司令部公告：1951.9.30. For Chinese version, see appendix VIII.

‘the lifting of restraints imposed by superior physical force or legal obligation’.¹⁹⁴ As Scott puts it, ‘to be emancipated is to get out from under, to be able to press ahead with no obstacles in one’s path, to enjoy some measure of unencumbered thought or movement, from a situation of constraint to one of some kind of freedom’ (2012: 148–149). Yet this does not imply that a restriction no longer exists, as survivors, still in confrontation with the government, must recount their persecuted past within the framework of current power relations.

Thus far, the Taiwanese government has claimed that the system of transitional justice is being conducted in accordance with the UDHR of 1948, as successive administrations have apologised for acts perpetrated in the past and recognised those who were persecuted. However, a claim of conformity to the global human rights discourse does not make survivors whole again, because socialism continues to be stigmatised in Taiwan. Whatever degree of democracy prevails in present-day Taiwan; the government nonetheless has its own political agenda. This means that the era of democratisation does not accord everyone an equal right to give voice to the past within the scheme of transitional justice. JC, for example, may be able to speak of his current pro-independence agenda, but often feels reluctant to recount his socialist past. The liberalism on which Taiwan’s democracy is founded is still limited when it comes to reflections on the past. Any political cause or narrative that potentially runs counter to the interests of the current government faces being silenced in the official discourse because, to the Taiwanese authorities, whether KMT or DPP, socialism poses the primary political threat. Accordingly, the competing transitional justice discourses, as described in this chapter, point to lacunae in the scheme of transitional justice in Taiwan.

Hence, the varying degrees to which my interviewees de-politicise themselves in the official discourse, and the way in which they narrate their past outside it, indicate the irreducibility of the two perspectives of survivors and the authorities. Ever since the concept of political victims was introduced in Taiwan after the Formosa Incident of 1979,¹⁹⁵ survivors have seized the

¹⁹⁴ Scott, J. W. (2012). The Vexed Relationship of Emancipation and Equality. *History of the Present*, 2(2), pp. 148–168.

¹⁹⁵ See detailed discussion in chapter 1.

opportunity to voice their past persecution in public. Claiming persecution became the first step in attracting public attention. At that time, no one could have predicted that Taiwan's system of transitional justice would be so limited in scope. Confronting the limited official transitional justice discourse, survivors' competing discourses focus on the present as a continuation of the past conflict. Given the field research discussed in this chapter, survivors, both socialists and non-socialists, still identify as political actors. They argue over the recognition of their past persecution and fight for their unfulfilled political ideals.

Furthermore, as mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, some of my socialist interviewees have recalibrated their political orientation due to socialists having been the primary target of the KMT regime in Taiwan. For example, since the 1950s, JC has maintained his socialist beliefs but supports the cause of independence. As he explains, "*my political goal is not to become Chinese but to make Taiwan a just nation*".¹⁹⁶ Likewise, VC and VT, the other two former socialists of the 1950s, are advocating independence, rarely mentioning their left-wing stance. It is the official discourse that has silenced VC, VT and JC's insurgent leftist past. Nonetheless, JC's politics evolved in response to his life experience, especially his witnessing of the horrifying 228 Incident. Meanwhile, VC and VT were intellectually inspired by books on Marxism that they read in Japanese when VC was working in the Taipei Post Office and VT was in his senior year of high school in the late 1940s.¹⁹⁷ Thus, they followed different paths to socialism but now, Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice coincidentally forces three of them to silence their insurgent past in Taiwan society.

Based on my field research, it is clear that not every pro-independence activist of the 1960s was profoundly inspired by socialism. The left wing in Taiwan suffered the most severe political repression during the 1950s; more than 80 percent of the political convictions were against socialists.¹⁹⁸ As AN, my pro-independence informant of the 1960s, explains, 'of course we hated

¹⁹⁶ Transcript of JC 2012,12 and 2014,7.

¹⁹⁷ Transcript of VT 2011, 5.

¹⁹⁸ 人權之路小組 (2008) 《人權之路 2008 年新版》。台北: 陳文成基金會。

the KMT regime, but we also lived under omnipresent anti-socialism'.¹⁹⁹ AN says it was not until his captivity under the KMT regime that he learned 'socialism' from fellow prisoners who were 'political criminals of the 1950s'. As elaborated in chapter 1, the KMT marshalled all of Taiwanese society into a collective atmosphere of anti-socialism. However, the insurgency never disappeared, for the KMT's harsh response continually inspired more 'political enemies' among the citizens of Taiwan.²⁰⁰

Meanwhile, one should not underestimate the importance of the identity of victims in the scheme of transitional justice. It is the de-politicisation of that identity that points up the flaws in Taiwan's transitional justice programme, which lacks the nuanced understanding of White Terror survivors that is needed. Reconsideration of their identity assists us in examining how the current power relations define the past. It shows how the identity of victims not only revisits the past repression, but evokes persistent mental suffering that colours the survivors' present. Also, there are competing discourses, which present in various forms. Some seek from transitional justice an opportunity to pursue their still unrealised political ideals, some merely appeal for recognition of their past suffering, and others seek to set the record straight with regard to the nature of the political conflicts of the past.

When it comes to the operation of transitional justice in new democracies, one of the basic requirements is that past abuses be recognised and steps be taken to address the harms that were suffered. Although, as the ICTJ suggests, systemic human rights violations affect not just the direct victims, but society as a whole, this chapter has focused only on the relationship and interactions between successive ROC governments and the survivors of the White Terror. As discussed, transitional justice is an umbrella term referring to various arrangements aimed at addressing systematic human rights violations; different nations have incorporated either retributive or restorative justice, or both, in their transitional justice projects. In terms of healing the victims' psychological injuries and

¹⁹⁹ Transcript of AN 2013,12.

²⁰⁰ I was told by every one of my informants that it was the KMT's brutal tactics that fuelled their resistance and made it their life's work.

preventing recurrence of systematic human rights violations, the ICTJ points to the validity of both approaches. Taiwan, however, has engaged in only a limited form of restorative justice.

Thus, the term 'competing discourse' not only refers to a tension between divergent viewpoints of the past, but denotes a power struggle between successive Taiwanese governments and the White Terror survivors as each seeks to control the definition of the meaning of the past. This contestation of the past comes to exist as a conflict in Taiwan's approach to transitional justice.

The term 'conflict' refers to two aspects. First, the memory of the White Terror is inherently contentious with regard to the present politics that shape the construction of the past. How we define the past reveals how we act and expect to be recognised in the present, and this is reflected in the discrepancy between the official and non-official discourses relating to the White Terror. While reconciliation is usually deemed to be the primary goal and value of transitional justice in transitional countries, the goal may be out of reach for the people of Taiwan. The KMT regime has not only failed to vindicate former political criminals but also maintains its hostility towards its longstanding political enemies—mainly socialists and advocates of independence. Such reconciliation as has taken place has been only between the KMT authorities and those citizens not deemed to have committed treason. All of society has been invited to forgive the past atrocities committed by the state, but not to forgive those who challenged the oppressive state. Thus, it is hard to envisage a reconciliation between the authorities and the survivors of the White Terror until the former fully vindicate the latter, as well as those executed, of the crime of treason and erase the stigma associated with their past criminal status. In this context, the politics of constructing the past is certainly a battleground between the governments and survivors.

Second, the term 'conflict' references the ongoing political struggle in relation to various political causes. White Terror survivors whose 'treason' stemmed from advocacy of Taiwanese independence were recognised and rehabilitated in the official discourse once the DPP, which has not ruled out that option, came to power in 2000. However, survivors who had been

convicted of espousing left-wing causes—especially those who supported unification with the communist mainland, still have not been embraced by the official discourse. Survivors from different political stances experience official recognition at varying levels, and some have had to compromise their ideology at the direction of the government in order to receive a measure of relief. Meanwhile, the non-official transitional justice discourses of my research subjects are categorised as follows: seeking recognition of their persecution, affirming their dissident past, and embracing their immutable political identities. For them, the process of reconciliation implicates the present as well as the past. For many of these White Terror survivors, what matters most is the ability to assert the rightness of their unwavering political convictions. Without a full vindication of their ‘treasonous’ past, the causes they champion continue to be viewed as ‘unacceptable’ in the minds of the public. Notwithstanding the legal guarantees of freedom of political opinion and speech that have come with democracy, the spectre of the socialist threat continues to haunt citizens’ minds in Taiwan.

Although White Terror victims are finding some measure of solace in the continued pursuit of their political causes, and notwithstanding the restorative justice some have obtained in the form of financial compensation and rehabilitation of individual reputations, it is clear that those interviewed for this research still suffer from anxiety and mental torment:

I know it is all finished. Yet, I do sometimes feel as if I will be oppressed again when I see the government act like this (Transcript of SC 2013, 10).

Only when the government starts to confess, will I start to believe that I will no longer be arrested or imprisoned (Transcript of TZ 2013, 11).

The KMT was evil then, and it is still evil now! They oppressed us, and even now I cannot accuse the KMT of their atrocities. How can that be? (Transcript of RJ 2013, 4).²⁰¹

²⁰¹ RJ was born in 1938 and was convicted of treason for pro-independence activities in 1962. He was also the co-defendant of SC. See more discussion about RJ in chapter 4.

Although a full recognition of my informants' past persecution implies an alleviation of survivors' trauma and shame, as discussed in chapter 4, the official discourse as currently constituted increases their mental burden. As a result, they may struggle for recognition of their past and present experiences, while also haunted by the potential recurrence of repression and the fear of further persecution.

Survivors' discourses not only concern how past conflicts are continued in the present; more profoundly, they concern the meaning of survivorhood. My interviewees are individuals who were persecuted and struggled in the past. Now, they negotiate, cooperate, and even compromise with the authorities, but also advocate and fight for their political ideals in the non-official domain. Hence, the uniqueness of the identity of victims in Taiwan has less to do with the evocation of their past repression by the government repression than with the challenge of reconciling Taiwanese society with their revolutionary past. White Terror survivors are not merely a living reminder of the past; they show that a newly democratic society may still silence some voices—in this case, the voices of socialists.

Conclusion

Democratisation never guarantees reconciliation, either within a nation or among nations. Conflict may persist in the form of discursive or ideological struggles, if not armed confrontation. Throughout the analysis herein, I have argued that the present is not a time of global reconciliation. As borne out by my field research and the work of other scholars, we are living instead in an era of continuing ideological conflict. Democracy and liberalism are ideologies, which, by virtue of the hegemony of the Western powers, are secured and realising an expansion. Ironically, against this background, the group of socialist survivors of the White Terror remains suppressed and their power to voice their past within the scheme of transitional justice remains limited. Thus, the memory of the past remains contentious.

The fact that the memory of the White Terror is contested both by its survivors and by the authorities suggests that the essential conflict to which the White Terror responded has found a way to persist into the present. This

chapter has shown that there are two conflicts from the viewpoint of survivors—one over the acknowledgment of their persecution and the other over the reality of their ongoing political agitation. Survivors object to their de-politicisation within the official discourse because their identity is, itself, political, and they are struggling for the power to define the past. It is true that democratisation in Taiwan has served to provide survivors with more leeway for public expression. However, an incomplete recognition of survivors' past persecution cannot compel the KMT authorities to take legal responsibility for the past atrocities, and constraints on their power to voice the past impedes survivors from being rehabilitated from their status as second-class citizens, especially if they espouse socialism, which is still regarded as a political threat in Taiwan. Accordingly, my interviewees' competing discourses show that transitional justice projects do not necessarily reverse the injustices of the past, especially when persistent power relations remain in play. Competing transitional justice discourse in this regard provides an approach for researchers to reconsider the pros and cons of Taiwan's transitional justice. More profoundly, their stories lead us to reconsidering the meaning of reconciliation and the profound influence of past political condition.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

It is originary: life is survival.

