



BRILL

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TAIWAN STUDIES

5 (2022) 165–180



brill.com/ijts

Reports



‘The Future of Taiwan Studies in the Post-COVID World’: Online Series on ‘COVID and Governance: Global and Social Solidarity’, 31 July 2020

Po-Han Lee

Assistant Professor, Global Health Program and Institute of Health Policy and Management, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan
pohanlee@ntu.edu.tw

Ya-Wen Yang

Assistant Research Professor, Institutum Iurisprudentiae, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan
ywyang@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Harry Yi-Jui Wu

Associate Professor, Cross College Elite Program, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan
harry.yj.wu@gmail.com

Wen Liu

Assistant Research Fellow, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan
wenliu@gate.sinica.edu.tw

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly disrupted research communities and agendas worldwide, including Taiwan studies. Consequently, the largest conferences for Taiwan studies in both North America and Europe were cancelled in 2020. In response, the North American Taiwan Studies Association, the European Association of Taiwan Studies, the Japan Association for Taiwan Studies, and the *International Journal of Taiwan Studies* jointly organised a series of online forums that aimed to encompass transnational and interdisciplinary approaches to Taiwan studies in the context of envisioning a post-COVID world. This report summarises the first event, on ‘COVID and Governance: Global and Social Solidarity’, which speaks directly to a moment of chaos, frustration, and yet hopefulness for Taiwan. It presents the papers of three discussants—Drs Ya-Wen Yang, Harry Yi-Jui Wu, and Wen Liu—who identified and explored the theoretical potential and limits of different ‘keywords’ popularised during the pandemic period.

Keywords

advanced deployment – border control – global solidarity – history of medicine – racial capitalism – #TaiwanCanHelp

1 Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic had greatly disrupted research communities and agendas worldwide, including Taiwan studies. For example, the largest conferences for Taiwan studies in both North America and Europe were cancelled in 2020. At the same time, Taiwan’s stellar response to the pandemic, combined with its geostrategic and political position amid the increasing tension between the West and China, has put Taiwan studies in a new international spotlight. This report summarises an online forum, ‘COVID and Governance: Global and Social Solidarity’, which speaks directly to this moment of chaos, frustration, and potentially yet arguably hopefulness for Taiwan.¹ The forum initiated a

1 A video recording of the forum can be accessed at <https://www.na-tsa.org/future-of-taiwan-studies-post-covid>. This report is a collaborative work: Ta-Yang Hsieh (president of NATSA, 2020–2021) provided information for the introduction; Po-Han Lee (the event moderator) wrote the section on ‘Keywording Taiwan’ and the conclusion. The three presenters—Ya-Wen Yang, Harry Yi-Jui Wu, and Wen Liu—drafted the respective sections, ‘Border Control’, ‘#TaiwanCanHelp’, and ‘Racial Capitalism’. The content of these three sections was reviewed

series of online events that aimed to address various issues concerning ‘The Future of Taiwan Studies in the Post-COVID World’. The series is a collaboration between the *International Journal of Taiwan Studies*, the North American Taiwan Studies Association (NATSA), the European Association of Taiwan Studies (EATS), and the Japan Association for Taiwan Studies, which jointly have intended to encompass transnational and interdisciplinary approaches to Taiwan studies in the context of envisioning a post-COVID world.²

2 Keywording Taiwan: ‘Solidarity’ and ‘COVID-19’

The main idea of the ‘COVID and Governance: Global and Social Solidarity’ forum was informed by the original theme of the 26th NATSA Annual Conference in 2020 to *keyword* (as a verb) Taiwan—both theoretically and methodologically. Against this background, taking the pandemic impact into account, the forum contributors have identified global ‘solidarity’ and governance as the starting point for engagement. Activists and caregivers around the world have advocated action that promotes a sense of togetherness as coronavirus swept the globe (Lee, 2020). Notably, the International Labour Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, International Fund for Agricultural Development, and the World Health Organization (WHO) issued a joint statement in October 2020, calling for ‘global solidarity’ especially with the most vulnerable communities (United Nations, 2020). In this context, this event represents an attempt to critically understand the politics of solidarity and community, which provide both opportunities and challenges for different groups of people.

With this agenda, Ya-Wen Yang (Institutum Iurisprudentiae, Academia Sinica) critically examined the way in which the state creates a big ‘Us’ versus ‘Others’ through border control, nationality, and other technologies of governance and territorialisation. She first re-examined a case decided by the Constitutional Court regarding severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) containment, followed by a discussion of ‘advanced deployment’ (超前部署,

and confirmed by the authors at different stages of preparing the report, with Po-Han Lee acting as the primary author and editor of this article.

