

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

AFTER THE MARTIAL LAW PERIOD: THE HOMEWARD MOVEMENT AND TAIWAN'S
STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY (1980-1992)

MI NI TZOU
SPRING 2019

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Sociology and Communication Arts and Sciences
with honors in History

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Kathlene Baldanza
Associate Professor of History and Asian Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Kathryn Salzer
Associate Professor of History
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This project is an oral history of Taiwanese leaders in World United Formosans for Independence, who organized the Homeward movement (Fan xiang yun dong 返鄉運動) in the U.S. in order to fight against the Kuomintang's dictatorship in the 1980s. The goal of this project is to present Taiwanese democratic struggles and progress after the end of Martial Law in 1987. I argue that the formation of democracy in Taiwan was due to a series of events rather than only the abolition of Martial Law. This has been done by studying the history of Taiwan's democratic progress and the documentation of the 100 Activist Union, as well as interviewing five key leaders of the Homeward movement. I show that this movement put an end to the blacklist system as well as the dictatorial law, the Criminal Code Article 100, which is a historical milestone for liberty in Taiwan. This oral history project aims to provide a closer account of this important episode in the Taiwanese peoples' struggle for democracy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	1
Chapter 3 Historical Background.....	4
The Dogs Are Gone, The Pigs Have Come: The KMT's Arrival in Taiwan (1945-1949)	4
The Martial Law Period (1949-1987)	7
The KMT's Strategies towards Taiwan's Independence movement in the U.S.	9
Chapter 4 The Participation in Taiwan's Independence Movement and the Campus Spies	12
Chapter 5 The Blacklist	24
Chapter 6 The Homeward Movement.....	28
Start of the Homeward Movement.....	28
Publicize Domestic Movement, Universalize the Homeward Movement	30
100 Action Alliance—A Practice of Non-Violence and Love	46
Result	49
Chapter 7 Conclusion.....	52
Appendix A Timeline of the Related Events of the Homeward Movement	54
References	58

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Cheng Nan-Jung Funeral (Taipei, 1989) from the collection of Chiang Kai-Shih...	29
Figure 2 WFTA's March (Kaohsiung, 1989). Retrieved from http://taiwaneseamericanhistory.org/blog/ourjourneys230/	32
Figure 3 The Black Mask Incident (Zhonghe, 1989) from the collection of History of Taiwanese American.....	34
Figure 4 Li Ying-Yuan (Taipei, 1990) retrieved from <i>ren sheng de jing tan hao</i> (人生的驚嘆號), 2002.....	36
Figure 5 Tzou Bukam's poem, Lí Ná Koh Bē-hiáu Siūnn from the collection of Chiang Kai-Shih	43
Figure 6 Lee Zhan-Yuan and other protestors (Taipei, 1991) retrieved from <i>Taipei People News</i> , 2016.....	48

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis supervisor, Professor Baldanza. She always answered my questions about my research and writing. She is the first person encouraging me to do the independent research, which inspired me to write this thesis. With her support, I was able to write the paper on my own pace and with creative ideas. I would also like to thank my honor advisor, Professor Salzer, for giving me advice and encouraging me when I felt down.

Additionally, I want to thank all my interviewees, Ms. Chen Wen-Jen, Mr. Kuo Bei-Hong, Mr. Li Ying-Yuan, Ms. Mao Qing-Fen, and Mr. Tzou Bukam for taking time sharing their experience with me as well as for their efforts on fighting for liberty in Taiwan. I would also like to thank Mr. Chiang Kai-Shih and Ms. Felicity Chiu for providing additional information and photos. Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents. They always allow me to follow my passion and offer support when I need it. This thesis started from the curiosity about my parents. This project gives me an opportunity to learn about their efforts on Taiwan's independence.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Starting in the 1960s, a group of young Taiwanese activists studying in the U.S. risked everything to overthrow the dictatorship in Taiwan. For this research project, I want to understand where the energy of the young Taiwanese protest group came from and how they were able to organize the historically significant Homeward (Fan-xiang 返鄉) movement in the late 1980s. My research is to record an oral history of the student leaders who had engaged in the movement. The interviewees include the students who were imprisoned by the Kuomintang (KMT) government due to intentionally breaking the Criminal Code Article 100, some of whom are still active in current politics:

- Kuo Bei-Hong (郭倍宏), currently in Taipei City, was the main organizer of the Homeward movement. He is currently the chairman of Formosa TV.
- Li Ying-Yuan (李應元), currently in Taipei City, was also one of the main organizers of the Homeward movement. He is the director of Environmental Protection Department in the government.
- Mao Qing-Feng (毛清芬), currently in Taipei City, was a treasurer of the newspaper, *Taiwan Tribune*, in the United States. She is still highly active in World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI).
- Chen Wen-Jen (陳婉真), currently in Changhua City, was the key female organizer of the Homeward movement.

- Tzou Bukam (鄒武鑑), currently in Taoyuan City, who was in charge of WUFI's "publicize domestic movement" plan to encourage underground domestic activists show up in public. He is my father.

Under the control of the KMT government in the 1980s, Taiwanese people did not enjoy civil liberties. According to the Criminal Code Article 100: (I) a person who intends to "destroy the national polity, seize state territory, change the constitution by illegal means or overthrow the government" were punished with imprisonment for more than seven years, and the ringleader with life imprisonment, and (II) anyone who "prepares or conspires to commit the above offence is punishable with imprisonment for not less than six months and not more than five years."¹ Additionally, the Act for the Control and Punishment of Rebellion stated that a person who violated the Criminal Code Article 100 (I) was sentenced to the death penalty under the period of National Mobilization for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion (1947-1991). Since the law did not clearly state what elements of crime is counted as violations, any political activities and expressions could potentially violate the law, which became a thoughtcrime.² This law restricted freedom of speech as well as freedom of assembly and association in Taiwan. Additionally, because the KMT government defined supporting Taiwan's independence as a rebellion, they had used this law to criminalize domestic Taiwan's independence activists. The idea of liberty and Taiwan's independence thus could not be developed well in Taiwan. Therefore, Taiwan's independence movement was mainly developed overseas. The interviewees and many other Taiwanese students in the U.S. formed different organizations and magazines, such as World United Formosa for Independence (WUFI), United Formosans in America for Independence (UFAI), Taiwan Justice Weekly News and Taiwanese Student Club, that supported liberty and

Taiwan's Independence. In response to the movement, the KMT government blacklisted them and marked their passports as expired to prevent them from returning home, in order to prevent the idea of liberty and Taiwan's independence from spreading in Taiwan and keep the pro-independence groups away.³

Aiming to challenge the problem of the blacklist and the Criminal Code Article 100, WUFI organized the Homeward movement in the late 1980s. In the Homeward movement, many Taiwanese illegally went back to Taiwan and made speeches that supported liberty and Taiwan's independence. As a result, eleven activists were arrested and punished by imprisonment upon their return to Taiwan.⁴ At the same time, a group of professors in Taiwan organized 100 Action Alliance supported this movement. They demanded abolishing the Criminal Code Article 100 and releasing the prisoners. The most famous leader of 100 Action Alliance is Lee Zhen-Yuan, who was a dean of the College of Medicine in National Taiwan University and the former president of International Society on Toxinology. Witnessing all these highly educated people imprisoned due to for acknowledging Taiwan's status as an independent country, and professors with high reputations stood out against the government, the society started to question the government. With years of protests roiling the entire nation, the government finally revised the Criminal Code Article 100 in 1992, such that only actual threats of violent action are considered as violations.

This movement is a historical milestone for liberty. It spurred changes that helped to bring Taiwanese people freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and association, and freedom of residence and movement. Taiwan is considered "a beacon of democracy"⁵ in Asia. The improvement of the democracy is like waves of the river driven by constant movement. The democracy and liberty that Taiwanese people enjoy nowadays is based on the efforts of their

predecessors. This oral history project provides a closer look at this important episode in the Taiwanese peoples' struggle for democracy.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The KMT's contributions to Taiwan's liberalization and democratization is often exaggerated.⁶ In fact, the democratization and liberalization of Taiwan were not the one-sided achievement of the KMT. It is a result of the social force opposing the dictatorship. Additionally, the influence of the end of Martial Law is over-credited in regards to Taiwan's democratization. Taiwan was neither immediately democratized nor liberalized with the end of Martial Law. After lifting Martial Law, the government continuously suppressed its opponents in various ways.

First, there is a popular opinion that the democratization of Taiwan is mainly due to Chiang Ching-Kuo's wisdom and vision of democracy. For example, some researchers consider the end of Martial Law as Chiang Ching-Kuo's own decision.⁷ Other studies also mention that Chiang Ching-kuo actively launched "several significant policies of political liberalization, including the lifting of Martial Law decree, the liberalization of press control, and the green light for the formation of political parties."⁸ Hsu Cho-Yun (1993) also states that the KMT government actively promoted political reforms and tolerated political opposition, and credits the democratization of Taiwan to Chiang's leadership.⁹

However, the social force from society was largely neglected in these studies. For instance, the Tang-Wai (黨外, non-KMT) movement was the major social force leading to Taiwan's democratization. The Tang-Wai movement refers to a political movement, opposing to the KMT authoritarianism, in the mid 1970s to the early 1980s.¹⁰ In 1986, the Tang-Wai leaders demanded "breaking the prohibition on opposition parties, ending martial law, allowing for the

popular election of major leaders..., and a separation of Kuomintang-government function.”¹¹

This movement was a great pressure to Chiang. His concern of losing political power forced him to lift Martial Law.¹² According to Hood (1997), “At times the KMT tried to clamp down on the opposition. But repression threatened the party’s legitimacy even more than tolerating dissent.”¹³ These series of democratic movements have confronted political violence, long imprisonment, White Terror and mind control. However, this side of the story was underestimated as “a series of interactions between the KMT and opposition forces”, and it was often defamed as “violent mass movement.”¹⁴

Additionally, although the end of Martial Law is a major improvement of democracy in Taiwan, it is often over-credited. Some claim that the end of Martial Law defused the conflict between the KMT and its opposition, and it encouraged society to demand additional political reform.¹⁵ Furthermore, the end of Martial Law is considered as a milestone of Taiwan’s freedom. According to Yeh Jiunn-Rong (2002), “lifting of Martial Law gave new freedom to the press, sparked the formation of political parties and association of voluntary groups, and encouraged the Taiwanese to gather and demonstrate.”¹⁶ Hood (1997) mentioned that after the end of Martial law, the political prisoners were “quickly released”; the KMT “security agents” in the U.S. stopped monitoring Taiwanese students as well as organizations supporting Taiwan’s independence.¹⁷

These illustrations are over-positive. Instead, I claim that the end of Martial Law did not stop the KMT suppressing opposing voices. Taiwan did not smoothly nor immediately become a democratic country. Moreover, I restate the fact that the democratization of Taiwan was due to social forces. In addition to the domestic force, I emphasize on how the overseas movement became an important force against the dictatorship. In this research, I use the history of the

Homeward movement in the 1980s as an evidence for my arguments. I will show the activists' experiences of the KMT's suppression, their practice on non-violence, and argue that their actions led to another wave of democratization after the end of Martial Law.

Chapter 3

Historical Background

The Dogs Are Gone, The Pigs Have Come: The KMT's Arrival in Taiwan (1945-1949)

Japanese colonization of Taiwan ended with their defeat in World War II. In 1945, Taiwan became a place under military occupation of the United Allies, but legally still belonged to Japan.¹⁸ Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of the KMT as well as the Republic of China, who was the commander of the China theater of the United Allies, according to General Order No.1¹⁹, sent troops to temporarily manage Taiwan. The Japanese colonization officially ended in 1952, when Japan renounced title to Taiwan in Treaty of Peace to Japan.²⁰

Despite of the fact that Taiwan's sovereignty remained vacant legally, the KMT unilaterally claimed that Taiwan belonged to the Republic of China (ROC) based on the Cairo Declaration.²¹ However, although the Cairo Declaration (1943) states that "all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China"²², this declaration is not an official treaty but a communique which could not legitimate the KMT's regime in Taiwan. In terms of legality, the official treaties after the World War II did not explicitly mention Taiwan's sovereignty status. The San Francisco Peace Treaty (1951), which was a treaty between Japan and the Allied Powers, and the Treaty of Taipei (1952), a treaty between Japan and the ROC, both only stated that Japan "renounced" all right, title and claim to Taiwan (Formosa) and Penghu (Pescadores).²³

According to *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (2015), the colonization of the ROC in Taiwan was acquiesced to internationally because the Allied Powers needed to maintain the partnership with the KMT. The U.S. adopted a “wait-and-see” policy that was “amply concerned with the interests and wishes of the Taiwanese in the course of the Civil War in China, they set back and watched the Kuomintang flee into Taiwan and gradually cement its dictatorial regime there.” Furthermore, the U.S. indirectly supported the ROC’s colonization in Taiwan. Following the Mutual Defense Treaty (1955), the U.S. provided a great amount of military and economic support, which in a way strengthened the KMT’s control over Taiwan.²⁴

Why did Taiwanese not declare independence after the Japanese colonization? There were three main reasons, according to *Taiwan: A History of Agonies*.²⁵ First, there was a conflict between who was pro and against Japanese government. There was no strong solidarity among the Taiwanese. The second reason was the lack of means of mass communication and thus resulted in the isolation of Taiwanese elites from the public. Finally, the Taiwanese had a complex feeling towards the arrival of the KMT regime due to the ethnic relation to China. According to Mendel (1970), Taiwanese had a “glorified image of the fatherland” due to their superficial knowledge of China and the Chinese.²⁶ Moreover, “Taiwanese knew they had played no part in liberating themselves and they had a deep complex over their supportive role in Japan’s invasion of China.”²⁷ Therefore, the KMT took advantage of Taiwanese’s complex feelings toward China and colonized Taiwan.

