

Taiwan's Missing Millions  
Cold Hard Numbers and the Pathology of the Waishenren

Jerome F. Keating Ph.D.  
National Taipei University  
jkeating@ms67.hinet.net

Millions are missing, yet no one is concerned. Millions are missing, yet no one accepts responsibility. Millions are missing, yet all seem in denial. The Kuomintang (KMT) and the People's First Party (PFP) continue to ignore their missing millions and focus only on 30,000.

Millions of dollars? No, we're not referring to the missing millions of KMT party money, though their lower rank party members should justifiably be concerned with who has been able to buy what, where and why. The millions we refer to are votes—the hard and fast tickets needed to win elections.

Numbers can be boring but they carry a truth. Percentages are deceptive; numbers don't lie. If only three people vote and I get two of those votes, to say I got 66% of the votes is better than saying I got two votes. So bear with this examination of the numbers of Taiwan's presidential elections of 1996, 2000 and 2004; they are crucial to the questions of accountability, subsequent denial and pathology.

Year	% of all eligible voters	Total Votes Cast
1996	76% voted	10,766,119
2000	82.69% voted	12,659,393
2004	80.27 % voted	12,914,422

Besides the admirable high percentage of voter turnout, simple arithmetic shows an increase of 2,148,303 votes cast from 1996 to 2004. Who benefited? The Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) did, but their numbers show an increase far greater than even the increase of votes. Look at the DPP results:

Year	DPP President/Vice President Candidates	Votes Received
1996	Peng Ming-min/Frank Hsieh	2,274,586
2000	Chen Shui-bian/Annette Lu <b>(won)</b>	4,977,737
2004	Chen Shui-bian/Annette Lu <b>(won)</b>	6,471,970

In eight years, the DPP gained 4,197,384 votes. What about KMT figures?

1996 KMT Candidates	Affiliation	Votes Received
Lee Teng-hui/Lien Chan	KMT <b>(won)</b>	5,813,699
Lin Yang-kang/Hau Pei-tsun	(KMT) Independent	1,603,790
Chen Li-an/Wang Ching-feng	(KMT) Independent	1,074,044

With two sets of KMT candidates running as independents in 1996, the KMT and its related candidates received a total of **8,491,533** votes to the DPP's **2,274,586**.

<b>2000 KMT Candidates</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Votes Received</b>
Lien Chan/Vincent Siew	KMT	2,925,513
James Soong/Chang Chau-hsiung	(KMT) Independent	4,664,932

Lien and Soong's combined votes in 2000 were **7,590,445** to the DPP's **4,977,737**; but the DPP won because of their split. Other candidates got less than 1% or 91,211 votes. After the election Soong broke from the KMT, formed the PFP party.

In **2004**, Lien/Soong on a KMT/PFP ticket got **6,442,452** votes to the DPP's **6,471,970**.

These are the cold hard numbers. In the give and take of eight years (four of which the KMT was in power and four of which it was not), the KMT lost and/or failed to gain approximately 4,197,384 votes. Who then was accountable?

In the year 2000, when Lien ran as the lead man, he took a shellacking. Lee Teng-hui as party chairman took the responsibility for the loss, but Soong's defection from the party was the major cause. Still even if Soong's votes were added to Lien's, the KMT vote total had already dropped by 900,000 plus votes. If the additional 1,890,000 votes cast that year were added in, it would make the loss over 2,790,000.

Lee's taking full blame for the losses in 2000 is debatable. In 2004 when Lee could not be blamed, the KMT still dropped another 1,147, 993 votes. From where were they lost? From Lien's previous numbers? From Soong's? No one has addressed this matter. Post election rhetoric has completely avoided it and how four million plus votes were lost in eight years. Accountability has been fogged over with rhetoric.

What rhetoric have we heard? First there were the insane theories on how the assassination attempt was fake. Henry Lee the forensics expert blew those out of the water. Then there was the insistence of a recount, with a victory of only 30,000 surely the DPP had cheated somewhere. The counting however was accurate and the recount proved only to be a distraction wasting money and time. Then the rhetoric focused on the question of the high number of invalid votes (300,000) surely they possessed the number that would give the KMT the win. Again the results were futile; the greater number of invalid votes favored Chen.

At this point one would have expected the rhetoric to adjust, but now two months after the election, excuses still come. Lien and Soong insist there is no justice, no truth; they deny their loss. When a political party loses over four million votes in eight years in addition to losing two elections, it is time for soul searching and not the blame game. The blame game however continues and the denial begins to take on pathological proportions.

