

Taiwan: Municipal Elections 2002 by Christian Schafferer

On 7 December 2002, about 1.3 million people in the city of Taipei and some 800.000 people in the city of Kaoshiung went to the polls to elect a new mayor and city councillors. In Taipei, incumbent mayor Ma Ying-jeou from the Kuomintang (KMT) won his re-election bid with 64 percent of the votes cast. In the Kaoshiung race, incumbent mayor Frank Hsieh from the ruling Democratic Progressive Party won the election by a narrow margin of 25,000 votes (three percentage points). In the city council elections, the KMT still succeeded in remaining the largest party in the Taipei city council, whereas in Kaoshiung the DPP emerged as the strongest political group.

City council elections

In 1967, the provincial municipality of Taipei was elevated to the status of a special municipality. Kaoshiung became a special municipality in 1979. Special municipalities are under the direct jurisdiction of the central government. First election of council members took place in November 1969 in Taipei and in November 1981 in Kaoshiung. Since then, city council election have been held every four years. Over the years, the number of seats has been increased from 48 to 52 in Taipei and from 42 to 44 in Kaoshiung due to population growth. In elections of city councillors the single non-transferable vote (SNTV) is applied. Under this system, Taipei

city is divided into six geographic constituencies with a district magnitude between seven to eleven (=number of seats) and one aboriginal constituency with one seat only. In Kaoshiung, there are five constituencies with district magnitudes ranging from five to ten and one aboriginal constituency with one seat.

In this election, political parties nominated seventy percent of the 113 candidates in Taipei, and about half of the candidates in Kaoshiung. The DPP nominated 27 of the 113 candidates in Taipei and only 18 of the 114 hopefuls in Kaoshiung. The Kuomintang nominated far fewer candidates this time due to the emergence of the People First Party, which fielded seventeen in the Taipei and nine in the Kaoshiung race (see [Table 1](#)). Two political parties took part in city council elections for the first time: the People First Party (PFP) and the Taiwan Solidarity Union (TSU). The PFP was founded by James Soong after his defeat in the presidential race of March 2000. The new party caused a deep split within the KMT with a significant number of members switching sides. In the following national election, PFP garnered 19 percent of votes (46 out of 225 seats). The party thus proved to be a new major political force in Taiwan's political landscape. The Taiwan Solidarity Union (TSU) was founded under the spiritual leadership of former president and KMT chair Lee Teng-hui in August 2001 after Lee had announced some time earlier that a new party would bring back stability to Taiwan by supporting incumbent president Chen Shui-bian (DPP). Taiwan experienced a political deadlock that lasted for several months after the government made public its plan to scrap the fourth nuclear power plant project (see also Taiwan's 2001 National and Local Elections). TSU garnered 8 percent of votes (thirteen seats) in national elections held in

December 2001.

Mayoral elections

Mayors of special municipalities had been appointed by the premier prior to the passing of the Special Municipality Autonomy Law in July 1994. The first direct election of the mayors of Taipei and Kaoshiung was held in 1994. Voter turnout averaged 80 percent. There were four candidates in Taipei and five in Kaoshiung. In Taipei, KMT candidate and incumbent mayor Huang Ta-chou received 26 percent of the votes cast, NP candidate Jaw Shau-kang 30 percent, DPP hopeful Chen Shui-bian 44 percent, and independent Jih Rong-ze less than 1 percent. This was a crucial victory for the opposition. In Kaoshiung, however, the KMT proved to be more successful. KMT candidate and incumbent mayor Wu Den-yih garnered 55 percent of the votes, DPP's Chang Chun-hsiung 39 percent, NP hopeful Tang A-ken 3 percent, and the other candidates 3 percent.

In December 1998, the second direct mayoral election took place. There were three candidates in Taipei. Former justice minister Ma Ying-jeou was nominated by the KMT, incumbent mayor Chen Shui-bian by the DPP, and Wang Chien by the NP. Ma won with 51.1 percent of the votes. Incumbent mayor Chen received 45.9 percent and the New Party's hopeful the remaining 3 percent. Voter turnout was 80 percent in both Taipei and Kaoshiung, where four candidates contested. Incumbent mayor Wu Den-yi (KMT) received 48.13 percent and was voted out of office by a margin of 78,000 votes by former legislator Frank Hsieh of the DPP. The NP candidate Wu Chien-kuo received only 0.8 percent and independent Cheng Teh-yao 2.4 percent of the valid votes cast.