2 In addition to the event summarised here, the series also included the following sessions: ‘How Does Hong Kong Security Law and “Decoupling from China” Impact Taiwan?’ on 28 August 2020; ‘The Impact of the COVID-19 Crisis on Taiwan’s External Relations: Views from Japan’ on 2 October 2020; and ‘From Taiwanese-language Films to the Future of Taiwan Cinema’ on 12 December 2020. The video recordings of these events can all be found at the website given in footnote 1.

chaoqian bushu), namely, proactive disease-control measures taken at the earliest signs of the COVID-19 outbreak. This timely engagement was concerned with the formation of the so-called ‘pandemic prevention community’ (防疫共同體, *fangyi gongtongti*), as well as tensions between migrant workers and insiders within the territorial boundaries. Ya-Wen therefore proposed ‘border control’ (國界管控, *guojie guankong*), in diverse forms, as the keyword for intervention.

On the other side of the coin, Harry Yi-Jui Wu (Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong, until 25 July 2021) paid attention to the effect of discursive practices on the international level. Drawing on the advocacy and diplomatic strategy regarding the #TaiwanCanHelp campaign, Harry explored the partnership between Taiwan and other countries in terms of international healthcare and humanitarian relief, by considering how both empirical and normative implications of the relationships between helpers and the helped reflect on geopolitical dynamics, in which Taiwan’s transient political status in international relations does matter. Hence, the perspective offered by the ‘history of medicine’ (醫學史, *yixue shi*) becomes the point of departure for analysis.

Observing the intensification of social mobilisation during the pandemic at both the domestic and international levels, Wen Liu (Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica) considered the particular significance of transnational activism at this time of crisis. Reflecting on the re-emergence of the Black Lives Matter movement and network, she critically interrogated the hierarchy between different communities and the selection mechanisms that include/exclude ‘members’ and ‘allies’ within and outside a society. Attending to the articulations between Asian-ness and Blackness and the necessity of transnational social activism, Wen uses the controversial case regarding Tedros’s racism accusations against Taiwan to illustrate the significance of ‘racial capitalism’ (種族資本主義, *zhongzu ziben zhuyi*) that requires a more nuanced approach from Taiwanese civil society and government (Robinson, 2000).

3 Border Control and Advanced Deployment

Taiwan’s legal structure to cope with a pandemic is very much a legacy of SARS in 2003. It is thus illuminating to ask where SARS leaves us today. How does it affect the strategy for COVID-19? How does it embody the rhetoric of ‘advanced deployment’, which, in turn, reinforces the boundary of body politics?

3.1 *SARS and the Oversimplified 'Trolley Problem'*

The 2003 SARS pandemic in Taiwan claimed 37 lives, including 11 medical staff members. The traumatic event led to an overhaul of regulations for disease control and a landmark constitutional decision, J. Y. Interpretation No. 690 (JYI 690). The key issue of JYI 690 concerns whether a quarantine order without the review and approval of courts violates the due process of law stipulated in Article 8 of the Constitution (Judicial Yuan Constitutional Court, 2011). The petitioner, Hwang, was a doctor of a public hospital, Taipei City Hospital, Heping Branch (Heping).

On 24 February 2003, when it was confirmed that internal infection had broken out in the Heping hospital, the Taipei mayor, Ma Ying-jeou, ordered that everyone in Heping, including patients and their visitors, be quarantined on site. Meanwhile, all hospital workers who were not in the hospital were recalled—they were needed, both to take care of people in the hospital and to be quarantined themselves. Hwang was out for lunch when the quarantine order was announced. Instead of returning to the hospital, he went home, researching advice about SARS prevention by the WHO, and then decided not to return to the hospital but quarantine at home. He believed that the quarantine order was wrong because gathering healthy and potentially infected people in one place without strict infection control was likely to spread the disease. Hwang's refusal to return eventually led to a severe fine, his dismissal, and pension deprivation (Chang, 2020; Chu, 2007).

Hwang sought redress in court but was ultimately rejected after appeal to the Constitutional Court. In the Constitutional Court's ruling, JYI 690, the Court acknowledged that compulsory quarantine limits people's physical freedom without safeguards that are usually required for criminal procedure. It nevertheless upheld the administrative quarantine order, confirming that such a measure is better subject to the discretion of the administrative branch rather than the judicial branch, for it requires expertise, promptness, and flexibility.

