INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600
Toward another miracle? Impetuses and obstacles in Taiwan's democratization

Wu, Jaushieh Joseph, Ph.D.
The Ohio State University, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Wu, Jaushieh Joseph. All rights reserved.
TOWARD ANOTHER MIRACLE?
IMPETUSES AND OBSTACLES IN TAIWAN'S DEMOCRATIZATION

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of the Ohio State University

By

Jaushieh Joseph Wu, B.A., M.A.

The Ohio State University
1989

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Bradley Richardson
Dr. Richard Gunther
DR. HAO CHANG

Approved by

Advisor
Department of Political Science
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Bradley Richardson, Dr. Richard Gunther, and Dr. Hao Chang for their guidance and insights throughout this dissertation research. Their comments and suggestions made the completion of this project possible. Gratitude is also expressed to President Lee Teng-hui and those who kindly granted interview opportunities and those who provided valuable data and assistance to me. And the support of my parents and other family members is the most important inspiration to my research. I would also like to say my special thanks to my wife Su for going through difficult times together.
VITA

October 31, 1954 . . . . Born - Changhua, Taiwan, ROC

1978 . . . . . . . . . . B.A., National Cheng-chi University, Taipei, Taiwan

1982 . . . . . . . . . . M.A., University of Missouri-St. Louis

1984-1988. . . . . . . Research Staff, Polimetrics Laboratory, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1988-1989. . . . . . . Graduate Research Associate, Graduate Teaching Associate, The Ohio State University

FIELDS OF STUDY:
MAJOR FIELD: COMPARATIVE POLITICS
MINOR FIELD: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ....................................... ii
VITA ................................................ iii
LIST OF TABLES ......................................... vi
LIST OF DIAGRAMS ....................................... viii
LIST OF MAPS ........................................... ix
INTRODUCTION ............................................ 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. THEORY AND RESEARCH AGENDA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Democracy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan in the Threshold of Transition</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories and Hypotheses</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Method and Data</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. DEMOCRATIZATION IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for Democracy in Contemporary China</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan: the People</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan's China Tie</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan under Japanese Rule</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chiang Kai-shek Era</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Chin-kuo: The Turning Point</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for Answers</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF TAIWAN</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Showcase of Socio-economic Development</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Growth with Distribution</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Society that Makes Demands</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Society that is Interested in Politics</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Conclusions</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. MAJOR ACTORS IN TAIWAN'S POLITICS:
KMT, DPP, AND MASS-ELITE RELATIONS. . . . . . . . 172

- KMT Versus DPP in Elections. . . . . . . . . . . 176
- Strength and Weakness of KMT and Opposition. . 181
- Elite-Mass Relations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 204
- Summary Conclusion . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 224

V. CLASH OF VIEWS:
NATIONAL POLITICAL ELITES ON THE ISSUES . . . . 227

- The Issue of National Identity . . . . . . . . . 233
- Parliamentary Reform . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 255
- Constitutional Amendment and Emergency Decree. 266
- Conflicting Perceptions of Democracy . . . . . . 271
- Summary Conclusion . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 285

VI. CONCLUSION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 299

- Research Findings. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 300
- Suggestions for Future Democratization . . . . . 311
- A Lesson for the Third World . . . . . . . . . . . 321

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 325
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Local Elections Held in Taiwan</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Matrix of Correlation of National Development</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Economic Growth Rate, GNP Per Capita</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Per Capita GNP, Economic Growth Rate</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Income Distribution on Selected Countries</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Major Social Indicators</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Media Exposure, Taiwan and US</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Public Protest Activities</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Interest in Election, Taiwan, US, Japan</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Discussion about Election, Taiwan, US, Japan</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Impact of Education, Age, Gender, Origin</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Discussing Election by Education</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Interest in Election by Age</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Discussing Election by Age</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Taiwanese vs. Mainlander on Education</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Media Exposure and Age</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 KMT and Tang-wai in Provincial Assembly Election</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 KMT and Tang-wai in County Mayors Election</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 KMT and Tang-wai in Legislative Yuan Election</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 KMT and Tang-wai in National Assembly Election</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Highest Votes for Opposition and KMT, 1986</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Vote Distribution and Electoral Outcome</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Party ID by Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Party ID by Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Party ID by Provincial Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>KMT Elite Attitude Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Opposition Elite Attitude Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF DIAGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Structure of the Government</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Evolution of DPP's Main Factions</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF MAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 MAP OF TAIWAN</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION
Although the Taiwanese themselves are still debating how the country should adjust its economic structure in the increasingly competitive global market, few would doubt that Taiwan (the Republic of China, ROC) has in recent decades created no small miracle in its economic development. A very consistent 7% average annual growth rate plus a projected $6,715 GNP per capita for 1989 put Taiwan's economy in the fastest growing category of the world (The Central Daily, 12/16/88:1). Because of its economic success, Taiwan has been able to allocate some of its financial resources into the infrastructure, research and planning, education, and other public projects. As a result, an equitable distribution of income piles on top of rapid growth. All of this led the scholars of Third World development to view Taiwan as a successful model of growth and distribution for the developing countries.

In spite of its rapidly growing economy, the Nationalist government has been criticized by some as being autocratic, and the political aspect of Taiwan's development has been said to have stagnated. According to the critics, there has been no basic change in the ruling structure, and late President Chiang Kai-shek and his son late President Chiang Chin-kuo have been the only rulers of the country from 1949 to 1988. The Parliament, consisting of the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Control Yuan, has more than 80% of its members elected in Mainland China in 1948, and they do not need to face the challenge of
reelections. Taiwan's citizenry cannot elect their own president, prime minister, governor, nor the mayors of the two largest cities—Taipei and Kaohsiung.

The government, moreover, was charged by critics with being completely dominated by the Nationalist Party (Kuomintang, KMT). The opposition activists were suppressed, and the government used an emergency decree and martial law to restrict the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of assembly. As a result, there was no voice but the voice of KMT, and there was no opinion but the opinion of the government. From any standard or definition of democracy, Taiwan was not impressive in its political development.

Notwithstanding all these charges, even the bitterest critics of the KMT government have to recognize that since 1986, a series of changes have led people to believe that the political aspects of Taiwan's development has made some significant changes. First, the late President Chiang Ching-kuo delivered a speech on December 25, 1985, and firmly assured that there would be no military rule after him and that no one in Chiang's family would succeed him (Hu, 1987:17-20). Second, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) was allowed to be founded before the elections were formally kicked off at the end of 1986, thus transforming the election into a multi-party competition. Third, a 38-year-old martial law was formally lifted in July 1987.
Fourth, the government has allowed street demonstrations and publication of political journals as a means of free speech. Fifth, mainlanders are permitted to visit their relatives in mainland China. Sixth, some exiled dissidents in the United States and most Taiwanese in mainland China are allowed to return to Taiwan. Finally, almost all political prisoners were released from prison before April 22, 1988 (SSW, 59:10). Meanwhile, heated debates within and without the KMT are underway concerning the necessary changes in the Parliament and the direct elections of the mayors, governor, and President. These changes have generated some excitement among those who watched Taiwan closely (Kao, et. al., 1988), and many thought that Taiwan would soon become another liberal democracy.

From an historical point of view, the recent changes in Taiwan are particularly meaningful. Since the late Ch'ing Dynasty, China has been searching for a political system that would modernize the country. Among the political ideas that were studied and pursued, democracy has been the central concern among many intellectuals. Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolution in 1911, Hu Shih and Chen Du-hsiu's literature revolution and May Fourth Movement in 1919, and Lei Chen's abortive attempt to establish a political party in 1960 were all designed to enhance the institutionalization of a democratic political system. However, none of the movements in modern China had achieved the level of political freedom and opportunities for participation that Taiwan has achieved.
since 1986. This is the first time in the history of Taiwan (as well as that of China) that democracy might be realized in the near future.

In spite of the excitement and hope generated by the political changes since the mid 1980s, reforms which were geared toward building democracy in Taiwan seem to have come to a halt since the death of Chiang Chin-kuo in early 1988. Solutions to many important and controversial issues have not been properly sought. First of all, the Parliament is still occupied by the senior members, who still consist of about 80% of the entire body. Second, the Constitution, written in mainland China in 1947, has been overshadowed by the emergency decree, which was declared by Chiang Kai-shek upon the loss of mainland China. Third, none of the most important executive positions, such as President, Prime Minister, Governor, and the mayors of Taipei and Kaohsiung, are subject to popular elections. All these indicate that although Taiwan may already have a high degree of political freedom, there is not yet a full democracy.

Putting all this in a comparative context, a few Third World countries have been able to make successful transition from authoritarian rule to democracy: a handful of countries in Latin America, Spain, Portugal, Greece, and South Korea. The attempt of some Eastern bloc countries, such as the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Poland, to incorporate different interests into their political systems
also met with initial success in mid 1989. As a general trend, democratization once again caught the attention of the world. Taiwan's great economic success has established a firm base for democracy to take place, and indeed, there seems to be a movement toward democracy since the mid 1980s. However, Taiwan has not yet achieved full democracy. For those who are concerned with Third World political development in general, and with the development of Taiwan in particular, it is unequivocally important to ask: Why is Taiwan not able to make this political transition into democracy despite its great economic success? What causes Taiwan to stagnate in its political reform? Is the stagnation caused by socio-economic factors, or by the decisions made by the political elites?

As a political science student who cares about Taiwan's development, I take on these research questions in the hope that scholars in the field will benefit from the lesson learned from this case. This study will provide some new information on the causes of delayed democratization and the proper means to understand those causes. This research project has found that Taiwan has reached a fairly advanced level of economic development, and along with that development the society in general has become more pluralistic and mature. However, the major finding is that the national political elites have drastically different views toward the most important issues of Taiwan's democratization, namely, national identity, Parliamentary
reform, the termination of the emergency decree and the amending of the Constitution. Moreover, the major elites in Taiwan also differ greatly in their perceptions of democracy and how to reach the goal. Lack of elite consensus on the major issues and on the means for achieving democracy is the prime cause of the delayed process of democratization. In other words, the major obstacle to Taiwan's democratization is found to be in the conflicting perceptions of the national political elites on democracy and their proposed solution to the critical issues of democratization.

The project itself will be organized into six chapters, each with a distinctive focus. In the first chapter, I will start with a search for a good definition of democracy, and will use that definition to look at the current state of transition in Taiwan. I then will review the literature on the origins of democracy. Two levels of hypotheses, one on the mass level and the other on the elite level, will be specified in terms of the relations between socio-economic development and the elite factor on the one hand and the transition from authoritarian rule into democracy on the other. The research method and the sources of data will also be elaborated in great detail in Chapter I.

Chapter II will provide an historical overview on Taiwan and China's search for democracy, including past attempts and current efforts. This chapter will briefly describe Taiwan before the KMT's rule, and then deal more extensively
with the regime characteristics of different periods after Taiwan came under KMT's rule. Chiang Kai-shek's authoritarian government will be shown to have several totalitarian features. Chiang Chin-kuo's era will be described as the beginning of social and political change, including gradual liberalization and greater tolerance for organized opposition. In spite of the significant changes taken place in the mid 1980s, there are still issues that Taiwan is not able to resolve in order to reach the rank of liberal democracy. The first potential explanation to be addressed will be the socio-economic conditions of Taiwan. In other words, this project will explore whether Taiwan has met the socio-economic prerequisites of democracy.

Chapter III will analyze the socio-economic development of Taiwan on three key concepts: growth, distribution, and the rising demand for participation. The findings indicate that Taiwan has been able to achieve both rapid economic growth and a very even distribution of wealth, two seemingly contradicting goals for most Third World countries. Moreover, the population in general is educated, urbanized, and exposed to mass media. Many in Taiwan have also participated in different protest activities to make their demands on the government. The conclusion of the chapter is that Taiwan has reached a fairly advanced level of socio-economic development. If the socio-economic condition is not the fundamental cause of Taiwan's difficulties in reaching democracy, could the answer then lie in the
national political elites?

Chapter IV takes an in-depth look at the national elites of Taiwan. In order to understand the national political elites, this chapter will first compare and contrast the electoral strength and weakness of the two main political parties in Taiwan—the KMT and the DPP. Social backgrounds of each of the elite groups and the social bases of elite support will also be discussed. Both parties will be described as catch-all parties which are very careful to avoid targeting specific social groups to be their main supporters.

Chapter V will provide a detailed description of these political elites' views toward different issues of democratization, including the reform of the Parliament, constitution amendment, termination of emergency decree, and the reunification/independence controversy. On each of these issues, the ruling elites can be clearly divided into liberal and conservative groups and the opposition elites can be categorized into radical and moderate groups. Each group's views will be outlined for the purpose of comparison. Elite interview data will be used extensively in this chapter as the main source of evidence. The conclusion will be that there is a fundamental conflict in elites' views on how democratization can be achieved.

Chapter VI is the conclusion of the research project. The main finding is that all socio-economic prerequisites
for democracy have been met in Taiwan, but there is still not full democracy. As this research illustrates, the causes of the difficulties of Taiwan's democratization lie in the conflicting views of the national political elites regarding how important issues should be resolved and how democracy can be achieved. A proposal for resolving the conflicting views will also be provided.
CHAPTER I

THEORY AND RESEARCH AGENDA
I. Defining Democracy

In studying the transition toward democracy, having a clear definition of democracy is undoubtedly very important. It is necessary to have an objective measure of democracy which can be applied in different cases as an indicator of whether one particular political system is democratic. There have been numerous attempts in the discipline of political science to define democracy. Some definitions come from an institutional perspective, some others come from a procedural perspective, and still others define democracy in more abstract terms.

Taking direction from Joseph Schumpeter and Max Weber, Lipset argued that "Democracy in a complex society may be defined as a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials, and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office" (Lipset, 1959:27). This definition specifies three main concepts: constitutionalism, mass suffrage, and majority rule. Carl Cohen, differs somewhat, stressing that "Democracy is the system of community government in which, by and large, the members of a community participate, or may participate, directly or indirectly, in the making of decisions which affect them all" (Cohen, 1971:7). As Cohen explained, this definition of democracy is about the breadth and depth of
participation and the range of issues upon which such participation can be effective (Cohen, 1971:33-4).

In his book *Contemporary Democracies* (1982), Powell explicitly stated that in order to be called a democracy, any political system must meet five criteria:

1. The legitimacy of the government rests on a claim to represent the desire of its citizens. That is, the claim of the government to obedience to its laws is based on the government's assertion to be doing what the people want it to do.

2. The organized arrangement that regulates this bargain of legitimacy is the competitive political election. Leaders are elected at regular intervals, and voters can choose among alternative candidates. In practice, at least two political parties that have a chance of winning are needed to make such choices meaningful.

3. Most adults can participate in the electoral process, both as voters and as candidates for important political office.

4. Citizens' votes are secret and not coerced.

5. Citizens and leaders enjoy basic freedom of speech, press, assembly, and organization. Both established parties and new ones can work to gain members and voters (Powell, 1982:3).

Another set of conditions were proposed by Robert Dahl in his classic *Poliarchy* (1971). Dahl's definition was fully endorsed by Lijphart in his * Democracies* (1984).

1. Freedom to form and join organizations;
2. Freedom of expression;
3. The right to vote;
4. Eligibility for public office;
5. The right of political leaders to compete for support and vote;
6. Alternative sources of information;
7. Free and fair elections;
8. Institutions for making government policies depend
on votes and other expressions of preferences (Dahl, 1971:3; Lijphart, 1984:2).

In Democracy and the American Party system, Austin Ranney and Willmoore Kendall (1956) also specified that any democracy must meet four principles: popular sovereignty, political equality, popular consultation, and majority rule (Ranney et. al. 1956:23). In the discipline of political science, one of the most profound procedural definitions of democracy was made by Juan J. Linz, who placed great emphasis on the procedures of democracy: "We shall call a political system democratic when it allows the free formulation of political preferences, through the use of basic freedoms of association, information, and communication, for the purpose of free competition between leaders to validate at regular intervals, by nonviolent means their claim to rule; a democratic system does this without excluding any effective political office from that competition or prohibiting any members of the political community from expressing their preference by norms requiring the use of force to enforce them" (Linz, 1975:182-3). Also pointed out by O'Donnell et.al. (1986), democracy is the institutionalization of social conflict, uncertainty, and representation in a procedural context. Democratic institutions are not created to ensure the domination of some groups or of one ideology in the society. The outcome of conflict is always determined by free competition within formal institutions; it is not
predetermined or arranged by any person or any group of persons.

All of these definitions may give the impression that there is not an authoritative definition in political science on the concept of democracy. Indeed, the definition of democracy is so fragmented that Lijphart even went so far as to say that "Democracy is a concept that virtually defies definition" (Lijphart, 1977:4). Adding a new definition to the concept of democracy may be futile and may cause more confusion. Nonetheless, by reviewing the definitions on democracy, one may find some common principles linking all of them together: universal suffrage, meaningful electoral competition, basic freedom, government according to consent, and so on. One may also find, particularly through the definition by Juan Linz, that democracy is a procedure to regulate and institutionalize social conflict through competitive and regular elections without excluding any social group. Each individual country may have a different degree of internal conflict, external pressure, socio-economic development, and institutional structure.

But no matter how different a country is from others, it has to fulfill the basic principles of democracy in order to be called a democratic country. For practical purposes, I would like to combine the common themes stressed by these social scientists into a set of principles which can serve as a measure of a regime's level of democratization. In
addition to the principles commonly emphasized by political scientists, one should also add the principle that all parliamentary seats should be subject to open and fair competition and that no one should be penalized for taking part in the open competition for political office. These two principles are not stressed by Western scholars perhaps because they are so pervasive and basic to the Western societies. In sum, only those political systems that meet all of the following principles can then be called full democracies. If a political system has none of the following characteristics, it is not a democracy at all, and if a political system fulfills only some of the following principles, it is then only a partial democracy or a pseudodemocracy. The principles are:

1. Universal suffrage and citizens' right to be elected
2. Basic freedom of speech, press, assembly, and organization
3. Fair, free, and competitive elections at regular interval
4. Eligibility of the most important executive offices and all parliamentary seats for competition
5. No political persecution

Some may argue that democracy is a matter of degree, and that democracy and authoritarianism are in fact a continuum (Personal interview, 8/16/88). This may be correct in a sense, for countries in the world vary in their degree of
democratization. However, there is a fine line that distinguishes an ideal type democracy from a country which is not completely democratized. A country must cross that fine line in order to be grouped with the countries that are called full democracies. If an ideal-type democracy is not clearly defined and that fine line between democracy and partial democracy is not clearly specified, the most authoritarian regime can claim that it too is a democracy, though to a different degree.

For example, post-war Japan fulfills all the above-listed principles and there is no question that Japan is a democracy. Communist China, as another example, even though improvements have been cited in recent years, fulfills perhaps none of these principles. People in China have only very limited freedom of expression; they have no open and fair elections; they have very limited chances of being in public office if they are not members of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP); practically none of the political offices are open to competition; The People's Assembly acts as a rubber stamp; and many still suffer political persecution. The conclusion in the case of China is that it is a long way from becoming a democracy.

Two concepts need to be clearly distinguished here: The concept of democratization and the concept of liberalization. As liberalization implies the loosening of the control of the authoritarian regime to let off some
"steam," democratization implies a real movement toward democracy (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986, V4:6-11). In studying Third World political development, the distinction between democratization and liberalization is crucial. Many Third World authoritarian regimes often use some degree of liberalization, such as sporadic elections and the freeing of political prisoners, as a means of satisfying the critics of those regimes. There are only a few countries in the Third World so far that could move toward the institutionalization of democracies. For this particular study, the distinction between the two concepts will be made clear in the following segment.

There has been debate in the discipline of political science around whether democracy is a good measure of political development because the concept of democracy is value laden (Dahl, 1971). Some argue that the measures that can be used to evaluate political development include institutionalization, economic performance, efficiency, equality, legitimacy, among others. I do not intend to join the grand debate on this philosophical issue, but my inclination is that democracy is the kind of political system that takes into account the voices of ordinary people and it is the kind of political system that people in the Third World are striving for.

It does not matter whether people understand or misunderstand the meaning of democracy, democracy is most
often taken very seriously. Throughout history, democracy is the only political experiment proven to be sustainable and desirable by the greatest number of people. Democracy, therefore, can be taken as one of the most important yardsticks of political development. I do not deny that the concept of democracy has been abused and is value laden. However, I do not accept the notion that democracy is political development, either; it is taken as a state of political system that many countries have accomplished and many more are trying to accomplish. In other words, democracy is but one of the measures of political development, and democracy is the exclusive concern of this research project.

II. Taiwan on the Threshold of Transition

During Chiang Kai-shek's era, Taiwan's citizens were guaranteed the constitutional rights to vote and to be elected. But in practice, the right to run for public office has been reserved for those who agreed with the government or those who had only minor disagreement with the regime. Basic freedom of speech, press, assembly, and organization, though guaranteed in the constitution, was overshadowed by the emergency decree and the martial law, which gave the Garrison Command\(^1\) unlimited power to enforce

\(^1\) The Garrison Command (Ging-Bei Dzon-Bu) is the highest military authority enforcing martial law.
censorship. Competitive elections were carried out for provincial assembly, and county as well as city-level legislative and executive branches. But the election fraud, intimidation, and coercion were so frequent that those elections could hardly be called fair or free. In addition, the top political offices, such as President, prime minister, and provincial governor, were not open to public competition. Even the institutions that were supposed to represent different interest of the people, i.e., the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Control Yuan, were handicapped by the emergency decree. Moreover, arbitrary jail sentences for political dissidents were very common. All this showed that Taiwan under Chiang Kai-shek could not be classified under the democratic category.

Until his sudden and untimely death on January 13, 1988, President Chiang Chin-kuo had been the only undisputable top leader of Taiwan since 1975. He could have continued to rule in his late years, as he did in his earlier years, through tight control. However, in 1986, Chiang made a series of speeches and interviews which outlined his determination to take the system for a decisive move. Late in the year, the politics of Taiwan took a dramatic turn when a group of opposition leaders announced that they had formed a new political party—The Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). The new party did well in the November 1986 election and received roughly 25% of the popular vote; the government apparently did nothing to change the reality,
even though the DPP was considered illegal until early 1989.

It was during the 1986 election campaign and its aftermath that the course of change shifted into high gear. On July 15, 1987, the 38-year-old martial law was formally lifted.* Street demonstrations of different scales have been tolerated by the authorities, and the law that governed the demonstrations was formally passed by Legislative Yuan in early 1988. Newspapers that carry reports on the opposition activities are free to publish, and opposition journals have no longer been subject to strict censorship. People who went to Taiwan with the Nationalist government in 1949 (so-called mainlanders) have been allowed to visit their relatives in mainland China; those who had no money to make the trip were assisted by the government and some humanitarian voluntary organizations. The issue of aging Parliament members has been on the agenda at the top level of the ruling party and has been a subject of heated public debate since the martial law was lifted. It was also tentatively decided by the KMT that the mayors of Taipei and Kaohsiung were to be selected by popular elections and the governorship was going to be determined by means other than appointment; this could all be realized before long.

Using the principles of democracy outlined earlier, one

* However, the Emergency Decree (Dong-Yuan Kan-Luan Hse-Chi Lin-Hse Tiao-Kuan) that gave birth to martial law is still in effect.
can reasonably argue that Taiwan has significantly changed from an earlier rigid system that hardly met any of the principles of democracy to a more open system that fulfills or partially fulfills most of the principles. First, citizens' rights to vote and to be elected were tested successfully in the 1986 election for national representatives. Second, basic freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, and of organization are largely observed by the government. Third, the 1986 election proved to be a fair, free, and open one in spite of its limited scale, and political coercion during elections is unheard of any longer. And fourth, almost all political prisoners have been quietly released by the government.

The argument here is that the transition process in Taiwan, started in late 1985, has marked a clear contrast to the previous. As pointed out earlier, Taiwan cannot be called a full democracy until all members of the Congress are popularly elected and the top executive offices are open to public competition. However, compared with the rule under Chiang Kai-shek and the first few years of Chiang Chin-kuo's rule, no one could question that the process of transition has been set in motion.

Returning to the distinction between liberalization and democratization, one can find the most prominent changes that have taken place in Taiwan are in the area of liberalization, such as freedom of speech and the freeing of
political prisoners. Change in the authoritarian structure has been slow enough to cast some doubt on the future of democratization in Taiwan.

One principle of democracy, perhaps the most important that is structure-related, is yet to be fulfilled. It is first of all, the eligibility of important public offices for public competition, including president or prime minister, governor, and mayors of Taipei and Kaohsiung, and secondly, the open contest for all seats of the Parliament. The "Voluntary Retirement Act," endorsed by the Legislative Yuan in January 1989 to retire the members of the Congress who were elected in 1947, did not specify a deadline for the senior Congress members to retire. According to a report on The Central Daily News, the KMT newspaper, the retirement of all senior members of the Congress would not be completed until 1999 (The Central Daily News, 1/27/89:1).

The Retirement Act has been presented by the government as one of the most significant steps toward democracy; however, the endorsement of the Act can hardly be characterized as a move toward democracy. The senior members of the Congress currently consist of about 80% of the total number of the members (World Journal, 2/9/89:1). Even though the percentage is reducing because of natural

---

*The percentage decreases overtime because of the death of the senior members, and precise data is up-to-date only briefly.*
decease, as long as there is any seat that is not open to contest, the political system of Taiwan cannot be called fully democratic. If the report in The Central Daily News proves to be correct, Taiwan will not have a chance to become a fully democratic country until ten years hence. This is a very long process compared to what many people had hoped.

In order to understand the complexity of the problem, one needs to ask why Taiwan cannot proceed faster to build a democratic political system. Is the socio-economic development theory of democratization appropriate for explaining the Taiwan case? Are Taiwan's basic social and economic conditions not enough to produce a liberal democracy? Or should one look beyond socio-economic development and inquire into the political history of Taiwan, or examine closely the perceptions and attitudes of the national political elites? Or is there any other plausible explanation on the incompleteness of the democratic transition? The following segment will explore the theoretical aspect of democratization and see if the answer to the above question lies in any of the available literature.

III. Theories and Hypotheses

It is true that there are not many serious and systematic studies of Taiwan in the area of political development.
Therefore to borrow other scholars' experiences on Taiwan, or to use their theories and hypotheses, for this study is truly difficult. Social scientists who have done serious studies on Taiwan are generally concentrated in the area of economic development. Research on Taiwan from Taiwan itself is also quite limited, and many are not done in a serious manner. Consequently, there is a genuine need for in-depth research on the political system of Taiwan, if we ever want to use Taiwan as a model for the Third World political development.

Not until recently have there been some Taiwanese political scientists, most trained in the United States, working on the areas of voting behavior and public opinion survey. They have conducted election surveys in a professional manner, and they have also used the survey data to do further studies. Two volumes are among the most important: *Voting Behavior and Election Culture* (1986), edited and published by The Chinese Political Science Association, and *The Voting Behavior in a Transitional Society* (1986), a collection of studies published by The National Cheng-chi University Election Research Center. These young scholars also assist poll organizations to conduct surveys on public attitudes. The results of their studies can be, and will be, an important part of the references on the mass behavior in Taiwan.

Important works on the origins and conditions of modern
democracy include Lipset's Political Man (1981) and The First New Nation (1979), Powell's Contemporary Democracies (1982), Cohen's Democracy, Cnudde and Neubauer's (ed) Empirical Democratic Theory (1969), Sartori's The Theory of Democracy Revisited (1976), Huntington and Nelson's No Easy Choice (1982), and Huntington's (1984) "Will More Countries Become Democratic?" Of course, this list is far from complete, but it is a sample of the political science studies that deal with the origins and conditions of democracy.

