

DECOLONIZING MATTHEW'S HEAVENLY EMPIRE

A Taiwanese Interpretation

Tzu yu Lin

Decolonizing Matthew's Heavenly Empire
A Taiwanese Interpretation



New Testament Monographs, 48

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Decolonizing Matthew's Heavenly Empire
A Taiwanese Interpretation

Tzu yu Lin



Sheffield Phoenix Press
2026

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Copyright © 2026 Sheffield Phoenix Press

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press
www.sheffieldphoenix.com

Sheffield Centre for Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies (SCIBS),
University of Sheffield, S10 2TN

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the publisher's permission in writing.

Typeset by ISB Typesetting

A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-918358-36-0 (hardback)
ISBN: 978-1-918358-43-8 (ePDF)

Contents

Acknowledgments vii
Abbreviations viii
Preface ix

Introduction 1
Matthew and Empires 1
Empire-Critical and Postcolonial Work on Matthew 1
Reading Matthew's Heavenly Empire Neoliterally 5
Reading Matthew in Asian Contexts 8
The Significance of the Taiwanese Context in Biblical Studies 13
Decolonial Theory 14
The Darker Side of Modernity: Coloniality 14
The Modern/Colonial World System 17
Colonial Wounds 21
Decoloniality 22
Decolonial Biblical Criticism 24
Overview of Chapters 26

Chapter 1
In the Shadow of the Son of David: The Boys, the Mother, the Empty Land, and the Ultimate Empire 30
The Boy King and the Eastern Empire 31
The Child and His Muted Mother 39
The Threat of Rape 44
The Son of David's Inheritor and the Ultimate Empire 49

Chapter 2
Repent, for the Heavenly Empire Has Come Near! Threats and Justifications of Imperial Expansion in the Parables 53
The Coming of Empires 54
The Value of the Colony 63
Burn the Devils 68
War without End 74

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Chapter 3
Delinking from the Utopian Illusion of the Heavenly Empire 78
The Hierarchical Opposition of the Heavenly Empire 81
The Eternal Punishment of the Disobedient Colonized/Goats 88
The 'Original Sin' of the Colonized/Sheep 92
The Hope of Eternal Accusation 95

Chapter 4
The Not-So-Good News of the Three Sermons on the Mounts:
The Darker Side of the Heavenly Empire 101
The Promise of the Heavenly Empire 102
The Darker Side of the Good News 107
The Heavenly Epistemic Violence 115
The Emperor's Peacemakers 120

Chapter 5
The Great (Colonial) Commission in Decolonial Perspective:
Decolonial Doubting 126
Fight for the Invincible Jesus 127
'But Some Doubted' 138
The Hope of *M̄-Kam-Goān* 144

Conclusion 148

Bibliography 153
Index of References 167
Index of Authors 170

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Acknowledgments

I am deeply grateful to my adviser, Dr Stephen D. Moore, who generously guided and supported me in completing the doctoral dissertation that yielded this monograph. I also extend my appreciation to my second and third readers, Dr Althea Spencer-Miller and Dr Dong Sung Kim. Your insightful suggestions made this project possible. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr Danna Nolan Fewell and Dr Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre—your feedback on my previous presentations inspired me to refine my work.

I also wish to thank Dr Hilary McKane, Director of Graduate Academic Services. Without your help, I would not have been able to complete my doctoral program so smoothly.

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr Luis Menéndez-Antuña, my former adviser during my Master of Sacred Theology (STM) program at Boston University. Thank you for encouraging and assisting me in applying to the doctoral program at Drew University. Without your support, I would not have been able to begin my academic journey.