— Jacques Derrida²⁰²

Over the last two decades, our relationship to the White Terror in Taiwan has changed. Once defensible, it has become controversial and anxious. In the words of Andrea Huyssen, we are living in an era of trauma and human rights. The transnational discourse of human rights may give us a better handle on such matters than the transfer of psychoanalysis into the world of politics and history (Huyssen 2003: 9). Arguably, the perspective of human rights and reconciliation has paved the way for rehabilitating the formerly abused and traumatised 'political prisoners', i.e., political victims, under the KMT regime in Taiwan. Nonetheless, the previously dominant perspective of political conflict remains defensible to a certain extent, continuing to prevent the former KMT party-state from acknowledging its accountability. In consequence, victims of the White Terror are still awaiting full vindication, inasmuch as the identity of political victim remains restrictive and monotonous.

But humans are unique, each different from one another, and so are their life experiences and memories of the White Terror. As discussed throughout this study, the 24 survivors have experienced and recollected their memories of the past in different ways. We continue to learn about the confluence of the perspectives of political conflict and political violence in their ways of remembering and recognising their past. Their self-evaluation swings between the identity of political insurgent and political victim. However, only the 'innocent' political victims can be embraced by Taiwan's

²⁰² From Derrida's last interview in 2004, available at: <http://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/~dclark/documents/rememberingJD/Derrida.I%20am%20at%20war%20with%20myself2.pdf>.

official transitional justice scheme, insofar as the identity of insurgent remains excluded from the official discourse of transitional justice. In consequence, the 24 survivor victims with whom I talked continue to strive to create a space to utter the identity of insurgent and a rather more comprehensive identity of victim in the transitional justice scheme. This phenomenon expounds the meaning of the controversy and anxiety of our relationship to the memory of the White Terror. Taiwan's scheme of reconciliation has not eased the painful memories, let alone dissolved the continuing tensions between survivors and the KMT party-state.

In short, this research focuses on the politics of constructing the past in the present in Taiwan, in terms of interactions between the survivors and successive governments on the scheme of transitional justice. It is research into the politics of memory that discerns the contestation of the past White Terror in the era of reconciliation.

Reconciliation in the ongoing conflicted era

As elaborated in chapter 2, to study memory is to study how past and present-day politics continue to interact with each other, framing and representing the past in our present-day lives. In other words, memory is not a product of the past, but a dynamic process in which individuals develop their knowledge of the past in terms of the power relations of the society to which he or she currently belongs. In the case of Taiwan, the country's present political condition is profoundly influenced by the political framing of the Cold War and the White Terror; the legacies of these phenomena, which overlap to a certain extent, have inevitably complicated the transitional justice discourse in Taiwan. While the Cold War was a time of anti-socialism, the White Terror was an enduring state of political conflict between the KMT regime and its political opponents, including left-wing pro-unification advocates, pro-independence activists, anarchists and so forth. Given that the rivalry between the USA and the Sino-Soviet bloc spurred the USA to assist the KMT in consolidating its authority in Taiwan, the political configuration of the Cold War underpinned the occurrence of the White Terror, although the spectrum of political opposition that the

White Terror sought to suppress reveals a more complicated picture than an ideological battle between capitalism and socialism.

The KMT regime was oppressive, as evidenced by the imprisonment, torture, and execution of its political opponents during the White Terror. It was not only people who had conspired against or expressed dissatisfaction with the government who were prosecuted as political criminals. Some of these former political prisoners were convicted of treason on no grounds whatsoever. The White Terror was a period in which the dictatorship loomed large in everyone's lives. Arguably, the perspectives of political conflict and repression cannot be considered in isolation from one another, as there was a circular relationship between the two. Opposition to the government led to being targeted for persecution, which, in turn, gave rise to more popular resentment and insurgence. In Masuda's words (2015: 269), *"this designation made many ordinary people in Taiwan not just passive actors or victims of the terror as usually described but, to some extent, active participants"*. The support rendered by the USA meant that the White Terror was not merely about clashes of ideology; it was a time when the KMT administration changed the logic of ordinary life in Taiwan. It was not only Chinese Communists who were the main political threat to the KMT regime. The term 'political enemy' did not merely refer to communists or socialists, because anyone who demonstrated interest in a political cause that was deemed to run counter to KMT interests could be viewed by the government as an 'enemy' to be eliminated. As my participants' various political stances have shown, when socialists were the common political enemy that united the USA and the KMT in Taiwan, the diversity of political groups suppressed under the KMT shows how the political configuration of the Cold War became localised in legitimising the KMT's authority in Taiwan.

As Walter Benjamin (2009; originally published in 1942) says, *"history is written by the victors"*. The dominance of the Western powers in the post-Cold War era has led to transitional justice being implemented in a narrow and biased manner. The USA and its allies effectively define which crimes should be redressed and which victims should be rehabilitated. First, it is the political conditions of the post-Cold War era that underpin the argument. The end of the Cold War marked the fall of socialism and the dominance of

capitalism and democracy, making the Western powers the victors and thus entitled to victors' justice. But the post-Cold War era has not brought an end to war. The NATO bombing during the Kosovo war in 1998–1999 was carried out in the name of humanitarianism, which Atanasoski (2013) would call 'humanitarian violence'. However, the refusal of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) to investigate alleged violations of international humanitarian law committed by NATO during its bombing campaign in Kosovo (Nagy 2008) suggests that it is, in Nagy's words, victors' justice that prevails in the ICTY. This suggests that any tribunals under Western dominance are liable to be skewed in favour of Western interests. Although the aim of tribunals related to transitional justice is to redress all past human-rights abuses, political conditions impose practical constraints.

Confronted with the restrictive discourse of global transitional justice in the post-Cold War era, Taiwan's political transition happened without removing the KMT regime and continues to delay a comprehensive reconciliation amongst the former political prisoners, the KMT regime, and the whole of society. In consequence, the former perpetrators have not been held accountable, and the former political prisoners remain stigmatised.

Given the three-aspect analytical framework with a Foucauldian perspective of power relations, the implementation of the *Compensation Act* in 1998 unprecedentedly defines the criteria for compensation and the identity of political victims. Justice was the primary aspect and institutional arrangement to be emphasised in the eyes of successive Taiwanese governments. Later, the *Archives Act* pictures the materials for producing the truth of the White Terror. However, the legal designation circumscribed survivors' narrations of their own past and the formation of Taiwan's scheme of transitional justice. As stated in the previous chapters, Taiwan's official contrition discourse about the White Terror never focuses on the nature of the political agitation in which the survivors of the White Terror were engaged but, rather, always on their past suffering. Any survivor who strongly affirms his political convictions would not fit the criteria of the official discourse for 'a surviving political victim'. Only those who assert their innocence of treasonous offences are officially identified as 'survivors of past atrocities', although the White Terror in Taiwan was more complicated

than the official discourse suggests. It was a time when any individual who was viewed as a threat to the KMT authorities could be accused of treason. People who had subversive thoughts or intentions, or who had committed subversive acts, as well as some who had nothing at all to do with subversion, were all at risk of persecution by the KMT regime. In consequence, the official representation of the past circumscribes Taiwanese citizens' view of their own history. Conditioned by the incomplete political transition in the 1990s and the restricted justice designation imposed on the survivors, the aspect of ethos, i.e., the cultural activities that seek to console the past wounds and secure democracy, in Taiwan's transitional justice scheme thus continues to repeat the rhythm of de-politicisation. The Taiwanese government has a stake in de-politicising the identity of political victims in order to consolidate the idea that the communists and socialists posed a threat to the stability of political conditions during the White Terror. By doing so, the perpetrators can evade legal responsibility for their atrocities.

Thus, we confirmed the unique journey of political transition has come to formulate particular power relations in terms of these institutional arrangement. Survivors, including each of my participants, has now remained unfree from the past conflict and wounds. Overall, these three aspects cannot be examined in isolation. Quite the reverse: a dialectical relation exists amongst them. The direction of the truth and cultural activities is underpinned by the legal designation; and these two aspects in turn strengthen the justification of the justice aspect. They only need to provide compensation and apologise for their past abuses to individuals who were 'political victims' as defined by the official discourse. In this regard, the government assumes no legal responsibility in that discourse for the injuries suffered by former political prisoners who own their revolutionary past. The transitional justice scheme in Taiwan remains controversial as neither the global political sphere nor geopolitics in Taiwan have fully reconciled with the socialists or communists.

Survivors' last resistance and unalleviated wounds

As surviving former political enemies and political victims, my 24 participants are witnesses to the ongoing controversial reconciliation scheme in Taiwan. Their non-official transitional justice discourses therefore enable us to explore how these men consider their past and present, and imagine their future, within the scheme of transitional justice, and, especially, how their response to the transitional justice scheme expounds upon the flaws and irony of the scheme. In this regard, a study of the power relations that surround my participants in the scheme of transitional justice is itself an investigation of the politics of memory. Based on my 10 months of field research with survivors in Taiwan, I argue that 'silence' is salient in deciphering the state of survivorhood, because it reflects how the official discourse suppresses the survivors' narratives. In other words, studying these men's silences could illuminate the power relations operating within the scheme of transitional justice.

What is silenced cannot be understood as merely an effect of one's traumatic experiences; rather, silence is itself a kind of testimony. While silence is often a tactic of the powerful, and also a weapon of dominated individuals (Bassett, 2013), it is also, as Sara Maitland insightfully argues, 'a real, separate, actual thing, an ontological category of its own: not a lack of language but other than, different from language; not an absence of sound but the presence of something which is not sound' (Maitland, 2008: 28). She sees silence as a form of oppression, as all silence is waiting to be broken. In this regard, White Terror survivors' silence can be viewed both as an outcome of the official discourse in the scheme of transitional justice in Taiwan and as their resistance to that discourse. As I have argued, most of my interviewees use silence as a weapon to assert their freedom to choose what kind of past to articulate in the official discourse. While the government has limited their freedom to describe their past in the official discourse, they are empowered to remain silent about the parts that they may be reluctant to recount publicly. Silence, in this light, recalls their past as a time of mixed persecution and struggle, and survivors' various manipulations of silence reveal that the state of survivorhood is complex. That is to say, silence not

only reflects psychological trauma, but can also shed light on the power relations affecting one's social and political life.

In the official discourse, they are encouraged to expose their shame about being oppressed individuals, but are not permitted to spell out their shame at having failed to effectively challenge the government. The official discourse deters citizens from exploring the meaning of survivorhood in terms of political conflict. To most people in Taiwan, the term 'White Terror survivor' implies an individual who has survived serious state repression without having harboured any specific subversive intent. However, these survivors are experiencing shame not only due to this acknowledged persecution but also due to their secret revolutionary past. While every survivor's life experience is unique, they have in common a politically constructed identity created for them by the official discourse. Identified as surviving victims, but not as surviving political dissidents, their survivorhood is incomplete in the official discourse. Because they survived political struggle as well as systematic abuse, the meaning of their survivorhood is complicated.

