

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Taiwan Strait is one of the most dangerous military flashpoints in the world and the most complex and challenging future foreign policy issue facing the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. Considering the severity of the situation and the powers involved, the US and China which both possess nuclear weapons, it is certainly more important than the current situation regarding North Korean and Iranian nuclear proliferations. The US policy towards Taiwan has been considered a strategic signifier of how the US wants to interact with China and the principle of US strategy in Asia.

Under the Bush administration during both first and second terms, there was a major policy adjustment to Taiwan according to a changing international situation. As the US was the dominant power in Asia as well as the world, any changes in US policy towards Taiwan, inevitably affected security and stability in the region. It is interesting and important for the study of international relations to study changes in US policy and the impact of international environment, including; threats of international terrorism, nuclear proliferation and also the rise of China, on the formulation of foreign policy in order to understand the tendency of US policy to alter in response to a changing situation.

A. Background and Significance of Issue

In 1949, the Republic of China under President Chiang Kai-shek lost the civil war, defeated by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) headed Chairman Mao Zedong, he decided to retreat to establish the provisional government on Taiwan, an island off the south China coast. On the mainland, the CCP Chairman Mao Zedong announced the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) without the recognition from the international community and the United States. The ROC government on Taiwan continued to exist and was recognized as the only legitimate government of China in the UN throughout the 1950's and 1960's.¹ At that time, the ROC government had the US's political, economic and military support and one day hoped that it would retake the mainland.

However, in the early 1970's several strategic changes occurred. The PRC-Soviet conflict and the clash over Ussuri River in 1969 provided China contact the US to counterbalance the Soviets. The PRC believed that improved relations with the US would be essential to guarantee the PRC security after the conflict with the Soviet Union. For the US, it saw contact with the PRC as a means of hindering Soviet power and hoped that the PRC could help the US end the Vietnam War. The first step of contact was known as "ping-pong diplomacy" which was the invitation to China of a US table tennis team by Zhou Enlai, the PRC premier, to be followed by the secret talks of Henry Kissinger, National Security Advisor of US President Richard M. Nixon.

¹ Alan P. Dobson and Steve Marsh, *US Foreign Policy since 1945* (London: Routledge, 2001), p. 78.

In February 1972, President Nixon made a historic trip to China marking the first time a US president had visited the PRC. During the trip, the US and Chinese governments issued the Shanghai Communiqué, acknowledging the “One-China policy” and the US affirmed its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue. Diplomatic relations between both countries were established on January 1, 1979 and the US switched the recognition to the PRC as the official government ruling China and acknowledged the One-China principle that there is one China and Taiwan is an inalienable part of China. The 1979 Normalization Communiqué further stated that the Taiwan situation is to be settled by the Chinese themselves and set forth the limits to US engagement with the island, including renouncement the bilateral defense treaty, withdrawal of formal diplomatic recognition.²

However, the US congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA) in 1979 mandating the US to continue unofficial relations with Taiwan so that Taiwan could remain independent. The US under President Reagan provided the “Six Assurances” to the government of Taiwan in order to promote the US commitment to Taiwan’s sovereignty and the rights to purchase advanced arms from the US which is contradictory to the 1982 Joint Communiqué between the US and China that the US “intends to reduce gradually its sales of arms to Taiwan...”³ Nonetheless, the US has never ceased arms sales to Taiwan and hence it become the major source of China-US friction and conflict.

The US, however, has sought to preserve its interests in both China and Taiwan

² Martin L. Lasater, *Policy in Evolution: The US Role in China’s Reunification* (Colorado: Westview Press, 1989), pp. 34-35.