In this election, there were two

candidates in Taipei. Incumbent mayor Ma Ying-jeou was nominated by the KMT and former political prisoner and legislator Lee Ying-yuan by the DPP. In Kaoshiung, five hopefuls took part in the election. Incumbent mayor Frank Hsieh was nominated by the ruling DPP and Huang Jun-ying by the KMT. Three independent candidates took also part in the Kaoshiung race: Chang Po-ya, Shih Ming-teh, and Huang Tien-shen.

Election Results

The mayoral election results were a foregone conclusion in Taipei and a small surprise in Kaoshiung. Incumbent mayor Ma Ying-jeou (KMT) won the race in Taipei with 64.11 percent of the votes, and in Kaoshiung incumbent mayor Frank Hsieh (DPP) received slightly more votes (24,838 votes) than his main rival Huang Jun-ying (KMT) despite opinion polls that suggested Hsieh would lose the battle (see [Table 2](#)).

Ma Ying-jeou's strategy was not to talk too much about specific future policies nor go into details of what has been achieved during his term. Instead, he tried to give the voters the impression that there are many problems but there is no need to worry because there is still Ma, who cares about the people. His campaign ads in Taiwan's media, for instance, frequently focused on the issue of rising unemployment and the lack of unity among the electorate due to the polarization of the populace between the blue and green camps, urging the electorate to be united and support him (see [Advertisement 1](#), [2](#), [3](#), and [4](#)). In his campaign speech on election eve, Ma spent most of his time telling the audience that we all work hard everyday and that life sometimes is difficult but we still have Ma to rely on, giving the electorate once again the impression of a good brother who will always

be here if help is needed. Ma relied on his charisma whereas his opponent, Lee Ying-yuan, relied on history and on offering "beef" – more social welfare to the residents of Taipei. His campaign team, for instance, placed a series of ads in Taiwan's mass media promising every unemployed person between 35 and 50 years of age a monthly subsidy of NT\$10,000 for the period of one year, and every single mother with a child under 12 years of age a monthly stipend of NT\$5,000 (see [Advertisement 5](#)).

Apart from social welfare policies, history was again a key element in the DPP's mayoral campaign strategy. In his campaign speeches and televised ads, Lee once again stressed his suffering during the white terror that lasted until the early 1990s. Televised ads tried to remind the voters of the dark times and of the fact that Lee Ying-yuan was blacklisted by the KMT government for his involvement in anti-KMT activities. A group of former schoolmates also put ads in mass-circulating daily newspapers showing a large photo of Ma and claiming that he was a spy for the KMT government while studying in the US (see [Advertisement 6](#)). The group strongly criticized Ma for being on the side of the dictator during the most crucial period of time in Taiwan's history of democratic development. Nevertheless, the electorate seemed to care little about Ma's alleged spying activities. It may be important for the people of Taiwan to discuss their history and the involvement of current politicians in the suffering of political opponents during the reign of white terror, but election campaigns are no longer the right place to talk about history. People have heard too much of such stories during the last 10 years and are no longer willing to talk about the old times.

The DPP's campaign strategy in the Taipei race changed compared with previous elections in the sense that Lee campaign team

refrained from relying on traditional campaign methods such as large street rallies. There may be various reasons for this, but one of the key ones is simply that voters do not know why they should join such rallies. The support of civil groups for the DPP seems to be vanishing, especially after the farmer's and fishermen's demonstration of Nov. 23 when over 100,000 people took to the streets of Taipei. Numerous former civil groups that supported the DPP in the past turned out this time urging the electorate not to vote for DPP candidates. Full-page ads in mass-circulating newspapers requesting the voters not to vote green were common (see [Advertisement 7](#)). This all made Ma Ying-jeou's election victory a foregone conclusion.

