ANCHOR 2: Our production team made a short film clip to introduce the subject of military occupation to our audience. Let’s watch that now.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

ANCHOR 1: So, we can firmly establish that Taiwan was **not** returned to China in late October 1945. That date only marks the beginning of the military occupation, and international law states that “military occupation does not transfer sovereignty.”

台灣

However, the websites of many of the leading think-tanks take it for granted that the territorial sovereignty of Taiwan was returned to China in 1945, and then base all of their analysis on that premise.

ANCHOR 2: Yes, we commonly see the statement that the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and the Republic of China (ROC) split amid civil war in 1949, with the ROC taking refuge in the Chinese province of Taiwan. So, this is supposed to have created a condition of “Two Chinas.”

中華民國和中華人民共和國

ANCHOR 3: But for Taiwan, we can extrapolate from this table of the Spanish American War cessions. We quickly see that the original sovereign (which was Japan) held sovereignty until the peace treaty came into effect, which would be April 28, 1952. So, in 1949, Taiwan was still sovereign Japanese territory.

割讓區

ANCHOR 4: So, this means that in late 1949, when the ROC moved its central government to occupied Taiwan, it was moving ***outside*** of China’s national territory. At that point, it immediately became a government in exile. Legally speaking, there is no way to interpret this as “Two Chinas,” because the ROC is neither a legitimate government for mainland China, nor for Taiwan.

1949年底

ANCHOR 2: Also, there is no way to interpret this in a manner which holds that China is a “divided nation.” This is because the so-called Republic of China government is located ***outside*** of China’s national territory.

ANCHOR 3: Nevertheless, despite all of these arguments, the question that always arises is: Does the ROC on Taiwan meet the international legal criteria for statehood?

Please stay tuned for our continuing coverage in Part 2.

End of Part 1
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CIA ANALYSIS: The Republic of China on Taiwan does not meet the qualifying criteria for statehood

中央情報局的分析：在台灣的中華民國

ANCHOR 1: We have produced a short film clip which reviews the history of Taiwan and offers a new perspective for discussing the Republic of China’s qualifying criteria for “statehood” under international law.
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ANCHOR 3: Many people are confused about this topic, and many websites of the leading think-tanks in the United States and other countries also contain much incorrect or misleading information. Let’s look at our next film clip.

很多人都搞不清楚這個話題

|  |
| --- |
|  |

ANCHOR 2: Military occupation is conducted under “military government.” Are there any other areas which were confirmed to be under United States Military Government (USMG) jurisdiction as a result of WWII in the Pacific?

ANCHOR 4: Yes, the Ryukyu island group is one specific example. United States Military Government jurisdiction over the Ryukyus and Taiwan are both confirmed by Article 4(b) of the treaty. Based on the records of military attacks on the Ryukyus and Taiwan in the WWII period, this is what we would expect.

琉球群島

ANCHOR 5: Did the Republic of China gain any rights to jurisdiction over Taiwan under the terms of the treaty?

ANCHOR 4: No, none.

ANCHOR 5: Has there been any end to USMG jurisdiction over these areas?

ANCHOR 1: Well, for the Ryukyu island group, the U.S. Commander in Chief Richard Nixon announced the end of USMG jurisdiction effective May 15, 1972. However, for Taiwan, no U.S. President has made any similar announcement.

ANCHOR 5: So, in the current era, the United States has continued to delegate the military occupation of Taiwan to the Republic of China, which is to say the Chinese Nationalists.

ANCHOR 4: That is correct. 這個說法是正確的。

ANCHOR 3: So, a correct assertion of Taiwan’s international legal position is to say that it is an overseas territory of the United States under military government. However, the administrative authority for day-to-day management tasks has been delegated to the Chinese Nationalists.

ANCHOR 1: Yes. In closing today, what is important for us to realize is this:

The solution to Taiwan’s problems must be found in Washington D.C., it will not be found in Taiwan.

End of Part 2