Viewed with hindsight, the quarantine order was controversial. It arguably caused panic and worsened infection in Heping (Ku, 2003). The government, however, defended the order as a necessary means to prevent further infection outside the hospital (Chu, 2007). In this vein, the Heping quarantine order was portrayed as a real-life trolley problem.³ The task at hand became a decision to choose whom to let die, and JYI 690 was criticised by some (e.g. Chang, 2020; Chiang, 2017), at least implicitly, for giving the green light to pull the lever on people in Heping.

3 The 'trolley problem' is a series of thought experiments, invented and coined by Judith Jarvis Thomson (1976: 206), for the ethical dilemma of whether to kill one to save many others.

However, framing the controversy in terms of the trolley problem was counterproductive, if catchy. The trolley problem presumes that loss of life is unavoidable, and hence justifiable, to save life. Such a trade-off is not the reality, far less the goal, of this public health scenario. By hastily accepting the problematic premise of the trade-off of lives, the trolley metaphor overlooks the nuance between scientific uncertainty, democratic trust, and civil disobedience. The critical issue is rather how to build trust for quick (and admittedly fallible) disease control decisions in an emergency while allowing constant debate and disagreement. This is exactly the challenge that Hwang's case posed to the disease control system, and JYI 690 was not able to fully answer it. Hwang rejected compliance because he thought the quarantine order was scientifically unsound, but the Court confirmed that it was not up to him to decide. Yet the same approach to demand observance may not always work if distrust is widespread and more citizens doubt how wise an order is. As JYI 690 rejected that Hwang could lawfully show his loyal dissent by way of disobedience, we are left with an unfinished task to determine the channels through which disagreement and trust can coexist in responding to the opaque emergency of plague.

3.2 *Advanced Deployment to the 'War' on COVID*

It is no accident that military metaphors are so often adopted in the effort to tame the virus, for people feel as vulnerable as they are in unknown warfare. One such term, advanced deployment, emerged as the main maxim in Taiwan's fight against COVID-19. Political rhetoric it may be (e.g. Office of the President, 2020), but it has a legal basis anchored in the extended authorisation of the post-SARS era. Indeed, taking precautionary and thus proactive actions long before real danger arrives often involves trial and error. It requires a more generous legal authorisation to limit people's freedoms based on the sheer prediction of threat.

Often, advanced deployment relies on borders, whether territorial or legal, tangible or intangible; thus Taiwan's main strategy has been fending off infection from the 'outside'. This special division of 'inside' and 'outside' also sheds a suspicious light on people deemed outsiders. Recall confirmed COVID-19 case no. 32, which was of an undocumented migrant worker, infected by the patient she was caring for in hospital (Taiwan Center for Disease Control, 2020). The government immediately released information about her whereabouts during the relevant period (CNA, 2020). A screenshot of her (fortunately, with a mask on) from CCTV on a bus was made available to the media (Huang, 2020).

However overreactive, this development was not surprising, since blue-collared temporary migrant workers (BTMWs) have been seen as a threat to

national health long before COVID-19. They endure frequent health checks—five times in three years, to be accurate—before and after their entry. Failure to pass the health check, even due to infection by relatively non-threatening parasites, can lead to rejection of the right of entry or deportation. The health check also reflects broader social anxieties towards BTMWS. For instance, between 1992 and 2004 checks included urine tests screening for narcotics (e.g. amphetamines, morphine, and cannabis). A mental health examination became part of the checks in 1997 to screen out ‘unsafe’ workers. Pregnancy is by no means an illness, but a pregnancy test has been requested for female workers since the start of the BTMW scheme, reflecting the double anxiety about unwanted immigrants and undesirable workers. Only in 2015 did the pregnancy test cease to be in the conditions for applying for a visa (Yang, 2021).

Today’s health check requirement for BTMWS is more anti-epidemic orientated. However, the occupation of foreigners affects whether they are perceived as ‘threatening outsiders’. For white-collared workers, the only category of foreign professional which needs to undergo a medical check for a work permit is language teachers in supplementary schools. Tellingly, their checklist is much shorter; nor is their medical check a condition for entry and stay.⁴ This structuring of health checks reveals two underlying assumptions: either only low-skilled workers can spread disease, or professionals cannot come from the same regime as low-skilled workers. Either way, the system is biased in terms of class and nationality.