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
BDAG	Walter Bauer, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd edn, 2000).
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
EGGNT	The Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament
HTS	*HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supplement Series
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MBI	Methods in Biblical Interpretation
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NRSVUE	New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition
OTE	*Old Testament Essays*
PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

Preface

Based ultimately on Homi K. Bhabha's concept of 'colonial ambivalence', many postcolonial and empire-critical biblical works have argued that anti- and pro-imperial discourses coexist in the Gospel of Matthew.[1] Unlike postcolonial theory's focus on ambivalent coexistence, decolonial theory's concept of 'modernity/coloniality' maintains that modernity and coloniality are 'two sides of the same coin' because modernity is 'the rhetoric of salvation', which justifies coloniality—the darker/hidden side of modernity.[2] Drawing from this notion, the present book argues that the liberationist and the imperial discourses in Matthew are two sides of the same coin, which means that the Heavenly Empire[3] is using the liberationist Good News to justify its imperial project; this is the darker/hidden side of the 'Good News' (see esp. 28.18-20, together with 13.47-50; 25.31-46). In doing so, this monograph is distinguishing itself from postcolonial ambiguity and pursuing the decolonial option, which encourages biblical readers to delink from the Heavenly Empire's all-encompassing Good News/imperial project.

In addition, this book reads Matthew from the perspective of the author's Taiwanese context to approach the imperial enterprise of the Heavenly Empire. Since the end of WWII, the Republic of China (ROC) has occupied Taiwan as its colony and imposed Chinese epistemology on the colonized Taiwanese to justify its colonization. Although Taiwan had never been a part of China, the Chinese colonizers attempted to disguise their domination by calling it 'reunification', which promises Chinese people well-being

1. See, e.g., Fernando F. Segovia, 'Postcolonial Criticism and the Gospel of Matthew', in Mark Allan Powell (ed.), *Methods for Matthew* (MBI; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 194-237 (235-36); Warren Carter, 'The Gospel of Matthew', in Fernando F. Segovia and R.S. Sugirtharajah (eds), *A Postcolonial Commentary on the New Testament Writings* (The Bible and Postcolonialism, 13; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2009), pp. 69-104 (73).

2. Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (Latin America Otherwise: Languages, Empires, Nations Series; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), pp. 66, 140, 162, 172, 205.

3. The expression ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν occurs thirty-two times in Matthew's Gospel. It is unique to Matthew, the other three canonical gospels all using ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ instead. I will explain below why I prefer to translate it as 'the Empire of Heaven' or 'the Heavenly Empire' rather than the traditional 'the Kingdom of Heaven'.

This is copyrighted material.
This file must not be copied, shared, posted online or made available in any way without the publisher's permission.

and happiness. However, their reunification legitimated the oppressions, exploitations, and humiliations of the colonized Taiwanese. This is the darker/hidden side of reunification—the Chinese version of modernity/coloniality. Unfortunately, now, the People's Republic of China (PRC), the second China, is also planning to colonize Taiwan and using the same discourse of reunification. To unpack the Heavenly version of modernity/coloniality, this book reads the Heavenly Empire in Matthew within the context of the ROC and PRC colonization efforts.

However, not every scholar identifies Taiwanese people as innocent victims. For instance, in his book, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, Kuan-Hsing Chen—an ROC scholar—mainly criticizes the US's imperial power in the contemporary world and argues that Taiwan fails to escape from the anticommunist ideology that was invented by the US during the Cold War.[4] Chen identifies Taiwan, South Korea, and Okinawa as US 'semi-colonies' because they all suffer under the US's military power.[5] However, while Chen praises South Korea's resistance to US imperialism, he argues that people in Taiwan fail to question the US's imperial power and continue to hate China due to the Cold War ideology.[6] Chen emphasizes, 'South Korea has become an important reference as I think about the political history of Taiwan',[7] and he further explains, 'In the case of North and South Korea, as well as that of Taiwan and mainland China, the historical experiences of nation and family clearly intersect'.[8] Is Chen's argument correct when he talks about South Korea and Taiwan? Is Taiwan really a semi-colony of the US?

1. *The Invention of China/中國*

To answer these questions, we should first reexamine the concept of 'China'/*中國*. Decolonial theorists have rightly questioned a lot of problematic Western inventions, such as race, gender, and America.[9] For instance, the leading decolonial theorist Walter D. Mignolo argues, 'the invention of America implied the appropriation and integration of the continent into the Euro-Christian imaginary'.[10] He further explains:

4. Kuan-Hsing Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (Durham, NC: Duke University, 2010), p. 181.
5. Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, p. 181.
6. Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, pp. 187-88.
7. Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, p. 115.
8. Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, p. 118.
9. Decolonial theory will be elaborated in a later section.
10. Walter D. Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), p. 3.