One important theme linking all the above mentioned works is that socio-economic development almost always goes together with political democracy. That is to say, the political scientists mentioned above argue that socio-economic development is a precondition for democracy. To paraphrase Gunther: "...achievement of a certain minimum level of socio-economic modernization (i)s an almost necessary (but clearly not sufficient) condition for the emergence of stable democratic regimes" (Gunther, 1987:1). Similarly, Carol Cohen wrote: "No community can long expect to be self-governing unless the members of that community enjoy a minimum level of material well-being" (Cohen, 1971:109). Perhaps the possible causal relationship between modernization and democracy is best summarized by Huntington:
The probability of any causal connection running from wealth to democracy is enhanced by the arguments as to why this would be a plausible relationship. A wealthy economy, it is said, makes possible higher levels of literacy, education, and mass media exposure, all of which are conducive to democracy. A wealthy economy also moderates the tensions of political conflict; alternative opportunities are likely to exist for unsuccessful political leaders and greater economic resources generally facilitate accommodation and compromise. In addition, a highly developed, industrialized economy and the complex society it implies cannot be governed efficiently by authoritarian means. Decision-making is necessarily dispersed, and hence power is shared and rule must be based on consent. Finally, in a more highly developed economy, income and possible wealth also tend to be more equally distributed than in a poorer economy. Since democracy means, in some measure, majority rule, democracy is only possible if the majority is a relatively satisfied middle class, and not an impoverished majority confronting an inordinately wealthy oligarchy (Huntington, 1984:199).

About 25 years before Huntington wrote this, Lipset had started a trend of systematic studies on this subject (Lipset, 1959:69-105; also Lipset, 1981:27-63). In his 1959 article, Lipset studied 48 European and American countries and grouped them into "stable democracies," "unstable democracies and dictatorships," "democracies and unstable dictatorships," and "stable dictatorships." Various indices of economic development were computed to compare the four groups of nations. The results overwhelmingly support the proposition that "the more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances that it will sustain democracy" (Lipset, 1959:75). In his 1963 study, Cutright carried Lipset's analogy a step further by showing the strength of the relationship between political development and other
socio-economic development. A very high correlation was found in the study between communication and national political development (Cutright, 1963:197-201).

Carrying Cutright's study still further, McCrone and Cnudde (1967) attempted to formulate an empirical model of democratic political development. A test was conducted on the communication model of democratization in the study, and it was found that there are high correlations between urbanization and education (r = .75), between education and communication (r = .85), and between communication and democratic development (r = .80) (McCrone and Cnudde, 1967:218). Empirical propositions were also raised by McCrone for further studies:

1. Democratic political development occurs when mass communication permeates society.

   Education affects democratic political development by contributing to the growth of mass communications, therefore:

2. Mass Communications occur when literacy and educational levels rise in society.

   Urbanization affects democratic political development primarily by increasing educational levels, which then increase mass communication, therefore:


Another theory shedding light on the origin of democracy is the cultural perspective. Important works in this area include Almond and Verba's *The Civic Culture* (1965) and Richardson's *The Political Culture of Japan* (1974). Sidney Verba defined political culture as "the system of empirical
beliefs, expressive symbols, and values which defines the situation in which political action takes place" (Verba, 1965:513). Undoubtedly, culture accounts for part of the variance that is not explained by socio-economic development. There are countries which have similar degrees of socio-economic development but different degrees of political development. To explain that difference, culture remains one of the most powerful explanatory variables (Almond and Verba, 1965:9). To have a close look at political culture, one may have to look at the fundamental values that remain consistent as well as the attitudes that change over time toward politics and government.

A large body of literature in political science studies the transition into democracy from authoritarian rule. These scholars, most of whom deal with specific case studies, approach the subject differently from the two above mentioned theories. Contrary to the socio-economic theory and political culture theory, which provide us with generalizations that allow us to test the hypotheses derived from them, the country-specific case studies are either testing those hypotheses or are engaged in an inductive effort at trying to come to generalizations. While general theories cannot provide a detailed account of how socio-economic development and political culture affect transition to democracy, case studies usually give us insights into how transition proceeds and why some countries succeed and some fail.
The most important collective effort that tried to explain the transition into democracy appeared in O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead's volume *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule, Prospects for Democracy* (1986). This work analyzed the problems of transitions in individual Southern European and Latin American Countries, and it also put some of the analyses in a comparative perspective. It is still early to judge whether the volume has illuminated our understanding of the dynamics of transition, but the collective effort of focusing on a single subject in comparative politics by itself is a tremendous achievement. However, in dealing with a large number of countries in Southern Europe and Latin America, which have drastically different processes and outcomes in their transitions into democracy, it is difficult to come to a definite conclusion on the conditions for successful democratization.

Some ideas laid out in *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule* were undoubtedly important and should be discussed vigorously by those who study democratic transition in comparative sense. An example was the earlier mentioned distinction between liberalization and democratization. Another example was that there were some factors that an authoritarian regime might be threatened by:

1. The authoritarian regime has realized the functional needs that led to its establishment. It is, therefore, no longer necessary (or even possible), and it collapses.

2. The regime has, for one reason or another, with one possible reason being (1), lost its
"legitimacy," and since no regime can last without legitimacy (support, acquiescence, consent), it disintegrates.

3. Conflicts within the ruling bloc, particularly within the military, for one reason or another, with one possible reason being (2), cannot be reconciled internally, and some ruling factions decide to appeal to outside groups for support. Hence, the ruling bloc disintegrates qua bloc.

4. Foreign pressures to "put on a democratic face" lead to compromises, perhaps through the mechanism of (3) (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986, V3:50).

The transition into democracy in the Third World may not have all the above mentioned factors, but they are certainly the starting point for one to examine the internal and external dynamics of the transition. In this research project, some of these factors will be examined very carefully.

Another important contribution of the volume was the introduction of democracy as uncertainty. "The process of establishing a democracy is a process of institutionalizing uncertainty, of subjecting all interests to uncertainty" (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986, V3:58). For those who are used to the certain outcome of political process and the arranged way of life, democracy may be a dramatic, or even devastating experience because they are required to think and act for their own interests. For those who used to think that their choices are better and their interests are more important than others, they also have to face the reality that there are other groups competing for domination. Institutionalization of democracy means the
institutionalization of conflict of interests. And the
collision and competition of interests are governed by the
rules that specify (a) the criteria for being admitted as a
political participant, (b) the courses of action that
constitute admissible strategies, and (c) the criteria by
which conflicts are terminated (From O'Donnell and
Schmitter, 1986, V3:56). In short, to reach democracy,
there is a need for a psychological breakthrough for all of
the citizens.

Other important case studies on transition into democracy
include Evin's Modern Turkey: Continuity and Change (1984),
Holm's (1986) article on Botswana, Africa's most stable
democracy, Gillespie's (1984, 1985, 1986) numerous articles
on the democracy in Uruguay, Larry Diamond's (1986) in-depth
research on Nigeria, Booth's (1986) article on Costa Rica,
Daniel Levine (1986) on Venezuela, and various other studies
on Pakistan, Korea, and the Philippines.

Undoubtedly one of the most successful cases of
transition from authoritarian rule into democracy is
contemporary Spain. The case of Spain also generated some
of the most important case studies dealing with transition.
Several case studies on the Spanish transition into
democracy in the 1970s include Gunther and Blough's
"Religious Conflict and Consensus in Spain" (1981),
Gunther's "Constitutional Change in Contemporary Spain"
(1981), and Gunther et.al. Spain After Franco (1986). By
examining the case of Spain carefully (relative to cases such as Venezuela, Botswana, and Peru, etc.,) it is not difficult to come to the general conclusions that in order to achieve a successful democratic transition, there has to be a certain level of economic well-being in the society, masses have to be demobilized and social and political conflict have to be contained at the elite level, and moderation and compromise have to be sustained by the negotiating elites. All of these are very important to this research project and will be taken into account to find the possible causal relations in the case of Taiwan. In the following segment, I will propose some possible relations among the important concepts and a set of hypotheses to explain those relations.

Based on the above reviews, socio-economic development has been viewed by many political scientists as the most important condition for the development of democracy. However, there are indications that the relations between socio-economic development and democratization are not linear. First of all, socio-economic development is not entirely a necessary condition for democracy to be established. The case that can used to attack the theory is India, which is the largest democracy in the world but remains to be one of the poorest countries in Asia. The doubt is that the socio-economic theory cannot satisfactorily explain the institutionalization of democracy in a vast but poor and traditional country. To explain the
success of democracy in India, one needs to look at other variables such as special historical experience.

Second, socio-economic development is not a sufficient condition for establishing a democracy at all. Generally speaking, many Third World countries are advancing on economic grounds, including industrialization, commercialization, urbanization, infrastructure, education, media exposure, etc., but democratization is not a popular phenomenon following the development of the economy. In other words, socio-economic development may explain part of the variation in Third World democratization, but it is not a good predictor at all. There are many more factors affecting the process of democratization other than socio-economic development. These factors may be comparative cross-nationally; but many important elements are unique and situational. In this sense, political scientists have to look at generalizable factors as well as the factors that cannot be generalized.

Another aspect of modernization that may contradict the idea of a linear correlation between socio-economic development and democracy is the disruptive nature of rapid modernization. As Huntington strongly argued in his *Political Order in Changing Society*, rapid economic growth without political institutionalization can destabilize the system:

- Social and economic change—urbanization,
- increases in literacy and education,
industrialization, mass media expansion—extend political consciousness, multiply political demands, broaden political participation. These changes undermine traditional sources of political authority and traditional political institutions; they enormously complicate the problems of creating new bases of political association and new political institutions combining legitimacy and effectiveness. The rates of social mobilization and the expansion of political participation are high; the rates of political organization and institutionalization are low. The result is political instability and disorder. The primary problem of politics is the lag in the development of political institutions behind social and economic change (Huntington, 1968:5).

Huntington's argument coincides with Karl Deutsch's (1961) in his famous article on social mobilization and Michael Hudson's (1968) analyses of Lebanese politics. Both scholars stressed the pressure on the system generated by economic growth. Iran and Lebanon can serve as examples of countries undergoing rapid economic and social development and the modernization efforts which had to give way to traditional and religious beliefs. Ted Gurr (1967; 1970) also argued that, even in the situation of growth, political violence might occur when relative deprivation existed, which was defined as discrepancy between value expectation and the ability to realize the expectation. Under such circumstances, one perhaps should argue that socio-economic development and modernization cause democracy to happen only when other conditions are met. In other words, there are intervening variables between socio-economic development and the development of democracy. These conditions could be historical, cultural, situational, or others. This
dissertation research will try to find out the most important factors that defer an economically advanced country from being a democracy.

One important intervening variable raised by political scientists who have studied third world democratization is the role played by national elites (Gunther, 1987; Gunther, 1989). One of the most significant proposals raised by those who studied elite attitudes in a transition process is the "elite consensus" the constitutional rules (Gunther, 1989:4). The argument is that only when the elite factions or individuals can cooperate with each other and agree on a set of constitutional rules, can the divisive conflict and crises of the society be contained, and can the institutionalization of democracy be sustained (Gunther, 1989:4).

Indeed, national political elites are the ones by definition in strategic positions of policy-making. They can dominate the course of the transition, shape the outcome of socio-economic development, and affect political change to a certain degree. After all, it is the elites who make the final decisions on whether to democratize the polity and on the extent and the scope of democratization. This is to

"In this research, national political elites are defined as "all those who are able, by virtue of their strategic positions in large or otherwise powerful organizations and movement, to affect national political outcomes regularly and substantially." Gunther, 1989:3."
argue that in order to understand the process of democratization in any particular country, the attitudes and behaviors of the political elite must be carefully analyzed. In other words, national political elite can be taken as one of the most important intervening variables between basic socio-economic development and democratization.

But as some who study political elites would point out, the concept of elite is vague and ambiguous (See Marcus, 1983; Zannoni, 1978). While the concept is frequently implied as the top few, the chosen few, and the most important few, there is a lack of precision on who can be included in the elite group in any given society (Marcus, 1983:8). For analytical convenience, national political elites are separated from other elites in a society. Moreover, in analyzing the process of democratization, there is a need to dichotomize national political elites into ruling elites and opposition elites. In this research, ruling elites are referred to as those who occupy top government or party positions. This will include the head of state, the head of administration, the cabinet members, active legislators, top bureaucrats, and top party apparatus. Opposition elites are referred to as the national political elites who oppose the ruling party. They

* Apparently high party apparatus in some countries, such as the United States, may not be as important as those in other countries, such as the Soviet Union, China, and Taiwan.
include those who form political parties to compete with the ruling party, those who form movements to oppose the government, and those who oppose or compete with the government without party or movement affiliation. Because the ruling elites and the opposition elites play distinctive roles in policy-making and in political transition, there is a need to study the two groups separately.

As indicated earlier, it is the national political elites who make the decision on the speed and extent of democratic transition. It is important to understand the willingness and ability of the elites, be they ruling or opposition, to start the transition process and move toward the goal of democracy. It is also important to understand why they do what they do, if they decide to lead the country on a course other than democratization. On many occasions, elites may merely be responding to the pressure from their constituents, or they may be acting on their own without consideration of the masses. Facing the pressure for participatory demands, the ruling elites may choose to ignore the pressure, to suppress the popular demands for participation, to respond to those demands incrementally, or simply give in to popular pressure. The opposition elites, on the other hand, may resort to violent means to overthrow the authoritarian regime, or may come to the negotiation tables to work out a set of mutually agreeable rules with other contending political parties. There is no doubt that democracy is more easily attainable when the political
elites are willing to enter negotiations with their opponents and competitors; therefore it is important to know under what conditions the national political elites are more likely to enter negotiations.

Based on the above reviews, the theory of socio-economic development as the precondition of democratization needs to be revised. It needs to take the variations and possible drawbacks of socio-economic development as well as elite perspectives into consideration. In dealing with democratization, then, one perhaps should think about a two-step process, with one step being socio-economic development without social conflict, and the other being elite decisions. Only when the process of democratization is divided into two steps can one clearly see how democratization can be achieved. Along the lines of this argument, the following statement is the central thesis of this research project: Socio-economic development may transform a traditional society into a modern society, but the possibility for a modern society to be transformed into democracy depends on the ability and the willingness of the national political elite to create a democratic political system. This basic model specifies democratization as the dependent variable, socio-economic development as the independent variable, and national political elites as the intervening variable. The following hypotheses can be derived based on this model:
HYPOTHESIS ONE

The chances for a successful democratization are higher when the level of population affluence is higher in a given country (Huntington, 1984:199).

When people become more affluent, they are likely to receive more education and information, and they are also likely to be exposed to more communication media. When the society in general becomes more affluent, secular and egalitarian values are also likely to be produced (Lerner, 1964). These factors will lead the citizens to be more informed about politics; in turn, the citizens will press the authoritarian regime for more political and personal freedom and more opportunities for participation (Deutsch, 1961). These factors will also produce "the social cohesion necessary to prevent disintegration in the face of democratic policy conflict" (McCrone and Cnudde, 1967:212). Cutright (1963) also established that communication was highly associated with national political development (Cutright, 1963:197). But if communication is examined as an dependent variable, it can easily be found that communication comes only after affluence. Therefore affluence will contribute to the national political development. Moreover, when people become affluent under the system, they have a stake in preserving the socio-economic system and are therefore less enthusiastic about overthrowing the political system. The affluent population, in this sense, can provide a stable environment for
democracy to be developed (Huntington, 1984:199).

HYPOTHESIS TWO

When the rate of economic growth is held constant, the degree of political stability is correlated with the degree of egalitarian distribution of economic resources (Huntington, 1968:45-7).

Two of the most important arguments made by Huntington (1968) are that, first, a fast-growing economy may generate new demands on the government for more participatory opportunities. If the government is not able to fulfill those needs, the polity will become unstable (Huntington, 1968:55). Second, modernization, though it produces equality at the mature stage, tends to produce inequality at the initial stage, which in turn is highly associated with political violence (Huntington, 1968:56-9). In the initial period of modernization, only the rich have means and opportunity to be involved in the more profitable economic activities; the majority of the population, which is mostly poor, lacks proper education and skill to be well paid. But as modernization proceeds, more and more people will become educated and skilled. If the rate of growth is held constant, inequality may be examined to see if it is a more important factor than the rate of growth to cause instability and political violence. Equality can also be controlled to see the effect of the growth rate on instability. Cases that may be used to support this
argument are Taiwan and Korea. While the two countries have almost the same rate of economic growth and enjoy almost the same degree of socio-economic development, they have different degrees of inequality and different degrees of political violence. Statistics show that the national income is much more evenly distributed in Taiwan than in Korea (Directorate-General of BAS, 1987a:8). On the issue of political instability, violent street demonstrations in Korea have been continuing since the mid 1980s and have forced President Chong to step down. Even though Taiwan has witnessed growing social protests, violent demonstrations remained sporadic. This rough comparison between Taiwan and Korea can serve as a good example for this hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS THREE
The scope and depth of democratic transition may be correlated with the scope and intensity of political violence on the mass level (Gunther, 1989:7).

Political violence frequently feeds more political violence in a chain of action and reaction. In a study conducted by Ted Gurr (1967), it was found that political violence exists in a society where there is a history or tradition of political violence or in a society which sanctions violence (Gurr, 1967:80). Political violence is very likely to polarize the participants of the conflict, who otherwise may be able to coexist peacefully. A very important function and purpose of democracy is to solve the
conflict within institutional frameworks. But if the conflict is carried out on the street, politicians who are responsible for conflict resolutions in the institutional structure, i.e., political elites, may have to respond to the sentimental demands of the mass in order to maintain their mass support. Subsequently political conflict will become too difficult to resolve within the institutions; Lebanon can be served as a good example. The violent clashes between the Palestinians and the Lebanese Christians in 1975 led the two sides to arm themselves, while the traditional political elites became enemies to one another. The situations became too difficult to reconcile among the elites because the violence and death continued to occur, and the democratic structure of the government was destroyed as a result (See Khalidi, 1979; Randall, 1984).

HYPOTHESIS FOUR
National political elites' willingness to reconcile with one another and enter negotiation does not correlate with the development of socio-economic conditions.

It is widely assumed by the school of political realism that politicians' decisions are based on rational calculations to increase and maintain their interest and power (Morgenthau, 1978). Different political leaders, motivated by different drives and needs, may take different factors into their calculations and have different approaches to their goals (Putnam, 1976). Furthermore,
political elites have different personalities, styles, abilities, and experiences. Therefore, it is very difficult to predict under what conditions the elites would act in certain manners, even though one can reasonably assume that all their actions are designed to increase and maintain their interests and power. Socio-economic development, according to this argument, may be viewed by some as an incentive for reconciliation and compromise, but may be at the same time taken by others as a necessary condition for violent confrontation or repression.

When socio-economic development has reached a higher level, the society as well as the elites most often become more pluralistic. The mass population also has a stake in preserving economic prosperity. Under these circumstances, those elites who refuse to negotiate or those who resort to violence may lose the support of the mass population. The ruling elites may also feel confident of conducting political reforms based on the consideration of regime legitimacy. The sources of legitimacy for political reforms come from the economic performance of the government, and political reforms can in turn increase the legitimacy of the ruling elites (Hirschman, 1977). However, opposing argument can also be made that when the social and economic conditions are on the decline, the government will be forced to make concessions. On the side of the opposition elites, when socio-economic conditions are at a higher level, they may feel compelled to negotiate with the government because
of the increase of governmental legitimacy due to its economic performance. But the ruling elites may also think that since the socio-economic conditions are relatively sound and the population in general supports the government because of its economic success, they do not need to risk the breakdown of the system in order to sanction political reforms. By the same token, opposition leaders may resort to violence when they see themselves losing ground because of the government economic success. In short, elites' willingness to negotiate and compromise should have no apparent correlations with the development of social or economic conditions.

HYPOTHESIS FIVE

When basic socio-economic conditions are held constant, the willingness of the elites to negotiate and compromise varies with the degree and the pattern of social cleavage.

Social cleavages frequently include such indicators as class, religion, ethnicity, language, and ideology. When social cleavages are deep, especially when they overlap, it will be difficult for the elites of the social groups in inferior positions to negotiate and compromise on a set of mutually agreeable rules for conflict resolution. When the

* Albert O. Hirschman (1981) came to a painful realization that his earlier argument (1977) about the positive relations between industrialization and market economy and a more humane government was not happening in the real world. See Hirschman, 1981:99-100.
overlap of social cleavage has reached the level of social polarization, negotiation and compromise become impossible. Angola was an obvious case of deep and overlapping social cleavages resulted in civil war. Other cases of utter social polarization, such as South Africa, Lebanon, and Israel, also indicate little hope for elite settlement in the near future.

However, when social cleavages are cross-cutting instead of overlapping, the chances for a negotiated settlement is better. In a deeply divided pluralistic society, political or community leaders have to demonstrate to their constituents that they are making efforts to improve the welfare of the community. But when the conflict between the groups are overly intensive on the mass level, it becomes difficult for the political leaders to show willingness to negotiate and compromise because these are signs of weakness and retreat. The mass, under such circumstance, will force the leaders to take a more radical stand toward the rival communities. In order to ensure their mass support, the elites are not likely to enter negotiations under such circumstances. Lebanon in 1975-76 clearly demonstrated this tendency (Khalidi, 1979).

HYPOTHESIS SIX
The time period of the consolidation of democratic transition is associated with the ability of the elites to reach consensus on the constitutional laws (Gunther,
It may be possible to have democratization without elite consensus. However, without a consensus on what the future of the country should be and without a consensus on a set of rules to bind elite behavior, democratization may take the form of prolonged street demonstrations or inter-elite conflict. While elite consensus may not guarantee a successful outcome of the democratization process, without a negotiated set of rules to regulate the behaviors of the important members of the main contending groups, inter-elite conflict may result only in continuing violence and armed struggle. The most important way to reach consensus is to draw the leaders of the important groups together and negotiate on the rules (Gunther, 1985:53). But if the elites cannot agree with one another on the basic constitutional issues, civil war or prolonged civil strife may be the result. In the case of Lebanon, democracy collapsed.

In a democratic country, the constitution frames the basic structure of the government and sets the basic rules for peaceful competition and conflict resolution. In order to have a constitution respected by all important groups, no leaders of significant groups should be excluded from participating in the drafting of constitutional laws (Gunther, 1981:384). If any group of political significance is excluded from constitution-making, it may later employ it
as a justification to become anti-system; this then threatens the normal procedure of democracy. In a democracy, election is the final judge of elite and group competition, and the leaders of all important groups should be included in the drafting of the electoral laws regarding the division of districts, the rules for running campaigns, and the number of representatives. Without all these rules, either social conflicts cannot be resolved peacefully or political games will be decided by the authoritarian rulers. All these require the national political elites to reach basic consensus on the rules.

All of the above expectations and hypotheses will be tested by this research project mainly with the case of Taiwan. But as pointed out earlier, there are non-comparable, particularistic, situational variables that are conditioning Taiwan's democratization process. These variables include Taiwan's "unique" historical background and international status as well as the identity problem derived from these two factors. These variables need to be explained and analyzed so that the transition in Taiwan can be understood comprehensively. This research project will describe and analyze in detail Taiwan's identity crisis and its impact on Taiwan's politics and democratization.
IV. Research Method and Data

As emphasized in the introduction, the primary focus of this research project is to find out why Taiwan is not able to carry out its full transition into democracy in spite of its great success in economic prosperity and social transformation. Even though Taiwan has made the initial transition efforts after 1986, those efforts only reached the level of liberalization. Basic government structure has not been changed into a fully democratic one. Without serious attempts to drastically reform the Congress and the selection process for the head of the government, Taiwan's political outlook remains undemocratic. This paper sets out to find the underlying causes and background factors that are dragging Taiwan's move toward democracy. With the working hypotheses proposed above, the important task now is to test those hypotheses and to see whether the correlations specified by the hypotheses can explain the sluggishness of the democratic transition in Taiwan in recent years.

The appropriate data for testing the first three hypotheses, which are related to socio-economic development, will come from several different sources. The first source is the government aggregate data on basic social and economic conditions. Indicators such as the Gini Index, income comparison between the top 20% of the population and the bottom 20% of the population, growth rate, GNP per capita, percentage of population that are in the middle and
upper-middle categories, literacy rate, industrialization, urbanization, etc., are available in the annual statistical summary published by the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting, and Statistics (BAS) of the Executive Yuan. The second source is the international aggregate data made available by the United Nations in its monthly and annual *World Tables of Social and Economic Indicators*. The available data from this source include growth rate, GNP per capita, import/export as percentage of GNP, literacy rate, as well as other social indicators for most of the countries in the world.

The third source of data is the election surveys conducted by National Cheng-chi University at Taipei during the 1986 national election. This survey data includes questions on electoral orientations and other attitudinal variables. The fourth source is the public opinion surveys conducted by various survey institutes in Taipei. Many of these survey findings were made available to me by the archive department of the Political and Economic Research Office of *The China Times*. These surveys cover a wide array of current social and political issues, such as election bribery, corruption, elections in general, the lifting of martial law, the forming of the Democratic Progressive Party, and the most important problems facing the nation. The basic outlook of social and cultural change that comes along with socio-economic development can be found in journal publications as well as daily newspapers published
There are different ways of gathering data for elite studies. The more common methods include social background analysis, surveys of elites (Putnam, 1976), analysis of the content of the speeches and statements of elites (Stewart, 1984), and in-depth interviews of political elites. Among them, in-depth interviews are the most direct way of gathering the views of the political elites. Through face-to-face, intense, question-response interactions between the interviewer and the respondents, true views of the political elites might be detected.

Some may question the validity of elite studies by arguing that politicians are among those who are most likely to lie to the public, and that their statements, speeches, and interviews are not to be taken at their face value. But one can also argue that virtually all sampled survey data have their pitfalls, should social scientists abandon the use of survey data? Obviously the answer is no. In-depth interviews, unlike prepared speeches and statements, give the interviewed elites little time to consider their answers beforehand. Besides, through follow-ups and probes, a true state of mind can be detected. The validity of the interviews of ruling elites can be measured through checking and comparing the interviews with the official stand of the government. If the interviews show some degree of deviation from official stand, the data can
be used with confidence, and vice versa. Other ways of checking the validity include comparing the data against interviews appearing elsewhere; if there is a high degree of consistency, the validity of the data is less questionable.

In order to test the hypotheses on national political elites to a satisfactory extent, particularly the hypothesis on the elite consensus on the basic rules of political competition, data will come from direct interviews with selected political elites in Taiwan. Qualitative in-depth interviews on the Taiwanese ruling elites and opposition elites need to be conducted to attain their views and their beliefs on how democracy should be achieved. For the purpose of this research, intensive elite interviews were conducted in Summer 1988, and the interview data will be used as the primary data for testing the hypotheses on political elites. The elites that were interviewed include the following:

Dr. Lee, Teng-hui
President of the Republic of China. A written interview was obtained. President Lee received his Ph.D. degree from Cornell University. He had been a trusted aide of late President Chiang Chin-kuo, and his former titles include Taipei City Mayor, Provincial Governor, and Vice President. He succeeded the presidency on January 13, 1988 when Chiang died.

Dr. Chi-yang Shih
Deputy Prime Minister. He earned his law degree in West Germany, and formerly held the position of Minister of Justice. Dr. Shih is one of a few native Taiwanese who entered the KMT's inside circle.

Dr. Lu-an Chen
Minister of Economy. He is the son of former Vice President Chen Chern, who was famous for his successful land reform program in the early 1950s. Minister Chen is an MIT
graduate and has been serving in the KMT and in the
government since the early 1970s.

Dr. Yin-jeao Ma
former Deputy General Secretary of the Nationalist Party and
the current Commissioner of Research, Development, and
Evaluation Commission of the Executive Yuan, a ministerial
level office. Dr. Ma received his law degree from Harvard
University.

Dr. Fredrick Chien
former ROC Representative to Washington, D.C. and the
current commissioner of the Economic Development Commission,
a super-ministerial office in charge of economic planning
and coordination. He is widely respected as one of the top
leaders of the second generation mainlanders in Taiwan. He
received his Ph.D. degree from the Yale Political Science
program, and is believed to be one of the most important
architects of current Taiwan-US relations.

Dr. Jeanne Chong-koei Lee
the director of the China Youth Corps and the head of the
KMT Women's Working Committee. She received her law degree
from the University of Paris. She is a member of the KMT
Central Committee, and has been attending the Central
Standing Committee meetings every Wednesday.

Dr. King-yuh Chang
former government spokesman and current Director of the
Institute for International Relations, which is the most
authoritative source of the government's information on the
international situations. Dr. Chang received his Ph.D. in
international relations from Columbia University. Currently
he is a member of the KMT Central Committee, and he briefs
the Central Standing Committee periodically on the current
world situation.