³ Martin L. Lasater, *The Changing of Guard: President Clinton and the Security of Taiwan* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), p. 226.

through a balanced “dual track” policy of maintaining cordial official relationship with China and cordial unofficial relationship with Taiwan. According to the TRA and the Six Assurances, the US is bound to defend Taiwan from China’s coercion but the US still has to adhere to the One-China policy regarding to the three joint Communiqués. Under these conditions, the US has faced a dilemma over the Taiwan Strait in preventing both China and Taiwan from taking unilateral action towards their goals which are reunification for mainland China; and independence for Taiwan. Therefore, the US has pursued a policy of “strategic ambiguity” requiring the US to remain unclear about how it would respond to a Chinese military attack on Taiwan.⁴

Nevertheless, there was a dramatic change in US foreign policy towards Taiwan and China since President George W. Bush had assumed the office. The Bush administration appeared to abandon the long-standing US position of strategic ambiguity and pursued a strategic clarity policy in favor of Taiwan’s defense. In addition to approving the second-largest US weapons sale package to Taiwan, President Bush also publicly stated that the United States would do “whatever it takes” to defend Taiwan, indicating a position more supportive of Taiwan than previous the US presidents.

However, after the attacks of September 11, 2001,⁵ the war against terrorism provided some space for the tense relationship between the US and China originated by the EP-3 spy plane incident and President Bush’s statement of defending Taiwan at all

⁴ Philip Yang, “Doubly Dualistic Dilemma: US Strategies towards China and Taiwan,” *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 6, no. 2 (August 2006): 209-225.

⁵ The massive terrorist attack on the United States in which two hijacked airliners were flown into the World Trade Center in New York City and another into the Pentagon, resulting in thousands of death, the collapse of the World Trade Center's twin towers and surrounding buildings, and part of the Pentagon building.

costs in April 2001. The US-China cooperation on counter terrorism efforts contributed to an improvement in bilateral relations. The Bush administration saw a constructive tie with China as an important tool in combating international terrorism and in resolving the North Korean nuclear issue. Besides, the US was not ready to confront China over Taiwan and to fight against terrorism at the same time. Subsequently, the balance of power in the Taiwan Strait had shifted in China's favor since September 2001 and continued in to Bush's second term.

Under the Bush administration's first and second terms, there had been new developments in the international environment, including the war in Iraq; the nuclear crisis in North Korea; anti-terrorism coalition building in world politics; Taiwan's movement towards independence; and problems between the Bush and Chen administrations, which had enormous impact on US foreign policy towards Taiwan and the across-Strait relations and also the security framework in East Asia. Therefore, it is necessary to deepen our understanding of the trends of the US foreign policy and future directions of international relations in the Asia-Pacific. This thesis aims to study the adjustment of US foreign policy and to analyze factors influencing US foreign policy making under the Bush administration, the ideas that generated US policy decisions towards Taiwan and the US-Taiwan-China triangular relationship, and also other factors influencing US Taiwan policy by focusing on domestic factors as well as international environment, especially China's influence.

B. Objectives of Study

1. To study the US foreign policy towards Taiwan under the George W. Bush administration.
2. To identify the major objective of US policy towards Taiwan under the George W. Bush administration?
3. To analyze internal and external factors that influence US policy making towards Taiwan.
3. To examine the impacts of the US-China relations on US policy towards Taiwan.

C. Research Questions

1. What is the US policy towards Taiwan under the George W. Bush administration?
2. What is the major objective of US policy towards Taiwan under the George W. Bush administration?
3. What are the important factors that influence US policy making towards Taiwan?
4. What are the impacts of the US-China relations on US policy towards Taiwan?

D. Scope of Analysis

The research focuses on U.S. foreign policy under the George W. Bush administration towards Taiwan since the Bush administration first assumed office in January 2001 and continued on the second term (2005 to 2009). In order to analyze US policy towards Taiwan, the role of China can not be ignored as most of all nations recognize the PRC as the sole legitimate government of China and Taiwan is an inalienable part of China. Any policy of US towards Taiwan especially in self-defense that may facilitate Taiwan; independence has had directly impact on China. In this regard, an in-depth analysis of the US-China-Taiwan Triangular relations needs to be considered.