> The mass of land and the people were there, but they had named their own places: Tawantinsuyu in the Andes, Anáhuac in what is today the valley of Mexico, and Abya-Yala in what is today Panama. The extension of what became 'America' was unknown to them.[11]

However, most people never question the invention of China/*中國*. Fortunately, Arif Dirlik, an influential historian and postcolonial theorist, properly examines and analyzes how the Chinese nationalists invented the concept of China/*中國* at the beginning of the twentieth century. To understand this invention, the first step is to separate the English term 'China' from the Chinese term *中國*.

In fact, people who lived in 'China' before the twentieth century did not know that they lived in China and were Chinese. More precisely, China/Chinese was only used by Western people. To support this argument, Dirlik invites readers to read the sixteenth century Portuguese soldier-merchant Galeoto Pereira's statements.[12] Pereira says:

> We are wont to call this country China, and the people Chins; but as long as we were prisoners, not hearing amongst them at any time that name, I determined to learn how they were called, and asked sometimes by them thereof, for that they understood us not when we called them Chins…. In conclusion they said, that the whole country is called Tamen, and the inhabitants Tamenjins, so that their name China or Chins, is not heard of in that country.[13]

What is '*Tamen*?' This word should be separated into two parts. '*Ta*' means 'great' (*大*), and '*Men*' is 'Ming' (*明*). Thus, *Tamen* is the Great Ming Empire (*大明帝國*) (1368–1644). Then, what does '*Tamenjins*' mean? Since '*jins*' means 'people' (*人*), *Tamenjins* refers to the Ming Empire's citizens. This narrative implies that the local people did not have the concept of China/*中國*, and they identified themselves as the Ming Empire's citizens (*Tamenjins*) under the Ming Empire (*Tamen*)'s domination. In the middle of the seventeenth century, the Ming Empire, the native Han people (*漢人*)'s empire, was colonized by the Manchu people (*滿洲人*) who were from outside of the Great Wall. The Manchu people established the Qing Empire (*大清帝國*) (1636–1912), and local people started to refer themselves as the Qing Empire's citizens. In his book, *The Invention of China*, Bill Hayton further illuminates this debate:

11. Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*, p. 2.

12. Arif Dirlik, 'Born in Translation: "China" in the Making of "Zhongguo"', *boundary 2* 46.3 (2019), pp. 121-52 (128).

13. C. R. Boxer (ed.), *South China in the Sixteenth Century (1550–1575): Being the Narratives of Galeote Pereira, Fr. Gaspar da Cruz, O.P., Fr. Martin de Rada, O.E.S.A. (1550–1575)* (London: Routledge, 1953), p. 29.

> In reality there was no state called 'China' during this period. From 1644[14] until 1912, 'China' was, in effect, a colony of an Inner Asian empire: the Qing Great-State…. The previous Ming state lasted for almost 300 years but it had not used the name China, either. Before the Ming, those territories had been part of a Mongol Great-State that had stretched as far as the Mediterranean: East Asia was just one part of its domain.[15]

Similar to Dirlik's argument, Hayton's words show that people in this land did not call the land 'China'/*中國*.

Now, this section has to deal with two questions separately. First, when did people connect 'China,' a term used by the West, with *中國*? Second, when and why did the local people adopt China/*中國* as their country name?

To answer these questions, we should move on to the term *中國*. In English transliteration, *中國* is *Zhongguo*. *Zhongguo* should be separated into two parts: '*Zhong*' (*中*) means 'central', and '*Guo*' (*國*) refers to 'empire'. Thus, the meaning of *Zhongguo* (*中國*) is 'the central empire'. Although some ancient writings use the term *中國*,[16] it does not refer to a specific ancient empire. However, the Jesuits, who entered the Ming Empire in the sixteenth century, invented the connection between China and *中國*.[17] In the Jesuits' map, they added *中國* alongside China, the term created by the West. Dirlik argues, 'the equivalence between "China" and Zhongguo suggested in Jesuit cartographic practice was directly responsible for the dyadic relationship these terms assumed in subsequent years'.[18] Thus, the answer to the first question above is that the combination of China/*中國* was an invention of the West. Like the invention of America, people in China/*中國* were also affected by Western coloniality during the Renaissance. However, China/*中國* did not become the official country name until the beginning of the twentieth century. Why?