However, the reality of colonization was far from Taiwanese’s most sanguine expectations. A Taiwanese saying describes the situation as “The dogs are gone, the pigs have come.” Japanese were like dogs that “barked at them but guarded them”; however, the KMT was “the pigs devour food and do nothing else.”²⁸ Since the KMT viewed Taiwan as a occupied

territory, Taiwanese lived under insecurity and inequality.²⁹ That is, the KMT were mainly focused on the Civil War with the Chinese Communist Party in China, and so the troops they sent to Taiwan were less educated and socialized, and were described as “filthy, illiterate, and treated the Formosans as an occupied people.”³⁰

Under the KMT’s regime, Taiwan suffered from major economic collapse and high rates of unemployment.³¹ First of all, the Taiwanese suffered from severe poverty, joblessness, and starvation.³² Russell H. Fifield, who was in U.S. Foreign Service in China and Formosa during 1945-1947, stated that “At least 90% of all the industry and agriculture of the island was controlled by some branch of the Government... Private and free enterprise in the island, restricted by the Japanese, was fast disappearing under the Chinese.”³³ Besides, due to the lack of a constitutional base, Chen Yi, the executive chief assigned by Chiang Kai-shek, could not effectively govern Taiwan.³⁴ The former American Ambassador also mentioned the “Three Acts of the KMT government” that might be the causes of Taiwanese revolt toward the government:

- 1) “Postponement by Chen Yi to December 1949 of the application of the new Constitution to Formosa.
- 2) The announcement that formerly Japanese-owned real estate might be sold at auction to favored mainlanders, who would then be allowed to evict or raise the rent of Formosans who had been living on it.
- 3) The February 14, 1947 decision to place absolute control of all external trade and most domestic production and commerce in the hands of few mainlander officials.”³⁵

The high rate of unemployment came with the political transition in Taiwan. Taiwanese who were in key positions in the society as well as government servants were dismissed from their jobs and replaced by people from the ROC.³⁶ Since many Taiwanese had adapted Japanese

as their official language under Japanese colonization, they lost their job because they could not speak Mandarin.³⁷ Taiwanese elites who received high education or had high status under Japanese colonization were forced to reject their culture and be “reeducated as Chinese”.³⁸ Furthermore, a high amount of the ROC citizens kept coming from China, causing the living standard in Taiwan to be even more difficult. According to Brown (2004), “corruption was rampant at all levels of government and the military, inflation skyrocketed, and the Mainlanders kept coming—some one to two million of them by the autumn of 1949.”³⁹

The mistreatment resulted in Taiwanese resentment. On February 28, 1947, a series of civic resistances broke out, later named the 228 Incident after its starting date. The KMT declared this incident as a “byproduct of Japanese education”, and targeted Taiwanese elites as criminals.⁴⁰ During the 228 Incident “the GMD [KMT] brutally suppressed the uprising, executing thousands of Taiwanese within a few weeks and later hauling many more off to jail.”⁴¹ The total amount of casualties is estimated to be ten thousand to scores of thousands, although the accurate number is not available.⁴² After the 228 Incident, on May 20th, 1949 the KMT started Martial Law for “security reasons”, which allowed government to implemented policies that were clear violations of rights guaranteed by the constitution.⁴³

The Martial Law Period (1949-1987)

Since 1948, the KMT were gradually weakened in the Civil War in China. With the failure of the Civil War, a huge number of Nationalist Chinese fled into Taiwan.⁴⁴ The KMT thus began a new period of rule in Taiwan. In December, 1949, the KMT officially moved the ROC

government to Taiwan.⁴⁵ With the imposition of Martial Law, the government practiced a series of suppressive measures, which was regarded as the start of the White Terror in Taiwan.

Under the White Terror period, Taiwanese people did not enjoy liberty in thought, politics, or education. According to *Taiwan: A History of Agonies*:

“A hundred suspects would be killed just to locate a single resistant. One would be shot to death on account of a volume of book in his possession; the other would be clubbed to death just on account for his membership in a college choir. When one was arrested; his friends would eventually be. Classrooms would be assaulted, students arrested at study; midnight house visits would be frequented. No justice; no fair trial. One execution followed another; luckier ones were sent to the prison on Green Island.”⁴⁶

Freedom of thought, research and publication was nonexistent. Chinese commented on Taiwan as “cultural desert.”⁴⁷ There was no political freedom, either. The KMT created a comprehensive monitor mechanism in checking any anti-government riots.⁴⁸

According to Ong (2015), the livelihood for Taiwanese people was worse. The first cause was a huge population growth after the ROC moved to Taiwan. There were 2 million Chinese refugees who came to Taiwan on top of the existing 10 million Taiwanese population. The 2 million Chinese refugees became the ruling class in Taiwan and made Mandarin the official language of the country. Many native Taiwanese regarded them as corrupt, indifferent, and irresponsible. Most of the Taiwanese felt powerless under this condition, and in order to survive, they followed the Chinese way of living.⁴⁹

Secondly, the economic policy, such as land reform, deteriorated local Taiwanese livelihood. Since the KMT needed lands to feed the huge population growth, the livelihood of Taiwanese farmers was sacrificed under the land reform. The situation was written as “at least a million of

the potential jobless pose a threat to the farming community. They cannot eat the rice they harvest, mix it with sweet potato at best or, at worst, live on potatoes for days on end.”⁵⁰ The Taiwanese lived within poverty and without freedom, and the resentment was growing and led to the anti-government movement later on.

The KMT's Strategies towards Taiwan's Independence movement in the U.S.

For the KMT, “rebel” (fei 匪) not only referred to the Communist Party of China, but anyone who could possibly threaten the KMT's claim of control over the Republic of China. Since the idea of Taiwan's independence implied to get rid of the KMT's authoritarianism, the KMT also regarded people who support Taiwan's Independence as rebels.

The study done by Chen (2012) shows that the KMT had created a comprehensive and bureaucratized mechanism in order to control Taiwan's Independence movement overseas. First, on November 21st, 1956, Inter-ministerial Committee for the Guidance Against Overseas Rebels (海外對匪鬥爭統一指導委員會) replaced Committee for Task Guidance Overseas (海外工作指導小組), with the intention to extend the international Fighting Against Rebels (對匪鬥爭) plan. Before 1964, the organization was focused on Asia. However, due to expansion of the United Formosans for Independence (UFI), the KMT shifted its attention to the U.S. It started a plan named Our Suggested Strategies targeting Conspiracy of Taiwan's Independence Party in the U.S. (針對旅美偽台獨黨之活動陰謀 我方應採之策略案) and organized ad hoc groups located in New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Los Angeles and Houston.⁵¹

In 1970, World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI) was established, and the KMT started a plan called the Anshiang Project (安詳計畫), targeting Taiwan's independence movement overseas. There were four groups involved in the Anshiang Project, including the Ministry of Education, China Youth Corps (CYC), National Security Bureau, and the KMT Third Central Committee. The Ministry of Education was responsible for inculcating the patriotism to the ROC domestically. China Youth Corps was responsible for contacting Taiwanese international students. National Security Bureau was responsible for suppressing the Taiwan's independence movement nationwide. The KMT Third Central Committee was responsible for suppressing the Taiwan's independence movement overseas.⁵²

They had various techniques to promote patriotism toward the Republic of China (ROC). First, they actively suppressed the Taiwan's independence movement, sponsoring scholars writing anti-Taiwan's independence articles as well as holding anti-Taiwan's independence speeches. They sneaked into Taiwan's independence organizations, strengthened the idea of anti-Taiwan's independence to international students, and invited Taiwanese celebrities to the U.S. and Japan discouraging the idea of Taiwan's independence, etc. On the other side, they established international student service centers in Tokyo, San Francisco, and New York, and created friendly Taiwanese associations such as Taiwan Welfare Association of New York. They also provided supports and emergency loans for international students.⁵³ After 1972, Inter-ministerial Committee for the Guidance Against Overseas Rebels and the KMT Third Central Committee combined into Committee for Task Overseas, which is still working nowadays.⁵⁴

Their main strategy was to use Taiwanese people against Taiwan's independence. Before 1970, Taiwan's independence organizations used the press, magazines, protests, and campus

campaigns to express their ideals, such as human rights, liberty, Taiwan's independence, democracy, etc. The KMT hired expatriate staff to write articles against the ideals. They further asked Taiwanese to sign their names to the articles to demonstrate wide support. They wanted to make the public think that Taiwan's independence was a discredited view.

According to Chen (2012), the KMT concentrated even more on the Taiwan's independence issue after 1970. They created an ad hoc group called Loyal Scholars and Students (忠仁忠貞學員). To oppose advocates, they were specialized on responding to Taiwan's independence statements, interfering with Taiwan's independence magazines, stopping Taiwan's independence press spreading to Taiwan. To oppose protests, they would interfere with the events. They would speak against protests in order to decrease protests' persuasiveness. They also recorded participants names into the blacklist. To control campus, they hired campus spies to report students' behavior.⁵⁵

Chapter 4

The Participation in Taiwan's Independence Movement and the Campus Spies

The formation of democracy in Taiwan was due to a series of events rather than only the abolition of Martial Law. Taiwan's independence movement often goes along with the democratic movement, since it highly emphasizes de-authoritarianism, which implies the pursuit of democracy. Therefore, the history of Taiwan's independence movement is able to show the democratic progress in Taiwan. This research aims to prove that Taiwan's democracy is not only because of the end of Martial Law by presenting the democratic struggles in Taiwan after the Martial Law period.

Taiwan's independence movement was able to flourish in the U.S. because of the freedom in the United States, and it was triggered by the KMT's political brutalities such as Kaohsiung Incident and the interferences from the KMT's campus spies. All the activists interviewed in this study mentioned that it is after they came to the United States that they started to participate in Taiwan's independence movement. Moreover, since the U.S. offered an environment for many Taiwan's independence organizations to develop maturely, the activists were able to organize the Homeward movement in the United States later on.

All the activists came to the U.S. in the early 1980s, except for Mao Qing-Fen who came to the U.S. in the early 1960s with her husband, Luo Fu-Quan, an important leader of Taiwan's Independence Movement and who was an ambassador of Taiwan to Japan from 2000 to 2004. First, they mentioned that the freedom in the U.S. provided an environment in which they were

able to discuss and read about Taiwanese issues freely. The Taiwanese students were also allowed to publish magazines as well as hold organizations.

When Mao Qing-Feng came to the U.S., she felt the environment was quite different than that of Taiwan. For example, her study group in college in Taiwan was canceled due to the fear of the KMT's intimidation, while in the U.S., there was no such pressure. She was able to discuss Taiwanese issues and receive information that she never heard in Taiwan. Additionally, she came during the period of Vietnam War (1955-1975), which she felt the prevalence of the sense of patriotism in the United States. The promotion of national identities was very strong. Under this atmosphere, the inter-cultural interactions in the U.S. inspired and strengthened her national identity as a Taiwanese. For example, during an international festival, she was struggling with what to wear. She felt that wearing cheongsam was not suitable for her since she was not Chinese. Overall, her national identity as a Taiwanese was stimulated while in the United States through intercultural interactions and discussions with other Taiwanese.

In October, 1980, Kuo Bei-Hong and his wife went to North Carolina State University to study civil engineering. In addition to preparing for future career, one of the main reasons he came to the U.S. was that he wanted to see Taiwan from an outside perspective. In the 1979, the Kaohsiung Incident as well as the end of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the ROC made him feel a sense of deception from the KMT. The U.S. ended official relations with the ROC and established them with the People's Republic of China (PRC). Kuo Bei-Hong said, at that period, the local Taiwanese were only able to get information of international relations from the KMT-controlled mass media.⁵⁶ As a result, before this change, the local Taiwanese thought there was a good relationship between the U.S. and the ROC. Thus, the local Taiwanese could not bear the fact that this important long-term friend abandoned Taiwan. After this change, he

realized that although local Taiwanese cared about the future of the country, there were too many restrictions on speech and on the flow of information. Thus, Taiwanese could not comprehensively understand Taiwan's position on international relations. He thought that with this distance from Taiwan in the U.S., he was able to clearly understand Taiwan's international situation, providing him a better idea of how to improve the country. Speaking of the U.S. in the 1980s, he described it as a "heaven on earth (世界的天堂)."⁵⁷ The U.S. was an advanced and safe country. He was surprised that nothing would happen even if he left the luggage at the airport. When his kids were born, there was a huge medical fee, which was an unaffordable expense for international students. Luckily, the U.S. policy took care of any U.S. born kids by providing food assistance for kids' daily needs, and the hospital also provided a cheaper medical fee. These made him feel that foreigners were also taken good care of by the U.S. government. In addition to the convenience and safety, the U.S. also provided an environment that everyone can grow freely. In the U.S., he was able to hold Taiwan Student Association, discussing different issues happened in Taiwan. This was not allowed in Taiwan. If any Taiwanese held study group, there was a chance to be punished by the Criminal Code Article 100. Organizing Taiwan's independence movement also violated the Criminal Code Article 100. Comparing to Taiwan in that period, people enjoyed freedom while living in the United States. The government seemed far from individuals. Kuo felt that as long as he followed the law, the government would not interfere his thoughts and behaviors. Thus, he learned how to prepare, why to fight and how to win in the United States.⁵⁸

Like Kuo Bei-Hong, Li Ying-Yuan also mentioned that there was not really interference from the U.S. government. The U.S. government was very respectful of individuals as long as

you completed your academic requirements. In the U.S., he also learned the concept of the non-violent movement, which made a large impact on his perspective towards activism. According to his autobiography, he was influenced by Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King and the Czech democratic movement, which made him realized that the importance to practice the non-violent movement in Taiwan.⁵⁹ Chen Wen-Jen emphasized that it was after she came to the U.S. did she really begin to think more about the issue of suppression. In the U.S., she read a lot of books that she never read in Taiwan, which allowed her to think more and challenge the KMT's brain-washing. Tzou Bukam, coming to the U.S. in 1984, also stated that the environment in the U.S. allowed the development of Taiwan's independence movement. He commented after years of development in the United States, "generations of Taiwanese continuously accumulated the energy and finally reached the highest point in the end of the 1980s."⁶⁰

In addition to the welcoming environment for Taiwan's independence movement to grow in the U.S., the KMT's series of violent state-suppression of dissent in the beginning of the 1980s motivated the activists to participate in the Taiwan's independence movement. Especially after Kaohsiung Incident in 1979, Lin I-Hsiung Incident in 1980 and the Chen Wen Chen Incident in 1981, the activists felt the sense of deceptions from the KMT and decided to take action.