Certainly, the findings about the embedded meaning of survivors' silence is central to the analysis of the power relations that survivors have been dealing with since the 1980s. Given the institutional arrangements that have been employed throughout the past three decades, survivors incorporate themselves into the scheme, yet also negotiate and resist, struggling over their power to raise voices that have been silenced for years. As a Foucauldian perspective would remind us, a study of subject and power relations is a question of 'capacity' (2000c: 336–348). Foucault has pointed out that the term 'power relations' refers to the assertion that power only exists as exercised by some over others (2000c: 340). Given the analysis stated in previous chapters, the condition of employing the transitional justice scheme in Taiwan is not fixed or stationary, but dynamic. The survivors continue to develop their tactics in response to the seemingly decisive and limited scheme. As stated, almost all of them have been cooperating with the official discourse since the 1990s. However, the situations with which my participants are confronted have changed slightly as some of them devote themselves in sparing the space of uttering the past, although the side of

persecution over lies the side of insurgence. At the same time, the pro-independence cause is gradually being welcomed by Taiwanese society (Shih 2014), insofar as pro-independence is now widely accepted by Taiwanese citizens. Take JC, who became a communist in the late 1940s and was sentenced to life imprisonment, but, while in prison, began to support Taiwan's independence rather than unification with communist China. Then there was VC, who had once supported socialism but was then converted to pro-independence during his imprisonment. Both of them choose to demonstrate their past as a time of pro-independence insurgence. Their reticence about their socialist past is an outcome of the limited culture of contrition, but also evidence that attests to their 'capacity' in the face of the power relations.

By the same token, pro-unification socialist survivors' actions in Taiwan also envisage the intricate power relations. Take Huzhuhui, discussed in chapter 5. As the most representative pro-unification socialist survivor association, Huzhuhui holds its own annual commemorations on the site of former executions practised by the KMT regime in Taipei. On the occasion of the non-official commemoration, such as Autumn worship stated in chapter 5, the executed ones suffered and sacrificed for their glorious political ideal. In the official transitional justice discourse, we continue to observe some members having shared their past persecution as a form of cooperation. Nonetheless, the insurgent scenes and episodes remain outside the scheme. Even the unofficial commemoration for Taiyuan Incident hosted by the pro-independence TVCA and WTVA, is still waiting for the official recognition. Only on the occasion of non-official commemoration and in the oral histories published by friendly writers such as Lan Po-Cho (1997; 2011; 2014), are these men viewed as insurgents, revolutionaries, and political activists. Despite the fact that political conditions have recently been smoother than during the 1990s, the tension left by the Cold War remains effective. The state of political struggle persists. The surviving political dissidents continue to live in a state of antipathy towards the KMT regime. Their lives continue to be a struggle over the terms of their belonging, and over their citizenship.

In Taiwan, these men rarely join in the debate individually but, in order to publicly embrace their political identity, they have established political victim associations, such as Huzhuhui and TVCA, which are organised primarily around their political ideals.²⁰³ Through these associations, survivors are able to engage collectively in the official discourse as well as their own. They are clearly aware of the importance of being recognised in the scheme of transitional justice, even though the official culture of contrition constrains the survivors from presenting themselves as 'former dissidents'. They remain political actors who propagate their political ideals outside the official discourse. Thus, on the one hand, they are de-politicised victims although, on the other, they continue to advocate their political causes in contemporary Taiwan. By studying these men's struggles at both individual and collective levels, no one's experience can be reduced. Yet, ostensibly, my participants have in common the present-day life is a continuation of their past political conflict.

Arguably, the picture of power relations nowadays is a co-consequence of the legacy of the Cold War and Taiwan's unique democratisation. Almost every survivor perceives the political conflicts of the past as continuing to resonate in his current life, including the scheme of transitional justice. For instance, the association of left-wing socialist survivors, Huzhuhui, continues to advocate the socialist political ideal. Accordingly, in their annual commemoration, oral history, and political events, they develop narratives that tie in with their contentious past. Nothing is more important to its members than advocating their enduring political cause. They have survived the era of government atrocities and, by the same token, have lived with the failure of their political struggle. The term 'conflict' thus does not imply a head-on collision of discourses but, rather, an ambiguous state in which White Terror survivors continue to cooperate with the authorities to a certain extent while still seeking to define their own place in the nation's history. Hence, transitional justice is not merely a process of reconciliation between society and past systematic wrongdoing but, more profoundly, it is a scheme for constructing the past to reflect the current political reality. As survivors are in their eighties or

²⁰³ See discussion in chapters 4 and 5.

nineties, the competing discourses are their own last resistance, striving to console their traumatised wounds, pursuing unaccomplished political ideals, and reconciling themselves with their beloved society of Taiwan.

A study of survival

No one's persecution can be reducible to the knowledge of victimhood (Levi 1990). The main contribution of this study is to scrutinise the so-called political victims of the White Terror using a person-centred approach. As sociological research, this analysis focuses on discovering a pattern in how survivors deal with their past. With the close-up observations of the 24 survivor victims, the intention is not to evoke the reader's sympathy by focusing on the misery this group has experienced. Rather, having acknowledged their collective oppression, the official discourse projects the identity of survivors. Inasmuch as the survivors have developed their own competing unofficial discourses within the scheme of transitional justice, it appears that, on the one hand, they consent to be represented as de-politicised victims in the official discourse while, on the other, they remain engaged in a struggle with the government and society over their political ideals. In short, amongst institutional and legal analyses of the employment of transitional justice in Taiwan, this research seeks to address the interactions between survivors and the scheme, focusing on how the employment of reconciliation and transitional justice is inevitably political and becomes the primary political battlefield in Taiwan. Throughout a thick description of my participants, the meaning of the political is unravelled in terms of their survivorhood, and how they continue to live under the circumstance of otherness that is continuously imposed upon them by the authorities and the global political situation. By scrutinising the survivors' lives from a collaborative perspective of global and domestic politics, the 'power relations' do not merely emerge from Taiwan's own political path. These power relations are the product of the co-consequence of Taiwan's unique political history and global politics. Suffice it to say that Taiwan's seemingly impossible reconciliation is, to a certain extent, a legacy of the Cold War.

Examining survivors' accounts of their current political lives from an anthropological perspective, I necessarily became a witness, interpreter and critic of the transitional justice discourse. As a native of Taiwan, my awareness of current political conditions sensitised me to the need to reveal forbidden White Terror narratives, and to put forward an account of the political agenda embedded in these narratives. In this regard, details of survivors' past insurgence is worthy of future research. In the past, researchers might have considered these men were persecuted merely with bad luck. Based on this research, it is noteworthy to examine how the KMT regime targeted these 'former political dissidents' in this effective way if the insurgences were true.

The White Terror and the 228 Incident are not the only two cases deserving more attention in Taiwan. During Japanese rule from 1895 to 1945, Taiwan was marshalled to join World War II for the Japanese Empire. As former Japanese, the Taiwanese of 1945 were considered to be responsible for the war crimes committed by the Japanese Empire. It is known that 175 Taiwanese-native Japanese soldiers were convicted and imprisoned as Class BC war criminals, and 26 of them were executed after the end of the war. After the end of WWII, Taiwan was no longer part of the Japanese Empire. The ever-changing geopolitics of the 1940s forced the Taiwanese people to face the transition of their political identity from the vanquished Japanese to the victorious Chinese. This marginalized the Taiwanese war criminals' position, both in Taiwan and overseas. Without Japanese nationality, Taiwanese-native soldiers are excluded from Japan's official compensation scheme. The same plight was inflicted on the Taiwanese comfort women. They confront tremendous challenges in their attempts to earn recognition from either the Taiwanese authorities or the Japanese government because, during WWII, they were Japanese, rather than citizens of the ROC. They are both war criminals and victims of war.

Taiwan has shared specific historical relations with Japan and has been a political ally of the USA. Confronted with the threat of Sino-Soviet Union during the 1950s and the need for US support, the ROC government signed the *Treaty of Peace with Japan* of 1952, agreeing to officially give up calling for war compensation from Japan. It was East Asian politics that impeded

Taiwanese citizens from reconciling with their former coloniser. As a result, regardless of Taiwanese NGOs advocating their idea of reconciliation in terms of the global reconciliation discourse since the 1990s, the changing political conditions continue to complicate Taiwan's path towards reconciliation with Japan.

Reconciliation is thus the most challenging issue in current East Asia. Based on this research, I have elaborated a clear picture of how both global and regional geopolitics frame the idea and employment of reconciliation in Taiwan. Using this approach, the issues listed here have more potential to contribute to knowledge about survival.

A study of survival means to question the continuing harm and unalleviated wounds. In this research, although I am one of very few individuals outside the community of survivors with whom they can share their revolutionary past, the deepest wounds remain too painful to probe. Not that I imagine that my role as a researcher is to heal my interviewees. On the contrary, I am always aware of the harm that my interviews could cause, especially when I raise questions with which they may feel uncomfortable. The ideal of global transitional justice encourages various groups in society to confess to their past, however shameful, controversial, traumatic, or otherwise vexed it may be. The advent of justice in Taiwan thus connotes an era of confession, in which we are obliged to expose such wounds; however, these confessions are limited by the authorities. The current political situation is overshadowed by the legacy of past political conflict, and limits our ability to define the past that we lived and the memories with which we are now living. The White Terror survivors, who personify the evidence of past atrocities and past struggle, are still fighting the authorities for recognition as they attempt to advance their varied political causes. In brief, their lives are characterised by enduring strife arising from these conflicts. These survivors are breathing their last, there is not much time for society to prepare to hear them. A profound re-consideration of the memory of the White Terror throughout this research thus evinces the plight of Taiwan's transitional justice scheme, which needs to be surmounted. All in all, survivors who lived through the past horror are still expecting a genuine

reconciliation to occur to pacify their traumatised and oppressed souls. They are still waiting for their voice to be heard.

Bibliography

- Acuna, C. H., 2006, Transitional Justice in Argentina and Chile: A Never-Ending Story. In *Retribution and Reparation in the Transition to Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 206–238.
- Agamben, G., 1999, *Remnants of Auschwitz*, New York: Zone Books
- Akpinar, A., 2003, The Honor/Shame Complex Revisited: Violence against Women in the Migration Context. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(5), 425–442.
- Alexander, J. C., 2012, *Trauma: A Social Theory*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Alexander, J. C., Eyerman, R., Giesen, B., Smelser, N. J., & Sztompka, P., 2004, *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, Cambridge: University of California Press.
- Alpers, S., 1991, The Museum as A Way of Seeing. In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution: 25–32.
- American Anthropological Association, 1947, Statement on Human Rights, *American Anthropologist, New Series*, Vol. 49, No. 4, Part 1 (Oct. - Dec., 1947), pp. 539-543.
- Améry, J., 1980, *At the Mind's Limits: Contemplations by a Survivor on Auschwitz and Its Realities*. (S. Rosenfeld & S. P. Rosenfeld, Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Aminzade, R., Goldstone, J. A., McAdam, D., Perry, E. J., Sewell, W. H., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C., 2001, *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrews, M., 2007, *Shaping History: Narratives of Political Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Atanasoski, N., 2013, *Humanitarian Violence: The U.S. Deployment of Diversity*, London: The University of Minnesota.
- Art, D., 2006, *The Politics of the Nazi Past in Germany and Austria*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Assmann, A., 2008, Canon and Archive. In A. Erll & A. Nünning (Eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 97–108.