The label of ‘outside’ threat is arbitrary but convenient. A BTMW who tests positive for tuberculosis after several years of stay is hardly an extraterritorial case. However, upon the test result, she immediately becomes deportable, falling prey to the border operation—if her employer so wishes (Hsieh, 2020). Often, promptly sending back the threatening ‘outsider’ fosters only false security, because she is likely to be deprived of the necessary medication to lower the risk of spreading the disease in her journey.

Today, in Taiwan’s struggle against COVID-19, more overseas and naturalised citizens are labelled as unwelcomed outside threats. This exposes how fragile and contingent the communal boundary is. COVID-19 is a difficult lesson inviting us to look more closely at who bears the costs, pain, and bias of the operation of boundary drawing. Since pandemics and public health crises are here to stay, our choice in everyday politics decides our collective, post-COVID tomorrow.

4 See Regulations Governing Management of the Health Examination of Employed Aliens, Arts 3–6. See <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=L0050018>.

4 #TaiwanCanHelp, and Yet, Can Taiwan Help?

While the rampancy of COVID-19 is yet to be quelled, Taiwan's experience in containing the virus has been considered exceptionally effective (Rowen, 2020; Zhang and Savage, 2020). Taiwan has demonstrated its capacity to keep the virus at bay and promise to assist other countries by donating face masks and sharing its disease prevention experiences. Between April and December 2020, Taiwan enjoyed consecutive 253 days without local infected cases. Yet can the 'Taiwan model' (as coined by the minister of foreign affairs Joseph Wu) and #TaiwanCanHelp (the diplomatic strategy initiated by the digital minister Audrey Tang) be successful in contributing to the world's battle against the worst pandemic since 1918 Spanish flu? The history of medicine could provide some insight. The campaign might not be as optimistic as it has been perceived domestically.

Scholars have argued that the relatively successful experience of disease control in Taiwan has been facilitated by the following factors: pro-active leadership (Soon, 2020; Yeh and Cheng, 2020), democracy (Wong, 2020; Yeh and Cheng, 2020), and civil society (Lo, 2020; Lo and Hsieh, 2020; Yeh and Cheng, 2020). From an international perspective, the vigilance of Taiwan's government and the mobilisation of its society could be the result of its decades-long isolation from international organisations, particularly its exclusion from the WHO (Lo, 2020; Rowen, 2020). In a tweet, the US health and human services secretary Alex Azar appreciated that 'Taiwan's efforts to share [with the US] their best practices and resources' (Reuters, 2020). However, these contributions perhaps only remain unrealistic to the international society. On top of the symbolic implication of 'face mask diplomacy', Taiwan's exceptionality appears irrelevant to what the international society is currently encountering; its experience is also difficult to translate into effective disease control measures for most other countries.

In fact the factors that facilitated a successful response in Taiwan were the culmination of several more significant and distant causes. For example, the mobilisation of civil society enabling citizens' compliance with health policies arguably results from the solidarity effect that emerged from the implementation of national health insurance in 1995 (Lo, 2020). On the one hand, such solidarity was tied to civil nationalism and the ethos of communal life that emerged during Taiwan's political reform from authoritarianism to democracy (Wong, 2020; Yeh and Chen, 2020). On the other hand, it is also observed that a strong sense of insecurity that led to the 'societalisation' of pandemic unpreparedness also mobilised the overall vigilance in Taiwan's civil society (Lo and Hsieh, 2020). This sentiment originated from citizens' distrust of failed

institutions and eventually led to the democratisation of institutional cultures. These phenomena are rarely seen in other contemporary developed countries, as 'equitable growth' has not been a common goal outside of Taiwan and South Korea (Wong, 2020). A society with such civility could exempt itself from being plagued like in Britain or the United States, where the disease affects underprivileged populations, or in China, where the outbreaks could only be eased with draconian measures.

The broad idea of the 'Taiwan model' has appeared several times in the contemporary history of global health; however, none of these examples can be easily duplicated. Take the history of malaria eradication, for example; the disease was eradicated in Taiwan in 1965, while the WHO had to quietly alter the objective from eradication to control because its vertical-model technical approach failed in India and sub-Saharan countries towards the end of 1960s. In the foreword to *Malaria Eradication in Taiwan*, for example, then minister of health Chang Po-Ya stated that Taiwan must maintain its achievement as a malaria-free country until the disease is totally eradicated worldwide (Chang, 2005). Such an assertion is ignorant of the WHO's despicable failure and subsequent policy turn. In his forthcoming book, Harry Wu details how Taiwan once led the WHO's work on international social psychiatry projects in the 1960s (Wu, 2021). While Taiwan boasts about its Formosan model of psychiatric epidemiology based on the legacy of this study, the WHO stopped collaborating with Taiwan in the 1970s due to a political decision made at the United Nations to recognise the People's Republic of China, a decision that also had a moral component due to the vastly larger population of the PRC compared with Taiwan.