In Kaohsiung, the election victory of DPP candidate Frank Hsieh was more of a surprise given the fact that claims of Hsieh's involvement in the Zanadau scandal seemed to do him serious harm. Apart from the scandal, the public in general feels discontent with current government economic policies. Taiwan's economy has been challenged by a recession and record unemployment. GDP has shrunk considerably throughout the last years while the nation's economists speak of the steepest GDP decline since the oil crisis of the 1970s. Much blame for the poor economy had been pinned on the DPP government. In addition, the farmer's and fishermen's demonstration and the subsequent resignation of key government members once again conveyed the message of an inefficient government. Perhaps dissatisfied voters did not go to the polls instead of voting for the KMT. With election turnout averaging 71 percent, the Kaohsiung election had the lowest turnout ever.

But whatever the turnout, the KMT candidate lost the election, leaving James Soong standing in the rain after his ridiculous performance in Taipei, when he kneeled down

begging for votes in support of Ma. James Soong's People First Party refrained from nominating its own candidates in the mayoral race. The party decided to support the KMT candidates instead.

In the city council elections, the DPP and the KMT received one third of the seats each in Taipei, and in Kaoshiung the DPP won more seats than the KMT for the first time in history. TSU performed poorly in Taipei and in Kaoshiung. In total, only two out of the fourteen candidates got elected. Surprisingly, the New Party had five out seven hopefuls elected. James Soong's People First Party had a meagre showing in Taipei where fewer than half of the party's candidates were voted into office. The Green Party once again failed to get enough popular support (see [Table 3](#) and [Table 4](#)).

It is interesting to note that the KMT for the first time practiced the forced vote distribution system (*pei piao*). In previous elections, it had been the party's strategy to support those candidates with higher popularity ratings in opinion surveys and to neglect the others. The KMT obviously has learned from its previous election defeats. Only one of the 21 KMT candidates in Taipei was not elected. *Pei piao* is a rational system based on the fact that the chance of someone being born on Monday is the same as of someone being born on Tuesday and has been successfully practised by the DPP for a long time. In this election, for instance, the KMT nominated five candidates in the third district of Taipei. The party gave each of its five candidates two single-digit numbers, i.e. zero and one to the first candidate, two and three to the second and so forth. Party supporters were urged to vote for the candidate whose number coincides with the last digit of their National Identity Number (*shenfengzheng zihao*). If most KMT supporters followed the strategy, each candidate should receive an equal

amount of votes. In other districts, the KMT nominated two, three or four candidates. In these cases, the party instructed the supporters to cast their votes according to the month in which they were born (see [*Advertisement 8*](#)).

Christian Schafferer is an assistant professor in the Department of International Trade at the Overseas Chinese Institute of Technology.

Table 4: Election results

Party	2002		1998		Changes	
	Votes	%	Votes	%	%	
Taipei						
Democratic Progressive Party	383,905	28.52	455,613	30.96	-7.87	
Kuomintang	431,830	32.08	589,907	40.08	-19.96	
People First Party	236,418	17.56	-	-	-	
Taiwan Solidarity Union	50,015	3.72	-	-	-	
New Party	121,399	9.02	273,195	18.56	-51.41	
Green Party	1,807	0.13	22,274	1.51	-91.13	
other parties ¹	0	0.00	37,838	2.57	-100.00	
independents	120,734	8.97	92,966	6.32	41.99	
Total	1,346,108	100.00	1,471,793	100.00	0.00	
Kaoshiung						
Democratic Progressive Party	191,913	25.03	211,954	26.81	-6.66	
Kuomintang	197,506	25.76	357,163	45.18	-42.99	
People First Party	91,903	11.98	-	-	-	
Taiwan Solidarity Union	51,500	6.72	-	-	-	
New Party	4,807	0.63	30,363	3.84	-83.68	
other parties ²	-	-	14,707	1.86	-100.00	
independents	229,189	29.89	176,308	22.30	34.01	
Total	766,818	100.00	790,495	100.00	0.00	

Compiled by Christian Schafferer; data provided by the Central Election Commission

¹ other parties: New Nation Alliance (27,282), Taiwan Independence Party (9,633), China Women Party (923).

² other parties: Taiwan Independence Party (14,707).