Mr. S.F. Weison Lee
a native Taiwanese elected to the Legislative Yuan in 1986,
a lecturer at National Cheng-chi University, a member of the
KMT, and a strong advocate of a more open system.

Mr. Shin-chih Shu
former Deputy Minister of Interior and a current consultant
to the Executive Yuan. He worked up the political ladder
from the town level government, and therefore is more
familiar with the conditions of the local government than
most central level government officials.

Mr. Pe-chun Chu
former General Secretary of the Central Election Commission
and a technical adviser to the Minister of Interior. He is
also a political science professor at the National Cheng-chi
University.
All of the above mentioned elites belong to the Nationalist Party. Opposition leaders that have been interviewed include the following:

Mr. Chia-wen Yao
Chairman of the Democratic Progressive Party (at the time of interview), the largest opposition party in Taiwan.

Mr. I-Jen Chiou
Deputy General Secretary of the DPP (at the time of interview), and a leader of the New Tide (Shin-chao-lio) faction.

Dr. Ching You
member of the Legislative Yuan and a professor at National Chen-chi University.

Mr. Chun-hong Chang
respected as the theoretician of the DPP because of his sophistication in leading the opposition ideology. He is one of the top leaders of the Formosa (Mei-li-daq) faction. He is the current General Secretary of the DPP.

Mr. Ning-hsiang Kang
Legislative Yuan member elected in 1986, one of the most moderate as well as the most respected DPP founding fathers.

Mr. Hsih-ping Fay
senior Legislative Yuan member and one of the founding fathers of the DPP. He is one of a few top DPP leaders of mainland origin. His position on the democratization in Taiwan has been termed moderate. He withdrew from the DPP in December 1988 in the conflict with other DPP leaders over the issue of the retirement of the senior Congress members.

Ms. Yong-su Shu
member of the Legislative Yuan and a leader in the Mei-li-dao faction.

Mr. Chen-jieh Lin
former Taipei City Councilman and the prime leader of the Progress (Chien-chin) faction. He was a strong advocate of street campaigns, and now he adopts the Green Party ideology and tactics.

Ms. Chin-chu Wong
member of the National Assembly and a leader in Shin-chao-lio faction. She is active in Central Taiwan area.

Mr. Fong-song Liu
an opposition writer and leader in Shin-chao-lio faction, and a member of the DPP Central Executive Committee.
Mr. Mu-yuan Shu,
Chief Executive of FAPA (Formosans' Association for Public Affairs) in Taiwan. He is a strong advocate of street campaigns against the KMT government.

Mr. Shih-chen Hwang,
County Mayor of Chang-hua and one of a few remaining politicians that have no party affiliation, or so-called "Tang-wai."

The questions that are asked of the elites to find out their perceptions of democracy and how democracy can be achieved in Taiwan include the following:

Assessing the liberalization process in Taiwan

What are the the most important changes in Taiwan recently? Is the process not enough, or is it too much? Why is it not enough, or why is it too much?

On Taiwan's democratization

How would you define democracy? In what areas is Taiwan lagging behind in democracy? What additional changes ought to be made? Do all of the seats of the Congress need to be open? What form of government do you prefer for Taiwan? And Why?

On the opposition

Is the opposition party satisfied with the elections? Is the opposition party looking for objectives other than electoral victories? Is the opposition party loyal? Should any political party be suppressed, and why?

On the obstacles to democratization

What are the main obstacles to democratization in Taiwan? How should those obstacles be solved? Is the military likely to intervene in the political process? Are the right-wing extremists, "Ai Tsen," going to cause problems in Taiwan's democracy? Will the aging KMT elites reverse the trend of democratization?
On Communist China

How can the ROC government resolve the conflict with Communist China?
How can the national goal of reunification be achieved?
Is there any contradiction between reunification and democratization?
Is the ROC government considering the policy of double recognition?
How can "double recognition" be accomplished?
Is "double recognition" compromising on the goal of reunification?
Are there any doctrines that would improve Taiwan's international relations but would not compromise on the goal of reunification?

These questions are designed to find out the differences among the political elites in their views on the democratization process in Taiwan. In addition to in-depth elite interviews, supportive materials and evidence may be found in political publications in Taiwan. Among the political publications, The Journalist (Shin Shin Wen, henceforth SSW) is a relatively young journal, but its reports are quite neutral compared to the opposition's or the KMT's publications. This journal will be used extensively for the purpose of current events and attitude surveys. If conflicting reports are noticed in different news sources, the reports in SSW will be used. In addition, China Times and The Independence Evening Post will also be used as the main source of current events. The Central Daily is the KMT newspaper, and it will only be used to obtain the government views on various issues.

The four above-mentioned journals carry interviews of political elites frequently, and they will be used as the
supplementation to the intensive elite interviews. Some journals and newspapers might carry reports on the squabbles of the ruling elites and the opposition elites on how democratization can be achieved or whether there should be democratization process at all. Some of these journals may be biased, but most often the internal struggles within KMT ruling circle are not revealed to the public at all. Selective and careful use of the journal reports on elites can be helpful to the research, and they are certainly better than no secondary sources at all. At any rate, this research project will search for the elite factors to answer why democratization is not achieved in spite of the socio-economic advancement of Taiwan.
CHAPTER II

DEMOCRATIZATION IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE
I. Searching for Democracy in Contemporary China

From an historical perspective, Taiwan's recent political change can be seen as one of continuing effort on the part of many Chinese people to create a democratic political system. Although the democratization process in Taiwan is far from complete, the degree of political freedom enjoyed by the people of Taiwan has exceeded any moment in the Chinese history. Only through a historical comparison can one find that the effort of many people in Taiwan to acquire democracy is not an isolated historical incidence.

There have been several serious attempts in China in recent history to modernize the country, and two of those attempts were aimed specifically at building a democratic China. The efforts to modernize the country was sparked in the Ch'ing Dynasty by the invading Western powers who possessed military might and modern technology. Yet China's inability to modernize prompted some people, particularly intellectuals, to look beyond the material aspects of the Western culture. After the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, many Chinese in different provinces attempted to establish a senate and to force the corrupted and incompetent to incorporate ideas from below. However, the tempo of change was not satisfactory to many revolutionaries who wanted to build an entirely new country right away. The 1911 revolution was designed by Dr. Sun Yat-sen not only to overthrow the Manchu dynasty, but also to carry out an
extensive social, economic, and political revolution. The May Fourth Movement was initiated by a group of intellectuals in Peking to bring about democracy. Taiwan's democratization is closely related to these two events, and they will be examined more closely so that some controversial issues involved in Taiwan's transition process can be set in a historical perspective.

A. Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Revolution

The 1911 revolution was the earliest attempt of some Chinese people to build a democratic political system. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the revolution and the founding father of the Republic of China, formulated "Three Principles of People"—nationalism, democracy, and socialism—as the revolutionary tenets of the newly established republic. Among the three principles, Min-Chuan is literally translated as people's power. In the speeches delivered by Dr. Sun, Min-Chuan meant democracy: people have the power to control the machine of the government:

We were not the masters until the overthrow of the Manchu emperor in Shin-Hai year (1911). Now this is a Republic, which is based on the will of the people. Everyone in the country can participate in national affairs. The country is now like a big corporation and everyone is a stockholder. Each person has the right to manage the matters of the corporation. This is the essence of the Min-Chuan principle (Chang,1969: 41).
After the people have political power, then what the government can accomplish depends on the will of people. Once the machine of the government is started by political power, it can produce tremendous strength. But when the people want it to stop, it has to stop. In sum, if you want to give people the power of direct management of the government, the motion of politics has to be controlled by the people (Chang, 1969: 43).

When I speak about the principle of Min-Chuan, I have to argue seriously that the system of representation is not yet real democracy. Only direct democracy is real Min-Chuan. Even though Great Britain, France, and the United States have democracies, they are not direct democracies, they are indirect democracies. My principle of Min-Chuan is the Swiss democracy, which is direct democracy. There are four categories in direct democracy: election, recall, legislation, and veto of legislation. These four powers are the powers of the people. Only this kind of concrete democracy can be called a real principle of Min-Chuan (Wang, 1967: 95).

From the above quotations of Sun's speeches, it is quite obvious that he wanted to create for China a democracy which is different from Western democracies. In Sun's blueprint of building a modern government, there would be five Yuans of the ruling government: Executive, Legislative, Judiciary, Examination, and Control. The Executive, Legislative, and Judiciary branches corresponded with Charles Montesquieu's political thought and the Western tradition of the separation of power. The Examination Yuan was designed by Sun Yat-sen to carry out the examinations of the civil services and to avoid the political spoil found in the Western democracies. The Control Yuan was created to enforce the ethic code of all branches of the government.
The above five branches together formed the "ruling power" of the government. In contrast, the "political power" of the people was designed to be held by the National Assembly, which represents the people in the central government to carry out the election, recall, legislation, and veto of legislation, the four powers of the direct democracy. In this regard, Sun's idea of direct democracy differed from the Western notion of direct democracy in a major respect, and Sun's direct democracy could hardly be called direct. Sun spoke of his direct democracy as superior to representative democracy; but since China was so large, direct democracy of the Swiss style was impossible for China to adopt. According to Sun, a good way to preserve the essence of direct democracy was to establish the National Assembly to directly represent the people in the central government. Ironically, because of the establishment of the National Assembly, Sun's design of democracy became indirect.

Despite the 1911 revolution failed to create a democratic political system for the Chinese people, the blueprint of a basic governmental setup was preserved by the 1947 Constitution drafted by the Nationalist government. This constitution has been the only supreme legal document in Taiwan since 1949 when the Nationalists were forced out of the Chinese mainland. There has never been any amendment to the Constitution, and the adaptability of the document has gradually become one the most controversial issues in
Taiwan's democratic transition.

Moreover, the Kuomintang (the Nationalist Party, KMT), established by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, represents the Chinese revolutionary tradition that overthrew the Ch'ing Dynasty. The communists defeated the Nationalist troops in 1949 and forced the Kuomintang to abandon China and retreat to Taiwan, but the tradition continues. Many loyal followers of Kuomintang believed that the Nationalist government was the only legitimate representative of the Chinese people and that the communists were nothing but a pack of bandits. This belief led to the preservation of the original Constitution, declaration of an emergency decree,\(^1\) and the preservation of the original members of the Parliament. All these have become the most controversial issues in Taiwan's democratization.

B. May Fourth Movement

The May Fourth Movement was a patriotic uprising at the beginning, but the aftermath of the uprising was the first serious attempt by many young intellectuals to reconsider the cultural and ideological aspects of a social revolution.

---

\(^1\) The formal title of the decree is "The Temporary Constitutional Provision in Mobilizing and Rebellion Quelling Period," or Dong-Yuan Kan-Luan Shih-Chi Lin-Shih Tiao-Kuan, and is customarily called the emergency decree, declared in 1948 at the height of civil war between the Kuomintang and the Chinese communists.
These intellectuals were divided in the latter period, with one side advocating the socialism of the Bolshevik Revolution and the other side Western liberalism. The impact of the movement on the ideological development of the liberal intellectuals in Taiwan has been significant, and Taiwan's earliest democratic movement was ignited by the "May Fourth" intellectuals.

On May 4, 1919 at the peak of the warlord period, a group of Western educated intellectuals in Peking University, including such famous names as Hu Shih and Chen Du-hsiu, were organized under the periodical New Youth (Shin Ching Nien). They searched for means for China to be modernized. These intellectuals addressed the nation about the importance of democracy and science to the modernization of China. The May Fourth period was characterized by great intellectual liberation from traditional bondage.

For instance, the literary revolution dramatically changed the style of Chinese writing from the separation to the unification of written and spoken language and that enabled more people to receive popular education. In addition, ideological development into socialism and liberalism made a deep imprint on both the Chinese Communist Party and the Nationalist Party. The most important intellectuals of both sides claim their heritage from the May Fourth Movement. Hu Shih, one of the most prominent May Fourth intellectuals, continued to play an important role in
academic circles in Taiwan until his death. In fact, Hu was one of the initiators in the abortive attempt to found the Chinese Democratic Party in 1960. The importance of the May Fourth Movement cannot be better stated than by Bianco, a French historian on China (Bianco, 1971:27-8):

What was the May Fourth Movement? In part it was an intellectual reawakening, sometimes called the Chinese Renaissance but in fact, if a comparison with European intellectual history must be made, closer in spirit to the eighteenth century. The May Fourth Movement was a kind of Chinese Enlightenment, a movement that advanced such eminently reasonable ideals as science and democracy. More important, it was a ground-clearing enterprise; it foreshadowed and paved the way for 1949 just as Voltaire had for 1789. The established order to be crushed in the Chinese was also the Church, or at least that religion without dogma, clergy, or prescribed form of worship known as Confucianism... The May Fourth Movement called into question the very basis of Chinese society. The young students who wished to be rid once and for all of the evils they denounced were not wrong to hurl themselves against the Confucian citadel crying "Overthrow Confucius & Sons!" (Ta-tao K'ung-chia-tien).

During this period, warlord fighting, Japanese invasion, and civil war followed one another until 1949. The intellectuals in the period were facing a dilemma over whether to support a democracy or a strong central government to unify China and to fight against the invading powers. In essence the two goals were in contradiction with one another: democracy would seriously curb the power of the central government, while defending China required a strong central government. As a result, the May Fourth intellectuals joined either the communist camp or the
Nationalist camp, both sides strongly emphasizing on the centralization of government power. In short, there was not a real chance for China to experiment with multi-party democracy.

Moreover, the society in general was still basically agricultural, and the population by and large was uneducated and isolated from the outside world. On top of that, there was a lack of modern infrastructure, modern industrial economy, and communication system that would mobilize the society. Consequently, the Chinese society was not yet prepared for a democratic political system. Democracy requires active participation of the mass population. If the major proportion of the population lives in poverty in isolated villages, meaningful participation in national politics would certainly be difficult. Without a mobilized population demanding for more political freedom and democracy, intellectual movements could not have a significant impact on the political system.

Nevertheless, the May Fourth Movement has left a legacy to the Chinese intellectuals, in both China and Taiwan. The May Fourth leaders who went to Taiwan had dominated the intellectual life of Taiwan for more than twenty years. They hanged on to the ideal of "democracy" and "science" and believed that these two concepts were the only means to save China. The abortive attempt to form an opposition party in 1959-60 was organized and led by May Fourth Movement
intellectual notables such Hu Shih, Lei Tseng, and Yin Hai-kwang. The mainstream opposition leaders in Taiwan today still make their connection with the event.

II. Taiwan: The People

Taiwan is an island to the southeast of mainland China; and for its natural beauty it was called Formosa (beautiful island) by Portuguese adventurers in the 16th century. Taiwan is separated from China by the Taiwan Strait, which is only about 100 miles at the narrowest point. The original residents of the island are aborigines whose ethnicity is closer to Malay and Indonesian than to the Han people of China. There are nine main tribes among the aborigines, and they all have a distinctive language and cultural traits that are entirely different from the Chinese.

When the Chinese immigrants started to occupy the fertile land of Taiwan, the fishing, hunting and gathering aborigines gradually retreated to the mountainous areas and came to be called "the mountain people." Through continuous immigration, Chinese in Taiwan gradually outnumbered the aborigines. By the time the KMT government retreated to Taiwan in 1949, the aborigines consisted less than 2% of the total population (Sih et. al., 1973:362). The total number of the aborigine population today stands at 325,000. Currently most of the Taiwanese aborigines live in the
central mountain areas and East Taiwan. As can be seen, there are striking similarities between the fate of the Taiwanese aborigines and the fate of the American Indians.

Besides aborigines, two main groups of Chinese people can be found in Taiwan: the Taiwanese and the mainlanders. Even though both immigrant groups are from Mainland China and are ethnically Han People, "mainlander" is generally a term to describe those latecomers who went to Taiwan with the Nationalist government in 1949. The current population of Taiwan includes about 10-15% of those who can be categorized as "mainlanders" (Tsai, 1987:4). When they were evacuated from China in 1949, mainlanders formed a heterogeneous group. It consisted of about one million Chinese coming from different regions of mainland China, speaking very different dialects, and occupying various government, military, and academic positions. It was the Nationalist government which filled the political vacuum left by the defeat of the Japanese in 1945, and in the early years of the KMT rule, therefore the entire ruling class is composed almost exclusively of mainlanders.

Within the group of the Taiwanese, two sub-groups can be distinguished, the Fukienese (customarily called Taiwanese after 1949) and the Hakka. These two groups are distinguished by the dialects they speak. The ancestors of the Fukienese came from southern Fukien Province and their dialect is found spoken only south of the Min River of
Fukien, while the Hakka speak a distinctive Hakka dialect found in Canton Province. The proportion of non-mainlanders that can be categorized as Hakka and Fukienese is about 15% and 85% (Sih et al., 1973:362). It is generally the case that mainlanders live in the urban areas, and Hakka people are concentrated in the mountainous areas such as Taoyuan, Mioli, Taichung, and Pingtung. Communal conflicts between Fukienese and Hakka were quite severe in their earlier years of immigration to the island, and the conflict was most likely originated from mutual distrust because of the incommunicable dialects. However, because of the compulsory primary education instituted by the Nationalist government, communal conflict between Fukienese and Hakka has become rare.

The conflict between the Taiwanese and the mainlanders created a problem for the early KMT rule on the island. When the Japanese troops in Taiwan surrendered to the Nationalists in 1945, most of the Taiwanese were joyful to see the end of the Japanese rule and the return to the motherland. However, the emotion of welcoming the Nationalist troops soon turned sour when the Taiwanese and the mainlanders first encountered one another. The Taiwanese found themselves, after half of a century of the Japanese rule, highly disciplined and in a much higher standard of living. To the Taiwanese, their mainlander brethren, whom they saw for the first time in fifty years, seemed to be preoccupied with enriching themselves rather
than managing the island's affairs. The sharp contrast between the mainlanders and the disciplined Japanese soon made the Taiwanese realize that returning to the motherland was not as joyous as expected earlier (Peng, 1973).

On the other hand, the Nationalist troops were very suspicious of the islanders because the Taiwanese were ruled and cultivated by the Japanese enemies for fifty years. The Taiwanese looked and dressed very much like the Japanese enemies (Peng, 1973). The Taiwanese were rigid, straightforward, and somewhat naively honest. And the educated Taiwanese spoke fluent Japanese but not a word of Mandarin. The Nationalist troops and officials, who had just come out of a long war with Japan in the devastated mainland, also found Taiwan abundant of resources. They were first amazed by the degree of advancement in Taiwan, and soon became corrupted by the abundance of materials (See Kerr, 1965).

The clash of the two cultures resulted in the February 28, 1947 incident, in which a woman selling unlicensed cigarettes was beaten to death by Nationalist officials. The incident was soon turned into an island-wide revolt against the Nationalist rule. The heavy-handed suppression carried out by the Nationalist reinforcement troops claimed the lives of between 10,000 and 20,000 Taiwanese (Kerr, 1965:310). The suppression silenced the Taiwanese in the next 30 years and paved the way for Chiang Kai-shek's rule, but it left a deep scar between the Taiwanese and the
After forty years of coexistence, the difference between the Taiwanese and the mainlanders seems to have blurred. The mainlander children and the Taiwanese children go to the same schools, receive the same education, and enter the same military service. Adoption of Mandarin as the official language and the only spoken language in the educational system greatly improves the communication between the two groups. Moreover, the entrance examinations into high school and college guarantee the equality of chances for those who wish to receive higher education. The cost of education is deliberately kept low and the children from poor families are able to attend universities. The mixture of groups in education also makes inter-marriage between Taiwanese and mainlanders more common and more acceptable to the people in Taiwan today. Certainly the educational system in Taiwan helped the homogenization of the two groups to a great extent (Tsai, 1987:6). Moreover, because of the physical separation from China, the mainlanders, particularly those who are born in Taiwan, have developed strong identity with Taiwan as their homeland (Tsai, 1987:7).

However, the integration of the Taiwanese and the mainlanders is slow and their social and political differences cannot be overlooked. Many Taiwanese find it irritating to see the Kuomintang and the central
bureaucracies staffed mostly by mainlanders. No matter how hard the regime tries to bring the Taiwanese into political prominence, the positions held by the Taiwanese in high and middle positions are disproportionate (SSW, 109:41). In addition, the Parliament is still full of the members elected in mainland China in 1947. Furthermore, the Nationalist government still claims sovereignty over the Chinese mainland and vows to reunify China; therefore the chance for the Taiwanese to be properly represented in the system is overshadowed by the "emergency" of having the "country" occupied by the communist rebels. As former DPP chairman Yao Chia-wen said, the KMT regime in essence is still a Chinese regime, not a Taiwanese regime (Personal interview, 8/8/1988).

In the economic sphere, most national and semi-national enterprises are headed and run by retired mainlanders and generals given these positions as political rewards. In other words, many Taiwanese are alienated by the "mainlanders' regime." Most of the second generation mainlanders in Taiwan feel that they are excluded from entering the private sectors of the economy due to their inability to speak the Taiwanese dialect. Many young mainlanders also find it extremely difficult to compete with Taiwanese politicians in elections. In numerous elections, Chao Shao-kang is the only second generation mainlander who is able to conduct successful independent election campaigns. In brief, many young mainlanders feel victimized
by the system as well.

The cleavage between the two groups in Taiwan and the scar left by the 1947 incident rendered Taiwan a vulnerable to violent political conflict between the government and some dissatisfied Taiwanese. The first outbreak of violence since 1947 was the 1977 Chongli incident, which was sparked by suspected electoral cheating (Gold, 1986). Violence broke out again in the 1979 Kaohsiung incident (Gold, 1986), and again in May 20, 1988, in Taipei (SSW, 63). In the newly founded DPP, the Shin-chao-lio faction advocates the overthrow of the mainlanders' regime through mass campaigns and the establishment of a true Taiwanese government. The faction controls almost half of the positions in the party.1

The hostility revealed by many Taiwanese toward the government makes it difficult for Taiwan to reach democracy without major obstacles. If the opposition, which is mostly composed of Taiwanese, keeps pushing on the emotional issues, such as independence and the legitimacy of the Nationalist government, there is a possibility that the society will become polarized and any peaceful means to democracy will become impossible. By the same token, if the

------------------------
1 In the election for DPP chairman in November 1988, the vote for the Shin-chao-lio candidate was roughly 40%. In the Central Executive Committee, Shin-chao-lio has 15 out of 31 members, and in the Central Standing Committee, 5 out of 11 members. See SSW, 87:58-60. In the DPP, the Shin-chao-lio is the largest faction only next to the Mei-li-dao, which now dominates the DPP.
government fails to solve the Parliament problem or pushes too hard on the reunification with mainland China, the Taiwanese may be antagonized and resort to violence to change the government, thus being deprived a chance for a peaceful transition. The ultra-rightist Anti-Communist Patriotic Front (Ai-tsen), which is organized by a group of mainland youth and is quietly supported by the KMT, fuels the possibility of polarization by engaging in street wars against the DPP. The activities of both extreme groups should be stopped if Taiwan is ever going to achieve a peaceful transition, and conceivably they will stop when the system is further liberalized.

III. Taiwan's China Tie

Taiwan came to be related with China in 1281 when the Mongol dynasty established an official presence in the Pescadores islands (Peng-Hu, see Map 2.1), lying between the mainland and Taiwan (Mancall et al. 1964:43). The immigration of Chinese to the island of Taiwan started in the 16th century, when hunger, poverty, and overcrowding prevailed in Southeast China where people were driven to find more fertile and less crowded land. Meanwhile, Western sea powers including Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands also landed on the island, attempting to make Taiwan their base for trading with China. In 1642, the Dutch East India Company expelled the Spanish settlement and became the ruler
of the island (Davidson, 1903:22). The Dutch missionaries on the island were eager in converting the Chinese to Christianity. In 1635, 700 natives of Taiwan were baptized by the Dutch, and in 1636, first school in Taiwan was established by the Dutch missionaries (Davidson, 1903:25).

However, the Dutch did not rule very long, for Cheng Chen-kung (Koxinga), a military commander who was loyal to the Ming Dynasty when the Manchurians swept China and established the Ch'ing Dynasty, conquered Taiwan and expelled the Dutch settlers in 1661. The Chinese whom Cheng brought to Taiwan became the largest group of immigrants to the island, and Cheng himself became the common father of the Taiwanese (Davidson, 1903:50-1). Meanwhile, the Chinese immigrants to Taiwan had increased substantially and steadily until the Manchu Dynasty ceded the island to the Japanese in 1895. The result of the Chinese immigration was that Taiwan had become ethnically and culturally Chinese.
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Although Taiwan was annexed by the Ch'ing empire in 1683, the Manchurians did not pay serious attention to the island, and the conflict between the Chinese immigrants and the native aborigines and between the Fukienese and Hakka carried on for two hundred years. It was not until 1887 that Peking realized the economic and political importance of Taiwan and made the first attempt to bring some order to the island by declaring Taiwan a province and appointing Liu Ming-chuan as the first Governor of Taiwan (Mancall, et.al:47). Liu Ming-chuan undertook serious social and economic reforms on Formosa, strengthened the island's military establishment, developed a viable transportation and communications system, modernized the educational system, and made an extensive land survey (Mancall, et.al.:48).

It is argued by some Taiwanese exiles in the United States and some Taiwanese opposition politicians that Taiwan has never been effectively ruled by China throughout the history of Taiwan. In addition, Taiwan was abandoned by China in order to make peace with Japan, and right after Taiwan was "returned" to China, it was separated from China again because of the defeat of the Nationalist government (Yao, 1988:8-9). These arguments are also used by many Taiwanese to express the idea that China has never really owned Taiwan as part of its territory, and therefore Taiwan should not be ruled by any Chinese regime, neither Nationalist nor communist.
However, both the Nationalist government in Taipei and the communist government in Peking never hesitate to repudiate the notion. To both governments, Taiwan was made into a province by China in 1887, and later Taiwan was agreed to be returned to China in 1943 by the Allies. Meanwhile, the debate on Taiwan's international status continues between Taiwanese oppositions and the government of Taiwan. The debate on the topic will be described and analyzed in full detail in Chapter V.

IV. Taiwan Under Japanese Rule

In 1895, China entered a war with Japan, and China ended the war with a treaty that ceded Taiwan and Peng-Hu islands to Japan. As a result of this treaty, Taiwan came to be ruled by the Japanese empire for the next fifty years. The colonial rule could be characterized as brutal, but the economic infrastructure it laid down became one of the most important foundations of the KMT's economical miracle in the 1980s.

Taiwan tried to offer military resistance to the occupying Japanese forces at the beginning, but failed totally in a few years. As the news of the treaty of ceding Taiwan to Japan reached Taiwan, Tang Chin-sung, the governor of Taiwan, proclaimed Taiwan as an independent republic and himself the first president of the republic, and vowed to return Taiwan to China's rule when the Japanese were
expelled (Davidson, 1903:278). When Tang was defeated in the north, Liu Yong-fu, the military commander in southern Taiwan, reorganized the resistance and was elected by his followers as the new President of the Republic in the port city of Tainan (Davidson, 1903:351). But the fighting did not last long. The subsequent occupation was a typical colonial rule, and resistance to it took a heavy toll on the Taiwanese (Kerr, 1974:112).

In spite of the brutality of the colonial rule, the Japanese did bring to Taiwan law and order, which had been largely absent in Taiwan. Law and order in Taiwan later came to a crash with the Nationalist forces. Under Japan's rule, some limited degree of local autonomy was granted the Taiwanese, and small scale elections were held beginning in 1935. The provincial and district level assembly elections could not be categorized as fair, though, because the Japanese members in these assemblies far outnumbered the Taiwanese members. But in one municipal assembly and in the village assemblies there were Taiwanese majorities (Ballantine, 1952:28). The limited elections gave the Taiwanese a rare exposure to democratic processes, which were not experienced by most other colonies in the world. When the Nanking government took over Taiwan in 1945, Taiwanese representatives also requested continuing autonomy, but were denied.