As noted by Ian Goldin (2013), the WHO functions in a world of divided nations. Demands from the WHO and the International Health Regulations 2005 have often conflicted with various national interests. This flaw explains the root cause of China's cover-up of COVID-19 outbreaks in early January 2020. Moreover, as Goldin argues, what has made COVID-19 uncontrollable arguably resulted from the neoliberal medical marketplace as well as a mistrust of surveillance authoritarianism. Taiwan's attainment has been too insignificant of reference value to most countries that are still struggling with the accessibility and equity of healthcare. One must realise that the mobilisation of Taiwan society was to certain degree rooted in its misgivings about China's poor response to SARS since 2003 (Lo and Hsieh, 2020; Soon, 2020). With such mistrust, it does not mean that if Taiwan were affected by a more serious outbreak, it could have been able to excel in containing the virus as it also faces the subtle boundary problem of healthcare membership (Lo, 2020). It is also a member of a cross-country care chain that needs flows of people to maintain

its economy. In this situation, economically required migrants could come from countries that Taiwanese people might feel hostility towards due to the risk of infection.

To make the #TaiwanCanHelp initiative work, one needs to be on top of Taiwan's ever-changing status on the world map. Its sporadic involvements in global health works were contingent upon the complex history of international relations. Its transient official representation at the World Health Assembly has proven that conventional UN-based global health diplomacy is insufficient to conquer persistent foreign policy tensions (Herington and Lee, 2014). It has been argued that post-COVID global health should move away from state-centric approaches. Instead, it requires either fundamental reform within international organisations, such as the WHO, or public health practitioners to focus on their role in trans-government networks (Lin, Liu and Wu, 2021). While the WHO has altered its style to pursue partnership-based health governance (Cueto, Brown and Fee, 2019), whether Taiwan could become dexterous enough to fulfil a niche in the global health market is the key parameter with which to evaluate the so-called Taiwan model.

5 Racial Capitalism and the Logic of Anti-Blackness

The COVID-19 pandemic has pushed Taiwan to engage with global racial discourses in unprecedented ways. While 'race' has rarely been at the forefront of political or academic concerns, accusations that Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, the WHO Director-General, had received racist attacks from Taiwan's netizens placed the island on the international stage of racial formation and politics. President Tsai Ing-wen and Taiwan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs quickly rejected such accusations as groundless and misleading. President Tsai further took this event as a chance to rearticulate how Taiwan understands what it is like to be discriminated against, particularly, by being continually excluded from international organisations such as the WHO under China's pressures (Blanchard, 2020). As a response to Tedros's accusation, Taiwanese netizens launched a hashtag campaign—#ThisAttackComesFromTaiwan—on Twitter by posting Taiwanese street food and the normality of daily life that people in Taiwan could enjoy due to the government's effective management of the viral outbreak. It was meant to counter Tedros's original accusation of the racist slurs that 'came from Taiwan'. It later emerged, in a report by the *New York Times*, as a crowdfunded media campaign under the banner 'Taiwan Can Help' to showcase Taiwan's knowledge of managing the pandemic (such as the

emphasis on using surgical masks as a preventive measure) and to document Taiwan's international health diplomacy during the pandemic.⁵

On the one hand, Taiwanese state officials turned the attack back to the WHO's unequal policy of participation; on the other, the netizens transformed the attack into a humorous and positive vision of internationalist participation. However, both the state officials and the netizens neglected the original questions around race and racism raised by Tedros. The general framing was turned into a discourse of Taiwan as an exemplar of Asian democracy that did not have the problem of racism. While Tedros's statement may have been mistakenly caused by Chinese trolls who actively pretended to be Taiwanese users to spread racist slurs (Ellis, 2020), Wen has argued that it is a missed opportunity not to include Taiwan in the movements towards global racial justice given the widened gap of racial inequality aggravated by the current pandemic.