- Assmann, A., & Shortt, L., 2012, *Memory and Political Change*. In *Memory and Political Change*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Assmann, J., 2008, Communicative and Cultural Memory. In A. Erll, S. B. Young, & A. Nünning (Eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 109–118.
- _____, 2011, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J., 1995, Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, (65), 125–133.
- Association, A. A., 1947, Statement on Human Rights. *American Anthropologist*, 49(1), 539–543.
- Bar-On, Dan 2007. Reconciliation Revisited for More Conceptual and Empirical Clarity, in: Janja Bec-Neumann (ed.). *Darkness at Noon. War Crimes, Genocide and Memories*. Sarajevo: Centre for Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Studies, 62-84.
- Bassett, C., 2013, Silence, Delirium, Lies? *First Monday*, 18(3).
- Beck, J. G., McNiff, J., Clapp, J. D., Olsen, S. A., Avery, M. L., & Hagewood, J. H., 2011, Exploring Negative Emotion in Women Experiencing Intimate Partner Violence: Shame, Guilt, and PTSD. *Behavior Therapy*, 42(4), 740–750.
- Ben-Ze'ev, E., Ginio, R., & Winter, J., 2010, *Shadows of War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bergson, H., 2011, *Matter and Memory*, Connecticut: Martino Fine Books.
- Bernecker, S., 2009, *Memory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Booth, W. J., 2001, The Unforgotten: Memories of Justice. *American Political Science Review*, 95(4), 777–791.
- Buckley-Zistel, S., & Stanley, R., 2012, *Gender in Transitional Justice*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burawoy, M., & Verdery, K., 1999, *Uncertain Transition*, (K. Verdery & M. Burawoy, Eds.), Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Butalia, U., 1998, *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India*. London: Penguin Books.

- Campbell, D., 1992, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Caruth, C., 1996, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*, London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Caruth, C., 2001, Parting words: Trauma, silence and survival. *Cultural Values*, 5(1), 7–26.
- Cassese, A., 1990, *Human Rights in a Changing World*, Cambridge: Polity Books.
- Chen, K. H., 2010, *Asia as Method*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Chen, K. W., 2008, Disciplining Taiwan: The Kuomintang's Methods of Control during the White Terror Era (1947-1987). *Taiwan International Studies Quarterly*, 4 (4), 185-210.
- Chen, C. H., and Chung, H. H., 2016, Unfinished Democracy: Transitional Justice in Taiwan. *Studia z Polityki Publicznej* 4 (12), 13-35.
- Chou, H. H., 1995, *Documentary Collection on US Aid to ROC: 1948–1965*, (H. H. Chou, Ed.) (Vol. I). Taipei: Academia Historica.
- Confino, A., 1997, Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method, *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 102 (5), 1386-1403.
- Connerton, P., 1989, *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connerton, P., 2008, Seven Types of Forgetting, *Memory Studies* Vol 1(1): 59–71.
- Corsane, G., 2005, *Heritage, Museums and Galleries*, London: Routledge.
- Crane, S. A., 1997, Memory, Distortion, and History in the Museum. *History and Theory*, 36(4), 44–63.
- Crew, S. R., & Sims, J. E. (1991). Locating Authenticity: Fragments of A Dialogue. In *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (pp. 159–175), Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Davison, P., 2005, Museums and The Re-shaping of Memory. In *Heritage, Museums and Galleries* (pp. 184–194), London: Routledge.
- De Behar, L. B., 1995, *A Rhetoric of Silence and Other Selected Writings*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- De Brito, A. B., Enriquez, C. G., & Aguilar, P., 2001, *The Politics of Memory and Democratization*. (A. B. D. Brito, C. Gonzalez Enriquez, & P. Aguilar, Eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Donnelly, J., 1989, *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Dower, John W., 2000, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*, New York: Norton.
- Duffy, L., 2005, Suffering, Shame, and Silence: The stigma of HIV/AIDS. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 16(1), 13–20.
- Durkheim, E., 2001, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. (M. S. Cladis, Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Durkheim, E., 2013, *The Division of Labour in Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Elias, N., 1978, *What is Sociology*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Elias, N., 1982, *The Civilizing Process*, Vol.II. *State Formation and Civilization*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Elster, J., 2004, *Closing the Books*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2006, *Retribution and Reparation in the Transition to Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erll, A., & Nünning, A., 2008, *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Etkind, A., Finnin, R., Blacker, U., Fedor, J., Lewis, S., Mälksoo, M., & Mroz, M., 2012, *Remembering Katyn*, Cambridge: Polity Books.
- Evans, T., 2005, *The Politics of Human Rights: A Global Perspective*, London: Verso Books.
- Fassin, D., 2007, Humanitarianism as a Politics of Life. *Public Culture*, 19(3), 499–520.
- Fassin, D., & Rechtman, R., 2009, *The Empire of Trauma: An Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Feher, M., 1999, Terms of Reconciliation. In C. Hesse & P. Post (Eds.), *Human Rights in Political Transitions: Gettysburg to Bosnia* (pp. 325–338). London: Zone Books.
- Felman, S., & Laub, D., 1992, *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, London: Routledge.

- Ferguson, K., 2003, Silence: A Politics. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 2(1), 49–65.
- Fierke, K. M., 2004, Whereof We Can Speak, thereof We Must Not Be Silent: Trauma, Political Solipsism and War. *Review of International Studies*, 30(04), 471–491.
- Fischer, M., 2011, Transitional Justice and Reconciliation: Theory and Practice, in B. Austin, M. Fischer, H.J. Giessmann (eds.) *Advancing Conflict Transformation*. The Berghof Handbook II. Opladen/Framington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Fleischauer, S., 2007, The 2-28 Incident and the Taiwan Independence Movement's Construction of a Taiwanese Identity, *China Information*, 21(3), 373-401.
- Foucault, M., 1972, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Tavistock.
- _____ 1973, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Classical Age*. Trans. R. Howard. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____ 1991, *Discipline and Punish*. London: Penguin Books.
- _____ 2000a, Society Must Be Defended. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984: Ethics* (pp. 59–66). London: Penguin Books.
- _____ 2000b, Technologies of the Self. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984: Ethics* (pp. 223–251). London: Penguin Books.
- _____ 2000c, The Subject and Power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984: Power* (pp. 326–348). London: Penguin Books.
- _____ 2000d, Truth and Power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed. & Trans.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984: Power* (pp. 111–133). London: Penguin Books.
- _____ 2000e, Subjectivity and Truth, In J. D. Faubion (Ed. & Trans.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984: Power* (pp. 87–92). London: Penguin Books.
- _____ 2007, Subjectivity and Truth. In S. Lotringer (Ed.), *The Politics of Truth* (pp. 147–168). Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Freud, S. 2010, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, London: Createspace.

- Freund, P. E. S., 1990, The expressive body: a common ground for the sociology of emotions and health and illness. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 12(4), 452–477.
- Geertz, C., 1973, Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The Interpretation of Cultures* (pp. 326–30). New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Gilbert, P., & Andrews, B., 1998, *Shame: Interpersonal Behavior, Psychopathology, and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gilligan, J., 1996, *Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and Its Causes*, London: Putnam Adult.
- Goffman, E., 1959, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London: Pelican Books.
- Goffman, E., 1968, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gordon, A., 2008, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gordon, S. L., 1990, Social Structural Effects on Emotions. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Gramsci, A., 1971, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds., G. N. Smith & Q. Hoare, Trans.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hajimu, M., 2015, *Cold War Crucible: The Korean Conflict and the Postwar World*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Halbwachs, M., 1992, *On Collective Memory*, (L. A. Coser, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hartling, L. M., Rosen, W., Walker, M., & Jordan, J. V., 2000, *Shame and Humiliation: From Isolation to Relational Transformation*, Massachusetts: Wellesley College.
- Hesse, C. A., Post, R., Neier, A., Cohen, D., Teitel, R., Fiher, M., & Ignatieff, M., 1999, *Human Rights in Political Transitions: Gettysburg to Bosnia*, (C. Hesse & P. Post, Eds.). London: Zone Books.
- Hodgkin, K., & Radstone, S., 2003, *Contested Past: The Politics of Memory*, (K. Hodgkin & S. Radstone, Eds.). London: Taylor & Francis.

- Hollander-Goldfein, B., Isserman, N., & Goldenberg, J., 2012, *Transcending Trauma: Survival, Resilience, and Clinical Implications in Survivor Families*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Hsiau, A.-C., 2000, *Contemporary Taiwanese Cultural Nationalism*, London: Routledge.
- Hunt, N. C., 2010, *Memory, War and Trauma*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huntington, S. P., 1991, Democracy's Third Wave. *Journal of Democracy*, 2(2), 12–34.
- Hurst, S., 2005, *Cold War US Foreign Policy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Huyssen, A., 2003, *Present Past*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Huyssen, A., 2011, International Human Rights and the Politics of Memory: Limits and Challenges. *Criticism*, 53(4), 607–624.
- Hwang, J. Y., 2016, Transitional Justice in Post-war Taiwan, In Schubert, G. (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Taiwan*, Oxford: Taylor & Francis Group Ltd.
- Ignatieff, M., 1999, Human Rights. In C. Hesse & P. Post (Eds.), *Human Rights in Political Transitions: Gettysburg to Bosnia* (pp. 313–324). London: Zone Books.
- Judt, T., 1996, The Past is Another Country: myth and memory in postwar Europe. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 36–69.
- Karp, I., & Lavine, S. D., 1991, *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Kaufman, G., 1993, *The Psychology of Sham*. London: Routledge.
- Kemper, T. D., Collins, R., Denzin, N. K., Hammond, M., Hochschild, A. R., Gordon, S. L., et al., 1990, *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, (T. D. Kemper, Ed.). New York: Suny Press.
- King, S. A., 2006, Memory, Mythmaking, and Museums: Constructive Authenticity and the Primitive Blues Subject. *Southern Communication Journal*, 71(3), 235–250.
- Kriesberg, L., 2007, External Contributions to Post-Mass-Crime Rehabilitation, in: Beatrice Pouligny, Simon Chesterman and Albrecht Schnabel (eds.).

- After Mass Crime. Rebuilding States and Communities* (pp. 243-271). New York: United Nations University.
- Kriesberg, L., 2004, From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation, in: Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov (ed.). *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation* (pp.81-110). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lacapra, D., 2001, *Writing History, Writing Trauma*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lambourne, W., 2009, Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding after Mass Violence. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 3(1), 28–48.
- Lansky, M. R., 1987, Shame and Domestic Violence. In D. L. Nathanson (Ed.), *The Many Faces of Shame* (pp. 335–362). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lawther, C., 2014, *Truth, Denial and Transition*, London: Routledge.
- Levi, P., 1991, *If This Is a Man/The Truce*, London: Brown Book Group.
- Lewis, M., 1995, *Shame*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Lin, S. L.-C., 2007, *Representing Atrocity in Taiwan: The 2/28 Incident and White Terror in Fiction and Film*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lüthi, L. M., 2010, *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Maitland, S., 2008, *A Book of Silence*, London: Granta Books.
- Manela, E., 2007, *The Wilsonian Moment : Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Masuda, H., 2015, *Cold War Crucible: The Korean Conflict and the Postwar World*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Moody, P. R., 1977, *Opposition and Dissent in Contemporary China*, California: Hoover Press.
- Moon, C., 2008, *Narrating Political Reconciliation: South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Müller, J.-W., Snyder, T., Gildea, R., Berger, T. U., Deighton, A., Price, M. E., et al., 2009, *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, (J.-W. Müller, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagy, R., 2008, Transitional Justice as Global Project: critical reflections, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 2008, pp 275 – 289.
- Nathanson, D. L., 1987, *The Many Faces of Shame*, New York: Guilford Press.