E. Analytical Framework

Since the Bush administration assumed office in 2001, there had been a major change in US foreign policy towards Taiwan influenced by new international challenges and US domestic politics in which there were linkages between domestic or national environment and international environment had to be considered in order to understand the change. Moreover, from the implementation of US Taiwan policy, contest among US domestic actors who generate foreign policy are also issued as a result of conflict over US national interest by which it directly affected US policy makers in conducting policy towards Taiwan. Therefore, there are two frameworks proposed in this research, one is

based on James N. Rosenau's "Linkage Politics" and another is mainly regarded to "National Interest" by Hans J. Morgenthau. These two frameworks would help analyze US policy towards Taiwan under the Bush administration with appropriate understanding.

1. National Interest

In the study of international relations, in order to answer the questions of behaviors of states, states' policies towards others, and also the goals and aims of the governments which pursue policies, the term "national interest" has traditionally been used to describe the goals and objectives of states' policies. The word "interest" derives from the Latin, meaning "it concerns, it makes a difference to, it is important with reference to some person or thing."⁶

However, there still has been the problem of the definition of national interest. Some observers have tried to define the national interest by considering the policy output of the state, believing the national interest actually guided and motivated the development of foreign policy. Many scholars defined the national interest as survival (self-preservation), security, prosperity, and prestige of the state. Nonetheless, there was still criticism of the concept of the national interest that it was too broad and too general. Therefore, Hans J. Morgenthau, the contemporary scholar most closely connected with the concept of the national interest, tried to provide a specific meaning to the concept of

⁶ Fred A. Sondermann, "The Concept of National Interest," *Orbis: A Journal of World Affairs* 21, no.1 (Spring 1977): 121-138.

the national interest. According to Morgenthau, “*the survival of a political unit...in its identity*” is the irreducible minimum of a state’s interest vis-à-vis other units, encompassing the integrity of a state’s territory, its political institutions, and its culture.” In practical term, this is correct as statesmen normally assume that the survival of the state over which they preside is the supreme national interest.⁷

Moreover, in order to narrow the concept of national interest, Morgenthau further affirmed that the national interest could be ascertained as well as advanced by the possession of power.⁸ Consequently, it led to the determination of power that Morgenthau defined power as anything that allows one state to establish and maintain control over another; therefore, it is in the interest of all states to acquire power.⁹ If the states make power a goal of foreign policy, the states can utilize gained power to protect and preserve their national interests. To Morgenthau, the national interest also depends upon the political and cultural context within which foreign policy is formulated.¹⁰

Besides Morgenthau, some scholars have also connected the national interest with the values, held by the people of the state. Robert Osgood stated that “National interest is understood to mean a state of affairs valued solely for its benefit to the nation...,” however, the definition of values, again, became the problem. Values, which are variant, often derived from past interaction of geographical, economic, demographic, racial and

⁷ P. A. Reynolds, *An Introduction to International Relations* (New York: Longman Publishing Group, 1994), p. 49.

⁸ Sondermann, pp. 121-138.

⁹ Daniel S. Papp, *American Foreign Policy: History, Politics and Policy* (New Jersey: Pearson Education, 2005), p. 43.

¹⁰ Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973), pp. 8-9.

socio-political influences. But not every value is equally important. Hopes, wishes, aspirations and dreams are not the same as practical and concrete interests such as survival or security of state. They would not be always reflected in the policy of states and their governments.¹¹

Different scholars built the hierarchy of interests differently. In regard to Osgood, the state's survival or self-preservation was at the top of the national interest because everything else would clearly depend on the achievement of this goal. Osgood also defined survival in terms of territorial integrity, political independence, and maintenance of fundamental governmental institutions. John Chase suggested this sequence of interests:

- (1) to deprive potential aggressors of bases from which they might launch attacks against the United States;
- (2) to support self-government and democracy abroad;
- (3) to protect and advance commerce; and
- (4) to help establish and maintain a favorable world balance of power.¹²

Nevertheless, Alexander L. George and Robert Keohane gave a contradictory interpretation of the concept of the national interest, they wrote about the three “irreducible” national interests: *physical survival* - by which they meant the survival of people, not necessarily the preservation of territory or sovereignty; *liberty* - by which they meant the ability of inhabitants of a country to choose their form of government and

¹¹ Papp, pp. 45-47.