The Kaohsiung Incident in 1979 is a significant motive for the Homeward Movement. Since the 1970s, the Tang-Wai movement had been getting heated underground. In 1979, the Tang-Wai activists founded a Formosa Publishing House in Taipei and published *Formosa Magazine*. The magazine delivered the idea of the Tang-Wai movement and sold well. On Human Rights Day, December 10, the Formosa Publishing Houses held a rally in Kaohsiung City that over thirty thousand Taiwanese participated in.⁶¹ However, the police brutally suppressed the rally with tear-gas and beatings. Hundreds of the participants were arrested. One

of the leaders was punished by life imprisonment and the other seven leaders were sentenced to 12 to 14 years of imprisonment.⁶² Kuo Bei-hong felt that he has been deceived by the KMT.⁶³ Tzou Bukam thought that the KMT's action contradicted to their idea in Three People's Principles, especially the Principle of Democracy. He said "the KMT's slogan was 'Free China', however, it was neither free nor China."⁶⁴ Chen Wen-Jen stated that even a legislator with tenure, Huang Hsin-chieh (黃信介), was arrested.⁶⁵ This represents the end of the conversation between the government and the activists.

In 1980, a Tang-Wai activist, Lin I-Hsiung, a lawyer and Taiwan provincial assemblyman, was the target of political brutality. According to Ong (2015) "His mother and twin daughters were massacred and his eldest daughter severely injured at home supposedly under 24-hour police surveillance... It was no doubt a blood-smeared warning against anti-government movements."⁶⁶ In 1981, Chen Wen-Chen, a professor at Carnegie Mellon University, died on the campus of the Taiwan National University. Dr. Chen went back to Taiwan visiting his family. One day before his death, he was interrogated by three agents from Taiwan Garrison Command, asking his relationships with people who participated in the Kaohsiung Incident and his support to *Formosa Magazine*. During the interrogation, Chen admitted that he had helped raise funding for *Formosa Magazine*, and he had talked about how to practice democratic and political reformation when he was in Taiwan.⁶⁷ Although the killers have never been found in both cases, it is widely believed that Lin I-Hsiung and Chen Wen-Chen were the targets of political assassination by the government.

Besides the domestic political brutalities, the KMT's intervention on Taiwan's democratic movements also reached the United States. In the 1980s, the KMT's campus spies

would intimidate students not to join political activities. Campus spy is one of the strategies that the KMT use to monitor Taiwanese students overseas. Campus spies were located widely in college campuses and tasked with reporting students who supported either Taiwan's independence or communism, which the opponents called "snitching" (打小報告).

There are two types of reward for campus spy. First, once campus spy reports to MJIB, they can immediately receive hundreds of US dollars, which is considered a lot in the 1980s. Therefore, there are many students who are willing to be a campus spy and infiltrate students' organizations. Secondly, people who received Zhongshan Governmental scholarship had the obligation to report Taiwanese international students' behavior.⁶⁸ The American media reported the KMT campus spies as "Taiwanese spies."⁶⁹ It emphasized that this action is considered illegal by the FBI.⁷⁰ An article titled "U.S. Foreign Student vs. Government Spies" appeared in *Monday* on April 25, 1977.⁷¹ This news mentioned that American government regarded campus spy as same as Iran secret police organization (SAVAK) and Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA).⁷²

Campus spy was not always underground. During the Seminar, Ministry of Justice Investigation Bureau (MJIB), publicly recruited students who were willing to devote efforts to their country overseas.⁷³ Their obligation was to write reports and collect students' information overseas. Campus spies would not only monitor Taiwanese international students but also harass them. Multiple libraries in the U.S. universities, such as Harvard-Yenching Library, had reported an issue about the anti-KMT's magazines been stolen.⁷⁴ Additionally, because of Chen Wen-Chen incident in 1981, which intensified the Taiwanese discontent with the government, also led

American society to criticize campus spy. Congress held two hearings announcing that American government were going to inspect campus spies.

If the students did not follow the rule, they might be added to the blacklist. However, the line of violation of the rule was really subjective. For example, Kuo Bei-Hong recalled when he invited new students to eat hot pot at his house, and there was one campus spy. The campus spy reported all of the students at that night, that everyone was Taiwan's independence activist except for himself. Furthermore, the campus spies also had a pressure to meet the quota. According to Kuo Bei-Hong, the campus spy had to send a report weekly or monthly. Throughout the years, they had collected countless reports, which led to the blacklist to overflow. Under this situation, the blacklist gradually became invalid and reached to an end in 1992.⁷⁵

The most well-known case of the interaction with campus spies in the 1980s is the North Carolina Poster Destruction Incident. Since the U.S. ended the diplomatic relationship with the ROC and established one with the People's Republic of China in 1979, the representative of China has been a controversial issue between the PRC students and the KMT students. Both sides wanted to claim that they were the only China. In October, 1982, the conflict bubbled to the surface at North Carolina State University. The PRC students held an event celebrating the National Day of PRC on October 1st, which happened to be the same day as the moon festival. The PRC students' celebration of National Day of China was thus held around the time of the KMT student's moon festival event. The PRC student's event posters provided information about the moon festival event held by the KMT's Chinese Student Association with a sentence about reunification of China and Taiwan: "people think of their family more on moon festival

and everyone celebrates cross-strait unification” (中秋佳節倍思親，兩岸統一人人慶). The KMT students worried that these posters would mislead others that they were also celebrating the National Day of PRC, which implied the PRC as the real China. They destroyed that information from all the posters and tried to frame Kuo Bei-Hong and other students in Taiwan Student Association, which whom they already had a conflict over leadership of the Chinese Student Association. This became a huge dispute between the KMT students and the Taiwanese students. Responding to the KMT students’ smear, Kuo Bei-Hong thus posted more than 200 posters to reveal their behavior and accused the vice president of the KMT’s Chinese Student Association, Chou Erh-Nan, of being a campus spy. The posters stated that, “Erh-Nan Chou: He always talks about democracy, yet he reports to the government about us to benefit himself...Get rid of Chou”, and “KMT. spy, Chou, Ern-nan. God! Let Chou get out of N.C.S.U.”, according to *the News and the Observer* in 1983.⁷⁶ The campus spies then sued Kuo Bei-Hong and the other Taiwanese student, Lin Kuo-Ching, in the U.S. for hazing and illegal advertising, however they were acquitted. This incident drew the media and the university’s attention to the issue of the KMT’s campus spy. According to the Raleigh Times (1983), the sergeant of the public safety department in North Carolina State University, Laura Reynolds “said that the event reflected a rivalry that is not confined to the N.C.S.U. ‘it’s not just on our campus. it’s all over.’”⁷⁷ The report also connected the incident with Chen Wen-Chen Incident which addressed the prevalence of the campus spies. *The News and the Observer* (1983) reported that the international advisor in North Carolina State University “was aware that some Taiwanese students were fearful of being watched by fellow students.”⁷⁸ As everyone was afraid of being reported to the KMT, Kuo’s direct opposition against campus spies brought the issue to the table and encouraged Taiwanese

students to confront the campus spies. On the other hand, this incident also put him onto the blacklist.

Li Ying-Yuan recounted that the campus spies would stand outside of the events he held and watch students. They would record who attended in that events and report them. Sometimes they might personally engage in the events and still write reports. Tzou Bukam stated that he had interacted with a medical school student saying that because he is sponsored by Ministry of National Defense, he had the responsibility of collecting information. Moreover, the KMT would demand everyone to participate in an orientation before studying abroad, in order to strengthen patriotism to the ROC and prevent students from being influenced by the activists.

Mao Qing-Fen provided an example of how closely the KMT monitored the activists. When Mao tried to sell land in Taiwan from the United State, the process should go through the Coordination Council for North American Affairs. When she went to the organization, the agent showed her *Taiwan Tribune* and indicated that her husband was the publisher. Mao pretended that she never saw this newspaper, and said that she and her husband were separated. Indeed, her husband was in Hawaii and she lived in New York. She later on told her kids to tell others that they did not live with their father and not to mention she went to work (she worked at *Taiwan Tribune*). Although she was able to sell her land eventually, this experience presents that the KMT's wide investigation and interference of Taiwanese activists' lives.

Additionally, Chen Wen-Jen mentioned a newspaper, *World Journal* (世界日報), which was a news company in North America held by a pro-KMT news agency, United Daily News. It spread false information about Taiwanese activists. For example, she indicated that when the Taiwanese activists held speech, the KMT members would prank and throw stones. They would

often hire gangs in Chinatown to attack Taiwanese activists. However, the *World Journal* would write that it was the Taiwanese activists who caused conflicts and attacked people. This became the reason why Chen and her partners decided to start a magazine, *Formosa Weekly* (美麗島週報).⁷⁹

However, these series of political suppressions did not slow the Taiwan's Independence movement. After many activists were sacrificed in the Kaohsiung Incident, many Taiwanese then started to think of ways to talk about the injustice and to demand freedom. Since Taiwan's independence movement hardly survived under such suppression, it rose overseas, mostly in Japan, North America and Europe. Taiwan's independence movement thus was even more spurred after these series of domestic political brutalities as well as the mechanism of campus spies. A key player was World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI).

WUFI was the largest Taiwan's Independence organization in the world. Chen Wen-Jen mentioned that WUFI was often described by Taiwanese as the highest-educated rebellion organization, since the members were mainly graduate students and professors.⁸⁰ Between 1956 to 1990, in order to avoid the FBI investigation and the KMT spy inspection, the Taiwanese organization went underground. WUFI was originally named Formosans' Free Formosa (3F), which was established in Philadelphia in 1956. 3F aimed to achieve Taiwan's independence by establishing a new country and to oppose the colonial regime. Later on, in January 1958, 3F changed its name to United Formosans for Independence (UFI) in order to avoid the FBI investigation. In June 1966, UFI was extended to 9 main regions in the U.S. and combined with Taiwan Issue Research Organization (台灣問題研究會), with a new name, United Formosans in America for Independence (UFAI). UFAI and other Taiwan's independence groups in Canada,

Europe, Japan, and Taiwan united together and became World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI). The headquarters was located in New York during the 1980s.⁸¹

You might wonder why Taiwan's independence organization had to avoid the FBI investigation. It was because 3F was established during the Red Scare period. 3F thus was suspended as a communist organization and investigated by the FBI in 1958. Even though after a series of conversations, the U.S. government realized that 3F was a Taiwanese democratic advocate organization, the FBI still kept interfering with the organization. Therefore, in order to prevent the organization from being considered as a terror organization, they changed the name to UFI.⁸² Between the 1960s to the 1970s, the U.S. government and the KMT had a cooperation plan. That is, the FBI provided lists of Taiwan's independence advocates in the U.S. and exchanged with the KMT's list of pro-communist Chinese.⁸³ In the late 1980s, after years of advocating by Taiwanese democratic organization, such as WUFI, Taiwanese Association for Human Rights and North America Taiwanese Professors Association, The U.S. politics turned into supporting Taiwanese political prisoners.

WUFI had published a newspaper called *Taiwan Tribune* (臺灣公論報) in 1981. After the Kaohsiung Incident, the president of WUFI, Chang Tsan-Hung, thought that they should start a newspaper to catch up the latest news in Taiwan. The newspaper was published twice a week. Chang asked Mao Qing-Fen's husband to be the publisher. They originally planned to publish the first publication in September. However, it turned out to be at July 31st in Long Island City due to Chen Wen-Chen Incident. Since her husband was not able to leave his job in Hawaii, Mao and her kids moved to New York and started to work there as a treasurer with a monthly wage of \$320 USD.⁸⁴ Although the staff of the *Taiwan Tribune* were not professionals, they were willing

to learn and work together for this publication for low wages. In October 1984, Kao Tzu-Min, a later KMT legislator sued *Taiwan Tribune* for libeling him and requested for 4.5 million dollars. Ramsey Clark, a previous U.S. Attorney General, defended them for free. Eventually, Taiwan Tribune won the lawsuit and could keep publishing.⁸⁵

In 1983, Kuo Bei-Hong established Taiwanese Student Association (臺灣學生社) and published a magazine called *Taiwan Student* (臺灣學生) with Li Ying-Yuan. This magazine was written by Taiwanese students from approximately eight universities. Later on, he became the president of UFAI to help solve the financial difficulty in *Taiwan Tribune*, maintain good relationship with other organizations, and to organize the Homeward movement with Li Ying-Yuan, who was the vice president of UFAI. Chen Wen-Jen had participated in multiple organizations, such as Coalition of Taiwan Independence. Tzou Bukam had participated in organizations such as Formosans Association for Public Affairs (FAPA), and helped organize the event, Run for democracy on Taiwan, in 1986. He was also a member of WUFI and worked in *Taiwan Tribune*.

Overall, due to the freedom in the U.S., the incidents such as Kaohsiung Incident, the interaction with campus spies, all the interviewees mentioned that it is after they came to the U.S. that they really started to participate in Taiwan's Independence movement. Young people found ways to organize at the grassroots, while the KMT government worked hard to suppress their movement.