Table 3: Election results

Party	2002		1998		Change	
	Seats	%	Seats	%		%
Taipei						
Democratic Progressive Party	17	32.69	19	36.54	-10.53	
Kuomintang	20	38.46	23	44.23	-13.04	
People First Party	8	15.38	-	-	-	
Taiwan Solidarity Union	0	0.00	-	-	-	
New Party	5	9.62	9	17.31	-44.44	
Green Party	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
other parties ¹	-	-	0	0.00	-	
independents	2	3.85	1	1.92	100.00	
Total	52	100.00	52	100.00	0.00	
Kaoshiung						
Democratic Progressive Party	14	31.82	9	20.45	55.56	
Kuomintang	12	27.27	25	56.82	-52.00	
People First Party	7	15.91	-	-	-	
Taiwan Solidarity Union	2	4.55	-	-	-	
New Party	0	0.00	1	2.27	-100.00	
other parties ²	-	-	0	0.00	-	
independents	9	20.45	9	20.45	0.00	
Total	44	100.00	44	100.00%	0.00	

Compiled by Christian Schafferer; data provided by the Central Election Commission

¹ other parties: New Nation Alliance, Taiwan Independence Party, China Women Party.

² other parties: Taiwan Independence Party.

Table 2: Results mayor elections

	Votes	%
Taipei		
Ma Ying-jeou (Kuomintang)	873,102	64.11
Lee Ying-yuan (Democratic Progressive Party)	488,811	35.89
Total	1,361,913	100.00
Kaoshiung		
Frank Hsieh (Democratic Progressive Party)	386,384	50.04
Huang Jun-ying (Kuomintang)	361,546	46.82
Chang Po-ya	13,479	1.75
Shih Ming-teh	8,750	1.13
Huang Tien-shen	1,998	0.26
Total	772,157	100.00

Compiled by the author; data provided by the Central Election Commission

Table 1: Candidates by party affiliation

Affiliation	2002		1998	
	candidates	%	candidates	%
Taipei				
Democratic Progressive Party	27	23.89	27	24.55
Kuomintang	21	18.58	32	29.09
People First Party	17	15.04	-	-
Taiwan Solidarity Union	7	6.19	-	-
New Party	6	5.31	16	14.55
Green Party	1	0.88	4	3.64
other parties ¹	-	-	10	9.09
independents	34	30.09	21	19.09
Total	113	100.00	110	100.00
Kaoshiung				
Democratic Progressive Party	18	15.79	20	19.05
Kuomintang	21	18.42	34	32.38
People First Party	9	7.89	-	-
Taiwan Solidarity Union	7	6.14	-	-
New Party	1	0.88	6	5.71
other parties ²	-	0.00	5	4.76
independents	58	50.88	40	38.10
Total	114	100.00	105	100.00

Compiled by the Christian Schafferer; data provided by the Central Election Commission

¹ other parties: New Nation Alliance (5), Taiwan Independence Party (4), China Women Party (1).

² other parties: Taiwan Independence Party (5).