¹² William C. Olson, David S. McLellan and Fred A. Sondermann, *The Theory and Practice of International Relations* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1983), p. 58.

to exercise a set of individual rights defined by law and protected by state; and *economic subsistence* - the maximization of economic welfare.¹³

Furthermore, according to Fred A. Sondermann, the national interest of one country must correspond to the national interest of other states. He wrote that “*Given the international context, given the continuing need to conduct foreign policy, to frame goals and to seek to achieve them, three qualities—modesty, restraint, and openness to change—should be cultivated by decision-makers, observers, and citizens alike:*

“modesty” means that one can know what is best for others—indeed, sometimes what is best for oneself; “restraint” in the assertion of one’s own interests (personal, organizational, group or national) as against those of others. Openness can mean two things: (1) a willingness to accept national self-interest as a fact without accepting it is as a norm; (2) a willingness to entertain alternative forms of the national interest and national policy.”

Morgenthau also earlier stated that “...the national interest of a nation...must be defined in terms compatible with [the interests of other nations].” George and Keohane, though holding other views on the concept of national interests, gave a preference to “self-regarding” instead of “other-regarding” and “collective” interests.¹⁴

¹³ Sondermann, pp. 121-138.

¹⁴ Ibid.

2. Linkage Politics

In regard to the framework of James N. Rosenau, linkage politics establishes a connection between the domestic setting of a nation and the resultant external behavior. In other words, while it is accepted that domestic politics can explain foreign policy, linkage politics stresses the need to explore the extent to which domestic is influenced by external environment and vice versa. Rosenau expressed the advantage of the linkage approach that it attempts to combine the influence of international constraints and domestic determinants as policy inputs to explain a country's foreign policy.

A linkage can be defined as any recurrent sequence of behavior that originates in the system and is reacted to in another. In order to distinguish between the initial and the terminal stages of a linkage, Rosenau referred to the former as an output and to the latter as an input. The linkage stages are differentiated according to their origin within the state or within its external environment. If the behavior sequences are deliberately created, the outputs and inputs are "direct," and if the patterns are unintentional the outputs and inputs are "indirect." Also an output can originate in the national political system or its environment. The concept of linkage politics also emphasizes on recurrent behavior in which outputs, inputs, and the linkages would not be conceived to be single events or the linkage scheme does not relate to isolated phenomena.¹⁵

To Rosenau, the interactions and linkages between national and international environments can be identified as being "penetrative," "reactive," "emulative" or fused in

¹⁵ James N. Rosenau, ed., *Linkage Politics: Essays on the Convergence of National and International Systems* (New York: The Free Press, 1969), pp. 44-46.

structure.

The “penetrative linkage” characterized as the direct participation or influence of the external and domestic environment in the foreign policy decision-making process of a country or the participation of members of one polity in the political processes of another.

The “reactive linkage,” the contrary of a penetrative one, results from boundary crossing without direct participation made within the unit (state). The actors who initiate the output do not participate in the allocative activities of those who experience the input, but the behavior of the input is a response to behavior undertaken by the output. The reactive processes are probable the most frequent form of linkage that was applied to analyze foreign policy, since they arise out of the joining of both direct and indirect outputs to their corresponding inputs.

The “emulative linkage” is a foreign policy respond similar to the action that initiates it. An emulative process is established when the input is not only a response to the output but takes especially the same form as the output.¹⁶

Fused linkages constitute a situation in which certain outputs and inputs continuously reinforce each other. Thus, a fused linkage is one in which the pattern sequence of behavior does not terminate with the input. As Rosenau stated, “a fused linkage is conceived to be a sequence in which an output fosters an input that in turn fosters an output in such a way that they cannot meaningfully be analyzed separately.”¹⁷

Rosenau also categorized internal factors (Polity Environment) and external factors (International Environment) which might give rise to foreign policy outputs and

¹⁶ Rosenau, pp. 46-47.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 49.

inputs as follows:

Internal Factors: separated into four main divisions, each of them including other subdivisions

1. Actors

1.1 Executive Officials - The officials of the departments and agencies that take political direction from the President and from laws passed by Congress.