The most important impact of the Japanese rule was a high
degree of socio-economic development together with the construction of modern infrastructure and irrigation system. Those who study Taiwan's rapid economic development in the 1970s and 1980s would certainly agree that the economic structure left by the Japanese laid a very good basis for the Nationalist government's development policies (Gold, 1986). In this respect, the Japanese economic achievement in Taiwan might have indirectly (and only indirectly) contributed to the popular demand for democratization in the 1980s.

V. The Chiang Kai-shek Era

Chiang Kai-shek had been the only ruler in Taiwan since the Japanese surrender until his death in 1975. The basic governmental setup was based on the 1947 Constitution made in China, and the strong government institutions were able to maintain political order. The nature of the regime could best be characterized as quasi-totalitarian or tight authoritarian, and individual political freedom was sacrificed for the myth of recovering the Chinese mainland. But it could not be denied that the local elections that were permitted prepared the Taiwanese for more and higher level electoral competitions.

A. General Characteristics of the Regime

Despite the frequently held elections, Chiang Kai-shek's
era was described by Cheng (1989) as a quasi-totalitarian rule for its comprehensive control over the society. The degree of control assumed by Chiang was close to that in a totalitarian state, but fell short on the economic control and local level politics (Cheng, 1989). Under the rigid system, Chiang was the highest leader of the state, commander-in-chief of the military forces, the chairman of the ruling party, and the final arbiter of the government policies. Martial law was declared which gave the Garrison Command a virtually unlimited degree of freedom to police the state and society. The Kuomintang, the ruling Nationalist Party, has penetrated deeply into the most distant corner of the island and firmly established its absolute control over the country.

Under Chiang's rule, people in Taiwan had never been allowed to criticize the Generalissimo, his families, his policies, or his government. The punishment was severe for those who dared disagree with him. Moreover, secret service agents were systematically networked to watch the dissenting activities of the people and to ensure political stability. In high schools and colleges, cells were planted among the

---

* On the economic aspect, the government implemented economic plans, monopolized large industries, regulated import-export activities, and strictly controlled the money supply. The policy of nationalization was to materialize Dr. Sun Yat-sen's principle of socialism. These socialist oriented economic policies, along with land reform programs, contributed to the economic equalization in Taiwan to a great extent. This will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.
students, and military officers also operated permanent offices to oversee and discipline the students. There were also personnel in charge of security in every government office, school, and large factory to ensure the loyalty of the civil servants, teachers, and the factory workers.

The cult of Chiang's personality was also highly visible in Taiwan, and the President was worshiped as a godlike figure fighting the holy war of anti-communism and as a savior star of the Chinese nation. Some liberal oriented intellectuals attempted to institute an opposition party in 1960, but the attempt ended in mass arrests by the regime. Throughout Chiang's reign, no opposition voice was ever developed to articulate different interests of the people. In sum, a tight authoritarian dictatorship was the best categorization of Chiang Kai-shek's rule in 1949-75.

B. The Constitution

The Constitution of Taiwan was in fact drafted and adopted in mainland China during the civil war between the Nationalists and the communists. In 1945, the Japanese invaders surrendered and the war between Japan and China ended, but the civil war between the Nationalists and the communists resumed and intensified. It soon became clear that Chiang Kai-shek was losing the civil war. In order to regain legitimacy in the eyes of the Chinese, Chiang called for a national reconciliatory meeting in Nanking in 1947.
After a series of negotiations among the participants in the meeting, the draft of the Constitution based on Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Min-Chuan principle was finally endorsed by the meeting, and later brought to Taiwan by Chiang as a symbol of his legitimate claim over China.


According to the Constitutional setup (as shown on Diagram 2.1), a Legislative Yuan was established to perform the function of making laws. A Control Yuan was established to oversee the ethics of the government officials and all
civil servants and its members were given the power of investigation and rendering penalty. The National Assembly was also set up to represent the highest political power—to elect and recall the president and the vice president, to enact and veto laws, and to amend the Constitution. Members of both the National Assembly and the Legislative Yuan were to be directly elected by the people, and the members of the Control Yuan were to be elected by City Councils and Provincial Assemblies. The above three branches of the central government together form the three branches of the Parliament.

The heads of Judiciary Yuan and Examination Yuan are to be nominated by the president and approved by the Control Yuan. The head of Executive Yuan, or Prime Minister, is to be nominated by the President and approved by the Legislative Yuan. The ministers and other high executive officials are also required to report to the Legislative Yuan on important government policies and to answer the questions raised by the Legislative Yuan members. This design makes the system somewhat similar to the British Parliament system, but the web of check and balance is much more complicated than a parliamentary system.

In practice, the Parliament did not act strongly for long, and the system of checks and balances stopped functioning the way it was designed to. Because of the domination of a single party and the domination of one man
over the party (the President and the KMT Chairman being the same person), the system strongly tilts toward a presidential system. Furthermore, because the majority of the Parliament members have been KMT members, party discipline forces the Parliament to give up its independence and it has become a mere rubber stamp. The National Assembly, designed by Sun to directly control the government, convenes only for a week once a year. As a body of more than three thousand original members, the National Assembly has not been able to make any important decisions on its own. Legislative Yuan members have simply stopped introducing individual bills to be legislated; all bills are Executive Yuan bills. Control Yuan members have not actively monitored the ethics of the government officials, many of whom abused their power and became corrupted. As can be seen, Dr. Sun Yat-sen's grand design of having a complicated web of check-and-balance among central government institutions was kept only in formality by his Kuomintang followers.

C. The Elections

Although the politics and government of the island could not be characterized as democratic under President Chiang Kai-shek, the regularly held local elections (See Table 2.1) did have some impact on the development of democracy in Taiwan. Compared to many other Third World countries, the
experience of regularly held local elections gave Taiwan a head start in preparing for democracy.

Table 2.1. Local Elections Held in Taiwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>TAIPEI* COUNCIL</th>
<th>KAOSHING* COUNCIL</th>
<th>COUNTY** COUNCIL</th>
<th>MAYORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989*** X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The elections in Taipei and Kaohsiung were part of county level council election prior to the change of the status of the two cities into cities directly ruled by the central government.

** County level elections include counties and county level cities.

***Expected.

(Source: Compiled from CEC, 1984, V2.)
In spite of the charges by the opposition politicians that the KMT conducted electoral fraud and ballot manipulations, the local elections appeared to be moderately successful. These elections enabled the people in Taiwan to understand and appreciate the value of participation in a modern society. The elections also gave the local elite a chance to compete with one another in electoral processes. To the central government, the frequently held local elections might have diverted people's attention away from national affairs to the issues that would not immediately challenge or jeopardize the legitimacy of the government.

By contrast, the long experience of local elections in Taiwan and the lack of experience of local elections in South Korea may to some extent explain the difference between two people's attitudes and behaviors toward politics. The university students in Seoul, presumably coming from the well-to-do families all over the country, became the spokespersons in the country's capitol for their local folks. Because South Koreans are deprived of their rights to directly participate in local affairs, they focus all their attention on national issues. When many South Koreans, particularly university students, found that the national affairs were determined in the hands of the authoritarian government without caring for the sentiment and the demand of the population, they became willing to engage in street warfare with government forces. In other words, there is not much to distract the attention of the
Korean local elite from national affairs, but the local elections in Taiwan consume the energy of its local elite and prevent them from minding national issues.

Taiwan's local elections can indeed be considered successful on some account, but the elections on the national level are less so. According to General Conditions of the Elections in the Republic of China, the first presidential election in the Republic of China took place in Nanking in 1948 by the newly elected National Assembly. There were two candidates for the presidential race and Chiang Kai-shek won the election without significant challenge from the other presidential candidate. The number of candidates for the vice-presidential race was six and the competition was intense. It took four different ballots before Li Dsong-jen was announced winner of the race (CEC, 1984,VI:3-8). The second presidential election took place in Taipei in 1954. There were two candidates running for presidency and three for vice presidency. After two separate votes for each race, Chiang Kai-shek and Chen Cheng won the elections (CEC, 1984,VI:14-20).

* The reason for the twist in this race is that the original rule of the presidential election requires candidate to win over half of the total number of the members of the National Assembly, which was 3,045. However, the total number in Taiwan in 1954 was only 1,573. Chiang Kai-shek was not able to win over half of the votes, and the National Assembly was required take the second ballot, which was according to the rule decided by a simple majority. The race for vice president had the same problem. To save himself from any further embarrassment of having to take a second ballot, Chiang had the rule
According to the 1947 Constitution, a president can only stay for two terms with six years to each term. Chiang's term was expired in 1960, but the Emergency Decree was amended to rule that during the emergency period, the presidential term would not be restricted by the Constitution. As a result, Chiang was qualified to run again (CEC, 1984, V1:22). In the presidential and vice-presidential election in 1960 and thereafter, there was only one candidate for each position. Thus presidential elections became ritualistic events and lost all democratic meanings. Chiang was the President of the Republic of China until he died in 1975. In 1978, Chiang Chin-kuo, Chiang Kai-shek's son, was elected President and Shieh Tong-min Vice President. In 1984, Chiang Chin-kuo was reelected President again, and the current President, Lee Teng-hui, was elected Vice-President.

In order to restore democratic meanings to the presidential electoral process, there is a need to remove all qualifications added to the Constitutional provisions. First of all, the provision in the Emergency Decree that the presidential term is not limited should be deleted. Secondly, an overhaul of the National Assembly is needed; the body has about 90% of the members elected in mainland China, mostly KMT members. Without these two changes, changed by the supreme court, which explained that "over half of the total votes" actually meant "over half of the total available votes." See CEC, 1984, 14-20.
presidential elections in Taiwan will remain a ceremonial event for the KMT.

Parliamentary elections in Taiwan were absent until 1969. The current Parliament of Taiwan, including the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Control Yuan, were formed in 1947-8 in mainland China. After the first term of the Parliament members expired, the reelection was not held because the Chinese mainland was lost to the communists. For the purpose of maintaining sufficient number of members in the Parliament, the government institute the rule of "fill-in" by the runners-up in the original 1947-8 election. According to the National Assembly Election Law, Rule 29, Section 3, when a seat is vacated before the term expires, the runners-up in the 1947-8 election can fill in in sequence. As a result of this ruling, the National Assembly was able to remain functioning. The situation was the same for the Legislative Yuan and the Control Yuan except that the "fill in by the runners-up" rule was applied only once (CEC, 1984,V1:165).

The rule of "filling in by the runners-up" had been strongly opposed by the Taiwanese as ridiculous. First, the runners-up in the 1947-8 election in China were not qualified for the position at all because they were the rejects in that election. Second, their careers in Taiwan did not prepare them to be members of the Parliament; some mainlanders could one day be a janitor and the next day a
member of the Parliament. Third, there would be no end to the domination of the mainlanders in the Parliament. Fourth, while the Taiwanese had to fiercely compete with one another in order to have a few members elected to the Parliament after 1972, some mainlanders could become one without going through the electoral process at all. The issue was seriously debated in the Legislative Yuan after martial law was terminated, and the vacancy-filling ruling of the National Assembly Election Law was finally suspended on March 11, 1988 (SSW, 58:22). Some opposition leaders further argued that those who became members of the Parliament by filling in should be disqualified and expelled from the Parliament, but their argument was to no avail.

In 1969, the government held the supplementary election of the National Assembly and the Legislative Yuan for the first time because of the significant demographic change in Taiwan. There were eight new members of the National Assembly and eleven of the Legislative Yuan (CEC, 1984, VI:206, 598-601). These Parliament members elected in 1969 do not have to run for reelection just as those senior members. Although the 1969 election was on a very small scale, it was significant in that for the first time the people in Taiwan could participate in national level politics, and the candidates were able to debate national issues.

At the end of 1972, the government started the
Parliamentary Supplementary Elections on a larger scale. In that particular election, 119 new Parliament members were elected in all three branches. Among these members, only 38 National Assembly members and 28 Legislative Yuan members were elected directly by the people in Taiwan, (CEC, 1984, VI:246-8); the rest were seats reserved for professional organizations, women, and overseas Chinese. These seats were controlled by the Nationalist Party. Meanwhile, the election for the Control Yuan was held indirectly by the City Council and the Provincial Assembly. The supplementary elections were institutionalized and became the most important elections in Taiwan. Opposition politicians were able to enter the national political arena as non-partisans and challenge the government policies. However, the credit of the larger scale supplementary elections must be given to Chiang Chin-kuo instead of his father, for Chin-kuo became the Prime Minister in 1972 and began gradual liberalization while his father was ill.

In summary, the period of Chiang Kai-shek's rule could best be seen as quasi-totalitarian or tight authoritarian. The government assumed a high degree of control over people's ideology and political activities. There was a constitution, but it was largely frozen by the emergency decree. The executive branch of the central government consequently became all powerful without any other branches to balance it, and thus the original design of Sun Yat-sen was only on paper. Even though there were frequently held
local elections, parliamentary elections were not held until 1969. The 1969 election was on such a small scale that it was only symbolic. Except for local elections, there was no political freedom or any institutions of democratic essence during Chiang Kai-shek's rule.

VI. Chiang Chin-kuo: The Turning Point

Chiang Chin-kuo's era began in 1972 when he became the Prime Minister. Although his father was still considered the highest leader of the country, Chin-kuo was undoubtedly making all important policy decisions on his own, for his father was ill most of the time during the final years. Chin-kuo's rule in Taiwan can be divided into three periods. The first period (1972-76) could be characterized as the loosening of the quasi-totalitarian system, the second period (1979-85) could be categorized as a loose authoritarian system, and in the final period (1986-88), Taiwan appeared to start its democratization process.

The distinction between the periods could be found in the manner the regime dealt with the opposition. In 1972-78, almost no dissenting voice could be heard and only a few non-partisan politicians could enter politics on an individual basis. In 1979-85, the opposition in Taiwan was allowed to publish some journals and to integrate individuals into an island-wide coalition under close watch. In 1986-88, the opposition was allowed to criticize the
government and to form a political party to challenge the government without the fear of crackdown.

A. The First Period (1972-78)

Although Chiang Chin-kuo assumed power as a continuation of Chiang Kai-shek's rule, there are important distinctions between the two. Unlike his father who suppressed all forms of opposition, Chiang Chin-kuo gradually liberalized the system. As soon as Chin-kuo became the Prime Minister in 1972, University Magazine, which advocated reform and liberalism in politics, was accepted and supported by the regime. In 1975, Chang Chun-hong, a KMT cadre who was dissatisfied with the way KMT handled the nomination process, withdrew himself from KMT and published another political journal The Taiwan Political Review (Tai-wan Chen-lun), the first political journal ever to defend the Taiwanese cause. This kind of publication would have been unthinkable in the 1960s.

More significantly, the supplementary Parliament elections were held regularly since 1972 on a larger scale allowing people in Taiwan to participate on the national level. More and more non-partisan Taiwanese politicians were able to enter the Parliament to challenge the government policies. A few Taiwanese leaders were even invited into the top ruling circle by Chiang Chin-kuo in a step called "nativization." Indeed Taiwan appeared to be liberalized in the earlier years of Chiang Chin-kuo's rule.
Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to suggest that there was a movement toward democracy in Taiwan during the early years of Chiang Chin-kuo's rule, for much evidence suggests otherwise. On the structural level, the KMT was still the overwhelming political force in Taiwan and no others were allowed to form and challenge that position. The supplementary election of Parliament did not change the fact that more than 80% of the members of the three branches of the Parliament were senior members. The Parliament functioned, very similarly to the Supreme Soviet in the USSR, merely as a rubber stamp. The opposition politicians who were able to enter the Parliament were too few to be influential at all. While Chin-kuo was more willing to listen to others, there was no doubt that he was the strongman of the country, and all important policy decisions, be they administrative or economic, were approved by him personally. On the more basic level, freedom of speech was still tightly curbed, and persecution based on political grounds were still common.

*A little known case of political persecution involved Pai Ya-tsan, a law school graduate who wanted to participate in the 1975 Legislative Yuan election in Changhua area. He was arrested because his election campaign flier contained quite a few sensitive questions, including the necessity of the martial law, the national goal of going back to China, and the reform of the Parliament. The questions were addressed to Chiang Chin-kuo, who was the Prime Minister at the time. But apparently it was too much for Prime Minister Chiang to handle, and Pai was sentenced to life in prison on sedition charges. See SSW, 59:10.*
In 1978, a Parliamentary supplementary election was scheduled to take place, and the opposition politicians in Taiwan for the first time engaged in an island-wide solidarity. A strong showing in the election by the opposition was predicted by many political observers at the time. But the sudden announcement of the recognition of communist China by the Carter Administration prompted the government to postpone the election (CEC, 1984, VI:370). However, the steam gathered by the opposition politicians continued to snowball. In 1979, the opposition in Taiwan became an integrated political force through Formosa Magazine (Mei-li-dao). The magazine drew together all important opposition leaders in Taiwan, and the term Tang-Wai (literally means outside KMT) became the synonymous of an opposition party. The magazine was the propaganda machine for the semi-party entity, the local distribution centers served as the branches of the entity, and the subscribers of the magazine were treated as potential members.

The rapid growth of the opposition seemed to be on collision course with the KMT, because Tang-Wai adopted a mass-protest strategy that was deemed by the government as too radical and destabilizing. After the riot incident in a mass rally in Kaohsiung on December 10, 1979, the growth and expansion of the opposition was halted.¹ The subsequent mass

¹ The day was International Human Rights Day. There is
arrest encompassed almost all major Tang-wai leaders and their active supporters. After the military court trial in early 1980, forty seven non-partisan opposition politicians were sent to prison. Included in the list is Shih Ming-teh, the general manager of the magazine, who received a life sentence for his repetitive seditious offense and is still serving his prison term as of today. Other founders of the journal received twelve to fourteen-year sentences, all on sedition charges. The magazine was shut down permanently after publishing only four issues.'

B. The Second Period (1979-85)

In this period, a greater degree of political freedom was permitted in Taiwan. Despite the opposition was dealt with severely by the KMT in 1979, it was not totally wiped out. A moderate force, under the leadership of Kang Ning-hsiang and his magazine The Eighties was allowed to continue. When elections resumed in 1980, the moderate opposition and the close relatives of the jailed political leaders were able to win the elections and enter the Parliament. In the still bitter argument between the opposition and the KMT on who started the violence in the rally, but the riot, however, gave the KMT a reason to crack down on the non-partisan political activists.

The Journalist (Shin Shin Wen, SSW) issue No. 13 gave special attention to the political prisoners of the Formosa Magazine group. It has a detailed report on who were arrested and who received prison sentences and where these people are at the moment. Western sources on the incidence include Far Eastern Economic Review (FEER), December 28, 1979 issue and April 25, 1980 issue.
subsequent years, Tang-Wai seemed to be testing and pushing the tolerance limit of the KMT. The KMT continued to permit the publication of some opposition journals. Tang-Wai was allowed to challenge the KMT in the Parliament, but KMT was strong in opposing the notion of overthrowing the government. KMT allowed Tang-Wai to continue to act as an island-wide opposition coalition, but it was rather slow in allowing the founding of a political party by the opposition. Albeit three well-known cases of political murder happened during this period,* in general terms Taiwan did appear to be liberalized to a greater degree during the second period of Chiang Chin-kuo era than the first period.

Some people contested that the process of democratization started in 1984-85 (this position was strongly held by the government). But one should understand that there were many contrary evidence. According to a 1985 article on The Asian Wall Street Journal (AWSJ), there was still a systematic violation of freedom of speech (AWSJ, 1/7/85: 6). As late as July 1985, there were still reports of political persecutions (AWSJ, 7/26/85: 6). It could well be the case that the government itself was divided on how open the

* The three cases are: the twin-daughters of provincial assemblyman Lin Yi-hsiung, Wang Wen-chen, a professor at Carnegie Melon, and Henry Liu, the author of Chiang Chin-kuo's biography. The reports of these cases were carried in Far Eastern Economic Review, March 21, 1980 issue, and 1985 Asian Wall Street Journal, 1/22, p.8; 1/30, p.8; 2/28, p.3; 3/19, p.1,9; 3/27, p.3,10; 4/10, p.3; 4/22/85, p.3.
system should be, and a consensus could not be reached.

C. The Third Period (1986-88)

The formal start of the process of democratization in Taiwan was in March 1986 during the Kuomintang's Third Central Committee Meeting, in which President Chiang outlined six political reform topics and revealed his desire to open up the system. The event certainly demonstrated Chiang's decision to take a democratic course for Taiwan. However, many people were still skeptical about the prospect of democratization because the KMT did not seem to go anywhere after Chiang's announcement. There seemed to be strong resistance coming from within the KMT against the move toward democratization, and the government-controlled newspapers were giving conflicting signals to the public. But the ambiguous situation was cleared on October 7, 1986, by Chiang. When interviewed by Mrs. Katherine Graham, Board Chairperson of The Washington Post, the aging President disclosed for the first time in public his determination to lift the martial law and the possibility of permitting new political parties.

Included in Chiang's reform package was the change of the Parliament. His determination to have the reformed completed was revealed by a government official who was close to Chiang personally. That particular official said that the task of Parliamentary reform was assigned to former President C.K. Yen. But Yen was old, and was confined to a
hospital bed much of the time. As a result, the reform of Parliament was going nowhere, and Chiang felt very bad about this. That official further pointed out that if there was one thing that Chiang felt disappointed about was that he was not able to accomplish the Parliamentary reform before he died. The problem of Parliamentary reform probably caused Chiang's death because he worried too much about it, according to the official (Personal interview, 9/10/88).

Another subject of Taiwan's liberalization was the permission of the founding of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). The DPP was founded on September 28, 1986, a move that was not allowed under the martial law. Many conservative KMT officials argued that it was an lawless act on the part of the opposition politicians and they should all be punished severely. Central Daily News, the KMT newspaper, carried articles and editorials sharply criticizing the opposition and urging the government to deal with the opposition in a swift manner. But surprisingly, the government took no action in spite of the strong arguments for it. It was widely reported that it was Chiang who single-handedly held back the wave of surging conservatism inside the KMT (The Central Daily News, 1/31/88). It could well be the case, for Chiang mentioned the possibility of permitting the forming of an opposition party in the October 7 interview with The Washington Post.

Perhaps the most important evidence that could
characterize the difference between the final years of Chinkuo's rule and the country in earlier periods were the activities in the Legislative Yuan after 1986. The elected DPP legislators, thirteen of them, in this branch of the Parliament formed a formidable block in challenging the KMT policies, criticizing the government stance on various issues, keeping the KMT moving along on the problem of aging Parliament members, and bargaining and negotiating with the KMT representatives on the passage of several pieces of legislation, such as the National Security Law, The Electoral Law Amendment, The Civil Organization Law, and The Public Demonstration and March Law.

Very frequently the opposition legislators would turn their right to make statements into opportunities to humble the government for not holding comprehensive general elections and for maintaining a large number of senior legislators. They continuously pressed for the resignation of the senior legislators. Sometimes they would go so far as to initiate fist fights with KMT legislators just to make their point across. Their strong attacks forced the government to take a softer stand on some of the legislation. Chu Kao-chen, one of the DPP legislators, certainly causes the Kuomintang serious trouble. He has occasionally turned the Yuan session into his personal show by jumping onto the podium and kicking the documents, tearing the papers, making lengthy speeches, arguing with KMT officials, humiliating the senior members,
and so on. His actions in the Yuan caused great media sensation, and also won him the nickname of "the number one battleship of Taiwan."

In brief, the activities in the Legislative Yuan, not counting the fact that majority of its members are senior members, have the appearance of multi-party competition. The Legislative Yuan itself became the battleground for intense competition as well as for negotiations and compromises between the ruling party and the opposition. No one in the 1950s or 1960s could imagine that all these activities could happen in the Legislative Yuan in 1987 and 1988. As stressed earlier, there is a need for Taiwan to overhaul the Parliament before it can reach democracy, but it is quite obvious that Taiwan is moving toward that goal.

Chiang also dealt with the issue of the Taiwanese/mainlander conflict toward the end of his rule. The issue was very sensitive to the government because it could not be denied that mainlanders were the dominating political actors in Taiwan. In previous years, the government condemned the argument that the Taiwanese majority was oppressed by the minority mainlanders. On May 10, 1987, Chiang revealed to a group of KMT officials in the Legislative Yuan that forty years ago, Chiang Kai-shek wanted Chen Chern, then the governor of Taiwan, to promote outstanding Taiwanese youth to high positions (SSW, 21:4). On July 15, 1987, Chiang Chin-kuo again told a group of his
Taiwanese friends that he had lived in Taiwan for forty years and could be counted as a Taiwanese (SSW, 21:4). Chiang's word demonstrated that he was willing to deal with the issue and find a common ground for the two groups. The talk laid the basis for a more reasonable ratio between mainlanders and Taiwanese in political offices. Chiang was noted for bringing many Taiwanese leaders into high political positions during his reign. But in order to end the Taiwanese suspicion of the regime as a mainlanders' regime, Chiang's talks would certainly encourage the Taiwanese to press for more equality in politics.

During Chiang Chin-kuo's rule, Taiwan's economy was in a high rate of growth. The unprecedented economic prosperity along with social development gave Taiwan a firm social basis for having a more democratic environment. The opposition and the general population, instead of just a few intellectual notables, are making demands for democracy. This aspect will be discussed in full length in Chapter III. When Chiang Chin-kuo was in power, the KMT itself faced a great internal change. Young and Western educated technocrats were gradually replacing the revolutionary old guards in making policy decisions. The minds of these second generation KMT elites undoubtedly impacted the party and the government. The analysis of their entrance into political prominence and the change inside the KMT, though, will be presented in Chapter IV.
D. Background Events of the Reform

In order to answer the question of why Chiang started the process of reform in a larger scale, assuming that it was Chiang who started it in 1986, it would be interesting and important to find out against what background that he had decided to do so. In other words, one needs to find out what went wrong during the period so that Chiang made the decision in favor of more extensive reforms. The background events during the period may help us understand why Chiang made the decision for change. Three events might be so important as to cause Chiang's concern over the political system: the murder of Henry Liu, the loan scandal of the Tenth Credit Cooperative, and the spontaneous protest activities in central Taiwan.

Murder of Henry Liu

A Chinese American named Henry Liu was found murdered execution style at his California home on October 15, 1984, and the murder implicated top military intelligence officers and possibly Chiang's second son. According to reports on The Asian Wall Street Journal (AWSJ), Henry Liu, a Chinese immigrant to the United States, was the author of a Chiang Chin-kuo biography which was banned by the government of Taiwan for its detailed depiction of Chiang's family affairs (AWSJ, 3/27/85:10).

The government, being very proud of its economic
performance, was publicly humiliated by the reports on the connection between Taiwan's military intelligence and an organized crime ring, the Bamboo Gang, which executed the murder order (AWSJ, 3/27/85:10). The government at first tried to distance itself from the murder and the organized crime ring, but when all fingers were pointed at the KMT, the government quickly indicted two top military intelligence officers (AWSJ, 3/27/85:3) and stiffly sentenced several gangsters who were allegedly involved in the murder (AWSJ, 4/10/85:3). Meanwhile, Chiang's son was sent to Singapore, away from the center of one of the worst political storms in Taiwan's history."

Loan Scandal

In early 1985, Taiwan's financial market was rocked by the outbreak of a loan scandal involving the Tenth Credit Cooperative. The Tenth Credit Cooperative was owned and operated by Tsai Tsen-chou, a KMT legislator. In February 14, 1985, the Cooperative was ordered by the government to suspend its lending operation when it was at a crisis level of over lending and on the verge of bankruptcy. The suspension created a run on the Tenth Credit Cooperative and one of its related enterprises, Cathay Investment & Trust Co., and sparked off the worst financial crisis and the

* The murder of Henry Liu was reported extensively by The Asian Wall Street Journal in the period between October 16, 1984 and April 10, 1985.
worst non-political demonstrations Taiwan had ever experienced (AWSJ, 2/15/85:3).