At the beginning of the twentieth century, many native elites—Han people (*漢人*)—were disappointed with the weakness of the Qing Empire, which was established by the colonizers—the Manchu people (*滿洲人*)—in the seventeenth century. Thus, the Han elites planned to build a nation-state and name it China/*中國* for two reasons. First, the Western world was already familiar with the term China/*中國* due to the Jesuits' cartography, and the Qing Empire also used the term China/*中國* to sign treaties with other empires in the nineteenth century.[19] Second, because *中國* means 'the central empire' and exists in ancient authors' writings, it would be a

14. The Qing Empire was established in 1636, and it occupied Beijing in 1644.
15. Bill Hayton, *The Invention of China* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2022), p. 8.
16. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', pp. 125-26.
17. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', p. 130.
18. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', p. 130.
19. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', pp. 130, 132.

great starting point to invent 5000 years of Chinese civilization and justify the central empire's future imperial expansion if they chose this term. As Dirlik argues, 'Naming the nation was only the first step in "the invention of China". The next…step was to…make Chinese (Zhongguohua), the land, the people, and the past'.[20] By borrowing from the Western people's technique of historiography, the Chinese nationalist elites created the 5000-year history of China, which combined all of the successive empires and kingdoms under the name China/*中國*—although, again, China/*中國* was not the name of any empire previously. These nationalists invented a linear and static China/*中國* without considering earlier empires' own identities and histories. For example, while the Yuan Empire (1271–1368) was built by the Mongol colonizers and the Qing Empire (1636–1912) was established by the Manchu colonizers, they would not have thought of themselves as belonging to the concept of 'China/*中國*'. Dirlik states:

> As the new idea of 'China/Zhongguo' was a product of the encounter with Euromodernity, the latter also provided the tools for achieving this goal. The new discipline of history was one such tool. Others were geography, ethnology, and archaeology.[21]

Just as Western people invented the Middle Ages by colonizing history,[22] the Chinese nationalists invented the 5000-year civilization of China by colonizing history. Thus, the Chinese nationalists appropriated the Jesuits' concept of China/*中國* and invented the imperial discourse of China/*中國*. As a result, the first China/*中國*, the ROC, was established in 1912. That is why Hayton argues:

> I have also tried to avoid using the term 'China' except where it is appropriate— generally from the period after the declaration of the Republic of China in 1912. To use it before this date is to fall into the nationalist trap of projecting terms (and their meanings) back into a past where they don't belong.[23]

Unfortunately, beyond colonizing time, the invention of China/*中國* also colonized space. For colonizing space, as Western people had already done so extensively, the Chinese nationalists invented the discourse of *五族共和* (Five Races Under One Union), which means that the Han, Manchu,

20. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', p. 134.
21. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', p. 134.
22. 'Men of letters in the European Renaissance invented the idea of the Middle Ages in order to locate themselves in the present of a history that they could trace back to Greece and the Roman Empire…. The idea of Western civilization that emerged at that juncture was based on pure and simple identity politics' (Walter D. Mignolo, 'Delinking', *Cultural Studies* 21:2 [2007], pp. 449-514 [470].
23. Hayton, *The Invention of China*, p. 6.

Mongol, Hui,[24] and Tibetan people all belong to the Chinese nation. However, since the Han people (*漢人*) were the majority who ruled the ROC, the purpose of this discourse was to justify the ROC's dominations of the Qing Empire's former colonies, including Mongolia, Xinjiang, and Tibet. That is why people in Xinjiang and Tibet are currently pursuing independence, and people in Mongolia have successfully established their own country: they all refuse to accept the Han people's invention of China/*中國*. That is why I identify the ROC as an Empire; and the ROC's territory, including Mongolia, was once bigger than the territory of the current PRC. Later, unfortunately, the second China, the PRC, which was established in 1949, also accepted the same discourse to justify imperialism. Dirlik correctly argues:

> [I]t was Manchu rulers of the Qing that annexed to the empire during the eighteenth century approximately half of the territory the PRC commands presently—from Tibet to Xinjiang, Mongolia, Manchuria, and Taiwan—as well as territories occupied by various indigenous groups in the Southwest.[25]

Hayton follows suit, arguing, '[The invention of China] underpins the PRC's right to rule Tibet, Xinjiang, Mongolia, Manchuria and Taiwan. It also gives it the authority to define who is Chinese and how they should behave'.[26] For legitimizing the re-colonialization of the Qing Empire's former colonies, the two Chinas, the ROC and the PRC, are still using the following discourse: 'these lands are the sacred and inseparable territories of China/*中國*'.[27] Under the shadow of the invention of China/*中國*, Taiwan and the Taiwanese people became oppressed by the two Chinas after WWII.