1.2 Legislative Officials - The officials that are selected and empowered to make laws for a political unit, such as a state or nation.

1.3 Civilian Bureaucrats - Body of employees in any government agency, except the military.

1.4 Military Bureaucrats - Body of employees in military agency, especially in Defense department.

1.5 Political Parties - The political organizations that seek to attain and maintain political power within government, usually by participating in electoral campaigns.

1.6 Interest Groups - Associations that aim to influence the policies or actions of the government.

1.7 Elite Groups - The groups of persons including corporate, political, and military leaders, who enjoy superior intellectual or social or economic status.

2. Attitudes

2.1 Ideology - The term ideology may be used to describe the shared beliefs of a group of people in which in US politics, ideology may separate the difference between Democrat and Republican.

2.2 Political Culture - The attitudes, beliefs, and values which underpin the operation of a particular political system.

2.3 Public Opinion - Public consensus, as with respect to an issue or situation.

3. Institutions

3.1 Executive - The branch of government charged with putting into effect a country's laws and the administering of its functions.

3.2 Legislatures - Lawmaking branch of a government.

3.3 Bureaucracies - The government characterized by specialization of functions, adherence to fixed rules, and a hierarchy of authority.

3.4 Military Establishments - The organization comprises of the heads of the armed forces departments, and responsible for coordinating and responding to defense issues.

3.5 Elections - A tool for selecting representatives in modern democracies.

3.6 Party Systems - The concept in comparative political science concerning the system of government by political parties in a democratic country.

3.7 Communications Systems - The telecommunications system that results from the technical and operational integration of the separate telecommunications systems of the several executive branch departments and agencies having a significant telecommunications capability.

3.8 Social Institutions - Any institution in a society that works to socialize the groups or people in it.

4. Processes

4.1 Socialization and Recruitment – The process of integration into the political system.

4.2 Interest Articulation - The process by which citizens and social groups express their needs and demands to the government.

4.3 Interest Aggregation - The process in which the political demands of groups and individuals are combined into policy programs.

4.4 Policy-Making - High-level development of policy, especially official government policy.

4.5 Policy-Administration - The process of policy management by administrators.

4.6 Integrative-Disintegrative - The processes which the existing systems or organizations provide either common or different approaches to any policies, depending on circumstances and interests.¹⁸

External Factors: identified along with the six sub-systems within the international system.

1. The Contiguous Environment

It refers to any cluster of polities that border geographically upon a given polity. Hence the contiguous environment allows for the consideration of such phenomena as boundary disputes, historic rivalries, traditional friendships, and the many other distinctive features of relations among immediate neighbors.

¹⁸ Rosenau, p. 52.

2. The Regional Environment

The Regional Environment, although based on considerations similar to those of the Contiguous Environment, is larger in scope. It extends to the entire region a given national system is located in. However, the concept of the Regional Environment is a flexible one. It depends on whether geographic, cultural, religious, or historical variables are considered in the delineation of this environment. The size of a region then can range from small areas to partial continents to entire continents. While the Contiguous Environment is important for the analysis of such phenomena as boundary disputes, historical rivalries, traditional friendships, and other features of relations among immediate neighbors, the Regional Environment is important for analysis of integrative tendencies among polities, as is evident from widespread post-war trends towards the institutionalization of regional federations, confederations, and common markets.

3. The Cold War Environment

The Cold War Environment characterizes the political or ideological bloc a national system belongs to or is associated with. Dimensions of the Cold War Environment are problems of peace and war, disarmament, foreign aid, space exploration, and culture exchanges. The socio-economic policies pertaining to the economic role of the government, rights of groups, and the welfare of individuals, are also dimensions of this environment.

4. The Racial Environment

This environment is considered an experimental category which encompasses phenomena that might perhaps be included in any of the others. However, it is useful to

determine whether categorization at the level of a major issue area is likely to yield significant insights that might not otherwise be developed into the nature of national-international linkages. This category may include all expectations, conflicts and trends that are external to a polity, but pertains to relations between racial or ethnics groups within the polity.