Chapter 5

The Blacklist

The blacklist was the KMT's secret monitor documentation before 1992. Taiwanese students, who were reported as supporting either Taiwan's independence or communism, would be put into the KMT's blacklist. The people in the blacklist were persecuted by the KMT government. Their actions were monitored, and their private information was sent back to the KMT government. Moreover, they were not able to go back to Taiwan. Their families in Taiwan were bothered by the government. Since the blacklist was not public, most of the Taiwanese students would not know if they have been monitored or reported as blacklisted. Only when they faced some restrictions and obstacles for the reason that they failed to pass the "security inspection" would they realize that they were in the blacklist.⁸⁶

Due to the participation of Taiwan's Independence movement, Kuo Bei-Hong, Li Ying-Yuan, Mao Qing-Feng and Chen Wen-Jen were marked into the blacklist. The major effect of the blacklist was that they were unable to go back to Taiwan. Either their visa for returning to Taiwan would be invalid (返台加簽) or they were not able to renew their passport. Before 1999, there was a regulation that Taiwanese people had to have an entrance visa to return to Taiwan (返台加簽).⁸⁷ National Immigration Agency was able to cancel any visa, which controlled Taiwanese activists entering to Taiwan and gave birth to the blacklist. This policy violated the freedom of living and moving mentioned in the constitution, and thus it was abolished in 1999. Without the valid documentation to go back to Taiwan, they had to think of ways to make a life in the United States. Since most of the people were students, professors, employees or the

relatives of those, they were able to stay in the U.S. legally. In the case of Chen Wen-Jen, she had received the permission of political asylum and got Permanent Resident Card, which she had abandoned when she ran for election.⁸⁸

For Kuo Bei-Hong, the inability to go back to Taiwan was a major inconvenience. Living in the U.S., he was unable to earn money outside of campus since he did not have any identity other than a student. Additionally, there was an economic gap between Taiwan and America. It was hard to support his life in America by the money he had earned from Taiwan. He also mentioned that people in the blacklist sometimes would tell their family members to pretend to be strangers in public. This made their family members think that they were doing something wrong.⁸⁹

Additionally, their family would be interfered with by the government. There would be people from the government “friendly visit” their houses in Taiwan or there would often be strangers wandering around their houses. Some of their family members had a hard time to find a job or be promoted. In the case of Mao Qing-fen and her husband, when her father came to visit them, her father was required to write a report about her husband’s behavior for the Taiwan Garrison Command.⁹⁰ Additionally, her husband’s aunt, who lived in Japan, was unable to go back to Japan after her visiting to Taiwan. This could happen perhaps because his aunt held a Taiwan’s passport. However, the winter vacation was going to end, and the kids had to go back to school. She asked a travel agency for help. During that time, travel agencies usually had good relationship with the Taiwan Garrison Command (台灣警備總司令部) due to needs of permissions of departure and entrance. The travel agency told her to bring \$20,000 NTD to a

tennis court under the Grand Hotel (圓山飯店). After they received the money, his aunt was allowed to return to Japan.⁹¹

In the case of Li Ying-Yuan, because of the blacklist, he could not visit his father while his father was severely ill.⁹² He could only hear his father calling his nickname over the phone.⁹³ Additionally, Li's brother was denied promotion. After he graduated from a police school, he was transferred to a remote area, where it was harder for him to be promoted. Li also mentioned that there were strangers wandering around his house in Taiwan, who most likely were the KMT's intelligence agents. Although his father did not tell him directly, he could tell that his father had been interfered with. His father often told him on phone to focus on study and not to do other extra things.⁹⁴ Similar to Li Ying-Yuan, Chen Wen-Jen's brother also had a hard time to find a job.⁹⁵

The activists in the interview were put into the blacklist for different reasons. One of the reasons they were marked into the blacklist was due to their publications. When Mao Qing-Fen's husband, Luo Fu-Quan, published a Taiwanese publication, *Formosan Gram*, in the 1960s, he always used his real name. The KMT thus recognized his name and marked them into the blacklist. They did not try to renew their passports since they knew that their original passports might be taken away. Therefore, they did not know the exact date they were in the blacklist. However, when they were in Pittsburgh, a new student studying in the University of Pennsylvania came to visit her and recognized her husband's name, which was appeared during the KMT's orientation. During the orientation, the KMT would warn students not to have contact with the activists such as her husband. Because of the blacklist, they remained stateless. Later on,

they got the U.S. citizenship since they had stayed in the U.S. for a long time. However, they did not go back to Taiwan until the Homeward movement in 1988.⁹⁶

Similarly, Li Ying-Yuan was marked into the blacklist due to publishing *Taiwan Student*, which was a publication organized by Kuo Bei-Hong and Li Ying-Yuan.⁹⁷ In the case of Chen Wen-Jen, she became into the blacklist in 1979, while she started a hunger strike for a reporter, Chen Bo-wen (陳博文), in front of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs in New York (北美事務協調委員會駐紐約辦事處). She mentioned that the government secretly removed her residency based on a special rule under Martial Law that if a resident moved out more than half year, the government could remove one's residency. She went to the U.S. in July, 1979, and her residency got removed in January, 1980.⁹⁸

In summary, due to the participation of Taiwan's independence movement, the activists were marked into the blacklist. Because of the blacklist, they experienced life difficulties and family obstacles, and were also unable to go back to their home. These suppressions drove them to start organizing the Homeward movement.

Chapter 6

The Homeward Movement

Start of the Homeward Movement

In the late 1980s, the environment had changed internationally and domestically, which made the activists believe it was the time to start the movement. First of all, Chen Wen-Jen mentioned that the international situation became more open to political exiles in the 1980s.⁹⁹ In 1983, Benigno Aquino, Jr., the father of democracy in Philippines went back to Philippines but was assassinated at the airport. However, three years later, his wife was elected as the president of Philippines. In 1985, Kim Dae-Jung, a Korean activist who was in exile overseas successfully returned to Korea.

At the same period, the political situation in Taiwan was gradually opening. In 1986, the Democratic Progressive Party became an official political party. At the same year, Hsu Hsin-Liang (許信良), an activist in the blacklist and the founder of *Formosa Weekly*, flew back to Taiwan, which is known as Taoyuan Airport Incident. The key leaders in DPP and the previous mayor of Kaohsiung County, Yu Teng-Fa (余登發) had bring groups of people to welcome Hsu, which is considered as the DPP's largest campaign after the Kaohsiung Incident.¹⁰⁰ In 1987, Martial Law was ended by the KMT government.



Figure 1 Cheng Nan-Jung Funeral (Taipei, 1989) from the collection of Chiang Kai-Shih

Moreover, on April 7, 1989, Cheng Nan-Jung (鄭南榕) self-immolated for freedom of speech and Taiwan's independence. Cheng Nan-Jung was charged with high treason and would possibly be sentenced to death penalty due to publishing a proposal for the Republic of Taiwan's constitution. He refused to show up in court and self-immolated in his office when the police tried to enter. Kuo Bei-Hong said "Because of Dr. Chen Wen-Chen (陳文成) and Mr. Cheng Nan-Jung (鄭南榕) sacrifice for us, we were not afraid of any of the KMT's intimidation."¹⁰¹ On Cheng's funeral, when the cortege arrived the Presidential Office, the government treated them with water cannon, riot police and roadblocks. When the people was outraged that the government still refused to talk to its citizens, Chan I-Hua (詹益樺), a grass-root activist self-immolated and ran toward one roadblock with the banner, "Born as Taiwanese, Die as Taiwanese."¹⁰² Chen Wen-Jen recalled, "This (homeward) movement was thanks to Cheng Nan-

Jung. Because of his and Chan I-Hua's self-immolation, the KMT was shocked that there were actually two people who died. The end of Martial Law was not because they succumbed to their conscience, but because the social pressure forced the KMT to end Martial Law."¹⁰³ After this incident, the Taiwanese activists were getting more firm on fighting for freedom. This case also is evidence of how the KMT continuously suppressed freedom in Taiwan even after the Martial Law period.

The change in political environment, the sacrifices of the predecessors and the experiences in the blacklist were huge motives of the Homeward Movement. Additionally, they also thought that the political movement needed to "grow on its own land."¹⁰⁴ They wanted to move the public sphere of the movement back to Taiwan. Therefore, the president of WUFI, Koh Se-Kai (許世楷), announced in 1987 "publicize the domestic movement, universalize the homeward movement (島內運動公開化，返鄉運動普遍化)." This is the start of the Homeward movement. "Publicize the domestic movement" meant to encourage the underground domestic activists to widely show up in public. "Universalize the Homeward movement" meant to invite all the Taiwanese in blacklist overseas to return to Taiwan.

Publicize Domestic Movement, Universalize the Homeward Movement

The Homeward movement was a non-violent movement organized by Taiwanese students with two goals: the first was to support freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and association, and the second was to bring back the public sphere of Taiwan's independence to Taiwan. The main organizers were Kuo Bei-Hong and Li Ying-Yuan. They challenged for three things. First, they wanted to abolish the KMT's blacklist. Secondly, they wanted to remove the

Criminal Code Article 100. Thirdly, they wanted to move Taiwan's Independence Movement back to Taiwan. The strategy was to actively challenge the KMT. By challenging the Criminal Code Article 100, they could show the ridiculousness of the law and the blacklist. At that time, Kuo was the president of UFAI, he believed that Taiwanese should not be restricted outside of the country. Kuo stated "we are all Taiwanese, and we did nothing wrong. Taiwan is our home. Therefore, we should have the right to go back to Taiwan."¹⁰⁵ Hence, the students flew back to Taiwan, even though they knew they would be arrested.

The first shot started in 1988. In 1988, World Federation of Taiwanese Association (世界台灣同鄉會) (WFTA) announced that it would hold the annual conference in Taiwan for the first time in history (on August 18th)¹⁰⁶, which implied Taiwanese activist overseas would return to Taiwan and break the blacklist. Chen Wen-Jen said that, "the president of WFTA, Professor Lee Shane-Rong (李憲榮), cooperated with WUFI and held the annual meeting first time in Taiwan. After he hold the event, many Taiwanese had come back to Taiwan."¹⁰⁷ Kuo Bei-Hong mentioned, "the president of WFTA, Lee Shane-Rong (李憲榮); the vice president of WFTA, Chai Min-Lu (蔡銘祿); and the core member in WUFI, Tsai Cheng-Long (蔡正隆), came back for this event"¹⁰⁸, so did other activists, Chang Ting-Lan (張丁蘭), Mao Qing-Fen (毛清芬), Ye Ming-Xia (葉明霞), Wu Shinn-Chih (吳信志) and Chuang Strong (莊秋雄).¹⁰⁹ The conference was successfully held in 1989, which encouraged more people to participate in the Homeward movement.



Figure 2 WFTA's March (Kaohsiung, 1989). Retrieved from <http://taiwaneseamericanhistory.org/blog/ourjourneys230/>

In this year, Mao Qing-Feng, Chen Wen-Jen and Tzou Bukam returned to Taiwan. Mao Qing-Feng was one of the participants of the WFTA's annual conference at her first return. Since she lost her nationality of Taiwan, she was naturalized to the United States. Having a U.S. passport, Mao smoothly got the visa and flew back to Taiwan. Mao especially mentioned a female activist, Stella Chen (陳翠玉), who participated in the Homeward movement at the age of 71.¹¹⁰ Chen Stella was the first Taiwanese nurse working in World Health Organization (WHO).¹¹¹ Unlike Mao, Stella Chen took a long journey to apply for her visa. She finally got the visa in Singapore with the assistance of Mao and her husband. However, she passed away shortly after she returned to Taiwan. Stella Chen had said, "Taiwan is my country. We want to go back. This is our right. I will devote my life to fighting for this right."¹¹² After she passed away, there was a big protest in front of Chiang Kai-shek Memorial Hall, demanding the right of returning home in August 26th, 1988. The activists symbolically brought her coffin in front of the

Presidential Office. This protest not only involved the activists overseas, the DPP also stood out to support the protest.

When Chen Wen-Jen flew back to Taiwan in 1988, she was caught at the airport and forced to return to the United States. During the interview, she mentioned that after she was forced to return to United States, she had accepted Kuo Bei-Hong's invitation to participate in the Homeward movement.¹¹³ Later on, she helped other activists, including Kuo Bei-Hong and Li Ying-Yuan, return to Taiwan. She commented "the entire Homeward movement was [started from] Kuo Bei-Hong persuading Taiwanese in the U.S. to return to Taiwan."¹¹⁴ Tzou Bukam came back in August. Unlike Chen, he came back smoothly because of his identity as a state-financed student, regardless of the work experience at *Taiwan Tribune*. Since he was required to work for the government after finishing his degree, the government even paid for his flight ticket. After he went back to Taiwan, he started to organize the activities for WUFI's underground members to show up publicly, which led to his imprisonment later on.