Tai, one of the owners of Cathay Group, which was one of the largest business empires in Taiwan and controlled the above two financial institutes as well as about 100 companies of different natures, was subsequently charged with fraud and other criminal activities (AWSJ, 5/15/85:9). Hsu Li-teh and Lu Jen-kang, two consecutive Ministers of Economy, were forced to resign for not stopping the criminal activities of the Tenth Credit Cooperative (AWSJ, 3/12/85:3). The financial crisis also prompted the government to take over the above two financial institutes, but the damage had already been done to the credibility of the government.10

Spontaneous Mass Protests

Despite the prohibition of the martial law, many people in central Taiwan took to the street over the issue of environmental protection. The government was not able to prevent some local groups from organizing mass campaigns to stop DuPont's intention to build a chemical plant in Lukang, central Taiwan. The people of Lukang invited scholars to deliver speeches about pollution and held demonstrations

10 The financial crisis created by the Tenth Credit Cooperative was reported extensively by The Asian Street Journal on February 15, February 26, March 12, and May 15, 1985.
against the government's decision to license DuPont's chemical plant (Personal interview, 9/7/88).

Activities in Lukang were widely supported by people elsewhere in Taiwan and for the first time an environmental issue was set on the national agenda (SSW, 2:35). Two decades of industrialization without proper treatment of industrial toxic waste has turned Taiwan into an area of heavy pollution (Severinghaus, 1989). The mass campaign in Lukang was also modeled by people in other cities to protect their self-interest, and demonstrations of nonpolitical causes spread throughout the island. As discussed in Chapter III, while people in Taiwan have become very bold in challenging the establishment and do not hesitate to fight for their own welfare, the government encounters great difficulties in satisfying the demands of the people.

E. The Decision to Reform: Three Explanations

Chiang's decision to make reforms must be closely related to the events in the period, and this can be testified by the people who were close to him personally. The social chaos and financial turmoil in the mid 1980s was accompanied by the ailing health of Chiang Chin-kuo. From those who were close to Chiang before he passed away, the chaos and turmoil played an important part in his decision to reform the system, because the decision to make changes came no earlier than 1986. In an exclusive interview by The Journalist (SSW), Dr. Sung Tsu-yu, current General Secretary
of the KMT and one who had direct access to the late President, revealed that

I clearly remembered the time when Mr. Chin-kuo made his decision to have the greatest breakthrough in politics was in late March, 1986, after the Third Plenum of the Central Committee of the Twelfth National Congress. He seemed anxious. From my conversation with Mr. Chin-kuo, he felt that many problems needed to be solved, even though the Third Plenum was considered success. Shortly afterward, he gave instructions to General Secretary Ma Hsu-li and told him to start doing research right away on granting permission to form opposition parties, lifting of martial law, reorganization of provincial government, and the reform of the Parliament, so that they could be realized soon...(SSW, 95:12)

In another interview, Dr. Ma Ying-jeao, Commissioner of the Research, Development, and Evaluation Commission of the Executive Yuan and Chiang's personal interpreter, also confirmed Chiang's appointment of a twelve-people task force to study the six reform issues after the Third Plenum of the Twelfth National Congress (SSW, 95:14). According to these two interviews, the precise timing of transition process could be pinpointed to March 1986. Dr. Ma, in the same interview, gave direct support to the proposition that Chiang's decision to reform the system was related to the socio-economic turmoil of the time. Dr. Ma said:

In 1984, the case of Henry Liu's murder unfolded. Later, several large scandals such as the Tenth Credit Cooperative scandal were also disclosed. These cases hurt our international image to a great extent. This was why we decided in November 1985 to hold the Third Plenum when things calmed down a little... The cases I just mentioned had catalytic effect. They made him consider that all of these events needed to be discussed (SSW,
The above passage strongly suggested that the direct cause of Chiang's decision to make the move was the social and political chaos created by the murder of Henry Liu and the Tenth Credit Cooperative scandal, and possibly other social problems in the mid 1980s. It would be interesting to find out why Chiang made the reform decisions because of the socio-economic turmoil. Three possible explanations can be derived from the available evidence.

**Personality**

The first possible explanation is that Chiang had a noble personality and wanted to do some good for the people and leave himself with a good name for history. The basis for this explanation is that Chiang was always sensitive about public criticism of the regime and how he would be judged by historians. The above two scandals and the social turmoil had apparently shaken people's confidence in the government, public criticism of the government officials became relentless, and the criticism was particularly harsh toward the authoritarian structure as being underlying cause of the chaos. The government had been emphasizing both capability and cleaniness in running public affairs, but it suddenly became public that the KMT government was closely linked with organized crime to curb the opposition and associated with one of the most notorious capitalists in Taiwan. Chiang, who always took criticism seriously, did not exert
more pressure over the society to quell the criticism against the regime; instead, he considered liberalization policies as his alternative. Many people, including Dr. Sung and Dr. Ma in the above two interviews, believed that Chiang was very concerned about the welfare of the people in Taiwan, and what Chiang could do to improve the welfare of the people was to reform the political system and to make the system into one that could be accepted by the people.

The Grand Master of the Regime

The second possible explanation is that Chiang's decision of liberalization was related to what he saw as the imminent danger of the authoritarian political system going out of his control. The assumption is that Chiang wanted to maintain KMT's position over the society. With Chiang's health weakening and without a strong opposition to check and balance, some divisions of the authoritarian system assumed their own lives. The intelligence authority, headed by Chiang in his earlier career, became an independent bureaucracy in running its own activities. Parliament, with the average age of 82 among the senior members, could not maintain the claim of legitimacy of the KMT for any longer. Chiang was the only person in the system that was able to push the reform programs ahead and force the senior Parliament members into retirement. Without some kind of reform, the KMT's legitimacy claim based on the senior members of the Parliament would soon diminish. Chiang knew
that his health could not get any better, and the only way to cope with the problem before it was too late was to institutionalize a democratic system that would remedy many of the regime's problems.

**Damage Control**

The third explanation was that Chiang realized the extent of damage the two scandals had inflicted upon the regime, both internally and externally. Externally, the US government to threaten to cut off its arms sale to Taiwan because of the political murder (AWSJ, 4/22/85:3). The threat was a slap on the face of the Nationalist government which relied entirely on the US for sophisticated weapons to defend itself against China and for diplomatic support in the international community. In order to change the American decision to cut off the arms sale, Chiang might have decided to consider political reform as a viable alternative. Internally, with elections becoming more and more competitive for the KMT, Chiang had to take people's mind off the scandals, particularly when the national level election was approaching in 1986. The legitimacy of the KMT to rule based on the claim that it represented all of China had been seriously challenged, and it could not afford to lose its other claim of legitimacy—victory in elections.

The above are three possible explanations why Chiang decided to make the sudden change to liberalize the political system. Chiang did not give any statement or
speech on the subject that could be used as direct evidence to support any of these three explanations. Perhaps only some elements in any of the three explanations were working in Chiang's mind, or perhaps all three explanations were working at the same time in Chiang's mind when he made the decision. But without further proof (which seems unlikely to be discovered), one can only rely on speculation about what went through Chiang's mind.

Since Chin-kuo's untimely passing in January 1988, Vice President Lee Teng-hui has succeeded the presidency and the party chairmanship. The peaceful succession was in itself a blessing for the continuation of the transition process. President Lee has brought in more Taiwanese and Western educated Ph.D.s into the Cabinet and the Central Standing Committee of the KMT. And for the first time in Taiwan's history, the number of Taiwanese Cabinet members exceeds that of mainlander members. President Lee, a native Taiwanese and a Western educated scholar, would certainly not be interested in retreating to the authoritarian past. He even suggested that the ruling in the Emergency Decree on the presidential term be suspended (The Central Daily, 12/26/88:1). Yet because Lee is not connected to the old KMT establishment, he might have some difficulties in implementing the Parliamentary reform, a critical step in democratizing Taiwan. But the system is moving now, and as put by a high ranking KMT official, the process of change
will continue, and no one can reverse the trend (Personal interview, 8/5/88).

VII. Searching for Answers

Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolution, the first attempt in Chinese history to establish a democracy, accomplished only the overthrow of the Ch'ing Dynasty and created the Republic of China. The May Fourth Movement, a period of great intellectual liberation, although succeeded in firmly establishing the concept of democracy in the minds of the intellectuals of the time as an ideal form of government, failed to affect the rest of the nation or the warlords who dominated China at the time. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the trend of liberalization and the attempt to establish a democratic party by Lei Tsen was mutilated by the regime. The current attempt to establish a democracy in Taiwan has so far succeeded in bringing a high degree of liberalization to the country by the elites.

The efforts of many people in Taiwan to bring about a democratic political system have come a long way, and the degree of political freedom enjoyed by the Taiwanese now has far exceeded any period in Taiwan's history, or China's history in a broader perspective. The relentless efforts of many opposition elites to push the transition process further and the desire of many ruling elites to build a more democratic environment have resulted in the opening of the
system for organized political competition. The change in
the 1980s might have gone beyond mere liberalization, for
the push for further and faster democratization has become
stronger over time. The momentum of the reform may have
slowed down since the death of late President Chiang Ching-
kuo, but society as a whole is building a stronger force
than ever to demand further democratization.

However, as pointed out in Chapter I, there are still
some serious issues that need to be resolved before Taiwan
can really be called a full democracy. First of all, the
Parliament has yet to hold a comprehensive general election
to replace the senior members elected in mainland China.
Moreover, the emergency decree is yet to be abolished so
that the country can enter a normal constitutional rule. In
addition, the head of the state is yet to reflect the
opinion of the public. These issues have been seriously
debated by the public, but there has not been any concrete
solutions to them thus far.

The puzzling question remains: why cannot the process of
democratization be completed after all the efforts by so
many people and after the significant changes in the 1980s?
What are the key factors that keep Taiwan from completing
the process of transition into democracy?

One plausible explanation for the failure of the previous
tries in China and early Taiwan to build a democratic
political system might lie in the basic socio-economic
conditions at the time. China in the first half of the twentieth century and Taiwan in the 1950s were both very poor. A majority of the population lived in isolated and poverty-stricken farming villages. A majority of the people were not educated or exposed to mass communication. As a result, the intellectual movements to build a democratic political system was countered by the unmobilized mass population. The authoritarian regimes were able to ignore or suppress the demands of the intellectuals without any tangible cost. Is there any significant change in Taiwan's socio-economic conditions, or do those conditions remain the same as they were in the 1960s, or earlier? Are the current socio-economic conditions in Taiwan sufficient to support a successful democracy? The investigation and analysis of Taiwan's socio-economic development will be the prime objective of the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
OF TAIWAN
Many political scientists have argued that socio-economic development is the most important precondition of political democratization (Huntington, 1984; Lipset, 1959; Cutright, 1963; McCrone and Cnudde, 1967; Lerner, 1964; Deutsch, 1961). According to their theory, when socio-economic conditions improve in a country, its citizens are more likely to make demands of the government for more political rights and therefore making politics more democratic. To this theory, the most important basis for democratic political development is the advancement of the economy and the modernization of the society. In order to find out whether Taiwan has the economic and social basis for democratic political development, the first and the most important aspect of the Taiwanese society that needs to be examined is its economic development.

The degree of association between socio-economic development and political development could not be better illustrated than by Cutright (1963) in Table 3.1. This chapter describes the development of socio-economic conditions in Taiwan and analyzes how this development affects mass culture and mass behavior.
Table 3.1. Matrix of Correlations of National Measures of Political Development, and Levels of Communication, Urbanization, Education, and Employment in Agriculture (N=77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-86</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Urbanization</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agriculture</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political Development</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Cutright, 1963:200)

A. Growth

Taiwan, according to general indicators of economic growth, has certainly achieved enormous success when compared with its own past and other Third World countries (Table 3.2 and Table 3.3). The simple fact is that the per capita GNP of Taiwan is expected to reach US$6,715 by the end of 1989 and the economic growth rate is expected to be maintained at 7%, a level that Taiwan has maintained for more than two decades, except for the few years of oil crisis and world recession (The Central Daily, 12/16/88:1). Inflation, another economic indicator, has also stayed at manageable 3% and lower since the mid 1970s (Gold, 1986). With this level of wealth and growth, Taiwan might soon catch up with the industrialized Western European countries' current level of development (See Table 3.5).

Based on available data on selected countries, Taiwan has
done fairly well also, even though it is not the richest nor the fastest growing country in Asia. Japan, Singapore, and Hong Kong are the Asian countries which surpass the level of Taiwan's wealth (See Table 3.3). But on the indicators of growth rate, Taiwan is only next to Korea, and on inflation rate and unemployment rate Taiwan is only worse than Japan, and is certainly much better than the Western industrialized countries as the data have shown (Table 3.2 and 3.3). When compared cross-time, Taiwan also seems more consistent than Western industrialized countries on the economic indicators such as growth rate, inflation rate, and unemployment rate, even though Taiwan had its share of trouble in the years of the oil crisis in the mid 1970s (Directorate-General of BAS, 1987b:7; Table 3.2). The only two industrialized countries that are able to consistently sustain this kind of economic performance are Japan and West Germany (Directorate-General of BAS, 1987b:7).

Because of the economic growth, Taiwan's social structure is drastically changing also. In 1945, a majority of the people in Taiwan were peasants living in the countryside. In 1961, the agricultural population was reduced to 49% of the total population. In 1986, the agricultural population was further reduced to 22.1% of the total population (Directorate-General of BAS, 1987b:83). In terms of distribution of gross domestic product (GDP), in 1951, agriculture was 32.47% of the GDP, industry was 23.86%, and services was 43.67%. In 1987, the distribution was changed
to 5.27% for agriculture, 51.99% for industry, and 42.74% for services (Directorate-General of BAS, 1988:32).

As stressed by the development theory, "no community can long expect to be self-governing unless the members of that community enjoy a minimum level of material well-being" (Chen, 1971:109). Economic prosperity makes higher education, literacy rate, and media exposure possible and enables the members of the society to be informed about politics and political issues. The more developed a society is, the more pluralistic it becomes; it becomes difficult for an authoritarian regime to govern effectively (Huntington, 1984:199). The evidence for this argument is more than clear, for a majority of the democratic countries are the developed industrialized countries, and democratization is taking place primarily in the newly industrialized countries in Southern Europe, Latin America, and East Asia. Data in Table 3.3 show that stable liberal democracies have much higher GNP per capita than less democratic countries.

It is truly difficult to draw conclusions as to the level at which democracy will take place based on the data presented in Table 3.2 and Table 3.3 because there are many more countries other than those presented in Table 3.3. And it will still be difficult to draw conclusions even though the data for most of the countries are available, because the variation is quite drastic. Singapore's level of
economic development is second only to Japan in Asia, but its political development toward democracy is not as rapid as Korea's, which has significantly less GNP per capita (Table 3.3). Great Britain, world's longest running democracy, has started to experience an economic slow down since the early 1970s. Its economic prosperity is gradually equaled by the newly developed countries such as Singapore (Table 3.3). Some Eastern European countries, such as East Germany, have a very high level of economic development, but democracy still seems a remote possibility. India is the world's most populous democracy, but economically it remains quite backward. In short, there is not a definite line for drawing the distinction between rich and democratic countries on the one side and poor and authoritarian countries on the other.

Despite the difficulty of drawing the conclusion concerning at what level a country should be expected to see a movement toward democracy, Taiwan, with GNP per capita expected to reach US$6,715 at the end of 1989 (Central Daily, 12/16/88:1), certainly has put itself into the newly industrialized category. This level of prosperity is close to that of Great Britain in the 1970s or Japan in the 1960s. Korea, another newly developed Asian country that is on a slightly lower level of development than Taiwan, has in recent years instituted a democratic political system. This suggests that, with Taiwan's current level of development, it should have seen a movement toward democracy as well. If
South Korea's current level of development can be taken as the fine line to cross for a country to move toward democracy, Taiwan has certainly passed that level. In other words; in terms of its economy, Taiwan has reached a level at which democracy can be expected to take place.

Table 2.2. Economic Growth Rate, GNP Per Capita, GNP Per Capita Growth Rate on Selected Years, Taiwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Growth Rate*</th>
<th>GNP Per Capita**</th>
<th>GNP Per Capita Annual Growth Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>US$ 144</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At 1981 constant prices

** At current prices

(Source: Directorate-General of BAS, 1988:1-2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per Capita GNP (US$)</th>
<th>Economic Growth Rate</th>
<th>Annual Rate of Inflation (%)</th>
<th>Unemp. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>6230</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>7420</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>8960</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9290</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10830</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Germany</td>
<td>10940</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>16690</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Directorate-General of BAS, 1987b:428-9)

**B. Distribution**

Economic development policies in some Third World countries have been criticized by many as over-emphasizing growth and under-emphasizing distribution. Indeed, the degree of income polarization found in some Latin American countries becomes one of the most persuasive excuses for continuing distribution-oriented policies in other socialist oriented Third World countries. Income polarization also becomes the most important source of social and political instability (See Huntington, 1968). But because of the seemingly mutual incompatibility between the growth-oriented policies and distribution-oriented policies, not many Third
World Countries can achieve a high rate of growth while maintaining a well-distributed national wealth, or vice versa. This problem poses a serious dilemma for many Third World countries trying to become modernized.

Taiwan is different. While Taiwan's economy is growing rapidly, its distribution is kept very well balanced (See Table 3.4). Inflation, which hurts lower-income families the most, is also kept low (See Table 3.3). By comparison, Taiwan is one of the Third World countries that has evenly distributed national wealth. Taiwan's wealth is more evenly distributed than that of the European welfare states such as Sweden and Norway. The countries that are on the same level of distribution are Japan and Netherlands. This is a very significant achievement.

Some Taiwanese scholars labeled the current change of social structure as the rise of the middle class, which encompasses educators, managers, entrepreneurs, politicians, party cadre, civil servants, and middle to high ranking military personnel, who make up of nearly 30% of the population (Kao et al., 1988:174-6). But according to statistics, the increase of income has been evenly distributed, and it is the whole society that has become affluent, not just the middle class per se.\footnote{According to government statistics, the average household income in Taiwan has increased from NT$104,157 in 1964 to NT$309,901 in 1986 (at constant 1981 prices) while the income ratio of the top 20% and the bottom 20% reduced}
Taiwan found that more than half of the population subjectively think themselves as belonging to the middle class (Kao et al., 1988:176). This subjective class consciousness is a very good indication of the even rise of social wealth.

Table 3.4. Income Distribution on Selected Countries and Selected Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Top 20%/Bottom 20%</th>
<th>Gini Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taiwan</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.3443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.3242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.3505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Japan</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.3805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Netherlands</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.3740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sweden</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. U.K.</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.3849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spain</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.3805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Norway</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Israel</td>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. India</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Italy</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. U.S.A.</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. S. Korea</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Australia</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Canada</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. France</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Argentina</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Malaysia</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Costa Rica</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mexico</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Brazil</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>0.4010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Directorate-General of BAS, 1987a:8)

from 5.33 to 4.60 in the same period. Government statistics also suggest that the majority of the population falls in the middle-upper income categories. See Directorate-General of BAS, 1987a:1,6.
Those who understand Taiwan's current economic situation might be wary the inconsistency of wealth distribution in the late 1980s. Because of the excessive amount of currency in the market, many people have invested heavily in the stock market and real estate and forced the stock and real estate prices to skyrocket. Those who invest in stock and in real estate have become much better off for their immediate return. However, those who cannot afford the investment are relatively worse off in their economic status because of the high cost of housing. It has become almost impossible for middle to lower level average urban wage earners to own a condominium, the most common housing in Taiwan. The widening gap between the well-to-do and the middle to lower income population can be felt as those who cannot afford housing have organized an interest group to pressure the government for proper attention to the matter (See SSW, 122).

Nevertheless, as revealed in Table 3.4, most of the democratic countries have relatively more egalitarian income distribution than those fluctuate between authoritarian rule and periodic democracy. An egalitarian income distribution creates a society in which most people are more likely to be satisfied with their economic status. It is also less likely to produce a polarized society and a potentially violent confrontation between classes. In many Latin American countries where the national income is very unevenly distributed, the potential for violent
confrontation cannot be overlooked, for a majority of the people have no share in the rapidly growing national economy. The viability of a military dictatorship is high in these countries because it is difficult for the civilian regimes to contain the poor and unhappy masses. Taiwan's income distribution is among the best in the world. This frees Taiwan from a potentially deadly confrontation between the rich and the poor and provides a peaceful environment for transition to take place.

Social scientists often debate the virtue of the indicators of economic growth, such as GNP per capita and growth rate, because they do not show the structure of the national wealth. Other than the distribution indicators used in Table 3.4, social scientists also examine other social indicators to determine the level of development of a country. The social indicators of development may include infant mortality rate, physicians and hospital beds per thousand population, school enrollment rate, literacy rate, and the percentage of the population engaged in agricultural and industrial productions. By comparison, Taiwan is also ahead of its Asian competitors, except Japan, on most of these indicators (Directorate-General of BAS, 1987b:426-429).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. K.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Germany</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. A.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Secondary Education Enrollment Rate  
B: Higher Education Enrollment Rate  
C: Literacy Rate  
D: Agricultural Population  
E: Industrial Population  

(Source: Directorate-General of BAS, 1987b:426-429)
Table 3.5 indicates that Taiwan's society has become relatively advanced, compared to most of its Asian neighbors. The proportion of the population involved in agricultural activities and industrial production indicates the degree of mobilization and urbanization in a society. Taiwan obviously has surpassed the traditional period, for only about one-fifth of its population is involved in agriculture. Many people in Taiwan have moved from the isolated farming villages into large urban centers, and the society in general is mobilized.

Perhaps the most important aspect of Taiwan's social development is its high literacy rate and high secondary education enrollment rate. Being able to read and write means being able to understand more abstract ideas and absorb more information. A higher literacy rate means that more people are capable of becoming politically informed by the print news media. Educated people do not have to rely on the learned for information and assistance. The educated are also more capable of making their own political decisions based on their own understanding of politics. Majority rule is possible only when the majority of the population is capable of making their own choices and decisions. Viewed in terms of from its general social indicators, Taiwan has reached a level of becoming developed, and it has built a fairly advanced social basis for democracy to take place.
Another important indicator of socio-economic development is the availability of channels of communication. According to an election survey conducted by National Cheng-chi University in 1986, more than 55% of the respondents read newspapers seven days a week, about 70% of the respondents read newspapers regularly, and only about a quarter of the respondents did not read newspapers. The same survey also revealed that more than 56% of the respondents watched TV news everyday, about 80% of the respondents watched TV news regularly, and only about 11% never watched TV news. In comparison with the 1984 Americans National Election Study survey respondents, the Taiwanese are exposed to approximately the same amount of news media (See Table 3.6). Although the quality of the media may be debated, there is no doubt that the Taiwanese are relatively highly exposed to communication networks. This may have a profound effect on the rising political consciousness of the people of Taiwan, for people have become more informed about national political issues. Under such circumstances, government control through propaganda loses its appeal because people understand what is good for them. In other words, mass media exposure makes democracy more likely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwanese*</th>
<th>American**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=1130)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=2257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Papers</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Papers 7days/week</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch TV News</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch TV News 7days/week</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From 1986 Taiwanese National Election Study conducted by National Chengchi University. The sample was drawn from Taiwan Province.

** From 1984 American National Election Study, via ICPSR

International exposure is also important to Taiwan's modernization. Foreign trade is one of the most important economic activities in Taiwan. Taiwanese businessmen are actively marketing their merchandise around the world. They bring back to Taiwan more than just financial success, they also bring back an international perspective to the society. Taiwanese students are seeking higher degrees abroad also. American government statistics show that Taiwan is the number one source of foreign students in the United States (The Centre Daily News, 12/29/88:1). The majority of Taiwanese students in the United States are in higher education institutions, and many of them return to Taiwan to teach at colleges and serve in the government after receiving their degrees. They bring back with them modern science, technology, thoughts, and visions. Because of the
rising income, many Taiwanese also go abroad for touring purposes. According to one statistic, there were one and one half million Taiwanese tourists in the world in 1988, nearly one out of every thirteen Taiwanese (The Centre Daily News, 12/10, 1988:1). In short, Taiwan is not an isolated or closed island any more.

II. Sources of Growth with Distribution

From the available social and economic indicators on Taiwan and other countries, Taiwan has passed the stage of underdevelopment. It is certainly one of the most spectacular economically developed nations in the Third World. As viewed by some economists, the first source of Taiwan's wealth and egalitarian distribution is created by the hard working small-to-medium scale private industries. As noted by The Economist, out of 706,500 registered business enterprises in 1983, 98.6% were operating at annual business revenue of less than NT$40 million, or the equivalent of US$1.1 million (The Economist, March 5, 1988, p.11). These small private firms, usually family firms, are highly productive, and are easily reoriented to different types of production when the original production lines are no longer profitable. They rapidly turn out the commodities, and are always on alert for new and different types of production. As a result, Taiwan probably has the highest density of presidents (business owners) in the
The second source of Taiwan's economic development, as stressed by some scholars of Taiwan, is the Japanese legacy. Wanting to make Taiwan a military base for conquering Southeast Asia, the Japanese took special care of the development of the island. Thomas Gold (1986) summarized that in the five decades of the Japanese rule in Taiwan, the Japanese took the lead in creating what today would be called a good investment climate on the island: enforcing law and order; unifying weights, measures, and currency; guaranteeing private property rights; building a modern infrastructure; mobilizing natural resources; increasing agricultural productivity; making investment capital available; and developing human capital, including the provision of public education and employment for women (Gold, 1986:44-5).

Among the important Japanese undertakings in Taiwan, the building of a modern infrastructure probably had the most significant effect on the development of Taiwan today. By the time the Nationalist Government took over in 1945, Taiwan already owned an island-wide road system, railroads, irrigation networks, electric power, public sanitation networks, and perhaps the most important of all, public education facilities. What the Nationalist government took over was in fact an area with a level of development much higher than that of the Chinese mainland.
Unlike most other former Third World colonies, Taiwan's agriculture was not entirely driven by the Japanese into plantations (Gold, 1986). In many other Third World countries, large plantations employ a large number of impoverished farm laborers. The economies in these countries also have problems in being restructured into a self-sufficiency system. In these countries, social and economic polarization was inherited at the time of independence. At the time Taiwan was returned to the Nationalist government, land was owned by small and median land owners and individual farmers (Peng, 1973). As the Japanese built many factories around the island, those who were employed in the factories did not form a proletariat class. Similarly, the business owners in Taiwan under Japanese rule were small and sparse, and the small business owners were not able to form a capitalist class (Gold, 1986). In short, inequality in economic status among the Taiwanese was not present by the time of the Nationalist takeover. Due to this, Taiwan had a better start than most other Third World countries, many of which had to battle poverty and inequality from the beginning of their development.

The third factor effecting Taiwan's economic development is the Nationalist government's egalitarian economic policies in the 1950s. Among these policies, land reform programs in the early 1950s were recognized by many as one of the most successful cases in the world (Gold, 1986;...
Without social and political attachment to the Taiwanese society and without apparent political opposition to threaten the regime, the KMT government had a degree of freedom that no other Third World country had in completing the land reform program (Gold, 1986). In the KMT's land reform, the first step was to fix the farm rent at the 37.5% of the crop yield (a step called San-chi-wu gien-dsu). The second step was the release of public farm land (Gong-di fang-lean). The third stage, land to the tiller (Gen-tse yo chi tien), was to limit the area of land allowed by landlords (Gold, 1986). Consequently, the land cultivated by cultivators increased from about 50% to 75%, and the land cultivated by tenants fell from 41.8% to 16.3% (Gold, 1986:66). The gentry class in the countryside was thus uprooted and equality was achieved after the implementation of the land reform program. The living standard of peasants was better, and their purchasing power significantly increased.

Another component of the egalitarian economic policy of the KMT government was its industrial policies. As soon as Taiwan was returned to the Nationalist government, wine, tobacco, salt, coal, and all other Japanese owned and operated industries were nationalized. Electricity, petroleum, and telecommunication were made into government monopolies (Kerr, 1965). The government also owned major shares in most heavy industries, such as automobile manufacturing, transportation, glass, sugar, aluminum,
cement, etc., and regulations made it difficult for individual investors to compete with the government (Gold, 1986). Rice, the main staple and the most important crop in Taiwan, was managed by the government through the island-wide farmers associations (Gold, 1986). Moreover, the KMT government also strictly controlled the banking operations by owning major shares in all banks (Gold, 1986). In other words, the government became the only capitalist in the society. In turn, the government used the accumulated capital to invest in public projects such as education, irrigation, highway, public transportation, and water supply, that all citizens could be benefited. In short, through these policies, the government of Taiwan was able to keep the society relatively well distributed and very few people were able to become very rich.