- Nobles, M., 2008, *The Politics of Official Apologies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nora, P., 1989, Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Memory and Counter-Memory*, 26(1), 7–24.
- Nozaki, Y., 2008, *War Memory, Nationalism and Education in post-war Japan: The Japanese history text book controversy and Lenaga Saburo's court challenges*. London: Routledge
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L., 1997, Narrative Authenticity, *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1–4), 83–89.
- Olick, J. K., 2008, From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practices and Products. In A. Erll & A. Nünning (Eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies* (pp. 151–163). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Olick, J. K., 2013, *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. London: Routledge.
- Olick, J. K., & Robbins, J., 1998, Social Memory Studies: From “Collective Memory” to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 105–140.
- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P. C., & Whitehead, L., 1986, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Peterson, R. D., 2002, *Understanding Ethnic Violence: Fear, Hatred, And Recentment in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plesch, D., 2015, Building on the 1943–48 United Nations War Crimes Commission. In T. G. Weiss & D. Plesch (Eds.), *Wartime Origins and the Future United Nations* (pp. 79–98). London: Routledge.
- Plesch, D., Weiss, T. G., 2015, *Wartime Origins and the Future United Nations*, London: Routledge.
- Plummer, K., 2001, *Documents of Life*, London: SAGE.
- Quinney, R., 1972, Who is the Victim? *Criminology*, 10(3), 314–323.
- Risse, T., & Sikkink, K., 1999, The socialization of international human rights norms into domestic practices: introduction. In T. Risse, S. C. Ropp, & K. Sikkink (Eds.), *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change* (pp. 1–38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Roht-Arriaza, N., & Mariezcurrena, J., 2006, *Transitional Justice in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R., 1999, Human Rights, Rationality, and Sentimentality. In O. Savic (Ed.), *The Politics of Human Rights: A Global Perspective* (pp. 67–83). London: Pluto Press.
- Rosenthal, G., 1993, Reconstruction of life stories: principles of selection in generating stories for narrative biographical interviews. *The Narrative Study of Lives*, 1(1), 59–91.
- Roy, D., 2003, *Taiwan: A Political History*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Savic, O., & Krug, B., 1999, *The Politics of Human Rights*, (O. Savic & B. Krug, Eds.). London: Verso Books.
- Schafferer C., 2007, Transitional Justice in Taiwan: An Austrian Perspective, *Contemporary Eastern Asia*, Vol. 6 (1), 17-32.
- Scheff, T. J., 2000, Shame and the Social Bond: A Sociological Theory. *Sociological Theory*, 18(1), 84–99.
- Scheff, T. J., 2013, Goffman on Emotions: The Pride-Shame System. *Symbolic Interaction*, 37(1), 108–121.
- Scheff, T. J., 1983, Toward Integration in the Social Psychology of Emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 333–354.
- Scheff, T. J., 1997, *Emotions, the Social Bond, and Human Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheper-Hughes, N., 1998, Undoing: Social Suffering and the Politics of Remorse in the New South Africa. *Social Justice*, 25(4), 114–142.
- Scott, J. W., 2012, The Vexed Relationship of Emancipation and Equality. *History of the Present*, 2(2), 148–168.
- Security Council, 2004, *Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies*. New York: United Nations.
- Shih, F. L., 2011, Memory, Partial Truth and Reconciliation without Justice: The White Terror Luku Incident in Taiwan, *Taiwan in Comparative Perspective*, Vol. 3, 140-151.
- _____, 2014, Transition to democracy at the expense of justice: the 2-28 Incident and White Terror in Taiwan. *Pathways to transitional justice in the Arab world — reflections on the Asia Pacific experience*, Middle East Institute, Washington, USA.

- Snyder, S. B., 2011, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stan, L., 2009, *Transitional Justice in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Reckoning with the Communist Past*, London: Routledge.
- Stan, L., & Nedelsky, N., 2013, *Encyclopedia of Transitional Justice: Entries on countries Volume 1*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stolojan, V., 2017, Transitional Justice and Collective Memory in Taiwan: How Taiwanese society is coming to terms with its authoritarian atrocities, *China Perspectives*, 2, 27-35.
- Tanaka, T., 2002, *Japan's Comfort Women: Sexual Slavery and Prostitution During World War II*, London: Routledge.
- Teitel, R. G., 2000, *Transitional Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____, 2003, Transitional Justice Genealogy. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 16, 69–94.
- _____, 2005, The Law and Politics of Contemporary Transitional Justice. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 38(3), 837–862.
- Teroni, F., & Deonna, J. A., 2008, Differentiating shame from guilt. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 17(3), 725–740.
- Thoits, P. A., 1989, The Sociology of Emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15(1), 317–342. T
- Thompson, P., 2000, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, J. H., & Stets, J. E., 2005, *The Sociology of Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Velikonja, M., 2009, Lost in Transition: Nostalgia for Socialism in Post-socialist Countries. *East European Politics & Societies*, 23(4), 535–551.
- Wallerstein, I., 1993, The World-System after the Cold War. *Journal of Peace Research*, 30(1), 1–6.
- Wang, N., 1999, Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 349–370.
- Walsh, K., 1992, *The Representation of the Past: Museums and heritage in the post-modern world*, London: Routledge.
- Wilds, K., 2000, Identity Creation and the Culture of Contrition: Recasting “normality” in the Berlin Republic. *German Politics*, 9(1), 83–102.

- Winter, J., 2006, *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*, London: Yale University Press.
- Winter, J., 2010, Thinking about silence, in *Shadows of War* (pp.3-31), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, N.-T., 2005, Transition without Justice, Or Justice without History: Transitional Justice in Taiwan. In *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, 1, pp77–102.
- Wu, R.-R., 2002, Toward a Pragmatic Nationalism: Democratization and Taiwan's Passive Revolution. In S. Corcuff (Ed.), *Memories of the Future National Identity Issues and the Search of a New Taiwan* (pp. 196–218). London: Routledge.
- Young, A., 1997, *The Harmony of Illusions*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Literature in Chinese

See Appendix II and III for state-sponsored research and publication

- 中研院近史所口述歷史編委會 (2000) 蘇東啟政治案件專輯。台北：中央研究院近代歷史研究所
- 王梅香 (2014) 冷戰時代的台灣文學外譯－美國新聞處譯書計畫的運作（1952–1962）。臺灣文學研究學報, 12 (19), 頁 223–254
- 江宜樺 (2007) 轉型正義與記憶政治。思想 5，頁 65-81。台北：聯經出版
- 行政院新聞局 (1989) 二二八事件專案報告。臺灣：行政院新聞局
- 李敖 (1991a) 安全局機密文件：歷年辦理匪案彙編 [上]。台北：李敖
- ____ (1991b) 安全局機密文件：歷年辦理匪案彙編 [下]。台北：李敖
- 呂滄一，胡淑雯 等 (2015) 無法送達的遺書：記那些在恐怖年代失落的人。台北：衛城出版
- 邱月亭 撰，陳建忠 指導 (2009) 解嚴後「白色恐怖」紀錄片的創傷敘事與記憶政治。新竹：國立清華大學台灣文學研究所碩士學位論文
- 林世煜、胡慧玲 (2003) 白色封印：白色恐怖 1950。臺北：國家人權紀念館籌備處

- 吳乃德 (2006) 轉型正義和歷史記憶: 台灣民主化的未竟之業。思想 2, 頁 1-34。
台北: 聯經出版
- 姚人多 (2008) 政權轉移之治理性: 戰後國民黨政權對日治時代保甲制度。台灣社會學 (Taiwan Sociology) 15, 頁 47-108
- 林邑軒 (2012) 來自彼岸的紅色浪潮: 從意義中介視角重構戰後初期「省工委」的地下革命行動。台北: 國立台灣大學社會學研究所碩士學位論文
- 林傳凱 (2014) 「大眾傷痕」的「實」與「幻」——探索「1950 年代白色恐怖『見證』」的版本歧異。歷史臺灣(8) 頁 35-82。台北: 國立臺灣歷史博物館
- 柯志明 (2003) 米糖相剋: 日本殖民主義下臺灣的發展與從屬。台北: 群學出版社
- 屏東縣警察局沿革誌編撰委員會 (2004) 屏東縣警察局沿革誌。屏東: 屏東縣警察局
- 梅心怡、張炎憲、沈亮 (2008) 梅心怡人權相關書信集: 跨國人權救援的開端 1968-1974。台北: 吳三連台灣史料基金會
- 陳英泰 (2005) 回憶, 見證白色恐怖(上)(下)。台北: 唐山出版社
- 陳嘉宏 (2006) 臺灣獨立運動史。台北: 玉山社
- 陳建忠 (2012) 美新處(USIS) 與台灣文學史重寫: 以美援文藝體制下的台、港雜誌出版為考察中心。國文學報 52 頁 211-242
- 陳明忠、李娜、呂正惠 (2014) 無悔: 陳明忠回憶錄。台北: 人間出版社
- 陳芳明 (1991) 謝雪紅評傳。台北: 前衛出版社
- 陳純瑩撰, 李國祁 指導 (1994) 台灣光復初期警政[1945-1953]。台北: 台灣師範大學歷史研究所博士學位論文
- 裘佩恩 (1997) 戰後台灣政治犯的法律處置。台北: 國立台灣大學法律學研究所碩士論文
- 曾品滄、薛月順、許瑞浩 (2000) 戰後臺灣民主運動史料彙編 (一) 從戒嚴到解嚴。臺北: 國史館
- 張富忠、邱萬興 (2005) 綠色年代: 臺灣民主運動 25 年 1975-2000。台北: 印刻中文

- 張炎憲、高淑媛 (1998) 鹿窟事件調查研究。台北：台北縣文化中心
- 張炎憲、陳鳳華 (2000a) 寒村的哭泣：鹿窟事件。台北：台北縣文化中心
- 張炎憲、胡慧玲、曾秋美 (2000b) 台灣獨立運動的先聲：台灣共和國。台北：吳三連台灣史料基金會
- 張炎憲、許明薰、楊雅慧、陳鳳華 (2002a) 新竹風城二二八。新竹：新竹市文化局
- 張炎憲、許明薰、楊雅慧、陳鳳華(2002b)風中的哭泣：五○年代新竹政治案件。新竹：新竹市文化局
- 張炎憲、曾秋美、陳朝海 (2003) 自覺與認同：1950～1990 年海外台灣人運動專輯。台北：吳三連台灣史料基金會
- 張炎憲、溫秋芬 編 (2006) 見證關鍵時刻高雄事件：「台灣之音」錄音紀錄選輯。台北：吳三連史料基金會
- 張炎憲、陳美蓉編著 (2010) 戒嚴時期白色恐怖與轉型正義論文集。台北：吳三連台灣史料基金會
- 孫友聯 (2012) 台灣勞工運動的突圍與創進。台灣人權學刊 1(2): 135-142。台北：東吳大學
- 藍博洲 (1997) 高雄縣二二八暨五○年代白色恐怖民眾史。高雄縣：高雄縣政府
- _____ (2001a) 臺灣好女人。臺北：聯合文學
- _____ (2001b) 麥浪歌詠隊：追憶一九四九年四六事件 (臺大部分)。臺北：晨星出版公司
- _____ (2007) 孤墳下的歷史：張志忠及其妻兒。思想 5，頁 153-190。台北：聯經出版
- _____ (2010) 老紅帽。台北：南方家園出版社
- _____ (2011) 你是什麼派。台北：南方家園文化事業
- _____ (2014) 台北戀人。台北：INK 印刻出版公司
- _____ (2016) 幌馬車之歌 (第三版)台北：時報文化出版。
- 藍博洲、張炎憲 (2014) 白色年代的盜火者。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處
- 蕭伶仔 (2009) 走進「白色家庭」：一九五○年代政治受難者家屬生命歷程探究。新竹：國立清華大學社會學研究所。

蘇慶軒 (2013) 國民黨國家機器在臺灣的政治秩序起源：白色恐怖中對左翼勢力的整肅（1948–1954）。政治科學論叢 (57)，頁 115–145

曹欽榮主編 (2012) 流麻溝十五號：綠島女生分隊及其他。台北：書林出版

臺灣黨務 (1951) 臺灣黨務 14: 51 台北：中國國民黨臺灣省改造委員會編印

臺灣民間真相與和解促進會 (2015) 記憶與遺忘的鬥爭：台灣轉型正義階段報告（共三冊）。台北：衛城出版

省文獻會（1966）台灣省二二八事件之真相。臺中：台灣省政府

Archives

C.I.A. (14th March 1949) *Probable Developments in Taiwan*. U.S.: Central Intelligence Agency.