In 1989, there were two major events: Chen Wen-Jen's second return and the Black Mask incident upon Kuo Bei-Hong's return. First, the sentence after Chen Wen-Jen's 2nd Return encouraged people to participate in Taiwan's independence movement. In the interview, she illustrated how she had played hide and seek with the police for months. She held a press conference at the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan. Then, she showed up at Cheng Nan-Jung's funeral on May 19th. After a series of negotiations with the police, she violated the National Security Law and was punished with five-month imprisonment, which was commuted to fines.¹¹⁵ Chen recalled, "later on, even Cheng Tzu-Tsai (鄭自才), who tried to shoot Chiang Ching-kuo, came back to Taiwan and was only punished with five-month imprisonment...After this court

decision, Taiwanese overseas knew that they could all come back without severe punishment”, which largely encouraged people to participate in the Homeward Movement.¹¹⁶



Figure 3 The Black Mask Incident (Zhonghe, 1989) from the collection of History of Taiwanese American

The second major event was called the Black Mask incident, which showed that the overseas activists gained huge support from the domestic population. In 1989, Kuo Bei-Hong flew back to Taiwan to make a speech on a campaign rally of Lu Hsiu-Yi (盧修一) and Chou Huey-Ying (周慧瑛) at Zhonghe Stadium. Lu was running for legislator and Chou was for member of Taiwan Provincial Consultative Council from the Democratic Progressive Party. At that time, Kuo was defined as the ringleader of overseas Taiwan's Independence activist by the KMT. According to *Taiwan People News*, the KMT offered a reward of 2 millions and 200 thousands for finding him out, and the head of General Staff Headquarters, MND, Hau Pei-Tsun (郝伯村), issued 12 warrants for his arrest.¹¹⁷ Kuo Bei-Hong mentioned that anyone who talked to him would be punished by up to two years imprisonment. If he was arrested, he would be

punished by life imprisonment or death penalty.¹¹⁸ At the rally, there were thousands of police trying to arrest him, according to *Taiwan People News*.¹¹⁹ After his speech, Minister Kao Chun-Ming prayed and then all the lights were turned off. The participants wore the same black mask as Kuo Bei-Hong to prevent him from being arrested. In reality, however, Kuo said that he was not trying to hide at all. Kuo stopped in the middle of the crowd and took off his mask. The police only focused on the moving people with black mask. Finally, he safely left the rally.¹²⁰

This event was a cooperation of activists overseas and domestically. The host, Chien His-Chieh (簡錫堃) planned the event and a director, Cheng Wen-Tang (鄭文堂) designed the black mask.¹²¹ Additionally, it is the support from the people who wore black masks allowing him to leave the site and go back to the United States. Since there were too many people wearing the same black mask, the police could not recognize him. In the interview, Kuo Bei-Hong chose to remain mysterious about how he had returned, but he illustrated the intense situation by saying, “on November 26th, I planned to take a ship at Linbian Township with Li Ying-Yuan. However, the person who was going to pick me up made a mistake. Fortunately, this mistake prevented us from being arrested because later on 12 a.m., there were 6000 police surround the ship, trying to arrest me.”¹²² Above all, this Black Mask incident indicates the existence of opposite opinions between the government and the people, as the person that the police wanted to arrest gained huge support from the people.



Figure 4 Li Ying-Yuan (Taipei, 1990) retrieved from *ren sheng de jing tan hao* (人生的驚嘆號), 2002.

In 1990, Li Ying-Yuan came back to Taiwan. As one of the main organizers of the movement, he described it as “a fully discussed and organized movement.”¹²³ According to his own biography, as he sent a fake public message that he would show up in conference of North America Taiwanese Professors’ Association (NATPA), he found another way to secretly return to Taiwan.¹²⁴ In July, he successfully returned to Taiwan. Similar to Chen Wen-Jen, he also played hide and seek with the police. He said,

“[I] took pictures around Taiwan. The one in front of the Presidential Office was the headline of mass media (Figure 4). This is also the largest ridicule to the blacklist system (成為黑名單制度的最大嘲諷)— a protest with irony not blood, a protest with disobedience not violence. The more the KMT wanted to catch me and the stronger accusations they made, the larger effect of the protest I achieved. I did not hurt anyone, but

my existence and my travel were the sharpest weapons that disclosed the government's ridiculousness and unfairness.”¹²⁵

Mao's second return in 1991 is a good example to illustrate how the activists came back. The activists either came back by ship or flight. When she came back to Taiwan, she borrowed her younger sister's passport. Her sister was very pretty with a long hair. Hence, she bought a wig from Macy's, trying to be more like her. As you know, it might not turn out well. When she got home, her son looked at her and say “mom, you look so stupid”. Therefore, she decided not to wear it and just be natural. She still wore a lot of makeup. She was really nervous during the flight, and she was so scared while waiting for customs. Finally, it was her turn. The agent stared at her and said “you are very pretty.” She responded “thank you” and then left with a huge relief.¹²⁶

All the interviewees, except for Mao Qing-Feng, were imprisoned upon their return to Taiwan. They were imprisoned in two different detention centers. Kuo Bei-Hong, Li Ying-Yuan and two other activists, Wang Kang-Lu (王康陸) and Chang Tsan-Hung (張燦鑒) were arrested to Tucheng Detention Center. Chen Wen-Jen, Tzou Bukam, and three other activists, Chiang Kai-Shih (江蓋世), Lin Yong-Sheng (林永生) and Hsu Ling-Jun (許龍俊) were to Taichung Detention center. Their imprisonment can be separated into two main reasons. I conclude that the activists in Tucheng Detention Center were imprisoned due to their return to Taiwan. The activists in Taichung Detention Center were due to devotion to the “publicize domestic movement.”

After the Black Mask incident, Kuo went back to the U.S. and invited more people in the blacklist to return to Taiwan. In 1991, Kuo directly showed up at the Taoyuan Airport and

“confess.”¹²⁷ Interestingly, although he was the wanted, the KMT initially decided not to arrest him but to deport him. Kuo said they was going to force him to take the next flight on 7 a.m at the next day.¹²⁸ On August 30th, Kuo was arrested in the Taoyuan Airport and sent to Tucheng Detention Center. Kuo already prepared for this result. He joked “I bought a special flight ticket, that not only send me from Los Angeles to Taiwan but also provide me free meals and living for 9 months.”¹²⁹

When speaking of his imprisonment, Kuo Bei-Hong quoted a poem written for Lin Yi-Shiung by Lin Shaun-Bu (林雙不) to express his feelings: “When people said you were a hero, I cried. I would rather you are just the kid’s father (人家說你是好漢我就哭了，我寧願你只是孩子的父親).”¹³⁰ He explained, “a hero’s fate is somewhat scary, sometimes you would rather be a normal person. We are the hero in a crazy world.” He said, “does not it feel good to have freedom in life? Then, why did we choose to go to jail? However, sometimes you would feel better to be in jail than enjoy [physical] freedom. When you were physically free but there is no dignity and hope, you would rather to be in the jail. If your imprisonment is able make a difference for the society, then it is worth it. There was no difference when you are inside or outside of the jail anyway. Outside [of the jail], there would be a jail in your heart. Inside [of the jail], there would be a jail that restricts your body.”¹³¹

At the same year, Li Ying-Yuan was also arrested and sent to Tucheng Detention Center. The police recognized his mole and identified him at a café.¹³² One investigator interrogated Li, and Li responded to him with the idea of non-violent movement.¹³³ In his biography, he mentioned that “for political prisoner, imprisonment is not a burden. No matter in which country,

[the government could] only restrict the body of the political prisoners, but not their thoughts.”¹³⁴

In his interview, he further explained, “we were all doctors or professors. When we were imprisoned, the society would rethink the situation. [they would think] why these good people want to do these actions. Maybe it is the government’s mistake so that they went to prison with courage and pride.”¹³⁵ While in court, Li refused to be handcuffed. Alternatively, he put on two handcuffs, one on each hand. He was allowed to bring a book, *100% of Freedom of Speech* (100% 言論自由) by Cheng Nan-Jung, which he believed it was because the public supports had reached a certain high point.

In the case of Tzou Bukam and Chen Wen-Jen, they were imprisoned due to organizing the domestic movement after they returned to Taiwan. As Tzou mentioned, Chen Wen-Jen and Lin Yong-Sheng visited Tzou on May 6th, 1991. They suggested that WUFI should be publicized if the organization wanted to develop in Taiwan. Since WUFI was not publicized, it was unclear that who the members were. Therefore, they planned to gather all the members to show up in public. Since then, Tzou went all over the places in Taiwan to find WUFI members and held the standing out event (現身大會). On September 4th, 1991, the WUFI standing out event was held in Taichung City. According to Tzou, approximately 100 members showed up. The event also sent a message that the members were not afraid of being arrested, which intensified the Intelligence Agency’s attention toward Tzou.

After the standing out event, Tzou Bukam, Chiang Kai-Shih (江蓋世) and other partners thought this was not enough. In order to be a formal organization, there should be a formal code, and so they started to write the code. However, Tzou got arrested while waiting for Chiang to discuss the organization code. He went to Yam Leaf (蕃薯藤), a commonplace for activists

gathering at Shilin, Taipei. As he found that there were many investigation agents waiting outside, he called Chiang and told him not to come. Chiang said that it was too late because he was already caught by the agents. At the same time, the agents misidentified Tzou with Chiang. Since the agent held Chiang's search warrant, Tzou told the agent, "I am not Chiang Kai-Shih. I am Bukam Tzou."¹³⁶ However, the agent took out another search warrant with Tzou's name and arrested him. After that, he was sent to Taichung for interrogation. In the police's car, the agent told Tzou that he went to the same college as Tzou, and asked Tzou why he chose to do such thing when he could study well. Tzou answered, "it is a problem of integrity."¹³⁷ During the interrogation, there were three groups of agents, asking the same thing again and again. Tzou said, their intention was to exhaust him and made him provide more information. Because Tzou thought there was nothing to hide and because he knew that the worst situation was three to four years of imprisonment, he responded honestly to everything they asked. The interrogation ended at 10 p.m., and he was imprisoned on death row. Tzou still vividly remembered that the death row said, "the agent told me that there would be a madman coming tonight, but you do not look like a madman."¹³⁸

Chen Wen-Jen was imprisoned due to organizing the Coalition of Taiwan Nation-building Movement (台灣建國運動組織) in Taichung City. On May 16th, 1991, Chen Wen-Jen and Lin Yong-Sheng established the Coalition of Taiwan Nation-building Movement. The objective of this organization resonated one of the goals of the Homeward movement, which is to support WUFI moving back to Taiwan. They publicly announced that this organization was the first WUFI office in Taiwan.¹³⁹ Besides, they also aimed to demand the right of association. Chen Wen-Jen concluded that, this organization related to the blacklists, WUFI, and its plan to

move back to Taiwan.¹⁴⁰ On June 8th, Chen Wen-Jen received a court summons due to violation of an offense against the internal security of the State (內亂罪), requiring her to attend to the court four days later. In response, she refused to attend and sold the summons for 60,000 NTD at the rebellion reception (叛亂餐會) on June 22nd.¹⁴¹

The Coalition of Taiwan Nation-building Movement was a more militant group during the Homeward Movement period. Different from the widespread idea of non-violence, the Coalition of Taiwan Nation-building Movement emphasized the civil right of resistance. She explained “I will not actively attack the government; however, if they attack us, I must fight back. This is the civil right of resistance.”¹⁴² With this principle, they prepared cannonballs, Molotov cocktail and barrels of gasoline in advance. On August 25th, the conflict with the government reached a high point. According to Ou and Huang (2014), some group members sprayed paint when they passed by the KMT’s office. The police then fired rifles into the air, and the members threw the Molotov cocktail as a counterattack. An hour later, the riot police gathered at their office. Some volunteers piled and ignited furniture on the road to create a barricade. Chen Wen-Jen and other members were ready to fight back. After a long standoff, the police decided to withdraw.¹⁴³ Due to this incident, Chen Wen-Jen was arrested to Taichung Detention center on February 8th, 1992 and punished with three years and ten months of imprisonment on a charge of violation of the Criminal Code Article 100 on March 14th.¹⁴⁴

Their imprisonment reveals that there were still strong restrictions for freedom in Taiwan after the end of Martial Law. The separation of imprisonment also brings a question that whether the KMT did it intentionally so as to divide the public support for the movement. In addition,

their imprisonment drove the society to question about the Criminal Code Article 100 as well as the blacklist.

Speaking of the media's reaction, Kuo Bei-Hong mentioned that the media focused on the issue since there were many highly educated Taiwanese were in jail.¹⁴⁵ Li Ying-Yuan said the pro-KMT media would portray the democratic activists as gangs, violent groups, and groups related to Chinese communists; however, although the pro-KMT media still defamed this movement, the activists had held speech widely to explain the situation. Therefore, Li added, the citizens were knowledgeable enough to understand the KMT's real intent, and the majority did not really believe what the media portrayed.¹⁴⁶ Tzou related to that by saying people had learned to "read the newspaper in an opposite way (報紙顛倒看)", which means people thought the truth was oppose to what was on the news.¹⁴⁷ Kuo Bei-Hong also illustrated the society's reaction by saying that "as Taiwanese people witnessed these highly educated people were imprisoned because of returning to their own country, they would start to question the government."¹⁴⁸



Figure 5 Tzou Bukam's poem, *Lí Ná Koh Bē-hiáu Siūnn* from the collection of Chiang Kai-Shih

Additionally, the activist also put a lot of effort into maintaining public attention during the imprisonment. At that time, the most supportive media outlets were the *Independence Evening Post* (自立晚報) and *The Common People's Daily* (民眾日報). Tzou Bukam, Chen Wen-Jen and other activists in Taichung Detention Center frequently published articles in those newspapers. Tzou wrote a poem, titled *Lí Ná Koh Bē-hiáu Siūnn* (If You Still Don't Understand), expressing his sorrow of not being able to hug his son during the imprisonment (Figure 5). Chen Wen-Jen published *The Prisoner Diary* (囚犯日記) in *Independence Morning Post* (自立早報) every day. Besides, Tzou participated in election for National Assembly in the prison with the goal of gathering public attention from the society.¹⁴⁹ When his goal achieved, he withdrew from the election and supported the other candidate from the DPP.