2. *The Darker Side of Reunification*

According to Mignolo, identifying the concept of 'America' as 'invention' instead of 'discovery' 'reflects the critical perspective of those who have been placed behind, who are expected to follow the ascending progress of a history to which they have the feeling of not belonging'.[28] Similarly, recognizing the idea of China/*中國* as 'invention' reflects the critical perspective of those who have the feeling of not belonging. Before 1945, Taiwan was not

24. Hui refers to Chinese Muslims, and most of them live in Xinjiang.
25. Dirlik, 'Born in Translation', pp. 144-45.
26. Hayton, *The Invention of China*, p. 5.
27. 蘇偉樺, '「台灣已是獨立國家」 國台辦嗆：不要誤判形勢', *華視*, 16 January 2020, https://tw.news.yahoo.com/%E5%8F%B0%E7%81%A3%E5%B7%B2%E6%98%AF%E7%8D%A8%E7%AB%8B%E5%9C%8B%E5%AE%B6-%E5%9C%8B%E5%8F%B0%E8%BE%A6%E5%97%86-%E4%B8%8D%E8%A6%81%E8%AA%A4%E5%88%A4%E5%BD%A2%E5%8B%A2-080000500.html.
28. Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*, p. 4.

included in the invention of China/*中國*. Taiwan was Indigenous people's land until different colonizers arrived in Taiwan in the seventeenth century. From 1626 to 1642, the Spanish colonizers occupied north Taiwan, while the Dutch colonizers had dominated south Taiwan since 1624 and they expelled the Spanish troops in 1642. Then, in 1662, the Han (*漢*) colonizers, the 'Ming Empire in exile',[29] defeated the Dutch colonizers in Taiwan and occupied Taiwan as its colony from 1662 to 1683. In 1683, the Ming Empire in exile was defeated by the Qing Empire, and Taiwan became the Manchu people's colony from 1683 to 1895. Because the Qing Empire lost the First Sino-Japanese War to the Japanese Empire in 1895, the Manchu people handed Taiwan over to Japan. Thus, Taiwan became Japan's colony from 1895 to 1945. Obviously, since the imperial discourse of China/*中國* and the first China, the ROC (1912–), were invented at the beginning of the twentieth century, Taiwan was never part of 'China/*中國*', and Taiwanese people were not identified as Chinese.

Unfortunately, Taiwan started to suffer from the imperial discourse of China/*中國* after WWII. In 1945, the US allowed the ROC Empire to colonize Taiwan after the Japanese Empire surrendered. To justify their colonization and exploitation, the ROC colonizers claimed that Taiwan was part of China/*中國* and all Taiwanese people were their Chinese family based on the imperial discourse of China/*中國* because Taiwan was a colony of the Qing Empire. According to the imperial discourse of China/*中國*, all of the Qing's colonies are China/*中國*'s territories.[30] They called their colonization 'reunification', and forced the colonized Taiwanese people to go to China/*中國* to fight their enemy, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), from 1945 to 1949. After the ROC lost the civil war to the CCP, they escaped to Taiwan in 1949. Unfortunately, the Chinese colonizers/refugees (ROC) still live in Taiwan. The Chinese colonizers/refugees (ROC) forced the Taiwanese to become Chinese by teaching China's 5000-year history and the Chinese language in the schools while destroying Taiwanese languages[31] and imprisoning/torturing/slaughtering Taiwanese people. Through imposing Chinese imperial epistemology and knowledge on the colonized Taiwanese, Chinese colonizers/refugees (ROC) legitimated their ruthless colonization, the darker side of reunification.

29. In 1644, the Han people's Ming Empire (1368–1644) was defeated by the Manchu colonizers. The latter established the Qing Empire (1636–1911).