搶救

國民黨議員候選人 讓馬英九市長放手做事

一、國民黨懇請您依出生月份支持：

北投、士林

① 吳碧珠 11-13月

② 賴香如 5-6月

③ 陳啟忠 7-8月

④ 原住民族 1-12月

內湖、南港

① 李序秀 3-4月

② 吳世正 5-6月

③ 陳義洲 9-12月

中山、大同

① 陳玉梅 1-3月

② 王浩 5-10月

③ 林香華 9-12月

中正、萬華

① 吳仁人 1-13月

② 陳忠敏 1-12月

大安、文山

① 蔣乃辛 1-3月

② 厲取桂芳 4-6月

③ 林其華 7-9月

④ 陳錦祥 10-12月

二、國民黨懇請您依身分證字號尾數支持：

松山、信義

① 楊育欣 1-2

② 王正德 2-3-4

③ 陳承德 5-6

④ 陳麗輝 7-8

⑤ 張靜芳 9-10



懇請：票，全力支持國民黨市議員候選人！
員全力貫徹責任里，市民依本表平均配
目前本黨多位候選人選情告急，懇請黨
澄清：本黨絕無與他黨共同配票之情事！

〈馬英九造勢晚會〉
今天(12月5日)晚上7:00~10:00在市立大同高中(長樂路167號)舉行
歡迎踴躍參加，一同為馬英九市長加油！

中國國民黨台北黨部

絕對的權利 絕對的腐化

民進黨執政越來越穩，卻離人民越來越遠 享受權利的滋味忘卻百姓的苦楚

北高市長務請支持「非民進黨候選人」讓民進黨有自我反省的機會重新找回理想



上街頭 現在幾萬國民成為台灣全民運動

- 過去：2000年 6850 名油頁工於台北製造沙塵「抗議」，070+部光武油桶架設式上線，在汽進入歷史
- 至今（2002）年
- 0513 康榮路推銷「國民黨，真難聽」員工擁擠活動，0531 康榮鋼鐵廠前線...
- 0827 反儲保變遷勞工大遊行，0901 健保照樣不降，執務當局動員清查；小民遭殃。
- 0928 教師 100,000 人上街爭取權益...
- 1110 勞工「秋鬥」一活不取，促資方→工人幹「飯」大遊行。
- 1123 康榮民 120,000 人上街爭取權益...

人民運動「批發行動與喊喊，反決心變則與實」
 編者有話可聽得死？是否感同身受？
 人民生活真的越來越苦。
 自從民進黨執政後。
 勞工失業率屢創新高...
 自從民進黨執政後。
 街頭抗爭的規模越來越大，人數越來越多...
 我們發現
 在野時有理想化的民進黨不見了。
 民進黨執政後，不再是弱勢族群代言人，士農工商只有得罪無辜...
 我們發現
 那理想型社會公平正義的民進黨消失了。
 因為民進黨執政後，享受了權利的滋味，面對經濟衰退、日軍暴行、
 第一海軍區，也無心實踐理想...
 所以，我們懇請全國父老耆親們。
 為了臺灣民主政治的健全發展與民生福祉。
 更本於愛護民進黨的心情。
 請於十二月七日北高市長選舉時踴躍投給「非民進黨籍候選人」。

過去堅定支持民進黨的臺灣石油工會第二分會
 常務理事林倍寬暨全體理監事 敬上



抓耙仔！好膽嚟走

▼ 1978年的馬英九，當時他是國民黨在波士頓的校園特務；在民主發展的關鍵時刻，他站在獨裁政權那一邊！



發起人 陳雲欣 美國聯邦政府國際發展署資深科學家 談啟興 哈佛大學醫學院副教授
李啟輝 哈佛大學公衛學院教授 江真如 美國OnPalm大學歷史系教授 (暫為哈佛校友)
支持單位 全美台灣同鄉會 台灣學生社 華商台灣服務中心 陳文成紀念基金會 王康紀念基金會

這個人，大家都知道他是誰，但他不願承認。就像猶太人追究納粹戰犯一樣，我們追究這個人的責任，已經十幾年。不久前他指責我們「多年來毫無長進」。我們要說，除非他坦白面對歷史，我們的追究不會停止。

1978年1月28日，為了抗議國民黨在俄國蘇聯地方選舉中舞弊引發的中選事件，我們一群留學生聚集在哈佛波士頓領事館外示威，這個人也到現場，但他不是來示威，而是來煽動。在波士頓的學生，對他早有耳聞，紛紛揮舞象徵及負責糾察的頭銜典上對他說：「馬英九，你不要再來了，這樣對大家都不好！」，他離開了。

可是，在示威結束，同學們拿下圍具後，這個人竟又回到現場指稱，在場的女學生都很恐懼，因為被規程紀錄代表的是被列入黨名單，並且危及在家人安全及生活。對部分2002年的台北人而言，這個人似乎是天使，但對1978年在波士頓領事館外示威的女學生而言，他是魔鬼。這張照片，就是在我們前去制止他，他從相機收到大衣口袋後被丟棄的歷史鏡頭。

那一段威權時期的黑暗歷史，無以計數的國民黨「校園間諜」，出於惡毒的變態心理利益驅使，甘願做獨裁政權的馬前卒，監視同學的言行；在關鍵的時刻，他們站在獨裁者的那一邊。我們這些黨名單的受害者，因為在關鍵時刻站在民主自由這一邊，數十年無法返國；相較於因為國共內戰而無法返鄉的「老兵」，我們因為爭取民主人權成為祖國的異名軍，更令人悲憤。