It was the public support that gave Tzou encouragement in the prison. The letters and postcards gave him mental support. Some public figures and legislators, such as Chen Shui-Bian and Hsieh Chang-Ting, visited him. In terms of social support, Tzou especially remembered an organization, Goa-Seng-Lang Association for Taiwan Independence (GATI; 外省人台灣獨立促進會) formed in 1992. He said, “the only time I cried during the imprisonment was because of Goa-Seng-Lang Association for Taiwan Independence.”¹⁵⁰ He thought that since the Goa-Seng-Lang (mainlander; 外省人) usually opposed to Taiwan’s Independence, the formation of this organization represented a huge improvement of Taiwan’s independence.¹⁵¹ Therefore, when the President of GATI, Liao Zhong-Shan (廖中山) came to visit him, he was so touched that he cried.¹⁵²

While talking about the social supports during their imprisonment, the interviewees said that a group called 100 Action Alliance (一百行動聯盟) played a key role in supporting them and demanding the abolition of the Criminal Code Article 100. In 1991, as the activists were arrested and imprisoned, a group of professors and students supported them. Kuo Bei-Hong mentioned “when I and other activists were in jail, there were supports from Amnesty International, and professors and teachers spoke for us. In order to avoid additional riot, the government revised the law and released us. This release represents Taiwan could start to enjoy freedom of speech, which is a huge change in the system.”¹⁵³ The “professors and teachers” refers to 100 Action Alliance. Kuo Bei-Hong further explained this group’s contribution, “on the national day, October 10, 1991, many professors and students from the National Taiwan University protested in front of the Presidential Office. The society was angry. Many professors and students stood out. The most famous people were Dr. Lee Zhen-Yuan (李鎮源) and Minister

Kao Chun-Ming who stood out against the Criminal Code Article 100 and the blacklist.”¹⁵⁴ Dr. Lee Zhen-Yuan was Li Ying-Yuan’s teacher. According to Li Ying-Yuan, Dr. Lee Zhen-Yuan had visited him in prison and Dr. Lee knew that the government was wrong.¹⁵⁵ He explained why Dr. Lee decided to stand out, “his coworker, Xu Qiang (許強), a director in internal medicine, was arrested because of participation in a study group and died after his arrest. He did not speak out immediately because the energy from the society was not enough yet. But now, he was ready to fight and risk his life. He was old and famous, and so he was not afraid of sacrifice.”¹⁵⁶ Indeed, Dr. Lee was a well-known pharmacologist and the dean of college of Medicine in the National Taiwan University (NTU). Li Ying-Yuan explained the significant influence of Dr. Lee in this event by saying, “with his ethical appeal, many of his students stood out with him. Since so many highly educated scholars protested, the society must have some problems. Within the system, the DPP also supported the movement. With the media and the social pressure, the KMT was forced to face this issue. In the end, they revised the Criminal Code Article 100.”¹⁵⁷ Chen Wen-Jen also mentioned two leaders from the 100 Action Alliance being supportive, “Chen Shi-Meng (陳師孟) really supported the movement. The main character was Lee Zhen-Yuan who was powerful and respectable.”¹⁵⁸ Speaking of the condition outside of the prison, Tzou Bukam referred, “the 100 Action Alliance, such as Lee Zhen-Yuan (李鎮源), Chen Shi-Meng (陳師孟), Lin Shan-Tian (林山田) and Liao I-En (廖宜恩), protested outside of the prison. Additionally, there were ten people imprisoned: five of them were from overseas; five of them were in Taiwan. Combining the energy from outside and inside the prison, the Criminal Code Article 100 and the blacklist can be broke.”¹⁵⁹

100 Action Alliance—A Practice of Non-Violence and Love

The formation of 100 Action Alliance stems from two major events: Taiwan Independence Association Incident (TIA Incident; 獨台會案) and 98 Referendum Big March (98 公投大遊行).¹⁶⁰ First of all, the TIA Incident shows that the tension between the KMT and the people in academia against the KMT's authoritarianism became intense. On May 1st, 1991, the KMT government announced the halt of the Period of National Mobilization for Suppression of the Communist Rebellion (動員戡亂時期). However, Taiwanese still could not enjoy freedom of speech since the Act for the Control and Punishment of Rebellion and the Criminal Code Article 100 still restricted liberty. Few days later, four activists, Chen Jen-Ran (陳正然), Liao Wei-Chen (廖偉程), Wang Hsiu-Hui (王秀惠) and Lin Yin-Fu (林銀福) were arrested due to the participation of Taiwan Independence Association (TIA) on May 9th, which is known as TIA incident. Some students and professors protested in front of Chiang Kai-shek Memorial Hall. During the protest, Chen Shi-Meng, a professor of economics in the NTU as well as one of the main organizers of 100 Action Alliance, was beaten by the police. The students then boycotted classes to support him and oppose police brutality.¹⁶¹ On May 17th, under the high social pressure, the Act for the Control and Punishment of Rebellion was abolished and the four activists were released. This incident shows that more and more students and professors started to protest against the government and concern of the laws that limited liberty. According to *100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech* (2008), after the TIA incident, the participants of 100 Action Alliance realized that if the Criminal Code Article 100 existed, Taiwanese people could not enjoy freedom of speech¹⁶², which sparked the organization of 100 Action Alliance later on.

The second major event was the march with the goal of initiating a referendum for Taiwan's admission to the United Nation (U.N.) on September 8th, 1991, which is known as 98 Referendum Big March (九八大遊行). As Zhang and Chen (2008) recorded, the organizers demanded that the government should join the U.N., release political prisoners Huang Hua (黃華), Kuo Bei-Hong and Li Ying-Yuan, and abolish the Criminal Code Article 100. However, the negotiation with the government failed. Chen Shi-Meng thus announced that if the KMT rejected these three demands, they were going to organize against the military parade (反閱兵) on the National Day.¹⁶³ The campaign of anti-military parade was later on organized by the 100 Action Alliance. Overall, this march represented the society's strong concern about the Criminal Code Article 100 and initiated the formation of 100 Action Alliance.

After Chen Shi-Meng's announcement, a group of professors and students formed 100 Action Alliance on September 21th, 1991. According to Zhang and Qiu (2005), the "100" has three meanings. First, it represents the Criminal Code Article 100. Secondly, it also refers to Cheng Nan-Jung's book, *100% of Freedom of Speech (100 % 言論自由)*. Thirdly, it shows the way they protest, which the protestors were grouped in one hundred.¹⁶⁴ Along with the Homeward movement, 100 Action Alliance demanded the abolition of the Criminal Code Article 100. Distinctively, the organizers were mainly professors with high reputation. The majority of the founders were professors including Lee Zhen-Yuan, the dean of college of Medicine in the NTU, Chen Shi-Meng (陳師孟), a professor of economics in the NTU; Lin Shan-Tian (林山田), a professor of law in the NTU; Zhang Zhong-Dong (張忠棟), a professor of history in NTU; Qu Hai-Yuan (瞿海源), a professor of sociology in NTU; and Liao I-En (廖宜恩), a professor of computer science and engineering in National Chung Hsing University.¹⁶⁵ Besides the

professors, the founders also included prestigious people from various professions, including Dr. Chen Yung-Hsing (陳永興); Lawyer Chen Chuan-Yue (陳傳岳), Minister Yang Qi-Shou (楊啟壽); Hakka Writer Chung Chao-Cheng (鍾肇政); and the president of Referendum Promotion Association, Chai Trong-Rong (蔡同榮).¹⁶⁶



Figure 6 Lee Zhan-Yuan and other protestors (Taipei, 1991) retrieved from *Taipei People News*, 2016

Their slogan was “oppose military parade, abolish the unjust law.” According to *100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech* (2008), there were two stages of the protest. First, they negotiated with the KMT, held speeches and published magazines. On October 5th and 6th, the leaders met with the KMT’s members, Soong Chu-Yu (宋楚瑜), Ma Ying-Jeou (馬英九), and Hong Yuh-Chin (洪玉欽), and negotiated for two principles: first, the government should decriminalize people who used non-violent way to express their political opinion; and secondly, the law should clearly state the elements of crime that defines the act of violent rebellions.¹⁶⁷ However, the negotiation was failed because of the president of the Executive Yuan, Hau Pei-Tsun’s disagreement.¹⁶⁸

Since the protestors could not reach consensus with the government through negotiation, they organized a campaign against the military parade on October 10th, the ROC's National Day. According to Zhang and Chen (2008), the 100 Action Alliance believed this campaign could emphasize the ridiculousness that the KMT held a military parade while neglecting the freedom of speech in Taiwan, which could gain more support from the public. The 100 Action Alliance used non-violent strategies to protest. They followed the principles of Urban Rural Mission (URM), which was a set of non-violent protest training. Trained by URM, Liao I-En taught participants how to sit and how to react when police entered.¹⁶⁹

During the campaign, Lee Zhen-Yuan sat with the students. Li Ying-Yuan explained the importance of Lee Zhen-Yuan's participation, "he protested during the military parade against Hau Pei-Tsun. Hau Pei-Tsun was a representative figure in military. He had been a powerful military leader. On the other side, Lee Zhen-Yuan was a powerful scholar."¹⁷⁰ This scene visualized the opposition between the academia and the government in terms of the issue of the Criminal Code Article 100, which successfully drew the society's attention. After the anti-military parade campaign, the 100 Action Alliance cooperated with the family members of the political prisoners who violated the Criminal Code Article 100. Together, they launched a petition to demand the abolition of the law.¹⁷¹

Result

The Taiwanese witnessed that these highly educated people were imprisoned because of returning to their own country, and the professors with high reputations stood out against the government. They started to question the government. With these years of protests roiling the

entire nation, the government finally revised the Criminal Code Article 100 on May 15th 1992, which only the actual threats and violence were considered as violation.¹⁷² The political prisoners, including the interviewees, Kuo Bei-Hong, Li Ying-Yuan, Tzou Bukam and Chen Wen-Jen were released in the same month. The blacklist was also abolished, and WUFI officially returned to Taiwan in October 22nd, 1992. Since then, supporting Taiwan's independence were no longer suppressed by criminalization.

Speaking of the idea of non-violence, the activists held different perspectives. Li Ying-Yuan supported non-violent approach and believed that revolution does not always involve violence. In his oral interview, he quoted from Voltaire, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." He said although he was angry at the KMT but he respected their human rights, therefore, he chose to challenge the system and the law instead of any violent action.¹⁷³ Chen Wen-Jen, on the other side, did not think that it would be an effective way to fight against a violent authority. She said, "insisting on non-violent movement is like cutting off one of your arms before fighting with others."¹⁷⁴ However, she emphasized the importance of timing and stated that there was no good timing for Taiwanese to start a revolution.¹⁷⁵ Kuo Bei-Hong and Chen Wen-Jen both agreed that if people were suppressed by a violent authority, they could use any means to defend themselves. Kuo Bei-Hong additionally mentioned that although the Homeward movement was a non-violent movement, he would not emphasize that, because he believed that the approach of a movement was determined by the situation as well as the type of the authority.¹⁷⁶

Reflecting on the Homeward movement, the activists annotated with different descriptions. Kuo Bei-Hong described, "we were like climbing wall to go home. We brought the keys, but we lost it when we got home. Therefore, we had no choice but climbing wall to get

home, not to mention that we lost our keys due to robbery. However, the government punished us with 10 years or more imprisonment for climbing the wall. Hence, we had no choice but to fight against the government, which was why we decided to organize the Homeward movement.”¹⁷⁷ Chen Wen-Jen also illustrated the movement as, “I wanted to go home but you locked my door. Therefore, I had to climb the wall to go home.”¹⁷⁸ Li Ying-Yuan described it as running a red light. In his autobiography, he mentioned, “the KMT did not allow Taiwanese overseas to go home, which was like the red light at the intersection that kept shining and did not let people pass through...Nobody would wait for 30 minutes for a broken red light. For me, this red light had been broken for three years.”¹⁷⁹ Kuo Bei-Hong thought that he was arrested at an important timing. He felt like he was the one who kicked the soccer during the penalty kick, which implies that the success of the movement was thanks to the people who had participated in the movement. He further explained, “Although it was tough, we were more fortunate than our predecessors because we were able to see the result.”¹⁸⁰ Tzou Bukam thought the positive result of the movement was thanks to the combined efforts inside and outside of the prison. Kuo Bei-Hong said that the success of the movement did not happen all of a sudden, instead, it was an accumulation over times. He concluded that “the revision of the Criminal Code Article 100 means that Taiwan became a country with freedom of speech. It is an important milestone in the history of Taiwan’s independence movement.”¹⁸¹

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Contrary to common assumptions, the formation of democracy in Taiwan was due to a series of events rather than only the abolition of Martial Law in 1987. The KMT's contributions to Taiwan's liberalization and democratization were often over-credited in existing documentation. After the Martial Law period, Taiwanese still could not enjoy complete liberty and democracy due to the law restrictions regulated by the Criminal Code Article 100 and the Act for the Control and Punishment of Rebellion Taiwanese. Furthermore, The KMT government still used the blacklist and campus spy mechanism to interfere the freedom of thought and suppress political dissent.

Due to this limitation, the public sphere for the Taiwanese to discuss the idea of democracy, liberty and independence were mainly overseas. According to the previous president of the ROC, Li Teng-Hui (李登輝), “in the 1990s, the energy overseas poured into Taiwan and combined with democratic movement, as a motive of changing Taiwan.”¹⁸² Indeed, the Taiwanese overseas had made a significant contribution on the progress of democracy and liberty. The largest organization for Taiwan's independence, World United Formosans for Independence (WUFI), had organized the Homeward movement to challenge the Criminal Code Article 100 as well as the blacklist system. Since 1988, many Taiwanese illegally went back to Taiwan and publicly opposed the KMT's authoritarianism. Some of the Taiwanese activists were imprisoned based on their return to Taiwan. Their goal was to give an end to the Criminal Code Article 100 and the blacklist. In the end, their goal was reached and the activists were released.

There were eleven activists imprisoned due the violation of the Criminal Code Article 100 during the Homeward Movement, and nine of whom in WUFI. The interviewees of this oral history are the four activists who were imprisoned by the KMT government due to intentionally breaking Criminal Code Article 100, including Kuo Bei-Hong, Li Ying-Yuan, Chen Wen-Jen, and Tzou Bukam; and Mao Qing-Fen, who widely made speeches on the issue of the blacklist. Since they were all highly educated students, society started to question the justification of the Criminal Code Article 100. While the activists were arrested and punished by imprisonment upon their return to Taiwan, there was another large campaign supported them. A group of professors and students in Taiwan organized 100 Action Alliance. They demanded abolishing the Criminal Code Article 100 and releasing the prisoners. With the intensified social dissent against the KMT, the government finally abolished Act for the Control and Punishment of Rebellion Taiwanese in 1991, and revised the Criminal Code Article 100 in 1992, such that only actual threats of violent action are considered as violations. In July 7th, 1992, the prohibition of the blacklist's return to Taiwan was removed. After the abolition of the Criminal Code Article 100 and the blacklist, Taiwanese people could enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and association, and freedom of residence and movement. The improvement of the democracy and liberty in Taiwan was significantly driven by the Taiwanese's years of efforts, and the force from Taiwan's society pressured the government to move toward the path of liberty and democracy.