The fourth source of Taiwan's prosperity today, and the threshold of the economic growth, was the shift from import-substitution to export-oriented industrialization. Because the KMT regime did not have any tie with the local population, the longer the Nationalist government stayed in Taiwan, the more it needed to search for an alternative source of regime legitimacy. Economic performance was perhaps the only way for the Nationalist government to build its legitimacy and make people accept its rule. In the 1960s, in seeking a higher economic growth rate, the Nationalist government eased the control on the import of materials and the export of products. Incentives, such as
low interest loans, were also adopted in the economic plans to encourage private investment and export activities (Gold, 1986). Taiwan's abundant, cheap, and skilled labor also attracted foreign capital to invest in Taiwan for export-oriented industries. Taiwan's export to the world, especially to the United States, rose rapidly. In 1960, Taiwan's export constituted only 9.6% of the expenditures of the GNP; by 1970, it rose to 28.36%; by 1980, it was 51.07%; and by 1987, it was 71.52%.

This rate of increase explains the rapid growth in Taiwan's export industries and the amount of wealth that could be accumulated through export activities.

III. The Impact of the Economic Development:

A Society That Makes Demands

Accompanying the rapid rise of economic prosperity is a change in people's political consciousness. As Huntington (Huntington, 1968:34) noted, the impact of social and economic modernization on politics includes "political mobilization <which> involves increased participation in politics by social groups throughout society." The relationship between economic development and the rise of demand for participation has been very well articulated by different political scientists (See Chapter I). This is

what has happened in Taiwan. A population that actively seeks its own political and economic interest in different forms can be seen as the most direct impact of Taiwan's economic performance on the society. There are several dimensions of making demands on the government in Taiwan, including the election of opposition politicians to the Legislative Yuan, protest activities, public opinion surveys, and the rise of student movements.

A. Support for the Opposition

The topic of popular support for the opposition will be dealt with in greater detail in Chapter IV, when the comparison of popular support between the KMT and the opposition is presented. The discussion that follows is an outline of the popular support for the opposition, which brings pressure to the government to make changes.

In the 1950s and the 1960s, when Taiwan's economy was not yet modernized, the society was largely quiet about political and social problems. Most people could best be characterized as apolitical, because they did not seek to express their political opinion. Only occasionally would there be politicians running for offices as non-partisan candidates (Peng, 1986:53-8).

In the 1970s when Taiwan's economy was shifted into high gear, the participation of the opposition politicians in politics also started to gather strength and receive more
popular support. But what the opposition was concerned about in this period was a greater degree of freedom of speech; the issues at the heart of democratization were left untouched (Peng, 1986:65-76). The popular support for the opposition reached its peak during the period in 1977 when a record high of twenty-one Tang-wai candidates were elected to the Provincial Assembly, almost one-third of the total number of the body (CEC, 1984b:92-100).

In the 1980s, however, the opposition politicians started to talk about very sensitive issues such as the reform of the Parliament, the lifting of martial law, the release of political prisoners, the termination of emergency decree, and the permission to new political parties (Peng, 1986:77-84). More significantly, popular support for the opposition politicians seems to be on the rise in the national elections, and more opposition candidates than before were elected into different branches of the Parliament.

The Legislative Yuan election in 1986 was frequently taken as the most important threshold for the opposition politicians. A record high of thirteen DPP candidates were elected into the Legislative Yuan. The total number of popularly contested seats for the Legislative Yuan is fifty-seven. There are also twenty-seven appointed seats reserved for overseas Chinese and sixteen contested seats reserved for professional groups. The thirteen seats held by the
opposition are not enough to threaten the domination of the KMT in the Yuan, but they offer a very strong challenge to the government.

As pointed out in Chapter II, in the nation's highest legislative body, the political opposition exposed the fact that the body was still dominated by the very old senior members. They also brought pressure directly to government officials regarding the scope and tempo of democratization during the sessions of interpellation. In addition, they tried to inject their ideas into the new legislation, such as The National Security Law, The Demonstration and March Law, and The Civil Organization Law. Occasionally, opposition legislators would disturb the session in order to stop the voting from taking place.3 Very frequently KMT officials and legislators had to enter rounds of negotiations with the DPP legislators before the final votes could be counted.

All of these opposition activities in the Legislative Yuan received high publicity in the news media. The opposition legislators' pressure on the government forced the government to look more closely into the permission of demonstrations as a means of political expression, the lifting of marital law, and a greater degree of political

3 Sometimes the opposition legislators would go so far as to initiate a fist fight or unplug the microphones, or use procedural motions to boycott the regularly scheduled voting.
toleration. The pressure of the opposition legislators also forced the government to deal with the issue of Parliamentary reform with more enthusiasm. Although the Voluntary Retirement Act, passed in early 1989, proved to be a KMT tactic to reduce the public pressure on the issue, it shows that the government had to do something about the problem in the face of public pressure.

B. Protest Activities

Demands for participation in the 1980s are also frequently expressed in the form of public protest, despite the protest activities are not limited to political ones. Because of the lack of formal and legal channels for private interests to be heard in the institutional setups in Taiwan, it is not unusual for private interests to be buried in the name of the public interest. But as the data below will show, more and more people in the 1980s are willing to challenge the establishment and let their interest prevail through collective protest activities such as rallies, marches, public hearings, demonstrations, blockade, petition, and strikes. All of these tactics have been used by people in Taiwan as forms of expressing their opinions and making their demands.
Table 3.7. Public Protest Activities, 1983-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Dispute</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Hwang, 1988b:6)

In spite of the prohibition by martial law, collective protest activities have increased throughout the 1980s. According to a study conducted by Dr. Hwang Teh-fu of National Cheng-chi University in Taipei, in 1983, there were 143 cases of collective protest activities reported; in 1984, the number of cases increased to 182; in 1985, 242; in 1986, 271; and in 1987, 675 (Hwang, 1988a:6; see Table 3.7).

In a government report, from July 15, 1987, the day the martial law was lifted, to March 31, 1988, there were 1,408 collective protest activities, an average of five times a day (The Central Daily, 4/20/88:2). This is clearly a upward trend among the people who stand up and demand their rights.

Even though the frequency of social protest is higher after the lifting of martial law than before, the upward trend of making demands through public protest started in
the early 1980s. The termination of martial law might have contributed to the significant increase in social protest activities after mid-1987 because of the lifting of this strong psychological barrier. But judging from the long term trend, the number of social protests would have continued to rise even if the martial law had not been lifted. The rising trend of social protests corresponds very well with the modernization theory: The more a society is modernized, the more its people will make demands (Huntington, 1968:32).

Dr. Hwang's study shows that there are four major types of social protest in Taiwan: political, environmental, labor disputes, and livelihood. The frequencies for each type of social protest are 170 for political, 382 for environment, 576 for livelihood, 242 for labor dispute, and 143 for others (Hwang, 1988a:6). Among the 1,334 protest activities in Hwang's study, 526 of them forced the targets of the protests to solve the problem immediately or promise to solve the problem later (Hwang, 1988b:16). It can be interpreted that protests have become an effective means to relieve the suppressed interest of the public. From this general trend, one can reasonably argue that the people in Taiwan are increasingly aware of their self-interest, and the demand for more political freedom and greater degree of liberalization is a part of this growing trend of people's increased consciousness of their rights and welfare.
Even though protest activities are a national trend, the diversity in these protests does not indicate a coordinated national movement. The only aspect of the protests that can be seen as coordinated is the political, and these are usually directed by Tang-wai, the traditional opposition politicians of Taiwan and the predecessor of the Progressive Democratic Party. According to Hwang's study, out of 170 political protests between 1983 and 1987, Tang-wai was involved in 90 of them, while the others were sporadic and spontaneous (Hwang, 1988b:7). In other words, Tang-wai has been the only nationally organized force consistently protesting the government and demanding more democracy.

To the government and the public alike, the most unexpected protest activity in the history of Taiwan was the one-day walk-out by the railroad workers on Labor Day, May 1, 1988. The railroad is a government enterprise in Taiwan, and few expected that government workers would go on strike. But when the government failed to respond to the complaints of the railroad workers concerning overwork, poor working conditions, and a lack of overtime pay, the workers simply took Labor Day off. Because of the significant impact of the walk-out on passengers, the government had to respond to the complaint immediately, and the railroad workers' welfare was greatly improved. This event encouraged many others who considered their welfare overlooked by their employers to do the same in order to have their welfare guaranteed.
The collective protest activities are encouraging to the process of democratization in a transitional period because they reveal the deficiencies of laws and governmental institutions, which no longer fulfill the needs of the people in the increasingly complex society. It was clearly stated in martial law that the collective activities such as strikes, marches, and demonstrations were prohibited. But when the people in Lukang, a small traditional town on the west coast of Taiwan, rose in January 1986 to resist the government's decision to permit DuPont to set up a chemical plant for fear of the kind of disaster that happened to Union Carbide in India, the government found itself confined by the overwhelming public support the people in Lukang received. Because of the strong resistance, DuPont withdrew its plan to build a plant in the area. This was one of the earliest in a series of island-wide protests on environmental issues.

It was made clear by the Lukang protest, and follow-up protests elsewhere, that the government had not institutionalized ways to predict public reaction to its policies. Martial law apparently did not prepare the government to deal with problems of this kind. Martial law, all powerful in containing opposition politicians, failed miserably in this instance. In addition, the Lukang protest exposed the lack of regulation regarding environmental protection. All this forced the government to review outdated or insufficient legal regulations so that it could
keep up with the development of the society. The termination of martial law was apparently contributed to by the protest in the mid 1980s. If the lifting of martial law can be taken as a significant step toward democracy, the protests of a different nature and a different magnitude can be seen as its most direct cause.

The rising protest activities are important to the government's decision to make changes because they show that the people of Taiwan are conscious of their self-interest, and are willing to stand up for their rights and welfare. They forced the government to realize that it must make changes to accommodate the people's rising demands for their rights, and the cost of suppressing those demands have become too high. In other words, the government can no longer govern effectively by relying on the traditional authoritarian means of control.

Among the different forms of protest, political protest is not the most frequent form employed (Hwang, 1988b:6). However, political protests are certainly the most important to the political development in Taiwan because of their impact on the political system. It is quite obvious that without an organized challenge to an authoritarian regime, it is not expected to give up its power and liberalize the system by itself. In the 1980s, protests have become carefully orchestrated events, not the spontaneous riots such as the 1977 Chongli Incident or the 1979 Kaohsiung
Incident, and are used to expose the government's abuses of power and to provide the general public with a different voice other than that of the government. Chiang Chin-kuo's decision to liberalize the system in 1986 might have been affected by the increasing frequency of political protest.

More significantly, more people became willing to participate in the rallies and demonstrations which, in essence, were demanding more freedom and democracy. The main participants in the demonstrations in the late 1970s and early 1980s were largely opposition politicians and their relatives and hardcore supporters, who had already put their career and lives on the line. The earliest demonstration took place in 1979, and the number of participants was only about one hundred (Peng, 1986:74). But after the mid 1980s, the magnitude of the demonstrations became much larger. The demonstration on Christmas Day, 1987, attracted about ten thousand participants (SSW, 42:13), and the one on May 19, 1989, gathered twenty-five thousand people (Centre Daily News, 5/20/89:2). These numbers have grown beyond the close associates of the opposition politicians.

The significance of the political protests is obvious: They challenged the very basis of the authoritarian regime and gradually eroded the legitimacy of the authoritarianism in the eyes of the general public. Very consistently, the political protests were aimed specifically at freedom of
speech, rights to demonstrate, rights to form opposition parties, martial law, aging Parliament, and the government based on the consent of the people in Taiwan. These political protests themselves were in defiance of martial law's prohibition of outdoor gathering, demonstration, and marches. At the onslaught of the public demonstrations, the government had no choice but to allow the formation of opposition parties and public protests. At this stage, martial law was in name only; the lifting the martial law only lifted the burden off the government in the face of public criticism.

Through public hearings and demonstrations, the regular exposure of the fact that the Parliament still has a large number of aging senior members also damages the legitimacy of the government. The attacks on the issue forced the government to repeat the same explanations for not retiring the senior Parliament members. But the longer the government is holding off the general election, the pressure built against the system would only grew stronger. The public might ultimately show their impatience with the government on the issue of Parliamentary reform in the coming elections. As the 1989 election approaches, KMT politicians preparing to run have sensed the public pressure, and many of them have to publicly disassociate themselves from the senior members to rid the public that of doubt they do not support the existence of the senior members (Central Daily, 7/6/89:2; 7/9/89:2; World Journal,
All of this can be seen as the build-up of public pressure to force the government to resolve the issue.

Political protests usually did not cause immediate positive improvement or promises of improvement as other types of protest activities (Hwang, 1988b:16). But the inaction of the government can be expected since the issues of political protests are usually related to the structure of the political system. It is not likely that the government will make any promise for improvement when that government is still in firm control. Nevertheless, political protests expose the problems of the system to the public and make the government realize that it has to make changes if it wants to maintain its political legitimacy. Therefore, in the long run, political protests destroy the basis of legitimacy of the authoritarian regime and force it to implement real political reforms. Ironically, the economic prosperity achieved by the Nationalist government created a population that eagerly seeks to express its desire for better government. This gradually erodes the regime's basis of legitimacy and forces it to give up the single-party rule.

Juan Linz (1970) argued that in a severely divided society, a politically influential military would be almost inevitable (Linz, 1970:267). Along the same line, violent political protests might lead to the reaction of the
conservative elites to curb opposition activities. This argument seems plausible enough in the aftermath of the Tienanmen Square massacre in Beijing on June 3, 1989. However, the magnitude of the political protests in Taiwan has never reached the level of those in China in May, 1989, nor have they threatened the KMT's dominant role in Taiwan's politics. Nor have Taiwan's political protests reached the frequency and the amount of violence as those seen in South Korea. The conservative elites in Taiwan might dislike the continuous challenge to the government and they might threaten to redeclare martial law (SSW, 64:12-15). But the political protests have not constituted such a threat to the government that a crackdown is inevitable. There is indeed a fine line on the political protests: They have to exist in order to push for reforms, but they cannot be so strong as to cause negative reactions.

C. Public Opinion Survey

In addition to open protest, the increasing social and political surveys conducted by independent polling organizations beginning in the mid 1980s are also an important form of making demands. These public opinion polls affect politics and political change in two ways. First, they force the government to recognize the poll results as a necessary reference for its policies. The government has become more careful in public opinion so that it does not antagonize the general public. Second, the
polls let individuals in society understand how the general public views the issues and how they should react to government's handling of the issues.

Since the mid 1980s, the public opinion surveys have covered such sensitive issues as the lifting of martial law (China Times, October 1986; June 1987), the founding of the DPP (China Times, October, 1986), corruption (China Times, 1987), election fraud (China Times, November, 1986), popular election of city mayors (China Times, September 1987), evaluation of political parties (China Times, January, 1988), mainland policy (China Times, March 1988), satisfaction with the government (Public Opinion Survey Cultural Foundation, POSCF, conducted regularly), National Security Law (POSCF, February 1987), corruption in the judiciary branch (POSCF, April 1987), public demonstrations (POSCF, April 1988), and Parliamentary reform (Independence Evening Post, April 1987), to name just a few.

Certainly there are issues that are still too sensitive to be surveyed, such as unification vs. independence, but the surveys conducted above can be seen as a "break through" from Taiwan's earlier periods when no public opinion polls of this kind were permitted. The results of these surveys gave the government some solid data regarding what the general public expects the government to do. A recent poll by the Public Opinion Survey Cultural Foundation showed that the approval rating of Prime Minister Lee Huan was only
50.2%, which was much lower than anticipated (Central Daily, 7/5/89:2). Lee Huan took over the Premiership in June 1989 from the less popular Yu Kuo-hua and the public had very high expectations of the new Prime Minister. Yet the low popularity (about the same level as the former Prime Minister and much lower than that of President Lee's 90%) forced the panicky Lee Huan to hold a press conference a few days later (Central Daily, 7/9/89:1-2) and forced his son to stop his election campaign for the Legislative Yuan (Central Daily, 7/10/89:2). This simple poll demonstrated that public opinion surveys are forcing the government to work more diligently and to be more sensitive to the public sentiment.

The surveys by independent polling organizations are also significant in the sense that people are now more willing to express their political opinions. Before the 1980s, people considering doing so got themselves into unnecessary trouble. Before the lifting of martial law, there was still a significant portion of the population who did not want to express their political opinions on sensitive issues. In some of the earlier surveys, the temporary refusal rate could be as high as 40% to 50% (The Independence Evening Post, 10/21/86; United Daily, 10/7/86; United Daily, 10/19/86). An election survey conducted by National Chengchi University in 1986 revealed a 70% temporary refusal rate on some questions. But after the martial law was abolished in July 1987, the sensitive issues gradually lost
their sensitivity. As a result, the temporary refusal rate has been significantly reduced (Central Daily, 7/4/89:2; SSW, 118:11), and this systematic bias in the surveys has also been significantly reduced.

D. Student Movements

University students in Taiwan as a group have been rather quiet compared with their South Korean counterparts. While students in South Korea are the backbone of political demonstrations and an important variable in the political changes in the country, student political activities in Taiwan almost never existed under martial law. But President Chiang Chin-kuo's promise to end martial law in 1986 seemed to have encouraged many students to seek more campus freedom and political reform.

The contrasts between the college students in Taiwan and South Korea are quite striking. It is important to find out what caused the students in Taiwan to remain politically inactive in previous periods. Causes for Taiwan's lack of student political activities are usually viewed as three-fold. First of all, the degree of ideological and behavioral control by the school authorities is very high in Taiwan. The military commissary is permanently staffed on the university campuses to oversee student activities and enforce student codes. The student codes may cause the expulsion of a student on the most serious charges such as anti-government activities. The Kuomintang also has branch
offices operating on every campus, and campus spies were also said to have existed in every class. There are required political courses such as Three Principles of People, Thought of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, and Research on Mainland China to ensure students' ideological purity. Second, after tough competition in high schools and the difficult entrance examination into universities (a situation very similar to that in Japan), college students indulge themselves in the fun activities instead of getting into serious debate on national issues or leading the society in pushing for political reforms. "University" in sound-translation into Chinese, is "let you have fun for four years;" there is a lot of truth to that. Third, Taiwanese parents almost always tell their youngsters to study in school and stay out of trouble. To may parents who witnessed the earlier brutal suppressions, becoming politically active is the most dangerous thing that could happen to a student. These three factors reinforce each other, and the students become non-political.

However, apparently encouraged by the forming of the Democratic Progressive Party, beginning in 1987, students started to organize their own dissenting activities. Student movements quickly spread from National Taiwan University in Taipei to National Chenkung University in Tainan and to National Chongyang University in Chungli. Their activities range from sit-ins, demonstrations, hearings, and petitions, to the publication of underground
Their demands are usually quite simple: the withdrawal of the military commissary and the KMT office on campus, and the dropping of censorship on student publications so that the students can enjoy more freedom of expression (SSW, 21:56-7). Students on some campuses demanded a larger role in the school administration and decision-making. Students in National Chongyang University want to have their chancellor fired, for he was appointed by the Ministry of Education for his extensive relations with the ruling circle instead of for his ability (SSW, 73:78-9).

It is assumed by the public that the number of students involved in the student movements is small, and the active participants of the movements have remained minority dissidents. This might be true in most of the universities, but there are no reliable data to support the argument or the opposite claim. Yet in some universities, the challenges to the school authorities are becoming phenomenal. In National Taiwan University, the parallel of Beijing University in China or Tokyo Imperial University in Japan, students elected a candidate not favored by the school authority to be the president of the student body (SSW, 67:70). In National Chongyang University, those who favor keeping their appointed chancellor will certainly find themselves in the minority (SSW, 73:78-9).

The reasons for the popularity of the student movements on some campuses vary. In National Chongyang University, it
is quite easy to understand why so many students want to join the movement: the chancellor appointed by the Ministry of Education antagonizes the students by trying to rule over students instead of listening to them (SSW, 73:78-9). The situation in National Taiwan University may be more complicated. As members of the leading university in Taiwan, students in National Taiwan University frequently play the leading role in campus activities across the country. It is they who started the student movements in Taiwan, and they now want to demonstrate that they are the most successful. In other words, just like the students in Beijing University, students in National Taiwan University want to become the model for the students in other universities in the fight for more campus freedom.

The student movements have had only limited successes so far. They succeeded in forcing the Ministry of Education to set limits on the professors taking full-time government or party jobs in addition to their teaching responsibilities; curbing the censorship power of the university authority; and reducing the role played by the KMT offices and the military commissary (SSW, 67:70). Meanwhile, students now seem to be more willing to go off-campus to join other social forces to make changes to the society. On May 20, 1988, a group of students intervened in the street fighting between police and peasant demonstrators and sought to end the violence by separating the two (SSW, 63:52-3). Many students also volunteer to organize teams to go to the
countryside to help those peasants whose production is devastated by the importation of American farm products. In sum, university students in Taiwan are gradually becoming politically active members of the society.

The above descriptions of the growing involvement of the Taiwanese in politics corresponds very well with the prediction of the socio-economic theory of democratization. Because of the growing wealth, availability of education and communication, increasing opportunities for traveling abroad, and the ever complicated society, people in Taiwan have become more active in public matters and in matters that are related to their immediate welfare and interests. People do not hesitate to let their voice heard; they elect opposition politicians to speak for them, and stand up for their rights and interests. In short, economic prosperity ultimately create a society that demands more political rights and intellectual freedom and a more democratic system.

IV. A Society That Is Interested in Politics

Democracy functions in a society in which the majority of the people understand where their interests lie and are able to make their own political decisions. Majority rule does not work if the majority of the people are not interested or do not care about the political process and political
issues. However, understanding politics and interest in politics do not happen in every society. They are frequently the product of socio-economic development. When people are more educated, have more time, have interpersonal relations extending beyond the kinship circle, people may then be more informed about politics. Interest in politics, from this viewpoint, is the indirect means by which socio-economic development affects political development.

If democracy requires that a majority of the people understand and be interested in politics, Taiwan certainly fulfills that requirement. The first impression of Taiwan's society in my field trip in summer 1966, after six years of absence, was that politics seems to be the most talked about topic in daily conversation. Cab drivers, the thermometer of political temperature, talked eagerly about politics with their customers. There are magazine booths on every corner of the city of Taipei, and numerous daily newspapers and weekly journals carry a heavy dose of political news. After thirty-eight years of martial law rule, people seemed to have an enormous appetite for political news. In just a few years, people in Taiwan suddenly seemed to be very intelligent about national politics.

Survey data confirm the above impressions. In a survey conducted by Taiwan's National Cheng-chi University in 1986, the proportion of the people interested in elections was significantly larger than those in the United States and
Japan (Table 3.8). 33.2% of the Taiwanese respondents reported that they were very interested in elections, while 22.5% of the American respondents and 11.2% of the Japanese respondents so responded. Only 16.8% of the Taiwanese respondents showed no interest in elections, while 33.4% of the American respondents and 49.7% of the Japanese respondents were not interested in politics at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan (N=1130)</th>
<th>US (N=2176)</th>
<th>Japan (N=2122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The data for the United States is drawn from 1986 American National Election Study conducted by University of Michigan, and the data for the Japanese sample is from the 1967 Japanese National Election Study by Ward. Both datasets were obtained via ICPSR in Michigan.

** The wording in the surveys in the three sets of samples were slightly different. The Taiwanese respondents were asked whether they were "interested in elections," American respondents were asked whether they were "interested in political campaigns," and the Japanese respondents were asked whether there were "interested in politics." Political campaign can be taken as the equivalent of election, but politics may be defined differently. This perhaps caused the difference between the Japanese respondents and the respondents from two other countries.

From the same datasets, discussing politics and elections
with others, another indicator of interest in politics, showed that about 10% more American respondents discuss election with others than did Taiwanese respondents, but about 20% more Taiwanese respondents than Japanese respondents did so (Table 3.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan (N=1130)</th>
<th>US (N=2176)</th>
<th>Japan (N=2122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The wording is also slightly different in the three surveys. The Japanese respondents were asked whether they "discuss politics with other people," and American respondents were asked whether they "discuss political campaigns with family or friends." Taiwan's respondents were asked whether they discuss election with family, friends, and neighbors in three separate questions. The results for Taiwan were computed with those who replied to have discussed elections with either family or friends or neighbors as yes, and did not discuss with any as no.*

The crude comparison of the survey results in three countries above did confirm the fact that Taiwanese are very interested in politics. They might not be as interested in politics as the Americans, but they are certainly much more interested in politics than the Japanese. The significance of people interested in politics is that they pay attention to what goes wrong in government and with government
policies, and they might transfer their view into support of the government or of the opposition. Conceivably, if one is not interested in elections or politics, it will not matter whether there is anything wrong with the government or who is in power. But if one is interested in politics, he might express his views to other people, he might vote consciously for a party or candidate, or he might actively participate in street demonstrations. The government, under such circumstance, must be more cautious about what people think about it policies.

Further examination on the 1986 Taiwanese Election Study dataset suggested that age, gender, and provincial origin have some impact on interest in election and discussion with others about elections. The impact of education is found to affect the discussion with others about election only. Table 3.10 presents the correlations between interest and discuss politics with others and education, age, gender, and provincial origin, and with each of the independent variables as a control variable.
Some rather interesting information is revealed in Table 3.10. The immediate finding is that age appears to be the most important independent variable affecting both interest in election and discussing election with others. Gender and provincial origin seem to have some effect on the interest in elections and discussing elections with others. However, when age is controlled, the correlations change significantly. This is particularly obvious in the correlations with discussing election with others. Among
the people in the older generation, males and mainlanders are more interested in talking about elections with others ($r = .254$ and $r = -.228$ respectively). But among the Taiwanese, the younger they are, the more likely they are to talk about election ($r = .251$). Among female respondents, the correlation between age and discussing elections is rather high ($r = .299$); apparently many more younger females talk about election than older females.

The explanation for the significant, but mixed results of age is that apparently the younger population is more likely to receive higher education because of the significant improvement in Taiwan's socio-economic conditions. In a separate run, education is found to have a correlation of $-.312$ with age. Table 3.10 also indicates that when education is controlled, the correlation between discussing elections and age is significantly reduced. In other words, education is more important in affecting people's discussing elections with others than is age. Table 3.11 shows the relationship between education and discussing elections with others.
Education makes one more informed or capable of being informed about politics, as the development theory argues. When the population in general becomes more educated, the people no longer rely on a few authoritative figures for their information or to solve their problems. As a result, the more developed a society becomes, the better educated its people will become. Education is perhaps the worst enemy of authoritarianism, for the more educated people become, the more likely they will have their own views on politics and policies. The educated people understand more about politics and talk more about government, and they are not likely to be indifferent to what goes wrong in politics.

The most puzzling result in the computation is that age has the opposite effect on the two dependent variables. The
older the respondents were, the more likely they were to be interested in politics, but the less likely they were to discuss politics with others. And contrary to the older respondents, the younger respondents were not so interested in elections, but more of them talk about election with others. The following two tables (Table 3.12 and Table 3.13) are to demonstrate the differences.

Table 3.12. Interest in Election by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE*</th>
<th>ROW PCT</th>
<th>YOUNGER</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>OLDER</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY INTERESTED</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT INTERESTED</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Younger: 20–32, new generation
Middle: 33–48, born after 1945 and educated by KMT
Older: 49*, born under Japanese rule
The first explanation of this interesting phenomena is that the older mainlanders are conceivably much better educated than the older Taiwanese. Most of the older mainlanders, or the first generation mainlanders in Taiwan, accompanied the Nationalist government to Taiwan in 1949. Many of them were government officials, civil servants, rich merchants, landlords, university professors, or university students. They were the highest educated group in the society at the time, and were able to staff the government administration, national enterprises, and universities. Perhaps the experience of civil war and retreat to Taiwan also made them more aware of what goes on in politics. All this caused to be interested in talking about politics. The 1986 Taiwanese National Election Study confirms the argument that older mainlanders are better educated than older
Taiwanese. The results, presented in Table 3.14, clearly shows the discrepancy of education between Taiwanese and mainlander among the older generation respondents. In other words, the distinction between the older Taiwanese and older mainlanders creates the dubious effect of age on interest in the election and discussing the election.