Department of State (5th April 1950) *Memorandum of Conversation*. U.S.: Department of State.

C.I.A. (20th March 1950) *Probable Developments in Taiwan*. U.S.: Central Intelligence Agency.

Dean G. Acheson files No. 66-5_38; 66-6_14; 67-4_29 (Truman library and museum)

Archives/Verdicts of the White Terror

- (40) 40 安潔字 第 3399 號
- (43) 43 審三字 第 108 號
- (44) 44 審復字 第 10 號
- (44) 44 審特字 第 24 號
- (44) 43 審三字 第 52 號
- (49) 警審特字第廿四號
- (49) 49 年度覆 普(浚)字 第 135 號
- (51) 警審更字第 15 號
- (51) 警審特字第 67 號

- (51) 警審特字第八十一號
- (53) 法審字第○○四六號
- (53) 五十三年覆高准字第三三號
- (56) 五十六年度初特字第四十號
- (57) 五十七年度初特字第 5、15、24、35 號
- (58) 五十八年覆普繕字第一九四號
- (58) 五十八年度初特字第廿八號
- (59) 五十九年度初特字第卅一號
- (59) 五十九年度勁需字第一八九六號
- (63) 六十三年初特字第廿號
- (63) 六十三年初特字第六十三號
- (63) 六十三年亮享覆普字第七○號
- (64) 減裁字第○一○號
- (69) 六十九年度重上訴字第一三二號

Newspaper

CAN News: 17 April 2009

聯合晚報 1989.04.08 三版

聯合晚報 1989.04.09 七版

蘋果日報 2011.07.15 論壇

蘋果日報 2012.07.19 論壇

蘋果日報 2013.03.23 論壇

壹週刊 No. 284: 2012.8.2.

Online Materials

The Human Rights Declaration of Political Victims of Green Island

<http://catalog.digitalarchives.tw/item/00/5e/24/66.html>

Dr Lai He Official Website

<http://www.laiho.org.tw>

Taiwan Association for Truth and Reconciliation (TRCT)

<http://www.taiwantrc.org/index.php>

Full Version of State-Sponsored Documentaries and Films (2011- 2015)

<http://www.nhrm.gov.tw/movielist?uid=927>

The Official Website of ICTJ

<https://www.ictj.org/>

Hai-Xia Magazines Online Archives

<http://haixia-info.com/issues.html>

The complete version of President Lee's speech on 10 December 1999

<http://goo.gl/b8W2ln>

The project website of Liuzhangli cemetery

<http://goo.gl/957df7>

Chen Ying-Tai's personal web site

<http://goo.gl/MUaJn9>

The complete version of President Chen's speech on 17 May 2005

<http://goo.gl/fjqQ5e>.

Online Authority Sponsored Oral History Documentary

<http://www.nhrm.gov.tw/movielist?uid=938>

Appendix I

The list of official documentation and non-official materials provided by the participants.

Periodicals and Newspapers

Type	Name/description	Name in Chinese	Timeframe (year.month h)
Periodicals	Ren-Jian Magazine (The left-wing periodical)	人間雜誌	1985.11– 1989.9
	Hai-Xia (The pro-unification- leftist periodical, has strong connection with leftist survivors)	海峽評論	1991.1– 2016.1
	Formosa	美麗島雜誌	1979.5– 1979.12
Newspapers	United News (The former Official Newspaper)	聯合報	1949.12– 1987.10
	Taiwan Shin Sheng Daily News	台灣新生報	1946-1969
	Apple Daily News	蘋果日報	2003.5– 2016.12

Documentaries and Films

Type	Name	Year of Publication (online version or on screen)
State-sponsored Documentaries	白色見證	2002
	青春祭	2002
	我的人權之旅	2008
	綠島的一天	2009
	遺忘與記憶 / 記與忘	2011
	蔡寬裕口述歷史	2014
	張常美口述歷史	2014
	鍾興福口述歷史	2014
	達飛口述歷史	2014
	涂南山口述歷史	2014
	劉辰旦口述歷史	2014
	楊田郎口述歷史	2014
	郭振純口述歷史	2015
	王文清口述歷史	2015
	胡子丹口述歷史	2015
	陳孟和口述歷史	2015
	林恩魁口述歷史	2015

	林昭明口述歷史	2015
	王宗霖口述歷史	2015
	吳聲潤口述歷史	2015
	陳欽生口述歷史	2015
	陳新吉口述歷史	2015
	陳中統口述歷史	2015
	蘇有鵬口述歷史	2015
	謝聰敏口述歷史	2016
	陳深景口述歷史	2016
	涂炳榔口述歷史	2016
	劉佳欽口述歷史	2016
	吳水燈口述歷史	2016
	張大邦口述歷史	2016
	高文章口述歷史	2016
	楊國宇口述歷史	2016
	洪其中/ 周碧霞口述歷史	2016
Non-Official Documentaries	如果我必須死一千次	2007
	紅色青春白色恐怖 (Red Youth, White Terror)	2011

	白色王子 The White Prince	2014
	冰與血-犧牲	2014

Appendix II

The Published State-Sponsored Oral History Project and Monograph on state-sponsored exhibition from 1997 to 2016

Presidency	The Published State-Sponsored Oral History Project
The KMT government 1996-2000	五〇年代工作小組 (1998) 《臺灣地區戒嚴時期五〇年代政治案件史料彙編 (共五冊, five volumes) 》。台北：國史館
	台北市文獻會 (1999) 《戒嚴時期臺北地區政治案件相關人士口述歷史：白色恐怖事件查訪 (上) (下) (two volumes) 》。台北：台北市文獻會
	呂芳上 主持 (1999) 《戒嚴時期臺北地區政治案件口述歷史 (共三冊, three volumes) 》。台北：中央研究院近代史研究所
	藍博洲 (1997) 《高雄縣二二八暨五〇年代白色恐怖民眾史》。高雄縣：高雄縣政府
	台北市文獻會 (1998) 《五〇年代白色恐怖：臺北地區案件調查與研究 (上) (下) (two volumes) 》。台北：台北市文獻會
The DPP government 2000-2008	臺灣省文獻委員會編印 (2001) 《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50-70年代文獻專輯:臺灣省立師範學院「四六事件」》 南投：臺灣省文獻委員會
	吳文星採編 (2001) 《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50-70年代文獻專輯:戒嚴時期臺灣政治事件口述歷史》 南投：臺灣省文獻委員會。
	中央研究院近代史研究所 《口述歷史》編輯委員會(2002) 泰源事件專輯。台北：中研院近代史研究所
	吳文星、許雪姬採編 (2001) 《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50-70年代文獻專輯:戒嚴時期臺灣政治事件檔案與口述歷史

	史》南投：臺灣省文獻委員會
	黃富三採編（2001）《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50－70年代文獻專輯：戒嚴時期臺灣政治事件檔案、出版資料、報紙人名索引(上)、(下)》南投：臺灣省文獻委員會
	朱德蘭主編，許雪姬、吳文星、黃富三共同編輯（2001）《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50－70年代文獻專輯：崔小萍事件》南投：臺灣省文獻委員會
	黃富三採編（2001）《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50－70年代文獻專輯：美麗島事件》南投：臺灣省文獻委員會
	許雪姬採編（2001）《臺灣地區戒嚴時期政治案件——50－70年代文獻專輯：林正亨的生與死》南投：臺灣省文獻委員會
	中央研究院近代史研究所《口述歷史》編輯委員會(2002)《泰源事件專輯》。台北：中研院近代史研究所
The KMT government 2008-2016	陳儀深採編（2009）《海外台獨運動相關人物口述史》。台北：中研院近代史研究所
	國家人權博物館籌備處（2011）《白色聲音》。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處
	陳新吉（2014）《馬鞍藤的春天：白色恐怖政治受難者陳新吉回憶錄》。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處
	國家人權博物館籌備處（2014）《遲來的愛—白色恐怖時期政治受難者遺書》。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處
	許雪姬主編（2015）《獄外之囚：白色恐怖受難者女性家屬訪問紀錄（共三冊）》。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處
	國家人權博物館籌備處（2015）《走過長夜輯一：秋蟬的悲鳴》。台北：玉山社
	國家人權博物館籌備處（2015）《走過長夜輯二：看見陽光的時候》。台北：玉山社
	國家人權博物館籌備處（2015）《走過長夜輯三：喚不回的青春》。台北：玉山社

	藍博洲 主編（2016）《鍾浩東百年紀念專刊》。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處
	國家人權博物館籌備處（2016）《冤獄、求生與揚名- 政治受難者歐陽劍華與張常美的生命故事特展專刊》。台北：國家人權博物館籌備處

Appendix III

The release of the formerly classified documentation that was published from 2008 to 2016.

All published by Academia Historica

<https://www.drn.gov.tw/>

Number	Title of the Volume
1.	周琇環編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——白雅燦案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
2.	蕭李居編 (2008)《余登發案史料彙編(一、二)》台北：國史館。*two volumes
3.	葉惠芬編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——李武忠案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
4.	王正華編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——李荊蓀案史料彙編(一、二)》台北：國史館。
5.	歐素瑛編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——李媽兜案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
6.	程玉凰編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——沈鎮南案史料彙編(一、二)》台北：國史館。*two volumes
7.	張炎憲、許芳庭編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——林日高案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
8.	蔡盛琦編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——張化民案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
9.	周美華編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——陳中統案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
10.	何鳳嬌編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——湯守仁案史料彙編(一、二)》台北：國史館。*two volumes
11.	許進發編 (2008)《戰後臺灣政治案件——學生工作委員

	會案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
12.	高素蘭編（2008）《戰後臺灣政治案件——駱神助案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
13.	許進發編（2008）《戰後臺灣政治案件——簡吉案史料彙編》台北：國史館。
14.	歐素瑛、林正慧、黃翔瑜（2014）《戰後臺灣政治案件——簡國賢案史料彙編（一）、（二）》台北：國史館。*two volumes
15.	謝培屏、何鳳嬌編（2014）《戰後臺灣政治案件——藍明谷案史料彙編》台北：國史館。

Appendix IV

Basic framework of interview with survivor victims of the White Terror

*This is the only basic interview structure for the in-depth interview. Conditioned by the scene at interview, questions are often raised in different ways and wording. And I as the researcher usually have chances probe into the topic during my interviews.