Appendix A

Timeline of the Related Events of the Homeward Movement

Year	Major Event	Kuo Bei-Hong	Li Ying-Yuan	Chen Wen-Jen	Mao Qing-Fen	Tzou Bukam
1979	The Kaohsiung Incident			Blacklisted: Hunger Strike for Chen Bo-Wen		
	The U.S. ended Diplomatic Relations with the ROC					
1980	Lin I-Hsiung Incident (2/28)	Study Abroad	Study Abroad			
1981	Chen Wen-Chen Incident (July)				Taiwan Tribune Started	
1982		North Carolina Poster Destruction Incident				
1983	Benigno Aquino, Jr., returned to Philippine.	Started Taiwan Student Association	Taiwan Student Association: Publisher (1983-1984)			
		Join WUFI				
1984		President of UFAI (1984-1987)				Study Abroad
1985	Kim Dae-Jung returned to Korea					
1986	DPP became a political party (9/28)		Visa got cancelled			Run for Democracy on Taiwan
	Taoyuan Airport Incident (11/30)					

Year	Major Event	Kuo Bei-Hong	Li Ying-Yuan	Chen Wen-Jen	Mao Qing-Fen	Tzou Bukam
1987	WUFI announced, “Publicize the Domestic Movement, Universalize the Homeward Movement” (June)		Official letter of prohibition to return to Taiwan			
	The end of Martial Law (7/15)					
1988	The Homeward Movement (1988-1991)	President of UFAI (1988-1991)		The 1st Return (7/24)	The 1st Return with WFTA	The 1st Return (August)
	WFTA’s First Annual Conference in Taiwan (August)					
1989	Cheng Nan-Jung Self-Immolation	The 1st Return	Vice President of UFAI	The 2nd Return		
		Black Mask Incident (11/22)				
1990			Return to Taiwan			Referendum Promotion Association
1991	TIA Incident (5/9) Abolition the Act for the Control and Punishment of Rebellion (5/17)	The 2nd Return	Arrested (9/2)	Coalition of Taiwan Nation-building Movement	The 2nd Return: 12/10 Night for Human Right	Organizing the standing out event
	100 Action Alliance (September)	Arrested at the airport (8/30)				Arrested
1992	Revision of the Criminal Code Article 100 (May)	Released (5/16)	Released (5/16)	Arrested (2/8) Released (5/18)		Released (5/18)
	Removal of the Prohibition against Blacklisted returning to Taiwan (7/7)					
	WUFI officially returned to Taiwan (10/22)					

Mi-Ni Tzou | Academic Vitae

| mini.tzou@gmail.com

Education

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, U.S.A.

Graduation: May 2019

Bachelor of Arts in Sociology

Bachelor of Arts in Communication Arts and Sciences

- Schreyer Honors College, Honors in History
- Paterno Fellows Program

Presidential Leadership Academy

Fall 2016 – Spring 2019

- Accepted into the Academy's class of 30 out of 191 applications
- Participated in two-credit seminar classes with Penn State University President and discussed issues in higher education
- Created a robust policy paper on the mental health issue while participating in a course with Dean of the Schreyer Honors College
- Write weekly online journal on class discussion and outside class experiences through Penn State blogs
- Participate in field trips, meeting with leaders in areas such as Public Policy, Economy and National Security

Honors Thesis

Honors Thesis. Tzou, M. N. After the Martial Law Period: The Homeward Movement and Taiwan's Struggle for Democracy (1980-1992).

- Conduct an oral history of the Taiwanese leaders in World United Formosans for Independence, who organized the Homeward movement in the U.S. in order to fight against the KMT's dictatorship in the 1980s
- Argue that the formation of democracy in Taiwan is due to a series of events rather than only the abolition of Martial Law
- Interview 5 main activists, record and translate the transcripts, and study the history of Taiwan's democracy

Award and Grant

Sociology Student Marshal, the Pennsylvania State University, 2019.

- Selected as the student who exemplifies the qualities and characteristics of this degree program
- Represent all sociology graduates in Spring 2019 commencement.

Erickson Discovery Grant Recipient, the Pennsylvania State University, 2017.

- Awarded to 83 out of 219 students engaging in original research

Presentation

"Homeward Movement: A Return of Taiwan's Democratic Movement from the U.S. to Taiwan (1980-1992)." Paper presented at *the American Association of Chinese Studies Annual Conference*, Baltimore, MD, October 6, 2018.

"Fighting against Dictatorship: Taiwanese International Students in the U.S. (1980-1992)." Paper presented at *Undergraduate Exhibition*, the Pennsylvania State University, April 18, 2018.

Research and Leadership Experience

Research Assistant, the Association of Religion Data Archives (ARDA)

Spring 2018 – Spring 2019

- Use SPSS and create labels files from codebooks, to assist the graduate students in the Sociology and Criminology department working on projects
- Correct calculation mistakes on the demographic data of the population growth of religions in America
- Search on recent research citation on ARDA and test out new features on the website

Lead Facilitator, World in Conversation

Fall 2017

- Worked in the center for Public Diplomacy with the goal of “building greater understanding on contentious topics through dialogues”
- Facilitated 90-minute Western-Eastern Dialogues once a week, with 10 international and domestic students, to increase mutual understanding between different cultures
- Coordinated a course, *West-East Exchange*, containing 30 Chinese students, to help them reflect on their intercultural dialogues and build consciousness on current social issues
- Attended weekly meetings to evaluate the effectiveness and the quality of dialogues

Research Assistant, World in Conversation

Spring 2017

- Conducted an evaluation research on Western-Eastern Dialogues by designing and collecting survey, organizing focus group, and weekly in-depth observation, at the largest university-based cross-cultural dialogue program in the United States

Teaching Assistant, *Race and Ethnic Relations*, the Pennsylvania State University

Fall 2016

- Facilitated weekly dialogues of race, politics and religion with 3 different class sections of the largest Race Relations course in United States
- Participated in weekly 3-hour professional training of facilitating leadership skills such as Socratic inquiry, reflective listening, linking, asking open-ended questions
- Encouraged students to think outside of the box and collaborate with conflicts

Skills

-
- Proficient Language: English, Mandarin, Taiwanese
 - Basic Language: French, Japanese
 - Statistical Analysis: SPSS
 - Conflict Facilitating Skills

References

- ¹ Peng, M. M. (1973). *Political offences in Taiwan: laws and problems*. Akron L. Rev., 6, 163.
- ² Liu, C. Y. 劉建佑. (2005). *zhan hou tai wan yan lun pan luan chu zui hua de que li 戰後台灣言論叛亂除罪化的確立*. Taipei: Graduate Institute of National Development, NTU.
- ³ Zhang Yanxian 張炎憲, Zeng Qiumei 曾秋美, Chen Chaohai 陳朝海 (2005). *Zi jue yu ren tong: 1950-1990 hai wai Taiwan ren yun dong yan tao hui 自覺與認同: 1950-1990 年海外台灣人運動專輯*. Taipei City: Wu Sanlian Taiwan shi liao ji jin hui, 2005.
- ⁴ Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). *lu se nian dai : tai wan min zhu yun dong 25nian [xia ce] 綠色年代: 台灣民主運動25年[下冊]*. Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻) , 152-155.
- ⁵ Office of the President Republic of China (Taiwan). (2001). Retrieved from <https://english.president.gov.tw/NEWS/3725>
- ⁶ Hood, S. J. (1997). *The Kuomintang and the democratization of Taiwan*. Westview Press, 59.
- ⁷ Nathan A. J. & Ho H. V. S. (1993). Chiang Ching-kuo's Decision for Political Reform. *Chiang Ching-kuo's Leadership in the Development of the Republic of China on Taiwan*, 31.
- ⁸ Yeh, J. R. (1997). The cult of fatung: Representational manipulation and reconstruction in Taiwan. *The people's representatives: Electoral systems in the Asia-Pacific region*, 30.
- ⁹ Hsu, C. Y. (1993). Historical Setting for the Rise of Chiang Ching-kuo. *Chiang Ching-kuo's Leadership in the Development of the Republic of China on Taiwan*, 1-29.
- ¹⁰ Hao, S., & Gao, Q. (2016). East Asian Pathways Toward Democracy: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of "The Third Wave". *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 16(2), 239-260.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1017/jea.2016.2>
- ¹¹ Hood, S. J. (1997). *The Kuomintang and the democratization of Taiwan*. Westview Press, 78.

- ¹² Hood, S. J. (1997). *The Kuomintang and the democratization of Taiwan*. Westview Press, 79.
- ¹³ Hood, S. J. (1997). *The Kuomintang and the democratization of Taiwan*. Westview Press.
- ¹⁴ Hsu, C. Y. (1993). Historical Setting for the Rise of Chiang Ching-kuo. *Chiang Ching-kuo's Leadership in the Development of the Republic of China on Taiwan*, 17.
- ¹⁵ Copper, J. F. (1987). Taiwan in 1986: Back on Top again. *Asian Survey*, 27(1), 81-91; Hsu, C. Y. (1993). Historical Setting for the Rise of Chiang Ching-kuo. *Chiang Ching-kuo's Leadership in the Development of the Republic of China on Taiwan*, 17.
- ¹⁶ Yeh, J. R. (2002). Constitutional reform and democratization in Taiwan: 1945-2000. *Taiwan's modernization in global perspective*, 47-77.
- ¹⁷ Hood, S. J. (1997). *The Kuomintang and the democratization of Taiwan*. Westview Press.
- ¹⁸ Huang, Z. (2008). *The Confirmation of the Taiwanese National Sovereignty: from De Facto toward De Jure*. Taipei: xian dai wen hua ji jin hui, 22.
- ¹⁹ See General Order No.1 I. (a). Office of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, 1945.
- ²⁰ See Treaty of Peace to Japan Article 2 (b), 1951.
- ²¹ Mendel, D. (1970). *The politics of Formosan nationalism*. University of California Press, 172.
- ²² "The Cairo Declaration," November 26, 1943, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers, The Conferences at Cairo and Tehran, 1943 (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1961), 448-449.
<https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/122101>
- ²³ San Francisco Peace Treaty, Article 2 (b), signed in 1951; Treaty of Taipei, signed in 1952.
- ²⁴ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 258-260.
- ²⁵ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 212-213.

- ²⁶ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 27.
- ²⁷ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 214.
- ²⁸ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 216.
- ²⁹ Mendel, D. (1970). *The politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 28-30.
- ³⁰ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 27.
- ³¹ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 23.
- ³² Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 215.
- ³³ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 28-29.
- ³⁴ Lee W. H. (2006). The Conflicts between Taiwan Provincial Government and Inspectorate General of Customs Taiwan Office during 1945-1947. *Taiwan Historical Research*, 13 (1).
- ³⁵ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 30.
- ³⁶ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 27; Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 214.
- ³⁷ Brown, M. J. (2004), *Is Taiwan Chinese? The impact of culture, power, and immigration on changing identities*. London: University of California Press, 237; Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 21.
- ³⁸ Mendel, D. (1970). *The Politics of Formosan Nationalism*. University of California Press, 27.
- ³⁹ Brown, M. J. (2004), *Is Taiwan Chinese? The impact of culture, power, and immigration on changing identities*. London: University of California Press, 9.

- ⁴⁰ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 220; *The Taiwan Shin Sheng Daily News* (1947, April 1).
- ⁴¹ Brown, M. J. (2004), *Is Taiwan Chinese? The impact of culture, power, and immigration on changing identities*. London: University of California Press, 9.
- ⁴² Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 222.
- ⁴³ Brown, M. J. (2004), *Is Taiwan Chinese? The impact of culture, power, and immigration on changing identities*. London: University of California Press, 9.
- ⁴⁴ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 228.
- ⁴⁵ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 228.
- ⁴⁶ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 228.
- ⁴⁷ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 245.
- ⁴⁸ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 246.
- ⁴⁹ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 231-246.
- ⁵⁰ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 236.
- ⁵¹ Chen Y. Q. 陳昱齊. (2012). *Guomindang zhengfu dui Meiguo Taiwan duli yundong zhi yinying 國民黨政府對美國台灣獨立運動之因應 (1961-1972) [Strategy of the KMT government on Taiwan*

independence movement in the United States (1961-1972)]. Taipei: Graduate Institute of Taiwan History, NCCU.

⁵² Chen Y. Q. 陳昱齊. (2012). *Guomindang zhengfu dui Meiguo Taiwan duli yundong zhi yinying 國民黨政府對美國台灣獨立運動之因應 (1961-1972) [Strategy of the KMT government on Taiwan independence movement in the United States (1961-1972)]*. Taipei: Graduate Institute of Taiwan History, NCCU.

⁵³ Chen Y. Q. 陳昱齊. (2012). *Guomindang zhengfu dui Meiguo Taiwan duli yundong zhi yinying 國民黨政府對美國台灣獨立運動之因應 (1961-1972) [Strategy of the KMT government on Taiwan independence movement in the United States (1961-1972)]*. Taipei: Graduate Institute of Taiwan History, NCCU, 58-77.