In the United States, the pandemic accelerated the movements of Black Lives Matter (BLM), following the deaths of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor as well as the brutal shooting of Jacob Blake. Many young people of Asian descent have joined the movements, often seeing the racialised attacks against Asians as being culpable for the 'China virus' as being connected to the racialised police brutality against Black bodies and the urgent need to forge their struggles towards global racial equality (Liu, 2020). Indeed, BLM has demystified the image of the US as the exemplar of multiculturalism and democracy, and rather, called out the historically rooted racial violence not yet resolved through reformist agendas.

Racial capitalism, an emergent paradigm in the study of racial relations, recognises that the processes of racialisation and capitalism are inseparable from each other (Melamed, 2015; Robinson, 2000). Under capitalism, racial violence can be exercised through seemingly rational and legal means such as state practices of law, policing, and military response. In the case of police killings of African American people, racial violence is legitimatised through claims of police self-defence and upholding the safety of the white and owning classes. At the same time, racialised working poor are praised as 'essential workers' but exposed and left to die by the uncontrollable spread of the virus. The logic of racial capitalism is inescapably global. As Jodie Melamed (2015) writes via Ruth Wilson Gilmore's (2002) work, racial capitalism is 'a technology of *antirelationality*'—it reduces the possibility of collective life and produces relations of separateness and difference to legitimate the necessary violence of neoliberal capitalism.

5 See <https://taiwancanhelp.us/>.

For scholars of Taiwan studies, the question is not only about how Black bodies are exploited and appropriated in the context of Taiwan, but instead, how the logic of anti-Blackness functions in our knowledge production and activist projects. For instance, the state officials' and netizens' responses to the racial critique operate via the logic of anti-Blackness by erasing conditions of racism and exceptionalising Taiwan's democracy. Rather than taking such a defensive approach, an alternative way of engaging with progressive internationalism and global racial solidarity is to seriously question the racialised and classed positionings of Han Taiwanese citizens and 'the foreign Other' whose labour the country depends on but who are viewed with suspicion as vectors of viral contagion, particularly those from the Southeast Asian region. It is also to challenge how Taiwan can intervene in global racial discourses more effectively rather than merely showcasing the Taiwanese Indigenous communities in representational terms. By acknowledging that ideologies of democracy, nationalism, and multiculturalism are part of the working mechanisms of racial capitalism, our political and theoretical objectives must expand beyond these claims to legitimise why and how Taiwan matters. On the contrary, only when we excavate how the state is actively producing violence via racial differences, can we move towards a truly progressive Taiwanese internationalism.

6 Conclusion

The online forum contributed to an important discussion about ideas and practices with respect to what constitutes a community and the way in which social and political relationships are constructed and maintained between members of such a community and between the community and others. Relevant questions have emerged on the most pressing issues in the COVID pandemic context, foregrounding critical discussion around 'solidarity' in terms of both the academic inquiry and political engagement of Taiwan studies. *Keywording* Taiwan thus requires a careful interrogation of how Taiwan has been and should be imagined, narrated, and represented, as demonstrated by the three panel discussants. Ya-Wen Yang's critique calls us to pay attention to the technologies of governing diseases and bodies—through controlling the borders and imposing burdens and duties upon individuals. In doing so, we may identify the tension between legality and legacy in the process of making sense of togetherness within the Taiwanese community.

Similar, and yet differentiated, tension can also be identified on the international level, in terms of the ambiguous relationships between Taiwan and other international counterparts. In this regard, Harry Wu locates the

#TaiwanCanHelp initiative and the ‘Taiwan model’ in a larger context of contemporary global health history, in which the One China policy and state centrism of UN-related organisations and agencies have always been barriers to sharing Taiwanese experience. Due to the marginalisation long experienced by Taiwan, at the earlier stage of COVID pandemic Taiwan largely missed the opportunity to take a more proactive approach to engaging in the transnational racial justice movement when it was involved in a racism controversy posed by Tedros. Wen Liu’s critique of racial capitalism highlights Taiwan’s ambivalent, if not self-contradictory, attitudes towards ‘outside-ness’ at the different levels—in excluding others and being excluded by others—that are considered from different angles by both Ya-Wen Yang and Harry Wu.

Notes on Contributors

Po-Han Lee

is an assistant professor at the Global Health Program, National Taiwan University. He is also a senior editor of *Plain Law Movement* in Taiwan. Previously, he taught sociology/criminology and gender studies at University of Sussex. He is interested in critical approaches to human rights and health equities, and is currently co-editing a book with Palgrave, *Towards Gender Equality in Law: An Analysis of State Failures from a Global Perspective*.