30. This discourse is problematic. First, if people follow its logic, they also can that Taiwan should also be reunified into the Dutch, Spanish, and Japanese Empires since Taiwan was part of these empires' territory, and all of them were Taiwan's 'mainlands'. Second, since the Qing Empire has disappeared forever, there is no reason to return Taiwan to China/*中國* because China/*中國* is not the Qing Empire.

31. There are many different languages, including Indigenous people's languages, in Taiwan.

Thus, when Kuan-Hsing Chen, whose position I summarized earlier, argues in his influential book *Asia as Method* that Taiwan's history is similar to South Korea, he is repeating the Chinese colonizers/refugees' imperial discourse of China/*中國*, because Chen is the second generation of these colonizers/refugees. Yes, Taiwan and Korea were the Japanese Empire's colonies before 1945. However, while the Korean people gained independence and entered postcolonial society after WWII, Taiwan was colonized by the ROC right after the war and is still a colony of the ROC today, which means the Taiwanese people have yet to enter a postcolonial phase. For Chen, the 228 Massacre in Taiwan in 1947 is similar to the Jeju April 3 incident in Korea in 1948, because he believes that both incidents were 'state violence' resulting from the ideology of anti-communism.[32] However, in Taiwan, the 228 Massacre had nothing to do with anti-communism. This incident occurred because of the conflicts between the Chinese colonizers and the colonized Taiwanese. Thus, this incident should be identified as a *colonial massacre* instead of state violence. Unfortunately, as a second generation Chinese colonizer/refugee, Chen believes in the discourse of China/*中國*, which identifies Taiwanese as Chinese, and ignores that Taiwan is a colony of the ROC. That is why he labels this incident as state violence. Moreover, the tension between Taiwan and the second China/*中國*, the PRC, is different from the tension between South Korea and North Korea. Why? The answer is simple. While people in South Korea and North Korea all identify themselves as Korean, the tension between Taiwan and the PRC is fundamentally about identity—the embrace of Taiwanese identity and the refusal of Chinese identity. For the Taiwanese people, the rhetoric of reunification is merely a justification for the two Chinas' colonization. Thus, although both the ROC (Taiwan) and South Korea embraced democracy at the end of the twentieth century, Taiwan is still a colony of the ROC.

3. *The Darker Side of De-Westernization: The Chinese World System*

So, has Taiwan, like Japan and South Korea, become a semi-colony of the US after WWII, as Chen has argued in his book? Keun-joo Christine Pae, a Korean theologian, also claims, 'Historically speaking, systemic terrors against (alleged) communists were commonly found in Jeju, Okinawa, and Taiwan, where the US military occupied immediately following World War II'.[33] However, her statement is incorrect because the US had no intention of sending the military to Taiwan until the beginning of the Korean War

32. Chen, *Asia as Method*, pp. 123-24.

33. Keun-joo Christine Pae, 'Faith-Based Popular Resistance to the Naval Base in Gangjeong of Jeju: Transforming Militarized US–Korea Relations for Peace and Justice', in Nami Kim and Wonhee Anne Joh (eds.), *Critical Theology against US*

in 1950. The US handed Taiwan over to the ROC Empire in 1945 instead of occupying Taiwan while the US controlled Japan until 1952 and South Korea until 1948 right after WWII. Now, while the US has mutual defense treaties with South Korea, Japan, and the Philippines and still keeps its military power in these countries, the US withdrew its military power from Taiwan in 1979 and abandoned its mutual defense treaty with the ROC (Taiwan) in 1980. The US severed diplomatic relations with the ROC because it decided to establish diplomatic relations with the PRC in 1979.[34] This section does not aim to deny the suffering of South Korea, Japan, and the Philippines resulting from the US military power. Rather, this section intends to highlight that, unlike other countries in East and Southeast Asia, historically speaking, Taiwan is more like a bargaining chip than a semi-colony for the US. The US government sold Taiwan to the ROC Empire in 1945, and sold it to the PRC Empire in 1979, and no one can guarantee that the US will not do so again, since there is no mutual defense treaty or diplomatic relations between the US and Taiwan.