Denial is no stranger to KMT history. It was over 40 years before they would admit that the "Communists bandits" of Mainland had won the minds and hearts of the people there.

In 1991 the KMT publicly gave up their dream of retaking the Mainland. It was almost 50 years before they could admit to and offer a public apology for the slaughter of innocents in the 2/28 affair.

It is a pathology fostered by a sense of entitlement and privilege from a past era when the KMT ruled Taiwan as a one-party state.

It is a colonial pathology; the pathology of waishenren (outsiders) that have no sense of localization and look down on the local people. It is a pathology where their presidential candidate in 2004 could only mount a negative campaign with no positive programs or vision for Taiwan.

It is pathology that led KMT TV stations to falsely report election results, pretending Lien and Soong were in the lead. This gave hope to their loyal followers but finally the inflated 100,000-vote lead could no longer be substantiated by fact. When the real return numbers finally caught up with them in the last hour of reporting they had to give up the façade. Even then instead of coming clean, the explanation and response of the leadership was “We were cheated.”

It is a pathology that along with the scam of the TV reporting suggests that their pre-election polls were also inflated figures. That could explain how on the evening of the election before any votes were even cast; the KMT leaders were already making excuses that Chen would use the assassination attempt to deny them their due votes.

Such a pathology of blind fanatical denial and entitlement even creates speculation that the shooter in the assassination attempt could easily have been a deranged KMT follower who wanted to guarantee the election for his entitled side.

This is a pathology that will not face the fact that the KMT Titanic has struck three icebergs with the 2000 presidential elections, the 2002 legislative elections and now the 2004 presidential elections. Their ship is sinking yet the captain desperately tells the crew to focus on how the deck chairs should be arranged. “Don’t be wimps!” he cries, “The ship is still in good hands. Trust us.”

It is a pathology where the leaders claim they are for democracy as long as only they can win. How similar their rhetoric is to that of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) which claims to be open to discussion and dialogue as long as their premise is accepted and their foregone conclusion is reached.

It is a pathology where KMT/PFP leaders refuse to attend the inaugural ceremonies whenever they are defeated (2000, 2004). In denial, hanging above the KMT Headquarters building is a huge black banner proclaiming there is no truth; there is no president. Protest rallies are held with no evidence but the claim they have been cheated.

Distract, distract, distract. Somehow with all these claims for truth, they believe that the real truth of the missing four million plus votes will not be discovered. Yet the numbers refuse to go away.

The rest of the world sees it. Some of the young Turks in their party, the “Blue Hawks,” the “567 Alliance” and the “V6” see it. They raise a feeble voice. Vincent Siew offers himself up as a token step down sacrifice but still there is no one with enough clout in the KMT to say, “This is madness. The old guard is beyond hope. Let the captain go down with the doomed ship if he wants. We can build a new ship.”

This is the pathology of certain limited waishenren, the pathology of the blind outsider with a sense of superiority that cannot adapt. It is the real reason for the internal strife in Taiwan. Fortunately not all waishenren have the same disease.

We are reminded of the man who has lost his job but cannot admit it to his wife and family. Every morning the man gets dressed as if going to work; he gives assurances to his family, leaves the house and wanders until it is time to go home. So the KMT leadership cannot admit to their members that again as they had on the Mainland, they have lost the hearts of the average voters. Again, they must find a way to distract their followers. They cannot let them see that in eight years over four million votes, one third of the voting public has lost faith in their leadership and abandoned them.

So the KMT leaders tell their members to keep protesting; the election is not over, it was a razor thin victory; justice and truth will come; we will find the missing votes somewhere.

The man tells his family to trust him; he will get a promotion; there is still a bright future. Some of the family still believe him but for millions the hand has already written on the wall.

---

This is # 8 in a series of comments and observations on the 2004 Taiwan Presidential Elections. Future articles include “A Look at Sisy Chen and Hsu Hsin-liang,” “A Tale of Four Parties,” “The Dark Side of Confucianism” and eventually “A Proffered Solution to the Two China Issue.” Readers can share these comments with friends and interested parties. Copyright: Jerome F. Keating Ph.D.

Jerome F. Keating Ph.D. an author and educator who has lived in Taiwan for 15 years is co-author of the book *Island in the Stream, a Quick Case Study of Taiwan's Complex History*.