Ya-Wen Yang

is an assistant research professor at the Institutum Iurisprudentiae, Academia Sinica. She received her PhD in law from SOAS, University of London. Her work focuses specifically on constitutional and human rights challenges posed by cross-border migration. Her current project concerns the basis and implication of loyalty as a dual boundary of the polity as well as the labour market.

Harry Yi-Jui Wu

is an associate professor at Cross College Elite Program, National Cheng Kung University. He graduated from Chung Shan Medical University with a MD and has a DPhil in the history of medicine from the Wellcome Unit, University of Oxford. As a historian of medicine, he conducts research mainly focusing on the transnational histories of medicine. His first book, *Mad by the Millions: Mental Disorders and the Early Years of the World Health Organization* (2021), was by MIT Press. In 2020 Wu was elected an early career fellow of Hong Kong Academy of Humanities.

Wen Liu

is an assistant research fellow at the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica. She received her PhD in critical social psychology at the Graduate Center, City University of New York. She is currently working on a book project titled *Assembling Asian American: Psychological Technologies and Queer Subjectivities* with the University of Illinois Press, and co-editing a book volume titled *Reorienting Hong Kong's Struggle: Leftism, Decoloniality, and Internationalism* with Palgrave Macmillan.

References

- Blanchard, Ben (2020) 'Taiwan rebuffs accusations it racially attacked WHO chief', *Reuters*, 9 April. Retrieved 23 March 2021 from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-taiwan-who-idUSKCN21R04R>.
- Chang, Po-Ya (2005) 'Forward', in Ministry of Health (ed.), *Malaria Eradication in Taiwan*, Taipei: Taiwan Center for Disease Control, xii–xiv.
- Chang, Tzewu (2020) '重返和平：SARS隔離黑洞中難以告別的記憶' [Returning to Heping: The unforgettable memory in the black hole of SARS quarantine], *The Reporter*, 13 March. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://www.twreporter.org/a/sars-memories-life-under-quarantine-in-heping-hospital> [in Chinese].
- Chiang, Wei-Lun (2017) '愛滋病歧視簡史(三) 真實世界的電車問題：侵犯少數人的人權是對的嗎?' [A brief history of HIV/AIDS discrimination (III): A real-life trolley problem: Is it fine to infringe minorities' human rights?], *United Daily News*, 26 December. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://opinion.udn.com/opinion/story/11496/2895926> [in Chinese].
- Chu, Hsien-Che (2007) 公共電視紀錄觀點：穿越和平 [Public TV ViewPoint: An exposure of the SARS-affected hospital: A memoir of the SARS crisis in Taiwan]. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TIcBEOEzYno> [in Chinese].
- CNA (2020) '案32外籍移工活動時序' [Footprint map of confirmed case no. 32 foreign migrant worker], 27 February. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://www.cna.com.tw/news/firstnews/202002275007.aspx> [in Chinese].
- Cueto, Marcos; Brown, Theodore M.; and Fee, Elizabeth (2019) *The World Health Organization: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, Samson (2020) 'Taiwan accuses Chinese trolls of fomenting racism spat with WHO', *Bloomberg*, 10 April. Retrieved 23 March 2021 from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-04-10/taiwan-accuses-chinese-trolls-of-fomenting-racism-spat-with-who>.

- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson (2002) 'Fatal couplings of power and difference: Notes on racism and geography', *The Professional Geographer* 54(1): 15–24.
- Goldin, Ian (2013) *Divided Nations: Why Global Governance is Failing and What We Can Do About It*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herington, Jonathan and Lee, Kelley (2014) 'The limits of global health diplomacy: Taiwan's observer status at the world health assembly', *Globalization and Health* 10(1): 71. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-014-0071-y>.
- Hsieh, Meng-Ying (2020) '國家從來沒把他們當人看！108名移工確診，民團揭真正防疫破口' [The state has never treated them as human beings! 108 confirmed cases of migrant workers: NGOs reveal the real epidemic prevention flaw], *Storm Media*, 10 December. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://www.storm.mg/article/3283645> [in Chinese].
- Huang, Sunrise (2020) '染疫外籍女看護搭公車畫面曝光，全程戴口罩' [Exposed CCTV scene of the infected foreign caregiver on bus: With facemask on all the way], *CNA*, 29 February. Retrieved 31 Dec 2020 from <https://www.cna.com.tw/news/firstnews/202002290081.aspx> [in Chinese].
- Judicial Yuan Constitutional Court (2011) '釋字第690號' [J. Y. Interpretation No. 690], Constitutional Court, 30 September. Retrieved 31 Dec 2020 from <http://cons.judicial.gov.tw/jcc/zh-tw/jep03/show?expno=690> [in Chinese].
- Ku, Martin (2003) 公共電視紀錄觀點：和平風暴 [Public TV ViewPoint: *Hoping Storm*: How SARS went out of control in Hoping hospital]. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sfsaCHyMuyY> [in Chinese].
- Lee, Po-Han (2020) 'Who governs what? COVID-19, global health, and Taiwan's multiple positionings', *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology* 67: 213–223.
- Lin, Ching-Fu; Liu, Han-Wei; and Wu, Chien-Huei (2021) 'Breaking state-centric shackles in the WHO: Taiwan as a catalyst for a New Global Health Order', *Virginia Journal of International Law* 61: 99–114.
- Liu, Wen (2020) 'Internationalism beyond the "Yellow Peril": On the possibility of transnational Asian American solidarity', *Transnational American Studies* 11(2): 13–16.
- Lo, Ming-Cheng M. (2020) 'How Taiwan's precautionary approach contained COVID-19', *Contexts* 19(4): 18–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504220977929>.
- Lo, Ming-Cheng M. and Hsieh, Hsin-Yi (2020) 'The "societalization" of pandemic unpreparedness: Lessons from Taiwan's COVID response', *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 8: 384–404. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41290-020-00113-y>.
- Melamed, Jodi (2015) 'Racial capitalism', *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1(1): 76–85.
- Office of the President (2020) 'Inaugural of the 15th-term President and Vice President of the Republic of China (Taiwan)', Office of the President, ROC (Taiwan), 20 May. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://english.president.gov.tw/Page/548>.

- Reuters (2020) 'Taiwan pushes WHO participation in rare ministerial call with U.S.; 28 April. Retrieved 3 May 2021 from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-taiwan-usa-idUSKCN22A03A>.
- Robinson, Cedric (2000) *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rowen, Ian (2020) 'Crafting the Taiwan model for COVID-19: An exceptional state in pandemic territory', *Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 18(14): 1–12.
- Soon, Wayne (2020) 'From SARS to COVID-19: Rethinking global health lessons from Taiwan', *East Asian Science, Technology and Society* 14(4): 647–655. <https://doi.org/10.1215/18752160-8771307>.
- Taiwan Center for Disease Control (2020) '公布第32例確診個案，為案27 外籍看護' [Confirmed Case No. 32 was the foreign caregiver of Case No. 27], 26 February. Retrieved 31 December 2020 from <https://www.cdc.gov.tw/Bulletin/Detail/ra20bYUzTRZoZGSg9LbpeA?typeid=9> [in Chinese].
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis (1976) 'Killing, letting die, and the trolley problem', *The Monist* 59(2): 204–217.
- United Nations (2020) "'Time for global solidarity" to overcome COVID's health, social and economic challenges', 13 October. Retrieved 16 April 2021 from <https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/10/1075322>.
- Wong, Joseph (2020) 'Combating COVID-19 in democratic Taiwan and South Korea', *Current History* 119(818): 210–216. <https://doi.org/10.1525/curh.2020.119.818.210>.
- Wu, Harry Yi-Jui (2021) *Mad by the Millions: Mental Disorders and the Early Years of the World Health Organization*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Yang, Ya-Wen (2021) 'Can equal protection for workers as a human right transcend state borders? The hard case of the Temporary Migrant Worker Programme', *Academia Sinica Law Journal* 28: 211–285.
- Yeh, Ming-Jui and Chen, Chia-Ming (2020) 'Solidarity with whom? The boundary problem and the ethical origins of solidarity of the health system in Taiwan', *Health Care Analysis* 28(2): 176–192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-020-00397-8>.
- Yeh, Ming-Jui and Cheng, Yawen (2020) 'Policies tackling the COVID-19 pandemic: A sociopolitical perspective from Taiwan', *Health Security* 18(6): 427–434. <https://doi.org/10.1089/hs.2020.0095>.
- Zhang, J. J. and Savage, Victor R. (2020) 'The geopolitical ramifications of COVID-19: The Taiwanese exception', *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 61(4–5): 464–481.