Coding Types	Questions / Notes	Index/ Content
Participant's information	Year of birth	Under Japanese rule / post-war
	Place of birth	Mainlander / Taiwanese / Other
	Gender	M / F / Other
	Education	None/ Primary school / Junior High School/ Senior High school/ Technology College / University / PhD / MD
	Place to stay after their release	Taiwan: Rural Area / Metropolitan / County Overseas: which country
	Occupation prior to and after their persecution	Business / serviceman / Physician / teacher / employee / student/ none / other
	Marriage	Yes: Before / After conviction

		No
Types of Conviction	The year of conviction	The 1950s / 1960s/ 1970s/ 1980s
	Conviction of Crime	Anarchism / Pro-communist / Pro-independence / Left-wing / convicted with no specific political cause but in the name of treason / other
	Year of Sentence	5 / 7/ 10/ 15/ life sentence
	co-defendant	Yes / No
	Place of imprisonment	Green island / Xindian Military Prison/ Jen-Ai prison (仁愛教育實驗所) / Garrison command / Tai-Yuan Prison
Condition of Interview	Location	Survivor's place/ The Human Rights Park / Café and Restaurant
		Survivor's place only two of us / there are other family members at home yet stayed away from our talk /join the conversation

	Number of interviewees at the scene		straight away
		The Human Rights Park	only two of us / with other survivor victims / with staffs of the Human Rights Park
		Café and Restaurant	only two of us / with other survivor victims
	Frequency of interviews with a participant	3 to 8 times for one participant	
	Duration of each interview	2 hours to 8 hours (including participant observation)	
	Anonymous	Yes/ No	
Political Engagement	Had / have been elected as politician	Yes / No	
	Had / Have joined social or political movement after being released	Yes: which one	
		No	
	Membership of political party	Yes: KMT/ DPP/ Labour Party / other	
		No	

	Membership of survivor association	Yes: TVCA/ WTVA/ Huzhuhui / other NO
Engagement of official transitional discourse	Receive Compensation	Yes / No
	Receive vindication certificate	Yes/No
	Have joined state-sponsored oral history Project / documentary / exhibition or not	Yes: how many times? No
	Have attended official annual commemoration of the White Terror since 2000 or not	Yes: how many times? No
	Apart from the role above, have been a collaborator of the official oral history project / documentary / Exhibition	Open answer
		Yes: volunteer of exhibition, human rights park/ Committee member of the annual oral history project / other
		No
	For you, what is transitional justice?	Open answer
	Why join / not join state sponsored oral history project / documentary / exhibition	Open answer
		Yes: desire recognition from public / other

Reflection on their own roles in the official discourse		No: suspicious to the government / have completely different perspective with government / other
	Why do/ don't you become a collaborator of the official sponsored project	Open answer
	How do you think of your role in Taiwan's memory project of the White Terror	Open answer Positive / negative
	How do you think of the compensation Act	Open answer Positive / negative
	How do you think of the vindication certificate	Open answer Positive / negative
	Do you regard yourself as a political victim defined by the compensation act	Yes: how?
		No: Why?
	If no, then how do you consider the identity of political victim ?	Open answer (Gap shown between one own answer and the official discourse)
	How do you consider the meaning of innocence?	Open answer (Gap shown between one own answer and the official discourse)
	Do you think of yourself a	Yes: in what sense?

Reflection on their own past insurgence	dissident, either for now or in the past?	No: then why not?
	From your perspective, what is political dissident?	Open answer Positive/ negative
	Between the identity of political victim and dissident, how do you regard yourself?	Open answer
	Have you been regret for your past insurgence?	Open answer
		Yes :further elaboration
		No: further elaboration
	The details of the past insurgence	Open answer (this part is one of the most challenging part, as questions are raised by the condition I encountered)
	The level of getting in touch with political affairs after one's release during the White Terror	Open Answer Positive to negative
	feel ashamed for past insurgence for not, and in what sense?	Open answer Yes/ No
	Have you ever felt regret for the past insurgence, and in what sense?	Open answer Yes /No
	If you can live again, would you still choose to conspire a	Open answer

	revolution	Yes/ No
Reflection on their memory of persecution	Please describe the conflictive incidents happened during your imprisonment	The Patriotic incident (1954) / Taiyuan Incident (1970) other
	In your memory of the imprisonment, who impressed you the most	Open answer
	In your memory of the imprisonment, who leaves you a sense of sorrow, why?	Open answer
	The most unbearable part during the imprisonment	Open answer
	The most cherished memory during the imprisonment	Open answer
	How do you think of the logic of persecution under the KMT	Open answer
	Economic and social life after one's release	Open answer
	The condition of the surveillance after being released	Open answer None to serious
	Do you feel ashamed for your own persecution	Open answer Yes/ No
	Have you revealed your past	Open answer

	to your family members?	Yes/ No
	Do you feel sorry for your own family	Open answer Yes / No
Reflection on their Competing discourses	Frequency of joining their own associations	Positive to Negative (regular gatherings, organisation affair, and so forth)
	One's role of the cooperation between associations and the government	Positive to negative
	The duration of the cooperation between one's association and the government	10 to 20 (years)
	Viewpoint of the cooperation between associations and the government	Open answer
	Reasons of remaining silent on one's own past insurgence in the official discourse	Open answer
	From past to hitherto, the primary political ideal	Open answer Reconciliation / political cause / other
	Does reconciliation matter?	Open answer Yes /No
	If it matters, who do you want to reconcile with? And	Open answer

	why?	The KMT / Taiwanese society / yourself / your former fellow insurgents
Reflection on the interview	Topics that silence my participants	Open answer: Persecution under the KMT/ events related to past insurgence / other
	Topics that enthuse my participants	Past insurgence/ Taiwan politics/ Taiwan history / personal political cause / personal plan in the transitional justice scheme / idea of reconciliation / other
	The timing when my participant started to narrate their emotion of shame	Past insurgence/ Past persecution / Family/ Current condition in the scheme of transitional justice / fellow victims / fellow comrades / other
	The timing when my participant started to narrate their emotion of trauma	Past insurgence/ Past persecution / Family/ Current condition in the scheme of transitional justice / fellow victims / fellow comrades / other

Appendix V

The Full Articles of the *Compensation Act for Wrongful Trials on Charges of Sedition and Espionage during the Martial Law Period*

Article 1	The act herein is enacted to compensate the convicts, who were wrongfully tried on charges of sedition and espionage during the martial law period, but could not receive compensation or relief after the martial law period.
Article 2	<p>The term 'martial law period' as used in this act refers to the period of time from May 20, 1949 to July 14, 1987, if the case took place in the main island of Taiwan. But if the case took place in Kinmen, Matsu, Dongsha and Nansha, the term 'martial law period' refers to the period of time from December 10, 1948 to November 6, 1992.</p> <p>The term 'convict' as used in this act refers to the person convicted of sedition, treason, or breach of Espionage Act in the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion, or sent to the reformatory education in the martial law period.</p> <p>Unless otherwise prescribed by this act, the convict or convict's relative may apply for compensation in accordance with this act within eight years from the date this act becomes effective.</p> <p>After the period of time prescribed by the preceding paragraph passes, should the convict or convict's relative fail to apply for the compensation in time due to some reasons, the deadline of the application shall be extended for another four years.</p>
Article 3	<p>The Executive Yuan may establish the Compensation Foundation for Wrongful Trials on Charges of Sedition and Espionage during the Martial Law Period (referred to as the foundation hereinafter) to identify qualified convicts and to review applications of compensation. The board of the foundation shall consist of scholars, righteous citizens from the community, judges, representatives of the government, and of convicts or convicts' relatives.</p> <p>The number of representatives of convicts or convicts' relatives shall not be less than one fourth of the board members of the foundation.</p> <p>If the applicant is not satisfied with the decision of the foundation, s/he may file administrative appeals and litigations according to relevant laws.</p>
Article 4	If the reputation of the convict and convict's relatives were damaged, they may apply for restoration of their reputation. If the household registration of the convict and convict's relative

	has been mistaken, they may apply for correction.
Article 5	<p>The amount of compensation a convict may receive is calculated by units. Each unit equals to ten thousand NT Dollars. The amount of compensation one convict can receive shall not exceed sixty units. In the case where the convict has deceased, or has deceased after filing her/his application, and the compensation will be collected by convict's relative residing in Mainland China, the total amount of compensation that relative can receive shall not exceed two million NT Dollars. Convict's relative in Taiwan who has the same place in the inheritance order shall have the right to claim the remaining amount of the compensation. If there is no such relative in Taiwan, convict's other relative in Taiwan who has the next place in the inheritance order shall have the right to claim the remaining compensation.</p> <p>The regulations regarding the standard, application, review and grant procedures of the compensation in the preceding paragraph shall be drafted by the foundation, and approved by the Executive Yuan.</p>
Article 6	<p>The candidates of compensation are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Convicts who were executed; 2. Convicts who were imprisoned; 3. Convicts who were sent to the reformatory education; 4. Convicts whose properties were confiscated.
Article 7	<p>The convict or convict's relative may provide the foundation concrete materials in written for being identified as a qualified convict.</p> <p>The foundation shall exercise its power independently to identify convicts, to process applications, and to grant compensation based on facts and materials from its own investigation.</p> <p>The foundation shall finish the application of identification mentioned in the first paragraph within six months after accepting the application.</p>
Article 8	<p>One may not apply for compensation in any of the following circumstances:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One has already received compensation according to the Wrongful Imprisonment Compensation or the Compensation for the 228-Incident based on the same facts; 2. The conviction for sedition or treason survives reviews according to the current laws or the current evidence laws. <p>The review mentioned in the second subparagraph of the</p>

	<p>preceding paragraph shall be done case-by-case by a reviewing committee set up by the foundation.</p> <p>The reviewing committee mentioned in the second paragraph shall consist of scholars, righteous citizens from the community, judges, and representatives of the government. Members of the reviewing committee do not necessarily come from the board of the foundation, but at least a half of them shall have the experiences or currently working as judges, prosecutors, or lawyers. The procedure and the result of the selection of the members of the reviewing committee shall be reported to the Executive Yuan by the foundation for review and approval.</p> <p>The foundation may not nullify or modify the decision of the reviewing committee without the approval of two third of the attending board members in a formal board meeting. In this meeting, at least half of all board members must attend. But if the modification to the decision of the reviewing committee by the foundation has a negative effect on the applicant, the case shall be remanded to the reviewing committee. The foundation may remand the case to the committee only once.</p>
Article 9	<p>In order to investigate the circumstances under which the formal judgments were made, the foundation may invite relevant people to the foundation to make explanation. It may request documents and files kept by the government or private organizations. The government or private organizations may not refuse such request.</p> <p>The files mentioned in the preceding paragraph include records related to trials of people accused of sedition, treason, or breach of Espionage Act in the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion.</p> <p>The foundation shall return the documents and files it has requested according to the first paragraph as soon as the investigation is done. The documents and files may not be used for purposes other than the investigation.</p>
Article 10	<p>Once this act and relevant regulations thereof shall apply to all convicts identified by the foundation after investigation. But if the investigation shows that the circumstance is one of those listed in the first paragraph of Article 8, the convict shall receive no compensation, and shall not enjoy the rights provided for by Article 4.</p> <p>The foundation shall deliver its decisions prescribed in the preceding paragraph to the applicant and the responsible governmental agencies.</p>
Article 11	<p>The fund of the foundation shall be utilized for the following purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Granting compensation;