5. The Resource Environment

All activities in the external world of any polity in which goods and services of the national systems are created, processed, and utilized, represent the Resource Environment. By “goods” in this context refers to non-human resources, while “service” pertains to human resources including such diverse phenomena as the training of technicians, education of youth, and training of military personnel. Nonetheless, it is only the activities that pertain to the utilization of these goods and services, and not the goods and services as such that make up the Resource Environment. Thus, this environment consists of such regularized activities as trade and fiscal relations, economic programs, attempts to acquire nuclear weapons, or, indeed, attempts to acquire any capabilities that will facilitate the conduct of foreign relations.

6. The Organizational Environment

This category is designed to facilitate analysis of linkage patterns that have been created by the proliferation and growth of international organizations. It encompasses all external organizations that have structure and personnel apart from the polities belonging to them, such as the United Nations, the Organization of American States, the Organization of American Unity, the International Court of Justice. However, it does not

include the many alliances and agreements in which elaborate specifications for interaction and cooperation that are not accompanied by the establishment of implementing machinery that has an identity of its own.¹⁹

In this thesis, the framework of linkage politics would help clarify the influence of domestic factors and external factors on the formulation of US foreign policy towards Taiwan under the Bush administration. The domestic factors which were main considered in this thesis were as follows: (1) the president—the head of executive branch who is the most important policy-maker; (2) Neoconservatives—the US foreign policy elite influencing the US foreign policy's formulation; (3) Bush and foreign policy elite's perception—the political ideology of US leading foreign policy-makers (4) Congress—the most important legislative body in the US; (5) Taiwan Lobby—the powerful lobbies seeking to pressure the government to adopt policy in favor of Taiwan.

The key external factors focused in this thesis were the attacks of September 11, 2001 and the following war on terrorism which were considered the global environment affecting overall global affairs. As the Cold War does not exist anymore, instead the era of globalization, emerged with new challenges such as threat of terrorism from non-state actors, has affected the overall global system of regimes, treaties and organizations governing international economic, political and security relations amid several countries in the world. The other influential external factors considered in this thesis, including the rise of China and the US-China relations, Taiwan domestic politics, and also China-Taiwan relations were regarded as regional environment influencing the US domestic

¹⁹ Rosenau, pp. 61-63.

actors who were responsible for the foreign policy making.

F. Hypotheses

1. The US foreign policy towards Taiwan under the Bush administration had first been a position of strategic clarity on Taiwan's defense and then adjusted to be ambiguous following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.
2. The objective of US policy towards Taiwan was to protect US strategic interest in Asia-Pacific and in Taiwan through maintaining 'status quo.'
3. The formulation of US policy towards Taiwan was influenced by external factors rather than internal factors.
4. Because of the importance of China in the strategic calculation on the war against terror, the Bush administration restrained Taiwan from challenging the 'status quo.'

G. Research Methodology

The thesis is developed by using a qualitative method. In order to answer the research questions, in-depth analysis of primary and secondary data is necessary. In this regard, journals such as China Quarterly, Asian Survey, Foreign Affairs including electronic journals, as well as books, theses, dissertations, speeches, press releases, interviewing articles, academic articles, and web pages are applied as sources of information for the research.

H. Review of Literature

Since there has been no book written directly about the US foreign policy towards Taiwan under the Bush administration in Thai and there has been hardly book in English on the same topic, mostly found in articles; therefore, I want to study the US Taiwan policy, especially under the Bush administration which had experienced new international challenges that affected not only the United States but also the world. In this respect, my reviews of some literatures relating to the issue are as follows:

Literatures in English

Robert Sutter article, *'The Taiwan Problem in the Second George W. Bush administration: US officials' views and their implications for US policy'* (*Journal of Contemporary China Volume 15, Number. 48, August 2006*), explained that the behavior of Taiwan leaders and people in 2003–2004 raised the salience of Taiwan's assertive movement towards permanent independence for US policy makers. Such assertiveness and moves towards independence of Taiwan did no longer viewed as pragmatic for US decision makers.