Table 3.14. Taiwanese vs. Mainlander on Education

The second explanation for this phenomena is that the older generation have more time to be exposed to the news media. Because of their daily dose of news reports on TV or
in newspapers, the older generation is aware of current events and political campaigns. The 1986 Taiwanese Election Study confirms this explanation. As Table 3.15 illustrated, the older respondents do have more media exposure. However, because the older respondents are generally less well-educated than the younger respondents ($r= -.312$), the older respondents were probably less capable of making sense of the election. In other words, the older generation might be exposed to more news media, which raises their interest in the election, but they are less able to discuss the election with others because of their lower level of education.
In summary, people in Taiwan are interested in politics, and they do not hesitate to talk about politics with their family and friends. This is confirmed by survey data drawn from a 1986 study conducted by National Cheng-chi University. As this secondary analysis suggests, the variables that are correlated with interest in politics include age and education. The younger one is in Taiwan, the more likely he or she will be to talk with someone else about the election. But the variable found to be underlying the relationship between age and discussing the election is education. The younger people in Taiwan are more likely to receive higher education than older people. The younger and better educated pay more attention to politics than the less educated. Education, an area of development that Taiwan is very proud of, effected people's orientation toward politics. The Taiwanese government's emphasis on education has encouraged its citizens to understand and be interested in the politics of a more sophisticated and more pluralistic society. This has paved the way for a more democratic political system in Taiwan.

Education has been one of the Taiwanese government's means of social and economic development. Because of the relative availability of education, the secondary education enrollment rate and the literacy rate has been maintained at high levels (see Table 3.5). The effects of education on individual's attitude (interest) and behavior (discussion) toward politics is subtly revealed by this exploration of
the 1986 Taiwanese Election Study. In the process of finding out the significance of education on people's attitudes and behavior, the significance of aggregate data for education enrollment rate and literacy rate has become clear: A better educational system and a higher literacy rate can better prepare the citizens of a country for a democratic political system. After all, democracy cannot function well when the majority of the people do not understand or are not interested in politics.

V. Summary Conclusion

The economic and social development of Taiwan in the past twenty years has transformed Taiwan into a modernized society. People are not only urbanized, mobilized, and educated, but also rich and informed. International trade and cultural exchange also greatly enlightened people's minds and broadened people's visions. In short, this survey of Taiwan's basic social and economic conditions reveals that the society has reached the preconditions of a democracy. Under the current socio-economic conditions, the government is no longer immune to the news media's close watch, the opposition's active challenge, and the people's criticism. All of these conditions have built a strong basis for a successful democratic political system. In other words, Taiwan has reached a level where people can expect democracy to take place.
However, regardless of how matured the society is on the scale of socio-economic development, the fact remains that Taiwan does not have the level of democracy as the development theory would predict. The high level of socio-economic development and social change do not guarantee the completion of the democratization process. In other words, the socio-economic theory of democratization has failed to explain Taiwan's experience of transition. Is there another explanation for why Taiwan is not able to complete the democratization process? Could the explanation lie with the national political elites? The following chapter will look closely at the organizations and backgrounds of the two main elite groups as a basis for understanding Taiwan's national political elites. The chapter that follows will examine closely the views and perceptions of the national political elites of some of the most important issues in Taiwan's democratization. Perhaps the study on the elites will provide some answers to the puzzle of Taiwan's experience of transition.
CHAPTER IV

MAJOR ACTORS IN TAIWAN'S POLITICS:
KMT, DPP, AND THE MASS-ELITE RELATIONS
Many significant political changes have taken place in Taiwan since the mid 1980s, and there seems to be a general movement toward democracy (Chapter II). But, as was argued earlier, the process of democratization is still far from complete, despite the fact that most social and economic indicators show that Taiwan in recent years has developed a fairly advanced economy and society (Chapter III). This rapid socio-economic development, particularly in the area of education, has transformed Taiwan's citizens into a modern, mobilized, and urbanized people. People in Taiwan are also becoming more aware of their interests and more interested in politics. They talk about politics, and they frequently go on the streets to make their demands heard (Chapter III).

Given such circumstances, democracy should have taken place in Taiwan, but it did not. Obviously one has to look beyond the socio-economic factors of democratization. National political elites, by definition, are those who occupy the strategic positions of decision-making that would affect the rest of the country. Conceivably, elites are factors of great importance in the process of democratization because of their ability to affect the rest of the country. After concluding that socio-economic development is not a significant factor that contributes to the sluggish process of democratization, this project intends to closely examine the elite factor to determine whether understanding the political elite is the key to
Taiwan's democratization process.

In order to find out more about the role played by national political elites in the process of democratization, one must first ask some important questions. Who are the national political elites? How do they do in the electoral competitions? What are their strengths and weaknesses? What pattern of support are the elites getting from the mass population? And most important of all, what are their views and perceptions about the key issues in democratization? This chapter will deal with the first few questions, and leave the final question for next chapter to explore.

In Taiwan, there are only two significant organized elite groups, the Nationalist Party (KMT) and the Progressive Democratic Party (DPP). Although many small political parties have come into existence since the martial law was lifted in mid 1987 as well as many individuals who have some political influence, the KMT and the DPP are the only two elite groups that can have significant impact on the process of democratization. The KMT has been the largest

---

1 According to the government, there are thirty-two legally registered political parties as of July 1989, but most of these parties have minimum political influence in Taiwan and are frequently called "little bubbles." Central Daily, 7/30/89:1.

2 Scholars are widely respected in the Taiwanese society, and many social scientists have very large audiences when they write in journals. The more popular scholars that have some degree of political influence include Hu Fo, a political scientist, Yang Kuo-su, a psychologist, Chang Chong-dong, a historian, among others. However, they are
political party in Taiwan, and has not faced any serious threat to its dominant position in Taiwan's elections. In contrast, the DPP, a formerly loose coalition of the individual opposition politicians of Tāng-wài, was not formed until 1986, and was able to send thirteen candidates to the Legislative Yuan in the election right afterward. The first real electoral challenge to the DPP is to come in November 1989 when the Legislative Yuan, the Provincial Assembly, mayors, and city councils hold the first election since the lifting of the martial law.

One of the most important reasons for the KMT's strong performance in elections is that it has a very centralized and well-organized central command system, which is a replica of Stalin's Soviet Communist Party. With a highly centralized command, the KMT has been able to distribute its support among its candidates evenly so that it can have more candidates elected than its real vote share. Not surprisingly, the DPP's organization is highly decentralized and faction ridden because it was formed by individual opposition politicians all over the country. One of the most serious threats to the existence of the newly-formed opposition party is internal conflict between its two large

not an organized political force that can affect the course of political development as the large organized political parties such as the KMT and the DPP.

The term literally means out-side the party (Kuomintang); it was used to describe the non-partisan opposition politicians.
The two main parties of Taiwan can be categorized as catch-all parties, because they have tried to avoid targeting specific social groups or classes as their chief supporters in order to not alienate other groups or classes. Secondary analysis of election data suggests that no demographic variables, except the Taiwanese/mainlander distinction, have any correlation with party identification. Even though the Taiwanese are split between identifying with the KMT and the DPP, mainlanders are almost exclusively supporters of the KMT. What qualifies the KMT and the DPP as the only two main parties in Taiwan?

I. The KMT versus the DPP in Elections

Elections are the most important game of political competition in democratic societies, and the outcome of elections in these societies can determine the share of political power among political parties as well as among individual politicians. As was discussed in Chapter II, Taiwan has held local elections since early 1948 and national elections since late 1969. Even though the election results in Taiwan do not always determine the national political outlook and the most important players in Taiwan's political arena, the electoral competitions that have been carried out so far do provide some evidence for understanding the pattern of social support for the ruling
Among the elections held in Taiwan so far, the KMT nominated candidates have won decisively virtually every one (Tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4). However, the opposition politicians, or Tang-wai, have been running against the KMT nominated candidates on an individual basis and have won a share of votes and seats. In general terms, therefore, the KMT has been Taiwan’s dominant political party, while the loose coalition of opposition candidates of Tang-wai is the only other political force that has been able to challenge the ruling Kuomintang.

In order to understand the dynamics of the elections in Taiwan, one has to bear in mind that, with the exception of the 1986 race for the Legislative Yuan, they were competed in by the ruling Kuomintang and some individual opposition politicians. These elections cannot be used as a very precise measure of the relative strengths of the ruling party and the opposition party. Since the founding of the DPP in 1986 before, the race for the Legislative Yuan, the individual Tang-wai politicians have been organized into an opposition party. Inheriting the traditional Tang-wai supporters, the DPP became the only party so far that is able to challenge the KMT’s dominant position in a national political arena, and has become the equivalent of the opposition party in the eyes of many people. Moreover, the DPP activists seem to have gathered some strength when it
became a legitimate party in 1989.

Among the elections held in Taiwan, the races for Provincial Assembly had been the highest representative institution open to public competition before 1969, the year the Legislative Yuan started its supplementary elections. In the Provincial Assembly races, Tang-wai candidates have been able to share a certain portion of the popular votes with the KMT in every Provincial Assembly election, even though the Kuomintang has been the apparent winner since the earliest election (See Table 4.1). In each of the Provincial Assembly elections held so far, the average vote share for the KMT candidates is 68.6%, while that for Tang-wai candidates is 31.4%. But the share of the seats in the Provincial Assembly for the KMT candidates has been larger than its vote share and stands at about 80%, while the other 20% of the seats go to Tang-wai candidates.

This same situation can be found in the elections for county and city mayors, which are the only executive positions open to public contest in Taiwan. In the mayoral elections, the KMT, again, has been the obvious winners, but Tang-wai candidates have been able to win a few seats. However, in the voting turnout, the share for the opposition candidates averages about 30%, although their share of the seats averages only about 13%.
### Table 4.1: Comparison between the KMT and Tang-Wai, Provincial Assembly Elections, by Seats and Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KMT Seats</th>
<th>KMT %Seats</th>
<th>KMT %Vote</th>
<th>Tang-Wai Seats</th>
<th>Tang-Wai %Seats</th>
<th>Tang-Wai %Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average**</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From CEC, 1986:10-1. ** Calculated
(Source: Seng, 1986:12)

### Table 4.2: Comparison between the KMT and Tang-Wai in County and City Mayors Elections, by Seats and Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KMT Seats</th>
<th>KMT %Seats</th>
<th>KMT %Vote</th>
<th>Tang-Wai Seats</th>
<th>Tang-Wai %Seats</th>
<th>Tang-Wai %Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average**</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Seng, 1986:12)
Table 4.3. Comparison between the KMT and Tang-Wai in Legislative Yuan Elections, by Seats and Votes (Popularly contested seats only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>KMT %Seats</th>
<th>%Vote</th>
<th>Tang-Wai Seats</th>
<th>%Seats</th>
<th>%Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average**</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compiled from CEC, 1987:335-52. ** Calculated.
(Source: Seng, 1986:12).

Table 4.4. Comparison between the KMT and Tang-Wai in National Assembly Elections, by Seats and Votes (Popularly contested seats only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>KMT %Seats</th>
<th>%Vote</th>
<th>Tang-Wai Seats</th>
<th>%Seats</th>
<th>%Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average**</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compiled from CEC, 1987:174-188. ** Calculated.
(Source: Seng, 1986:12).
The elections for the Legislative Yuan and the National Assembly can be found to have a similar pattern. The rough proportion of votes for the KMT and Tang-wai is about seven and three, and that of seats is about eight and two. Nevertheless, vote percentage for the opposition is rising slowly in recent national elections, even though the average share of seats is not rising with the vote share. This trend can be detected in Tables 4.3 and 4.4.

Based on the results of the elections held so far, one can reasonably conclude that the KMT has been able to capture about 70% of the popular votes and Tang-wai about 30%, while the share of seats for the KMT is about 80% or higher, and that for Tang-wai is about 20% or lower. There is no doubt that the KMT is the only political party that is able to accomplish overwhelming victories, and Tang-wai offers only slight challenge to the ruling Nationalist Party.

II. Strengths and Weaknesses of the KMT and the Opposition

In addition to the KMT’s ability to obtain about 70% of the popular vote, its share of the seats is about 10% higher than its vote share. In other words, there is a tangible discrepancy between the vote-share and seat-share between the two main political forces. For example, in the 1985 election for the Taipei City Council, 25.5% of the elected City Councilmen were non-partisans, but the popular vote for
them was close to 30% (CEC, 1984B: 156-63). This result was celebrated by the opposition politicians as the closest between the votes and the seats won by Tang-Wai. A roughly similar result can be found in the 1980 election for the Legislative Yuan: Tang-Wai won only 11 out of 52 popularly contested seats, or about 21%, yet it won about 28% of the popular vote (Table 4.3). A more dramatic outcome can be found in the 1986 National Assembly election, in which the opposition won 13 out of 59 popularly elected seats, or 22%, but took 35.2% of the popular vote (Table 4.4). In the Legislative Yuan election in the same year, non-KMT candidates won 13 out of 57 seats, or 23%, but the popular vote for them was as high as 33.1% (Table 4.3).

The important questions are what explains this discrepancy and what explains the strength of the KMT and the weakness of the opposition in these elections? The answers for these questions can be found, first, in the tactics of the Tang-wai politicians; second, in the organizational strength of the KMT; and third, in the contradictions within the opposition camp.

A. The Tactics of the Tang-wai Leaders

As was previously mentioned, the Tang-wai was a loose coalition of opposition politicians before the Democratic Progressive Party was formed in 1986. There was no national organization to bind the political activities of individual politicians so that Tang-wai could have a nationally
coordinated program to nominate candidates or to conduct campaigns. As a result, some nationally known opposition leaders have been able to receive very high amount of popular votes because of their personal charismas and popularity, but other less known opposition politicians suffer because their potential supporters voted for the better known ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Yuan District</th>
<th>Highest KMT Votes</th>
<th>Highest OPP Votes</th>
<th>Minimum Votes Needed to Win</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st District</td>
<td>109,979</td>
<td>159,374</td>
<td>78,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd District</td>
<td>107,997</td>
<td>141,885</td>
<td>88,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td>130,634</td>
<td>191,840</td>
<td>86,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th District</td>
<td>92,485</td>
<td>120,338</td>
<td>72,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th District</td>
<td>118,806</td>
<td>112,433</td>
<td>94,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th District</td>
<td>55,426</td>
<td>n.a.*</td>
<td>47,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipei City</td>
<td>139,617</td>
<td>134,839</td>
<td>74,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaohsiung City</td>
<td>86,903</td>
<td>91,984</td>
<td>62,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu Kien Province</td>
<td>16,833</td>
<td>n.a.*</td>
<td>16,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opposition candidates did not run in these districts.

(Source: Compiled from CEC, 1987:344-352)

As Table 4.5 indicates, the strength of the opposition lies in the ability of some individual politicians to capture a large share of votes in elections. For example, Chu Kao-chen received 120,338 votes in the southwest electoral district in the 1986 Legislative Yuan election. The KMT candidate who came closest to him got only 93,028 votes (Table 4.5). In the same year, Shu Yong-su polled
more than 191,000 votes from the West-Central district in her bid for the Legislative Yuan, leading the top KMT candidate by about 30,000 votes (Table 4.5).

In the 1986 election, Shu and Chu were not the only DPP candidates who gained high voter support. Hong Chi-chang received 161,384 votes in the Taipei County district for a National Assembly seat and the leading KMT candidate obtained only 115,068 votes (CEC, 1987:177-88). In the Taipei City district in the same race, 125,283 voted for Chou Chin-yuh, and the number of votes needed to be elected was about 63,000 (CEC, 1987:177-88). Kang Ning-hsiang picked up 134,839 votes in his contest for the Legislative Yuan in the Taipei City district in which the minimum vote needed to be elected was only 74,288. You Ching received 159,374 votes in his bid for the Legislative Yuan in the Taipei County district and the closest KMT candidate was about 50,000 votes behind. Hsu Kuo-tai received 141,885 votes in the Legislative Yuan election in the northwest district, and he beat the leading KMT candidate by approximately 34,000 votes (CEC, 1987:344-52). As Table 4.5 shows, in the 9 Legislative Yuan electoral districts in 1986, the highest vote in five districts were won by Tang-wai candidates, and four of them by wide margins. The high popular vote for individual opposition candidates is transformed into a political challenge to the government party in the national legislative body.
Very ironically, the ability of Tanp-va members to capture votes happens to be its own weakness under the current electoral system for the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Provincial Assembly. The term to characterize the electoral systems for these elections is "single-entry multi-member system." Under the system, Taiwan is divided into electoral districts based generally on county boundaries. There are about three to seven seats assigned to each district depending on the size of the electorate in the district. The competition for seats in each district is decided by each candidate's share of the votes, and the candidates with the highest share win the seats. The system differs from single member district or any proportional representation, the most frequently encountered electoral systems in Western democracies.

The problem for a high concentration of votes for several opposition politicians in the multi-member electoral system is that the uneven share of votes among candidates of the same party hurts the party's general performance. In each district, a high concentration of votes for one candidate means less vote share for others, assuming that the

---

* The term is provided by Professor Liu I-chou of National Cheng-chi University, who is a specialist of Taiwan's elections.

* In the 1989 Electoral Law Amendment, the electoral districts for Legislative Yuan were revised from five larger districts in the Province with Taipei and Kaohsiung as separate districts into smaller districts based on county boundaries.
proportion of votes for a party is certain. Were the opposition candidates able to coordinate their campaigns and distribute their constituent resources, more politicians could have been elected. The 1986 Legislative Yuan election in Kaohsiung District provided an example: Two opposition candidates were able to coordinate with one another and divide the city into two areas for their campaigns, and both candidates were elected as a result (Personal interview, 7/20/88). The DPP has realized the problem arising from the uneven distribution of votes, and some party leaders have worked toward a more rational distribution of votes among the opposition candidates (Personal interviews, 7/20/88; 8/11/88).

Table 4.6 is a hypothetical presentation of the results of the KMT's even and Tang-wai's uneven vote distribution. In this hypothetical situation (which is close to the real problem the opposition candidates face), the opposition could have two candidates elected if they could coordinate their campaigns and distribute their vote sources more evenly.
Table 4.6. Vote Distribution and Electoral Outcome,  
(Five Seats in the District, Hypothetical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMT Candidates</th>
<th>%Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>Tang-wai Candidates</th>
<th>%Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Elected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 (80%)</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td><strong>1 (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though a better distribution of the votes could mean more individual candidates elected, there is a serious debate within the DPP concerning whether it is more important to get 50% of the votes or to get 50% of the contested seats. Both of these goals would undoubtedly give the DPP a position from which to ask for the right to become the ruling party, given the fact that the Parliament still has a substantial number of senior members. But the two goals require two very different strategies to accomplish.

In order to get 50% of votes in an important election, the DPP needs to involve as many candidates as possible to mobilize voters (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/11/88). It means that fewer candidates will be elected and less voice in the Parliament because the individual vote share will become less as the number of candidates increases. This strategy was strongly articulated by the Shin-chao-lio
faction, but was disliked by those who emphasized the "Parliament line." Those who supported this strategy argued that even if the DPP could grab 50% of the contested seats, there would still be no chance of becoming a ruling party because most of the seats in the Parliament will still be occupied by senior members. 50% of the votes, furthermore, would mean the end of the KMT's legitimacy to rule (Personal interview, 9/7/88).

In order to get 50% of the contested seats, however, the DPP needs to enforce strict party discipline in dividing the "turfs" and nominating its candidates in the elections (Personal interviews, 7/20/88; 9/7/88). This means many active opposition politicians will be eliminated during the nomination process. But party discipline is difficult to enforce in the DPP, which has a decentralized party organization and is faction ridden. Currently the DPP is leaning toward the latter strategy, and has completed the nomination process for the elections at the end of 1989.

B. The KMT's Organizational Strength

Despite the fact that all of the DPP leaders that were interviewed for this research project cried foul claiming that the KMT violates electoral rules by delivering cash directly to the voters in many remote areas,* the KMT's

* The claim is not always substantiated. However, election fraud was also claimed by one high-ranking government official as the first electoral problem that must be dealt
victories have been so decisive and consistent that election fraud could be ruled out as the only reason for the KMT's victories. Contrary to the DPP, which depends heavily on the strong showing of individual politicians, the KMT's real strength, in addition to its ability to obtain very high vote counts, lies in the ability to impose party discipline on individual candidates. The Organization Working Committee can very well control the nomination process (Lei, et. al., 1986:125-30; Peng, 1987:57-8).

Moreover, as the ruling party for forty years, the KMT has firmly established its organizational network throughout Taiwan. Through its teams and cells, the KMT is able to determine the volume of votes it is likely to receive in every locale. With that confidence, the KMT calculates the maximum number of candidates that it is able to win in each electoral district. Then individual KMT candidates will be asked to campaign in his (or her) own area so that no one is taking votes away from any other KMT candidates (Lei, et. al., 1986:125-30; Seng, 1986). This practice has allowed the KMT to have most of its nominated candidates elected in the races for the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Provincial Assembly and to ensure its dominant position in the elections.

Furthermore, the KMT's status as the ruling party also

----------

with. Personal interview, 8/16/88.
enables to utilize media to establish itself as the only party that can find the future for Taiwan. Due to the government's control over television stations, opposition politicians were frequently painted as a radical, violent, and irresponsible gang of conspirators. People possibly voted for the Kuomintang due to their fear of a chaotic future if the opposition should come to power. In a public opinion survey conducted by The Journalist immediately after Chiang Chin-kuo's death in January 1988, 39.6% of the respondents thought the possible barrier to the political development of Taiwan would come from the opposition (SSW, 45:17). The percentage is very high when compared to 7.4% that replied communist China, 2.4% military, 15.1% KMT conservative faction. In other words, the opposition in Taiwan has a serious image problem, and this was directly or indirectly caused by the KMT's organizational strength and control of the media.7

The KMT, after its forty-year domination of Taiwan, has firmly established in the society. With about two million card-carrying members in Taiwan, or roughly one-tenth of the population, the KMT has been able to organize its party to its electoral advantage.8 The KMT has also maintained its

7 As will become evident later, there is indeed a radical faction in the opposition camp that advocates street demonstrations to overthrow the KMT.
8 In contrast to the KMT, the DPP's membership is only about 18,000. World Journal, 7/24/89:7.
highly centralized, top-down decision-making mechanism, which is a replica of Stalin's communist party organization. Under this party organization, the party chairman is the most important decision-maker. Other important decision-makers may include the general secretary and deputy general secretaries, members of the Central Standing Committee (CSC), and the directors of the various working committees. There are also various committees and teams in local areas that complete the party network in the society (Peng, 1987). This centralized command system has faced some degree of challenge from the popularly elected politicians, but the general outlook has not been changed.

With its centralized command system, the teams and party cadres are all mobilized to support the party nominated candidates during the election (Seng, 1986). The ability of the party to command two million card-carrying members enables the KMT to precisely specify the location of sources of support. In contrast, the DPP depends heavily on the popular opposition politicians to attract unspecified crowd to its support. This has led some professional DPP party workers to rethink the DPP's party organization so that they can also pinpoint where their supports are in order to better distribute the DPP's votes among its candidates in elections (Seng, 1986).
C. The Factional Conflict in the DPP

**Diagram 4.1. The Evolution of the DPP's Main Factions**

1949  Non-Partisan (Wu-Tang Wu-Pai)

1975  Tang-Wai (Outside the Party)

- Non-Partisan
- Other Parties

1979  Mei-li-dao (Grass Root)

1980  New Generation (Street Line) (Anti-System)

- Mainstream (Parliam. Line) (Reform within)

1983  Writers Asso. Chien-chin (Independence) (Democracy)

1987  Shin-chao-lio  Mei-li-dao  Reintegrated

1988  Shin-chao-lio  Mei-li-dao

1989  Shin-chao-lio  Mei-li-dao

- Direct evolution
- Indirect evolution

(Source: Peng, 1986; Hwang, 1985; personal interview, 8/12/88.)
The factional conflict in the opposition camp is potentially a threat to the party unity and in some occasions has caused the loss of elections. Ever since the opposition forces started to seek a united front in the late seventies, factional conflict has been a serious challenge to them. In fact, factional division is so important that no one can neglect it when he studies the opposition forces in Taiwan (Peng, 1986). The factional politics inside the opposition camp very often determines the policy-positions, ideologies, and attitudes toward the overall future of Taiwan. The following diagram (Diagram 4.1) is a general picture of how the main factions have evolved in the DPP.

The most important source of Tang-Wai's factional division is ideological and philosophical differences concerning how democracy can be reached in Taiwan. The second source is the leadership style of individual Tang-Wai politicians. As discussed in Chapter II, 1977 was an important year in Taiwan's recent history (Gold, 1986). In that year, local elections for the Provincial Assembly and the country-level mayors were held, and the first spontaneous outburst of public anger since 1947 over election fraud resulted in a riot in Chongli, northwest of Taiwan. The result of the election was a record-high twenty-one Tang-Wai politicians elected Provincial Assemblymen and four county mayors (Hwang, 1985:50). The small victory encouraged some of the opposition leaders to take a more radical step to challenge and criticize the KMT
government. However, some other opposition politicians of the time did not believe in radical means of reaching democracy. This ideological difference gradually evolved into two ideological camps which were customarily termed by the Taiwanese as "reforming the system" and "reform within the system," with Hwang Hsin-jieh and Kang Ning-hsiang as their respective leaders.

1979 was another milestone for Taiwan's opposition. Two dissident magazines, representing two opposition factions, were published, The Eighties and Formosa (Mei-li-dao). Formosa, published by Hwang Hsin-jieh and supported by those who want to reform the system, was able to attract all major opposition politicians of the time and became the most important political magazine ever published by Tang-Wai (Peng, 1986:75). Mei-li-dao was the first major effort of Taiwan's opposition to develop an island-wide united front against the KMT. In this effort, Hwang Hsin-jieh and Shih Ming-teh drew individual opposition politicians to support the magazine. Those who went forward to participate in the integration include politicians from different backgrounds and different regions with very different styles and ideologies. Among them, Wang Tuo, Yao Chia-wen, Kang Ning-hsiang, Cheng Gu-yin, Hwang Hwang-hsiung, Wei Ting-chao, Liu Feng-sung, etc., were never considered the members of the faction. This suggests that the formation of Mei-li-dao in 1979 was more a grand coalition for individual opposition politicians than a faction per se.
But because of Mei-li-dao's radical stand and interest in mass campaigns, Formosa was ordered by the Garrison Command to shut down after the 1979 Kaohsiung incident, shortly after publishing its fourth issue. However, The Eighties survived. The Eighties, published by Kang Ning-hsiang and edited by Chiang Tsun-nan, was a comparatively milder journal, but it was also very critical of the government's public policies. The main difference between the two journals was that Formosa emphasized the power of the masses in promoting democracy, while The Eighties looked deeper into the problems of the society and politics and tried to find solutions to those problems (Peng, 1986:74-6). In some respects, Formosa was more grass-root oriented, while The Eighties was more intellectually oriented (Hwang, 1985:52). Kang and Chiang believed in literary criticism, electoral competition, and strong rivalry with the ruling party in the Parliament. The two magazines in fact developed into two distinct ideological appeals in protesting the ruling government (Hwang, 1985:54).

When the 1979 Human Rights Day Rally in Kaohsiung, a port city in southern Taiwan, turned into riot, the government cracked down on Formosa magazine and imprisoned almost all of its leaders. Legislator Kang Ning-hsiang then assumed the leadership role for the remaining Tang-Wai forces and continued the opposition's confrontation with the government. For about three years, Kang was able to keep the opposition movement alive, and many people at the time
believed that Kang's moderate ideology provided a better means for opposition and that, therefore, Kang should be in the Mainstream of the opposition (Peng, 1986:78). The name Mainstream Faction (Tsu-lio-pai) was then attached to Kang and those who surrounded Kang. During the heyday of Kang's faction, the Legislator was frequented by foreign politicians and journalists. He also struggled to maintain the island-wide united front of opposition. Until 1986-87, Kang's Mainstream had remained the largest and the most noticeable faction in the opposition camp. Politicians who were considered part of Kang's faction included legislators Hwang Hwang-hsiung and Chang Chun-hsiung, Taipei City Councilmen Chang Teh-ming (who was also a legislator in 1980-83), Lin Wen-lang, and Kang Hsua-mu, and Provincial Assemblymen Su Chen-tsang and Yiu Shih-kun, to name just a few (SSW, 87:68).