	<p>2. Subsidizing teaching materials or works on cases of wrongful conviction of sedition and espionage during the martial law period;</p> <p>3. Subsidizing investigations and research projects on wrongful trials of charges of sedition and espionage during the martial law period;</p> <p>4. Organizing memorial and academic activities for wrongful trials of charges of sedition and espionage during the martial law period;</p> <p>5. Subsidizing any other works or activities that can facilitate the restoration of reputation of convicts in wrongful trials of charges of sedition and espionage during the martial law period, and can promote democracy in Taiwanese society.</p>
Article 12	<p>The funds of the foundation come from the following sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Donations from the government through its annual budget; 2. Donations from domestic or international companies, organizations, or individuals; 3. The interest of the funds and the profit from investments of the funds; 4. Other sources of income. <p>In case of insufficient funds, the government shall make donations through its budget allocation.</p> <p>The compensation granted in accordance with this act is exempted from the income tax.</p>
Article 13	<p>The term “convict’s relative” as used in this act refers to the spouse of the deceased or the missing convict, and the statutory heirs of such convicts according to the paragraphs one to three of Article 1138 of the Civil Code.</p>
Article 14	<p>The payment of the compensation shall be made completely within two months from the date on which the foundation approves the application. The compensation shall be assigned to the Treasury if the payment is not collected within five years after the recipient is notified, unless there is a good cause for not collecting the compensation.</p> <p>People residing in mainland China who are eligible for claiming the compensation may either collect the payment by themselves or delegate people in the Taiwan to do so. Those who wish to collect the payment by themselves may apply for entering Taiwan. If there are more than two people eligible for the same compensation, they shall authorize one of them to collect the payment on behalf of the other(s).</p>
Article 15	<p>The rights to collect compensation prescribed in this act may</p>

	not be seized or transferred, or served as bond.
Article 15-1	<p>Those who fit in one of the following circumstances may apply compensation within the period of time prescribed in the fourth paragraph of Article 2 of this act. The application shall apply mutatis mutandis of this act:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where people were involved in the activities during the martial law period, in which other participants were deemed as convicts as prescribed in the second paragraph of Article 2 of this act, but were convicted of offences other than sedition, treason, or breach of Espionage Act in the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion; 2. Where people were convicted of sedition, treason, or breach of Espionage Act in the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion, or sent to the reformatory education during the period of time from December 10, 1948 to May 20, 1949, before the martial law was declared; 3. Where people were deprived of personal freedom by the law enforcement or the military based on suspicion of sedition, treason, or breach of Espionage Act in the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion, but were not indicted, tried, or received or not an official decision not to prosecute during the period from December 10, 1948 to the end of the Mobilizing Sedition-Suppressing Period; 4. Where people were deprived of personal freedom by the law enforcement or the military for breach of the War Crime Trials Act in Taiwan, but were acquitted later during the period of time from October 25, 1946 to May 20, 1949, before the martial law was declared.
Article 15-2	<p>People who were killed by the law enforcement or the military or died as a result of the official pursuit on suspicion of sedition, treason, or breach of Espionage Act in the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion during the period of time from December 10, 1948 to the end of the Period of Mobilization for the Suppression of Communist Rebellion, may be granted for compensation according to the circumstances. The application shall apply this act mutatis mutandis.</p>
Article 16	<p>This act becomes effective after six months from the date this act is promulgated.</p> <p>The amendments to this act become effective on the dates of their promulgation.</p>

Appendix VI

The complete text of the Autumn Worship 2009

<http://chinatide.net/?p=180>

2009 年 10 月中秋，台灣地區政治受難人互助會、台灣地區戒嚴時期政治事件處理協會的同志們、烈士遺族以及各界代表，謹備鮮花素果祭獻五○年代白色恐怖犧牲者的英靈。我們懷著無比崇敬的心情，從全島各地齊聚在馬場町，來緬懷先烈們英雄的事蹟，是你們用生命見證了民族分離對峙的痛苦，是你們的意志凝聚了中華兒女的愛國心，是你們的社會主義理想開啟了我們前進的道路，是你們的偉大抱負構建了一個民主統一、繁榮昌盛的民族願景。

今年是新中國建政六十週年，也是兩岸隔海對峙的六十週年。回想六十年前的歷史場景，在那個交織著戰爭與革命、黑暗與光明的歷史轉折點，你們繼承了日據時期在台灣從事反帝民族解放運動的先輩們光榮的愛國主義傳統，自願自覺的承擔了中國人民解放運動的時代使命，為了終結國家內戰，完成民族統一，義無反顧的投入新民主主義革命的歷史洪流，最終獻出了自己寶貴的生命。

你們的苦難集中表現了海峽兩岸中國人民的苦難，是百年來民族解放運動中無數的民族苦難的組成部份。你們的人生是如此的短暫，而它的價值卻是那麼的光明燦爛；你們燃盡自己的身軀，為我們照亮前進的方向；□你們用鮮血灌溉土壤，讓草兒長得更綠，讓花兒開得更紅，讓海峽兩岸的年輕一代更加成長、茁壯。同志們，安息吧！通過你們的犧牲、通過你們的鮮血、通過你們的抱負和理想，喚起了一代又一代知識青年的覺悟，也鍛鍊出一個日漸茁壯的隊伍，你們尚未完成的一切事業，就由我們年輕的一代來承擔。

今天，我們在這裡要告慰我們的先烈們：偉大的中國人民解放運動，雖然走過了許多迂迴曲折的道路，但在祖國人民的共同努力下，正一年又一年的朝向繁榮富強的道路前進。如今，一個面向現代化、面向世界、面向未來的社會主義

新中國，已經取得了百年未有的國際地位，相信再經過一代人，至多是兩代人的努力，一個富強、民主、文明、和諧的社會主義現代化中國，將巍然屹立在世界東方。另一方面，冷戰結束，特別是晚近的伊拉克侵略戰爭和金融風暴，在在暴露了美國霸權主義已經是強弩之末，過去因為帝國主義的操弄而長期分離對峙的兩岸歷史，也終將走完它的最後一頁。如今，兩岸關係已從「分離對峙」轉移到「和平發展」，為最終實現祖國的和平統一奠定基礎的階段；台灣人民也在歷經了數十年的痛苦磨難，自覺的走向與「台獨」狂想相互對立的方向。當然，歷史的經驗告訴我們，黎明來臨前總還有黑暗，我們面前的道路還很漫長，也不平坦。我們會繼承前輩們的遺志和教訓，保持謙虛、謹慎、不驕、不躁的作風，加強團結，艱苦奮鬥，在你們用鮮血照亮的道路上繼續前進，為建設一個真正的獨立、自由、民主、統一與富強的新中國做出應有貢獻。

安息吧！死難的同志，別再為祖國擔憂！

你流著血照亮著路，我們繼續往前走。

台灣地區政治受難人互助會全體同志暨家屬

2009/10/18

Appendix VII

The complete text of the Autumn Worship 2012

《犇報》第 45 期(Chia Wan Ben Post Issue/ number: 45)

2012 年 10 月 27 日，秋風颯颯的時節，台灣地區政治受難人互助會、台灣地區戒嚴時期政治事件處理協會的會員同志、烈士遺族以及兩岸和平發展論壇相關團體的各界代表，齊聚馬場町，以最沉痛肅穆的心情，致祭無數在白色恐怖所犧牲的人民英雄。

從日據時代開始，台灣就有無數的先烈前輩投入反帝、反殖民、反壓迫的民族解放鬥爭，與大陸人民共同譜寫了近代中國最為堅苦，卻無比豪壯的英雄贊歌。1940 年代，當中國人民迎來了反法西斯戰爭的偉大勝利，內戰與冷戰的陰霾卻隨之籠罩在海峽兩岸的上空。1950 年代初，美國第七艦隊強行駛入台灣海峽，在違反中國人民的意志之下，公然介入中國內戰。帝國主義的幽靈披了一件邪惡的新衣，徘徊在美麗的寶島，陰魂不散。面對接踵而來的獨裁與壓迫，英勇的台灣人民繼承了日據時代以來愛國主義的光榮傳統，懷抱著社會主義與民族統一的崇高理想，前仆後繼，將一生只許綻放一次的青春，澆灌給他們摯愛的、包含台灣在內廣袤的中國土地。

魯迅先生說：「什麼是路？就是從沒路的地方踐踏出來的，從只有荊棘的地方開闢出來的。」我們的先烈前輩與人民英雄用他們的雙手，披荊斬棘，為我們開闢出了一條康莊大道。「中國的春天生長在戰鬥裡，在戰鬥裡鼓舞著全人類」，先烈前輩英勇的戰鬥，鼓舞著我們，讓我們充滿無比的勇氣與信心迎接海峽兩岸遲來的春天。

一百餘年來，中國人民遭受著恥辱、血淚和酸辛，多少英雄烈士為之流血獻身。終於，革命激流沖垮了重重障礙，改換了天地，兩岸中國人民頭上升起了一輪紅日！中華民族任人欺凌的時代已經一去不復返了！2012 年我們在台灣歡欣鼓舞地見證了中國人「上九天攬月，下五洋捉鱉」，「神舟九號」與「天宮一號」成功進行了手控對接，中國的女性也航向了浩瀚的太空；我國深海載人潛艇「蛟龍號」，成功下潛海底超過七千米，突破了世界紀錄。我國獨立發展、自主運行的「北斗衛星導航系統」，已經在今年覆蓋了亞太地區，即將在 2020 年覆蓋全球。雖然先烈前輩無法親歷祖國的壯盛與強大，但是你們的理想與精神還活著——追求民族的獨立與尊嚴，不願再受人挨打，為著亞洲與世界的和平充實著自己。

兩岸雖然被迫隔絕超過了六十年，但形勢變動快速，尤其是 2008 年之後，兩岸終於露現了久違的黎明與曙光。先烈前輩們是國共內戰的見證人，而今天我們代替先烈前輩們見證兩岸的和平發展。兩岸民間的交流逐漸步入常軌，民眾穿梭於兩岸求學就業。在和平的局勢之下，兩岸攜手合作，共同實現中華民族偉大的復興！

雖然外在形勢仍然險惡，帝國主義勢力仍虎視眈眈地掣肘中國。但是從近來南海與釣魚島的局勢來看，中國人民展現出了勇氣與信心——中國的事情，必須由中國人自己解決。先烈前輩們，請不要再為祖國擔憂，我們謹記著你們的遺志，我們堅信民族的和解與團結將會有更進步的發展，繼續為《兩岸和平協議》的落實而努力。民族的和平統一、兩岸中國人民的親切聚首，也指日可待。

今天我們嚴肅的站在這裡，心情已不再悲傷，甚至懷抱著些許破曉之際的喜悅。但是，沒有先烈前輩們的犧牲與奉獻，不會有現在。舊世界的金城，是你們沉重的屍骨壓垮的，是你們洶湧的血衝倒的。你們用自己的身軀，點燃了青春的

火燄，「星星之火，可以燎原」。我們還要鬥爭，還要前進，讓你們的理想，開更多鮮豔的花，結更多的果。

安息吧，尊敬的烈士！別擔憂，人民的同志！我們將踏著你們指引的路，用我們的眼淚，用我們的歌，用我們的腳印，持續著未完的兩岸和平發展與和平統一之路！願你們的英靈永遠和我們同在！

「為了反對內外敵人、爭取民族獨立和人民自由幸福，在歷次鬥爭中犧牲的人民英雄們永垂不朽！」

Appendix VIII

The complete version of the Taiwan Garrison Command announcement on 3rd September 1951

Provided by National Central Library

<https://www.ncl.edu.tw/>

台灣省政府與台灣省保安司令部，昨（廿九）日書告我愛國同胞，促請大家檢舉匪諜，茲錄誌原文如后：

親愛的同胞們：

政府當局為了鼓勵檢舉匪諜。特地在報上公佈了一項獎賞辦法，并規定自九月廿一日起至十二月卅一日止為告發匪諜及嫌疑份子的期限。我們凡是有良心血性的愛國者，每個人都應提高警覺，澄清思想，堅定意志，勿受匪諜的欺騙利用，大家應知道受匪諜欺騙利用的後果，不但厄害了個人也同時危害了國家，因此凡是不注意防諜的人，就等於甘心自殺，其次，我們應當注意的是：檢肅匪諜不僅是今日台灣的措施，也是所有自由民主國家當前特別注重的一個緊急措施，所以同胞們為了自身的利益，大家的幸福，國家世界的安危，都應該趕快勇敢地檢舉匪諜。

後面就是「檢舉匪諜獎勵辦法」的摘要，請嚴密注意這個關係大家禍福的事情，大家通力合作，排除這些壞人。

台灣省政府 台灣省保安司令部同啟 民國四十年九月