Philip Yang in *Doubly Dualistic Dilemma: US strategies towards China and Taiwan* (*International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, Volume 6, Number. 2, August 2006*) also supported the idea that the United States has begun to implement separate dual strategies in its relations with Taiwan and China in order to simultaneously deter

unilateral action while balancing the rival political and military forces of each side in order to maintain the status quo.

According to Chulacheeb Chinwanno's article in *Thailand's strategic perception of Cross-Strait relations (Ensuring interests: dynamic of China-Taiwan relations and Southeast Asia, Malaysia: Institute of China Studies, 2006)* the China-Taiwan relations has become a major concern as the deterioration of the Sino-Taiwanese relationship could lead to armed conflict with overwhelming effects to the Asian region. After the 9/11 incident, as the US had sought for China's supports on US's war on terror, China had utilized the Bush administration to put pressure on Taiwan, specifically concerning President Chen Shui-bian's movements towards independence.

Michael D. Swine in *Trouble in Taiwan (Foreign Affairs, Volume 83, Number.2, March/April 2004)* affirmed that Bush had changed American policy towards Taiwan. From having pledged in April 2001 to do "whatever it takes" to help Taiwan defend itself, Bush instead reaffirmed US support for maintaining the status quo in the Taiwan Strait in 2003. President Bush also rebuked Taiwan's president, Chen Shui-bian, by stating that the US opposed any unilateral actions made by Taiwan's leader to change the status quo. However, Chen downplayed Bush's efforts to restrain him with the support from some conservatives and liberals in the US Congress. Therefore, the tensions in Taiwan Strait had continued.

Pan Zhongqi's article, '*US Taiwan Policy of Strategic Ambiguity: a dilemma of deterrence*' (*Journal of Contemporary China, Volume 12, Issue 35, May 2003*) clarified three main troubles of a policy of strategic ambiguity in dealing with the Taiwan issue:

the dilemma of deterrence; a cross-Strait arms race; and possible military involvement in potential cross-Strait conflict and recommended that the US should not abandon its strategic ambiguity policy as it would help facilitate peace keeping and stability maintenance in the Taiwan Strait.

Jiemian Yang in *The Bush Administration's Taiwan Policy: Evolution and Trends* (*American Foreign Policy Interests, Volume 24, Issue 2, April 2002*) maintained that the September 11 events have significantly changed the foreign and security policy of the Bush administration. The US needed to foster a global coalition against terrorism, it need assistance and cooperation from China. Therefore, the US tried hard not to be confrontational with China over Taiwan issue, it had a large stake in keeping the Taiwan issue a “no-unification, no-independence, no-war” issue.

According to reviews of some literatures, it was founded that most literatures provided the trends of the US Taiwan policy in the same direction affirming the adjustment of the US Taiwan policy. The reasons of adjustment mainly came from the September 11 events and China, but there were no the analysis of to what extent China and the 9/11 incident had influence on the formulation of US Taiwan policy and also of other factors that may influence the US foreign policy, especially the interactions between external factors and internal factors who involved in the policy making. This thesis therefore would try to fill the gap amid other literatures and to clarify the reasons of the adjustment of US policy including the influential factors behind the changing for being useful background for further study.

I. Presentation

The thesis is separated into five chapters.

Chapter 1 presents thesis proposal including background and significance of issue, research questions and objectives of the study, scope of analysis, analytical framework, hypothesis, and research methodology.

Chapter 2 demonstrates the historical background of US foreign policy towards Taiwan since 1784 when Taiwan still represented China until it lost official international recognition including from the US. In this chapter, a number of US policy adjustments, since the US switch of its recognition to the PRC to the year 2000 before the September 11 incident, are identified as they were results of changing international environment.

Chapter 3 relates to the Bush presidency, illustrating the formulation of the Bush administration foreign policy towards Taiwan before and after the attack of terrorist on September 11, 2001.

Chapter 4 consists of the analysis of the objectives of US Taiwan policy and the influence of international environment, including new regional and global challenges, and the rise of China, on the US Taiwan policy under the Bush's presidency (January 20, 2001-January 20, 2009).

Chapter 5 provides the conclusion of thesis and prospect.