這段歷史，是台灣人民共同的痛，也是台灣人民的共同記憶，我們要推動立法，撫平傷痛，讓全民謹記在心，讓這樣的事情永遠不再發生。我們要學習情誼統一後，公布前東德情治機構監視人民相關檔案的經驗，要求歷史館將散落在各部會的相關史料整理、分析，出版，並公布相關檔案讓當事人調閱，讓受害者知道「為何被禁止返鄉」；我們要求把這段歷史，放在教科書中，當作歷史及人權教材，讓下一代更加珍惜得來不易的民主成果。

歷史可以原諒，但不能忘記。威權時期人性受到嚴重扭曲，我們願意寬容看待，只要加害者坦然面對對於照片中的這個人，我們的態度亦是如此。我們希望地承認這段歷史，早日走出他一輩子陰影，莫不為人知的角落，走出良心的譴責。可惜這個人多年來拒絕承認，他甚至拒絕供的說他曾經是我們當中某些人。今年九月亦譴責我們他顯不願意以過去黨宣隊中策劃的身份，提案公開讓在黨史館中的黨名單史料，他低頭沉默良久，不吭一聲；這種態度，我們無法釋懷，更無法原諒，我們會用全世界民主國家對待黨宣隊政治人物的道德標準，繼續追究。

逝者已矣，來者可追，我們期待全民與我們一同戮力譴平傷痛，更期待這個人，能直面對，協助揭露歷史真相！

李應元有主張 台北未來有希望

讓台北成為善待小市民的城市 李應元提出體貼小市民的政策承諾

李應元體貼小市民的政策承諾

經濟篇

- 獎助企業雇用35到50歲中壯年失業者，每人每月一萬元為期一年。
- 提供單親媽媽家庭12歲以下孩童每人每月5000元托育津貼。

交通篇

- 上任兩個月內，主動退回馬英九四年來在「交通陷阱區」開出的兩百萬張違規告發單，將罰款還給台北市民。
- 全面取消非路口紅線區，便利駕駛人上下客貨，店家增加商機。

福利篇

- 垃圾袋減價一半，打擊偽袋，擴大垃圾減量功效。
- 國小全面營養午餐，學童健康均衡，頭好壯壯。
- 提供一萬個SOHO族，每人200萬創業基金。

讓台北成為善待小市民的城市【李應元的心情日記】

過去四年，這個城市不曾善待過認真生活、認真打拚的小市民。
讓這個城市重新懂得小市民的心，讓這人出賣的勞力及智慧小市民，繼續在台北這個城市，
活得更有尊嚴，更有信心，讓這個城市成為善待小市民的都市。

從0.1磅做起

國際車用汽機油製油技術協會（API），為了提高汽車的品質與耐用，進行國際標準的實驗。我們發現，如果將舊引擎的舊機油換成1.5L的，就能夠節省半磅的潤滑油。所以研發人員們就製出來了1500個零件，舊機油的重量則由0.1磅，經過不斷改善，終於研發成功。

在島國，市政也是一樣的重律，就是最細微的地方做起，我們所製出是為了讓市政機關更便利，從車油換到戶用便器清潔。我們所員工的一條經驗，還有從這出市民的一樣熟悉經驗，我對於台北的戶政局也成為這所第一間獲得ISO9002品質認證的政府機關，也帶給了您最偉大的服務品質！

讓社會團體中兩個十分認真負責的份子，在台北市這座山平線的點點，讓這九個位階的點，給我們一份承諾，所給的承諾點了！給神政府，我的責任就在於把這些承諾點，還有，我重新改裝已有的承諾人真一紙，把這份責任與承諾點更快樂。

2002.12.4




世界看台北 創始領袖

② 馬英九

有更多的人民服務者，再讓任何黨力和謀黑！

團結力量大，12月7日為英九需要大家一票又一票的支持。



蔣經國 中華民國 21年12月8日(星期五)晚上8:00 為英九服務之心路(觀台北學二樓演講室)