⁵⁴ Tseng T. H. 曾咨翔 (2010). *The international status of Taiwan and China government-in-exile 台灣國際地位與中國流亡政府*. Taipei: Graduate Institute of Taiwan History, NCCU; Diao M. P. 刁曼蓬 (2012). tui xiao guo min dang 推銷國民黨 [Promote the KMT]. *CommonWealth Magazine*, 105. Retrieved from <https://www.cw.com.tw/index.php/article/article.action?id=5038025>

⁵⁵ Chen Y. Q. 陳昱齊. (2012). *Guomindang zhengfu dui Meiguo Taiwan duli yundong zhi yinying 國民黨政府對美國台灣獨立運動之因應 (1961-1972) [Strategy of the KMT government on Taiwan independence movement in the United States (1961-1972)]*. Taipei: Graduate Institute of Taiwan History, NCCU, 100-144.

⁵⁶ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

⁵⁷ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

⁵⁸ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

- ⁵⁹ Li Y. Y. (2002). ren sheng de jing tan hao. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 2002, 69.
- ⁶⁰ Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- ⁶¹ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 303.
- ⁶² Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 303.
- ⁶³ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ⁶⁴ Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- ⁶⁵ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ⁶⁶ Ong, L. (2015). *Taiwan: A History of Agonies* (M. Ong, Ed.; Y. Shimamura, Trans.). Taipei: Avanguard Publishing House, 304.
- ⁶⁷ Wecht, C. H., Curriden, M., & Wecht, B. (1996). *Grave Secrets: a Leading Forensic Expert Reveals the Startling Truth About OJ Simpson, David Koresh, Vincent Foster, and Other Sensational Cases*. (Huang Yi trans.) EP Dutton. Retrieved from:
http://www.cwcmf.org.tw/the%20truth/wecht_1.pdf
- ⁶⁸ “Taiwanese spies in U.S. Universities” (1976, March 15), *The Daily California*.
- ⁶⁹ “Taiwanese spies in U.S. Universities” (1976, March 15), *The Daily California*.
- ⁷⁰ Hsu C. J. 許建榮 (2009). Surveillance on Overseas Taiwanese Students under the KMT’s Administration: A Case Study in the United States 國府統治時期對海外留學生的監控－以美國為例. *Taiwan Studies in Literature and History* (1), 262.
- ⁷¹ “U.S. Foreign Student vs. Government Spies” (1977, April 25). *Monday*

- ⁷² Hsu C. J. 許建榮 (2009). Surveillance on Overseas Taiwanese Students under the KMT's Administration: A Case Study in the United States 國府統治時期對海外留學生的監控－以美國為例. *Taiwan Studies in Literature and History* (1), 264.
- ⁷³ Hsu C. J. 許建榮 (2009). Surveillance on Overseas Taiwanese Students under the KMT's Administration: A Case Study in the United States 國府統治時期對海外留學生的監控－以美國為例. *Taiwan Studies in Literature and History* (1), 261.
- ⁷⁴ Hsu C. J. 許建榮 (2009). Surveillance on Overseas Taiwanese Students under the KMT's Administration: A Case Study in the United States 國府統治時期對海外留學生的監控－以美國為例. *Taiwan Studies in Literature and History* (1), 259.
- ⁷⁵ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ⁷⁶ McInnis D. & Berman J. (1983, January 6) Dispute about homeland puts Taiwanese in Court, *News and the Observer*.
- ⁷⁷ Price D. (1983, January 6) Chinese Students Convicted. *The Raleigh Time*.
- ⁷⁸ McInnis D. & Berman J. (1983, January 6) Dispute about homeland puts Taiwanese in Court, *News and the Observer*.
- ⁷⁹ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ⁸⁰ Chen W. J. 陳婉真 (2016). ci ke bing tuan —424ci jiang shi jian guan xi ren ce xie 刺客兵團－424 刺蔣事件關係人側寫. *Taiwan People News*. Retrieved February 18, 2019, from <https://www.peoplenews.tw/news/6c040763-bc42-4445-b878-8a5f8acf962c>
- ⁸¹ Zhang Y. X. 張炎憲, Zeng Q. M. 曾秋美, & Chen C. H. 陳朝海 (2005). *Zi jue yu ren tong, 1950-1990 hai wai Taiwan ren yun dong yan tao hui* 自覺與認同: 1950-1990 年海外台灣人運動專輯. Taipei City: Wu Sanlian Taiwan shi liao ji jin hui, 97-101; Chen M. C. 陳銘城 & Shi Z. F.

施正鋒 (2000). *Taiwan du li jian guo lian meng de gu shi* = *A history of World United Formosans for Independence*. 台灣獨立建國聯盟的故事=A History of World United Formosans for Independence. Taipei City: Qian wei chu ban she, 46-47.

⁸² Zhang Y. X. 張炎憲, Zeng Q. M. 曾秋美, & Chen C. H. 陳朝海 (2005). *Zi jue yu ren tong, 1950-1990 hai wai Taiwan ren yun dong yan tao hui* 自覺與認同: 1950-1990 年海外台灣人運動專輯. Taipei City: Wu Sanlian Taiwan shi liao ji jin hui, 78.

⁸³ Zhang Y. X. 張炎憲, Zeng Q. M. 曾秋美, & Chen C. H. 陳朝海 (2005). *Zi jue yu ren tong, 1950-1990 hai wai Taiwan ren yun dong yan tao hui* 自覺與認同: 1950-1990 年海外台灣人運動專輯. Taipei City: Wu Sanlian Taiwan shi liao ji jin hui, 103

⁸⁴ Oral Interview with Mao Qing-Fen; July 25, 2017.

⁸⁵ Yang Y. X. 楊遠薰 (n.d.) *luo fu quan yu mao qing fen hui shou lai shi lu* 羅福全與毛清芬 回首來時路. Retrieved from <https://www.tahistory.org/> 羅福全與毛清芬-回首來時路-◎-楊遠薰/ on October, 22, 2018.

⁸⁶ Hsu C. J. 許建榮 (2009). Surveillance on Overseas Taiwanese Students under the KMT's Administration: A Case Study in the United States 國府統治時期對海外留學生的監控—以美國為例. *Taiwan Studies in Literature and History* (1), 247-251.

⁸⁷ Sifa Yuan Dafaguan Jieshi No. 454 (司法院大法官解釋第 454 號解釋) [Judicial Yuan Interpretation No. 454] (May 22, 1998) (Taiwan).

⁸⁸ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.

⁸⁹ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

⁹⁰ Oral Interview with Mao Qing-Fen; July 25; 2017.

⁹¹ Oral Interview with Mao Qing-Fen; July 25, 2017.

- ⁹² Li Y. Y. (1990). li ying yuan de tiao zhan 李應元的挑戰 [Li Yingyuan's challenge]. Taiwan: Avanguard Publishing House, 1990, 131-132.
- ⁹³ Li Y. Y. (2002). ren sheng de jing tan hao. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 2002, 20.
- ⁹⁴ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ⁹⁵ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ⁹⁶ Oral interview with Mao Qing-Feng; July 25, 2017.
- ⁹⁷ Li Y. Y. (2002). ren sheng de jing tan hao. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 56.
- ⁹⁸ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ⁹⁹ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ¹⁰⁰ Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). *lu se nian dai : tai wan min zhu yun dong 25nian [shang ce]* 綠色年代: 台灣民主運動25年 [上冊]. Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻), 233.
- ¹⁰¹ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹⁰² Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). *lu se nian dai : tai wan min zhu yun dong 25nian [xia ce]* 綠色年代: 台灣民主運動25年 [下冊]. Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻), 75.
- ¹⁰³ Oral Interview with Chen Wen Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ¹⁰⁴ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹⁰⁵ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹⁰⁶ Chen L. 陳隆, Chen T. F. 陳錦芳, & Lu R. J. 盧榮杰 (2003) shi jie tai wan tong xiang hui lian he hui (shi tai hui) jian shi 世界台灣同鄉會聯合會 (世台會) 簡史. *di shi san jie shi tai hui nian hui shou ce* 第十三屆世台會年會手冊. London.

¹⁰⁷ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.

¹⁰⁸ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

¹⁰⁹ Chiu Wan-hsing 邱萬興 (2016) hai wai hei ming dan chuang guan hui tai de gu shi 海外黑名單闖關回台的故事. *Taiwan People News*. Retrieved January 22, 2019, from <https://www.peoplenews.tw/news/3396e363-8671-49f0-b95c-42d514b9fd40>

¹¹⁰ Oral Interview with Mao Qing-Fen; July 25, 2017.

¹¹¹ Li J. R. 李錦容 (2003). *tai wan nu ying xiong chen cui yu* 台灣女英雄陳翠玉. Taiwan: Avanguard Publishing House, 8.

¹¹² Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). *lu se nian dai: tai wan min zhu yun dong 25 nian* [xia ce] 綠色年代: 台灣民主運動 25 年 [下冊]. Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻), 42.

¹¹³ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.

¹¹⁴ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.

¹¹⁵ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.

¹¹⁶ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.

¹¹⁷ Chiu Wan-hsing 邱萬興 (2016) hai wai hei ming dan chuang guan hui tai de gu shi 海外黑名單闖關回台的故事. *Taiwan People News*. Retrieved January 22, 2019, from <https://www.peoplenews.tw/news/3396e363-8671-49f0-b95c-42d514b9fd40>

¹¹⁸ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

¹¹⁹ Chiu Wan-hsing 邱萬興 (2016) hai wai hei ming dan chuang guan hui tai de gu shi 海外黑名單闖關回台的故事. *Taiwan People News*. Retrieved January 22, 2019, from <https://www.peoplenews.tw/news/3396e363-8671-49f0-b95c-42d514b9fd40>

¹²⁰ Oral interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

¹²¹ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

- ¹²² Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; August 14, 2017.
- ¹²³ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹²⁴ Li Y. Y. (2002). *ren sheng de jing tan hao*. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 2002.
- ¹²⁵ Li Y. Y. (2002). *ren sheng de jing tan hao*. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 2002.
- ¹²⁶ Oral Interview with Mao Qing-Fen; July 25, 2017.
- ¹²⁷ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹²⁸ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹²⁹ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹³⁰ Lin S. B. 林雙不. (1981). *pan wang* 盼望 [Hope], *ba shi nian dai magazine* 八十年代雜誌 [The eighties].
- ¹³¹ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹³² Li Y. Y. (2002). *ren sheng de jing tan hao*. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 2002.
- ¹³³ Li Y. Y. (2002). *ren sheng de jing tan hao*. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life]. Taiwan: ren wu.
- ¹³⁴ Li Y. Y. (2002). *ren sheng de jing tan hao*. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life]. Taiwan: ren wu.
- ¹³⁵ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹³⁶ Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- ¹³⁷ Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- ¹³⁸ Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.

- 139 Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). *lu se nian dai : tai wan min zhu yun dong 25nian [xia ce]* 綠色年代: 台灣民主運動25年[下冊]. Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻), 138.
- 140 Ou S. Y., Lin C. H., & Huang H. Y. (2014). *hai wai hei ming dan xiang guan ren wu kou shu fang tan lu* 海外黑名單相關人物口述訪談錄. Taipei: Academia Historica, 300.
- 141 Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- 142 Ou S. Y., Lin C. H., & Huang H. Y. (2014). *hai wai hei ming dan xiang guan ren wu kou shu fang tan lu* 海外黑名單相關人物口述訪談錄. Taipei: Academia Historica, 303.
- 143 Ou S. Y., Lin C. H., & Huang H. Y. (2014). *hai wai hei ming dan xiang guan ren wu kou shu fang tan lu* 海外黑名單相關人物口述訪談錄. Taipei: Academia Historica, 301-309; Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). *lu se nian dai : tai wan min zhu yun dong 25nian [xia ce]* (綠色年代: 台灣民主運動25年[下冊]). Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻), 139.
- 144 Ou S. Y., Lin C. H., & Huang H. Y. (2014). *hai wai hei ming dan xiang guan ren wu kou shu fang tan lu* 海外黑名單相關人物口述訪談錄. Taipei: Academia Historica, 308-309.
- 145 Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- 146 Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- 147 Oral interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- 148 Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- 149 Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- 150 Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- 151 Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- 152 Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- 153 Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- 154 Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.

- ¹⁵⁵ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹⁵⁶ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹⁵⁷ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹⁵⁸ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ¹⁵⁹ Oral Interview with Tzou Bukam; July 14, 2017.
- ¹⁶⁰ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan.
- ¹⁶¹ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 4.
- ¹⁶² Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 3-4.
- ¹⁶³ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 5.
- ¹⁶⁴ Zhang F. Z. 張富忠 and Qiu W. X. 邱萬興 (2005). lu se nian dai : tai wan min zhu yun dong 25nian [xia ce] (綠色年代: 台灣民主運動25年[下冊]). Taipei: INK yin ke (INK 印刻), 146.
- ¹⁶⁵ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 6.
- ¹⁶⁶ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 6.
- ¹⁶⁷ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). 100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由 [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 6-7.

- ¹⁶⁸ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). *100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由* [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 6-7.
- ¹⁶⁹ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). *100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由* [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 12-13.
- ¹⁷⁰ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹⁷¹ Zhang, Y., & Chen, F. (2008). *100 xing dong lian meng yu yan lun zi you. 100 行動聯盟與言論自由* [100 Action Alliance and Freedom of Speech]. Taipei: Guo shi guan, 12-13.
- ¹⁷² Zhonghua Minguo Xing Fa (中華民國刑法) [Criminal Code]§100.
- ¹⁷³ Oral Interview with Li Ying-Yuan; July 10, 2017.
- ¹⁷⁴ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ¹⁷⁵ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ¹⁷⁶ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹⁷⁷ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹⁷⁸ Oral Interview with Chen Wen-Jen; July 24, 2017.
- ¹⁷⁹ Li Y. Y. (2002). ren sheng de jing tan hao. 人生的驚嘆號 [The exclamation mark of life] Taiwan: ren wu, 2002, 70-72.
- ¹⁸⁰ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹⁸¹ Oral Interview with Kuo Bei-Hong; June 20, 2017.
- ¹⁸² Zhang Y. X. 張炎憲, Zeng Q. M. 曾秋美, Chen C. H. 陳朝海 (2005). *Zi jue yu ren tong, 1950-1990 hai wai Taiwan ren yun dong yan tao hui 自覺與認同: 1950-1990 年海外台灣人運動專輯*. Taipei City: Wu Sanlian Taiwan shi liao ji jin hui, 2005, 97-101