Furthermore, Taiwan was also sold to the PRC by the United Nations in 2007. After WWII, the ROC became one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. However, in 1971, according to United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758, the UN recognized the PRC as the 'only lawful representatives of China' and decided to 'expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek[35] from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it'.[36] After that, the PRC became the only China/*中國*, and the ROC (Taiwan) was not allowed to join organizations such as the UN, WHO, and ICAO. More precisely, the UN did not sell *Taiwan* to the PRC in 1971 because the representatives of China/*中國* in the UN were the would-be Chinese colonizers of Taiwan. However, in 2007, the former ROC president, Chen Shui-bian, who is Taiwanese, used the name 'Taiwan' to apply for joining the UN. This was the first time the ROC had used 'Taiwan' to apply. Since Resolution 2758 declared that the PRC is the only China/*中國*, Resolution 2758 did not claim that Taiwan is China/*中國*'s territory. Unfortunately, after the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon received President Chen's application and later also received a protest from the PRC, Ban refused to send President Chen's application to the UN Security Council and argued, 'the

Militarism in Asia: Decolonization and Deimperialization (New Approaches to Religion and Power Series; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 199-226 (206).

34. These events happened when Jimmy Carter was the US president.

35. Chiang Kai-shek was the former ROC president.

36. UN. General Assembly (26th session: 1971), *Restoration of the Lawful Rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations*, A/RES/2758 (25 October 1971), https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/192054.

United Nations considers Taiwan for all purposes to be an integral part of the People's Republic of China'.[37] His argument was far more damaging than Resolution 2758 because he identified Taiwan as the PRC's territory, which implies that the UN allowed the PRC to colonize Taiwan. In 2007, the UN officially sold Taiwan to the PRC through Ban's hands.

Following Resolution 2758 and Ban Ki-moon's approval, most countries have ended their diplomatic relations with the ROC (Taiwan) and emphasize that Taiwan is part of the PRC according to the imperial discourse of China/*中國*. What will happen if countries do not support the invention of China/*中國*? As Mignolo points out, the PRC has become the leading power of 'de-Westernization', which disputes the control and management of the Western 'colonial matrix of power' to pursue 'multipolarity'.[38] Mignolo refers to the PRC's economic strategy as a 'partnership' and argues, 'Partnership… means association in business rather than alliances and politics. You are not forced to do business with me, and I will not consider you an enemy if you do not'.[39] However, this is Mignolo's utopian illusion because he is blind to the PRC's oppressive economic system. For instance, recently, the PRC enforced extreme economic sanctions against Lithuania because Lithuania tried to be closer to Taiwan.[40] Thus, instead of referring to this behavior as a 'partnership' and 'multipolarity', this monograph recognizes this behavior as similar to how a crime boss disciplines his subordinates. On the one hand, Mignolo praises the PRC's de-Westernization and identifies the discourse of China/*中國*, *which was invented in the twentieth century*, as a re-establishment of 'knowing' and 'sensing'.[41] On the other hand, Mignolo continues to ignore the PRC's global designs, which manipulates the world into eliminating Taiwanese people's local histories, dignity, knowing, and sensing.

Thus, this book does not agree with Kuan-Hsing Chen's argument, when he claims that Taiwan's situation is similar to South Korea. The reality is that, while South Korea has diplomatic relations with 191 countries, the ROC

37. John J. Tkacik, Jr, 'Taiwan's Status Remains "Unsettled"', *The Heritage Foundation*, 1 October 2007, https://www.heritage.org/defense/commentary/taiwans-status-remains-unsettled.

38. Walter D. Mignolo, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations* (On Decoloniality Series; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2021), p. 485. These concepts of decolonial theory, such as 'de-Westernization' and 'colonial matrix of power', will be elaborated in a later section.

39. Mignolo, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*, p. 79.

40. Reuters, 'Lithuania demands China revoke sanctions against official over Taiwan visit', *Reuters*, 18 August 2022, https://www.reuters.com/world/lithuania-demands-china-revoke-sanctions-against-official-over-taiwan-visit-2022-08-18/.

41. For Mignolo, 'sensing' and 'emotioning' is inseparable from 'knowing', since the body (not least the colonized body) is inseparable from the mind (*The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*, p. 10).