In 1982-83, a group of young radical writers waged a war against Kang's ideology and leadership for his soft stand against the KMT. These radical writers included Lee Aw, Liu Feng-sung, Chiou I-jen, Cheng Nan-jon, and Wu Nai-teh, the so-called Tang-Wai New Generation (Hwang, 1985:29). They strongly articulated the idea of mass campaigns against the KMT government if Taiwan was ever going to achieve democracy, and fiercely criticized Kang's call for peaceful competition with the KMT in the Parliament. As a result, the opposition movement in this period clearly divided into two ideological camps, "Parliament Line" and "Street Line,"
with the former favoring peaceful electoral competition and the latter street confrontation. The radical writers in 1983 formed the Tang-Wai Bien-Lien-Huai (Writers and Editors Association) as a united front against the KMT as well as the moderate wing of the opposition. Later the radicals published their independent journal entitled New Tide (Shin-chao-lio), and this radical faction was thus called the Shin-chao-lio faction. Most of these radical writers were usually not considered charismatic enough to run for election, but they provided a middle-level cadre for the opposition organization when it gradually became an island-wide unified force and a semi-party entity. When the Democratic Progressive Party was formed, the Shin-chao-lio faction was the key to the organization because they were the only professional party workers.

As the government became more tolerant of the opposition in the mid 1980s, the Shin-chao-lio faction turned toward the idea of an independent Taiwan as the ultimate solution to Taiwan's political problems, and saw street demonstrations as the only way to overthrow the Kuomintang and establish democracy. This faction also stressed ideological purity in opposing the KMT rule—no compromise, no cooperation, no negotiation, and no end to the struggle until the KMT is overthrown (Personal interview, 7/13/88). Because of their emphasis on ideological purity, which is based on the degree of support toward the ideal of the independence of Taiwan from China, the faction has developed
into a tightly organized group. Less tolerance was given to other opposition leaders who considered other options for the future of Taiwan beyond independence. Their attitudes were criticized by some DPP leaders as drawing smaller and smaller circles to limit the DPP appeal, painting itself into a narrow corner (Personal interviews, 9/7/88; 9/6/88).

As was mentioned earlier, the Mainstream was under heavy attack by the radicals in 1983 as the election for the Legislative Yuan drew closer. The opposition camp soon realized the heavy toll inflicted upon Tang-wai by the internal struggle. Kang Ning-hsiang as well as two other Mainstream incumbents lost their Legislative Yuan seats to Kuomintang candidates (Hwang, 1985:81). After the defeat, Kang Ning-hsiang modified his "Parliament Line" ideology somewhat. In a personal interview, he stressed that the "Street Line" was just as important as the "Parliament Line," a view which was a significant modification from his earlier position (Personal interview, 8/13/88).

Meanwhile, the disbanded Mei-li-dao reunited into a strong faction again after Hwang Shin-jieh and Chang Chun-hong were released from prison on May 30, 1987. Compared to Shin-chao-lieo, the radical wing of the DPP, Mei-li-dao is more pragmatic in its outlook. Many members of Mei-li-dao have held elected positions and think that elections are just as important as street protests, if not more important. They also think that democracy, instead of independence, is
what Taiwan needs at the moment (Personal interview, 9/6/88). This marked the breaking point between Mei-li-dao and Shin-chao-lio. Currently, the entire DPP camp is divided by the argument on whether the DPP should pursue democracy or independence (SSW, 76:21). Each faction rallied its supporters within the party, and the power struggle between the two factions threatened the cohesiveness and the unity of the newly established party (SSW, 78:19).

It is worth noting that the Mei-li-dao faction, the radical wing of Tang-Wai in the late 1970s, became the moderate and pragmatic faction after 1987. The cause for the change is three-fold. First, many members of the faction are professional politicians who consider election as their chance for achieving power and fame. After the Kaohsiung Incident in 1979, they learned the lesson that excessive street confrontations would prompt the Kuomintang to crack down on the opposition movement and end their chance for further electoral victories. Second, a majority of the members of Shin-chao-lio came from the Mei-li-dao after the Kaohsiung Incident, and therefore the most radical elements were out of the Mei-li-dao at the current stage. It was the Shin-chao-lio faction which turned radical, and it made the Mei-li-dao look tame in comparison. The Mei-li-dao members released from jail hold the same political opinions today as they did ten years ago. Third, the Mei-li-dao in 1979 was not really radical in the first place; it
was termed radical only when compared with Kang's Mainstream faction. It gave the image of radicalism because, on the one hand, the faction considered street protest as a normal channel for political expression, and on the other hand, it has incorporated many progressive writers.

The power struggle within the DPP is associated closely with the power struggle within the Taiwanese community in the United States. Some argue that the factional conflict in the DPP was spilled over of the power struggle in the United States (SSW, 77:39). However, more evidence suggests that the factions in Taiwan search for their international allies to increase their power and leverage (SSW, 77:26-9). The most radical Taiwanese organization in the US which advocates violent revolution, including terrorist activities, against KMT is the Taiwan Independence League, and this organization is aligned with Shin-chao-lio faction of the DPP. Meanwhile, Peng Ming-min, a pragmatic Taiwanese exile, formed Formosans' Association for Public Affairs (FAPA) as a lobby organization for the rights of the Taiwanese Americans. Unlike the Taiwan Independence League, FAPA advocates democracy through electoral competition and self-determination, and has becomes the natural ally of Mei-li-dao.

There are several other small factions in the DPP. The most noticeable is the Lin Chen-jieh Faction, or the Progress (Chien-chin) faction. Lin has been actively
participating in the opposition camp since the 1977 election. In the early 1980s, Lin was a member of the radical writers group. But he withdrew from that group in 1983 because he could not agree with others who started to propagate the idea of the independence of Taiwan from China. In the same year, he published *Chien-chin* (*Progress Weekly*) to spread his Green Party-style opposition philosophy (Personal interview, 8/13/88). Because Lin advocated the intensification of street confrontations against the government, he won the nickname of "Little Master on the Street." After Hwang Hsin-jieh and Chang Chun-hung were set free by the government and started their effort to reintegrate their former associates, Lin aligned himself with the reorganized Mei-li-dao faction and became one of the most vocal supporters of the ideal of "democracy now and independence later" (*Progress Weekly*, 13, 14, 15).

The DPP chairman race in 1988 was the showdown between the two largest factions and the two opposition ideologies, Mei-li-dao and Shin-chao-lio, democracy and independence. After months of bitter struggle and open conflict, Mei-li-dao won six out of the total of eleven seats of the Central Standing Committee and sixteen out of the total of thirty-one seats of the Central Executive Committee. Hwang Hsin-jieh, the leader of Mei-li-dao, was also elected chairman of the DPP, with one hundred and twenty-three votes to ninety-seven votes over the incumbent chairman Yao Chia-wen, a candidate favored by Shin-chao-lio (*SSW*, 87:57-9). The
result of the race gave the more moderate Mei-li-dao a temporary leading edge over the more radical Shin-chao-lio.

On of the most important effects of the election was that Kang's Mainstream faction was not able to work out a coherent list of candidates for the Central Executive Committee and completely lost out in the formal party establishment (SSW, 87:68). Kang's followers were absorbed into the two main factions and Kang's faction in the DPP was eliminated. However, Kang's potential for making a comeback cannot be ignored; he remained one of the most respected opposition leaders in Taiwan (SSW, 118:11). For the time being, the Democratic Progressive Party is quite evenly divided between Mei-li-dao and Shin-chao-lio.

In order to cope with the possible serious dispute stemming from factional conflict, the DPP's party constitution specifies that the party should establish an independent and neutral arbitration committee to settle any serious disputes among the party members (DPP Party Constitution). In addition, a few factional leaders considered it necessary to learn the institutionalization of factional politics of the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan (Personal interviews, 9/6/88; 8/11/88). Their idea was that each faction clearly specified its program, ideology, and followers, and the composition of CEC and CSC depended entirely on the number of delegates they were able to get. In other words, it would be just like two small parties
within a bigger party. (Personal interview, 7/13/88). However, the idea of institutionalizing factional conflict was not a popular idea within the DPP because it was viewed as Shin-chao-lio's ploy to increase its grip over the party organization since it is the only well organized faction in the DPP.

Even though the DPP is badly divided between the two main factions, and some DPP leaders even predicted that the final split was inevitable (Personal interview, 7/13/88), the DPP has been able to maintain the basic unity of the party. Both sides realized that if they could stay together, they might have a chance to defeat the KMT in the future elections. But if they split, the hope of defeating the KMT would be dimmed (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 9/6/88; 9/7/88). In summary, the conflict between the two main factions is deeply rooted in each faction's ideology and philosophy. The constant, bitter, internal struggle within the opposition camp prohibits it from becoming a stronger competitor in the elections against the KMT. The attacks on one another also reduced the ability of the Tang-vai politicians to gain more seats in various elections.

IV. Elite-Mass Relations

After examining the electoral competition between the KMT and the DPP, two questions immediately rise. The first whom do the two camps represent? To answer this, we need to look
at the background factors of the elites to see whether they subjectively set out to represent any particular social group. The second question is, who supports the elites of the two sides? This is to ask whether the elites on the two sides receive support from any particular social group, or whether any particular social groups wanted to be represented by a particular party. The following segment will try to answer these two questions.

Subjectively, both the KMT and the DPP have tried to be catch-all parties and not to exclude any social group or class from their programs. The KMT has changed from a great deal of concern about ideology and national security to a great deal of concern about economic reform for the entire population. Its leadership circle has also included representatives from different social backgrounds. The DPP, although it does not formally include representatives from different social groups, calls in its party platform for the welfare for all of the people in Taiwan. In terms of mass support for the two parties, the 1986 Taiwanese Election Study data suggests that the correlations between party ID and commonly-used demographic variables such as income and education are quite low. This indicates that the two parties do gain support from different social groups. However, it also suggests that "provincial origin," the Taiwanese/Mainlander distinction, is a significant factor in identifying with political parties.
A. Elites’ Mass Representation

KMT Elites

KMT elites have gone through significant changes in the post Chiang Kai-shek era. Under Chiang Kai-shek, the Central Standing Committee consisted of military chiefs, party ideologues, propaganda specialists, and heads of intelligence services. It had maintained the outlook and the essence of a “revolutionary democratic party” of the Soviet style. Changes slowly were realized when Chiang Chin-kuo took over as the party chairman in 1975. The new chairman incorporated a number of reform-minded government technocrats into the CSC and gradually transformed the KMT from a “revolutionary party” to “reformist party” (Chang, 1988:3). Because of the personnel turnover in the top ruling circle, the party itself has become more concerned with economic performance and political performance in the later period of Chiang Ching-kuo era, instead of ideology, national security, social stability, and political control (Cheng, 1989:5). However, it was still quite obvious that all important policy decisions went through Chiang Chin-kuo for clearance before implementation. He might consult with other members of the ruling circle, such as Cabinet members, Central Standing Committee members, or his secretaries when a policy decision was about to be made, but there could not be any doubt that his decision was final (Central Daily, 1/12/89:4)
After President Chiang Chin-kuo passed away, KMT elites once again went through a significant change. When Chiang Chin-kuo was in charge, the Central Standing Committee was more of a consultative body for Chiang than the highest decision-making body of KMT (The Independence Morning Post, 7/15/88:2). But after the passing of the party strongman, the CSC members became the collective leaders of the party and the state. President Lee Teng-hui, who lacks seniority in the party establishment, is not able to lead in Chiang's style. Policy decisions, which are made by the majority vote in the CSC, can only be reached after intense debate and bargaining. This is exemplified by the debate over the election of the acting party chairman and the issue of trade with the Soviet Union (SSW, 47:9-13; SSW, 84:12-15).

In statistical terms, the composition of the current KMT ruling elites is revealing. After the Thirteenth National Congress, a native Taiwanese (Lee Teng-hui) became the formal chairman of the Nationalist Party, and more than half of the Central Standing Committee (CSC) members are also Taiwanese; this destroyed the myth that the KMT is a mainlanders' party. Moreover, among the thirty-one members of the current CSC, eight have received foreign Ph.D. degrees, and the average age of them is 63.7, as opposed to 70.7 for the previous CSC, first put together by Chiang Chin-kuo in 1984 (The Independence Morning Post, 7/15/88:2). The younger and better educated elite recruits of the KMT appeared to be replacing the revolutionary old guard, and
the "revolutionary" nature of the party is fading rapidly.

The backgrounds of the CSC members evidence the KMT's new effort to tie itself to the changing society. In addition to the highest military, government, and party officials, the new CSC also includes representatives from business circles, education, science and technology, veterans, overseas Chinese, local politicians, and labor (The Independence Morning Post, 7/15/68:2). This arrangement is designed to bring different voices into the policy-making process of the Nationalist Party.

In terms of government administration, the trend of change is similar to that observed in the party. The average age of the new cabinet, which was reorganized after the thirteenth National Congress of the KMT in July 1968, was 58, almost four years younger than its predecessor. Among the twenty-four new cabinet members, eleven were Taiwanese and fifteen had foreign Ph.D. degrees (SSW, 72:23). It is difficult to say whether these younger and highly educated KMT elites were anxious to have the political system democratized, but it is easy to understand that they are not likely to change the liberalized system back to the rigid form.

These changes, particularly in the role the President, the chairman of the ruling party, and the majority of the CSC being Taiwanese, have a profound impact on the relations between the KMT and the opposition. The opposition leaders
can no longer argue that KMT government is a foreign regime (Personal interview, 9/6/88). A leading opposition politician openly acknowledged that the nature of the political conflict in Taiwan is not between the Taiwanese and the mainlanders any more. The conflict in Taiwan now is a competition between one Taiwanese party against another Taiwanese party. The DPP should now compete fairly with the KMT since both parties are now Taiwanese parties (Personal interview, 9/6/88). A very significant portion of the Taiwanese dissidents residing in the United States, particularly those who belong to FAPA (Formosans' Association for Public Affairs), have also recognized that Taiwan's government and politics are no longer monopolized by the mainlanders, and the overseas Taiwanese should abandon their revolutionary rhetoric against the Nationalist government and support a peaceful reform instead (SSW, 84:40-1).

Although the KMT has tried to balance the representation of mainlanders and Taiwanese in the party center and the government administration, the issue of "provincial origin" still produces an undercurrent in the party. What the Taiwanese see is that most of the key government and party positions, as well as the seats and committee positions in the parliament, are held by mainlanders: 22.16% of the central level civil servants, 25% on local level, and 80.3% of the government appointments (SSW, 109:41). However, the mainlanders, particularly the second-generation descendants,
see a crisis for political participation and are afraid that they will become an "endangered species" in the increasingly important electoral games: The only second generation mainlanders who were able to win in a popular election in 1986 were one legislator and two National Assemblymen (SSW, 109:41).

From these conflicting arguments, one can find that the KMT does not want to exclude either Taiwanese or mainlanders from the party. The problem is that mainlanders are over-represented in the government administration and party organization (15% of the population compared to about half of the CSC and Cabinet or about 80% of the total government appointments), even though they are under-represented in the national elections for the National Assembly and the Legislative Yuan. While this is not a satisfactory situation for everyone, it has served to successfully avoid the connection that the KMT supports the minority mainlanders only.

One of the KMT's founding ideology, the Principle of People's Livelihood, one of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People, calls for a socialist ideal of wealth redistribution. The KMT would have been a socialist party or a party for the workers and the peasants if that ideology had been fully implemented. But the government's main economic strategy, outside of the government monopoly of large industries, has been a neo-laissez faire market
While the interests of the workers and the peasants are not strongly articulated by the government, they are not fairly represented by the KMT elites either. In either government administration or party organization, only one KMT elite (Shieh Sen-san, a legislator and a CSC member) has a worker background. Under such circumstances, no one can call KMT a party of the workers and peasants.

From the above description, it can be concluded that the KMT does not appear to represent any particular social strata or social group. On the contrary, it has tried to avoid the impression that it is excluding any particular social group. This is shown in the fact that the CSC has included representatives from labor, business, and local interests. To have the majority of the CSC members Taiwanese is also an attempt to show that the KMT is not excluding the interest of the Taiwanese, who are the majority of the residents on Taiwan. All of these efforts can justify the argument that the KMT is trying to be a catch-all party.

DPP Elites

The background of the DPP elites is very different from that of the KMT. Unlike the KMT, which has been the only ruling party in Taiwan since 1949, the DPP is only a recent creation by the opposition politicians. It has never become a government party, and has no tie with the powerful
military; therefore the power center of the DPP does not have any representatives of present or previous government and the military. Perhaps the most important difference between the KMT and the DPP elite is that the DPP elites do not represent the powerful institutions of the government.

In addition, the composition of the DPP's Central Executive Committee (CEC) is also radically different from the composition of the KMT's CSC in the sense that the majority of the DPP elites are elected public representatives. The great majority of the thirty-one Central Executive Committee members are either elected politicians or formerly elected politicians, and most of the rest are professional party organizers (Centre Daily News, 11/1/88:2). Among the elected politicians, some have legal backgrounds, but most are political activists who make politics their way of life. Other important leaders of the DPP, but not on the CEC list, include legislators such as You Ching, Chu Kao-chen, and Kang Ning-hsiang. They can all be included in the professional politician category.

Another significant difference between the KMT and DPP elites is that mainlanders in the party power center consist of a tiny minority. After Fay Shih-ping withdrew from the DPP in December 1988, the only noticeable mainland DPP elite is Lin Chen-jieh, the leader of Chien-Chin Faction and a member of the CEC (Central Daily, 12/20/88:1). Even though the DPP has tried to avoid the connection that it is
a party exclusively for Taiwanese, there is no doubt that the mainlanders are not well represented in the party center. It is a clear contrast to the KMT's CSC, which has mainlanders comprising almost half of its membership.

CEC membership is obtained through a competitive internal election process (Centre Daily News, 11/1/88:2). This election does not allow the DPP to carefully arrange its decision-makers to include people from different social strata as does the KMT. Those who are able to be included into the CEC are either prominent politicians or top party organizers, and those who profess to represent a certain segment of the population will have difficulties being elected by the members of the party.

Moreover, the DPP's party platform has tried very carefully not to alienate any social group or any segment of the population. It is the public impression that the DPP is a party of Taiwanese, but in its party platform, it has not even implied that Taiwan should be ruled by Taiwanese only. The only article that would appear to be offensive to any social group is the call for abolishing the parliament seats reserved for overseas Chinese and the government agency for Mongolians and Tibetans affairs. The only article which seems to be appealing to a specific social group is the rights of the aborigines to self-rule (DPP Constitution and Platform: 17, 37). Overseas Chinese, Mongolians, and Tibetans are meaningless in Taiwan's elections, and the
article on the abolition of overseas representatives and the
government agency for Mongolians and Tibetans would not
affect the DPP's source of support. The aborigines in
Taiwan are only a very small minority (See Chapter II), and
the call for the aborigines' self-rule is more of a gesture
to them in order to win their support for the DPP. Since
the party platform makes no appeal to any specific social
class, such as peasants, workers, urban middle class, or
business owners, the DPP can also be described as trying to
be a catch-all party.

While the DPP maintains itself to be a catch-all party,
its radical faction (Shin-chao-lio) has determined to
cultivate support from peasants, workers, and college
students, the so-called deprived social groups (Speech by
Hong Chi-chang, 5/14/89, Columbus). These social groups are
traditionally supporters of the KMT, but that support is not
always very solid. These groups are not mobilized to
pressure for their welfare, and their interests are not
articulated in public. Presently, peasants' average income
is only about three-fourths that of the national average
(Directorate of BAS, 1987A:42), and they are always the
first to suffer in the losing trade wars with the US (SSW,
64:62). Working conditions in many instances are poor and
workers' welfare is often neglected in the name of
international competitiveness. College students are often
coerced and coopted into absence from politics through the
KMT's penetrating cells and the presence of military
commissaries on campus. Without any political organization articulating the interests of these social groups, they are not likely to switch their support from the KMT to other parties.

Shin-chao-lio's effort to stress the interests of these social groups can partially be interpreted as an effort to become a faction for the under-mobilized and the under-privileged social groups. But a better explanation is that the radical DPP faction has tried to broaden its basis of social support. However, the factional conflict in the DPP, as explained earlier, involves different strategies to broaden social support. The more moderate faction of Mei-li-dao considered it necessary to disassociate itself from any kind of socialism or to present itself as being not just for the workers and peasants for fear of alienating the urban middle class and the business owners. As a result of this conflict, it is ironical to see that the Shin-chao-lio faction is involved in virtually every social movement and mass campaign for the peasants, workers, and students, although the DPP itself has often maintained that the party has nothing to do with it (SSW, 63:54).

To conclude this analysis of the DPP elites, I would argue that, except the radical faction, DPP elites have tried to represent as many social groups as possible. This is to say that the DPP has tried to be a catch-all opposition party competing against a catch-all ruling Party.
It would be hard for the DPP to alter its character into a class or group specific party because the DPP is an island-wide anti-KMT coalition instead of a party organized by a group of ideologically unified elites. The attempt by the radical faction to mobilize workers, peasants, and students might (or might not) broaden the DPP's basis of social support, but it is not likely to transform the DPP into a socialist party. In the long run, the DPP will still present itself as a party for those who are dissatisfied with the rule of the Nationalist government.

B. Mass Support for the Elites

The masses' support for the two parties is in fact quite confused. On the one hand, no social group's support for the activities of either party is overwhelming. On the other hand, the support for either party does not come from any specific group or class of the population. In a sense, this can be expected when both of the two major parties are trying to be catch-all parties. The mixed support from the society in turn reinforces the catch-all nature of the parties. Neither party knows exactly where its main social support is, and neither wants to lose support from any of the social groups or social classes.

The origin of the KMT was as a mass mobilization party used to overthrow the Ch'ing Dynasty in 1911. The ability of the party to conduct mass mobilization was greatly
enhanced when Chiang Kai-shek reorganized the Nationalist Party based on that of Stalin's Communist Party. When the Nationalist government retreated to Taiwan in 1949, the entire party structure was kept intact. The KMT has since penetrated deeply into every corner of the society through its well established network, and its potential for the communist Chinese style mass mobilization cannot be overlooked. Nevertheless, the KMT had tried to demobilize the population and depoliticize political and social issues for there is no need to do so when there is no real threat to its dominant position.

Contrary to the KMT, the Democratic Progressive Party has been very serious about its mass campaigns and protest activities ever since its establishment. Often the activities take the form of speeches delivered by charismatic opposition leaders, and sometimes they take the form of marches. As a result, the DPP has established itself as the only genuine mass mobilization party in Taiwan. Because of the success and capability of the DPP in mobilizing masses in its protest activities, the KMT was forced to increase its mass activities in response. Beginning 1987, the KMT legislators have also sponsored their own events, outdoor gatherings, and protest activities (SSW, 22:51; The Central Daily, 3/6/88:2). For this reason, the two major parties in Taiwan are both mass mobilization parties.
The masses' response to the mobilization efforts by either party is dubious as can be expected. Some small fraction of the population is always more enthusiastic than the rest. But there is no clear indication of the specific social group or social class that is more likely to join the activities of the two parties. For example, veterans of the nationalist army from the mainland period as a social group have been viewed as among the most loyal supporters of the Nationalist government, but a splinter group of the veterans has been very visible in the DPP's protest activities. Peasants all over the countryside of Taiwan are also traditionally KMT supporters in elections. But the DPP's efforts to organize "Peasants Power Associations" have started to gather strength in central Taiwan. The protest by the farmers on May 20, 1988 turned into the worst riot in Taiwan since 1947 (SSW, 63). College students, traditionally apolitical, have been passive supporters of the regime. But with the continuous efforts of some dissenting students, an increasing number of college students have become strong advocates of the DPP's political and social reforms. In short, there is no clear social group or class line that can divide the two parties.

The 1986 Taiwanese Election Studies data collected by National Cheng-chi University give a very clear indication of the precariousness of this supports. The following section analyzes the party support along socio-economic background factors based on the total of 1130 sample cases.
drawn from Taiwan Province.*

1. Income and Party ID

The middle class (or more specifically, the middle income population) in Taiwan has been treated by many scholars as the providing basis for Taiwan's stability. It is satisfied with the government's economic performance, which make this segment of the population affluent. In turn, the middle class supports the government so that this economic prosperity can be preserved. However, the same argument also suggests that the middle class is the enlightened population who would support the opposition to press the government for more political freedom and a better political system. But there is no indication of which argument is closer to reality. The cross-tabulation between party support and class produces the following results:

* Because of the high rate of temporary refusals on the two party ID questions, two party ID related variables are computed into a single party ID variable. The valid number of cases is increased to a more sensible level. But the cases are still low in some cells when cross-tabulation is performed. Tang-Wai was the name attached to the opposition in Taiwan before the Democratic Progressive Party was formed, and it was taken as the synonymous for the opposition party.
The above table produces a negligible Pearson's R of .007. The results of this exercise show that the majority of the identifiers of the two parties are from middle income families. The difference between the two is that the opposition identifiers are drawn somewhat more heavily from the middle income population. Reading the column percentages, the two parties' identifiers do not vary significantly to indicate that any class gives either side more substantial support. The proportion of non-KMT identifiers is apparently less than the election turnout of about 30% for the opposition; this is perhaps the effect of the temporary refusals on the party ID questions.
2. Education and Party ID

One can argue that those who benefit from the Nationalist government's education policy are more likely to identify with the KMT. Therefore the higher educated population are more likely to support the KMT and the lower educated are more likely to side with the opposition. However, one can also argue that education is required to give people sufficient information to dissent with the government, therefore the more educated one person is the more likely he is going to identify with the opposition. The confusion is also shown on the following statistical manipulation based on the 1986 Election Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8. Party ID by Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROW PCT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANG-WAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low: uneducated, primary school, or junior high school
Middle: senior high school, or professional school
High: college
The cross-tabulation has a Pearson's R of .008, not very different from that of the previous table. However, by examining the table above, a slight relation between education level and identification with the KMT can be detected. Comparing the row percentages, one can find that the opposition identifiers lean slightly toward lower education while KMT identifiers are leaning toward higher education. Comparing the column percentages, one can further find that while the lower educated people are siding more with the opposition, the higher educated people are siding almost completely with the KMT. But this relationship cannot be stressed too far because the correlation coefficient is very low.

3. Provincial Origin

Provincial origin (Taiwanese vs. mainlanders) could be a very significant variable that correlates with party ID. Without deeper investigation, the origin of the KMT in Taiwan may give a clue. It was a party imposed on Taiwan in 1949 by mainlanders. No matter how much the KMT has tried to blend into the local population, there is still a clear indication that the party apparatus is in the hands of mainlanders. Moreover, mainlanders in Taiwan may feel that their minority position as well as their politically privileged positions can only be protected by the KMT and they would undoubtedly identify with the KMT. In contrast, the opposition forces in Taiwan are locally grown. One of
the loudest arguments from the opposition camp is that Taiwan should be ruled by the Taiwanese themselves, not mainlanders (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/8/88). It can be expected that most of the supporters of the opposition are Taiwanese. The statistical result of the cross-tabulation between party ID and provincial origin is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCEAL ORIGIN</th>
<th>TAIWANESE</th>
<th>MAINLANDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTY ID</td>
<td>ROW PCT</td>
<td>COL PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMT</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANG-WAI</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross-tabulation produced a rather strong R correlation of .21, providing some evidence that provincial origin does have a significant relationship with party identification. By reading the row percentages, one may find that both KMT identifiers and opposition identifiers are drawn heavily from Taiwanese. This is because about 85% of Taiwan's residents are categorized as Taiwanese. Nevertheless, there is a distinction between the two party
identifiers, the distinction being that the opposition identifiers are almost exclusively Taiwanese. From the column percentages, the trend is quite obvious as well. While a segment of Taiwanese support the opposition, almost all of the mainlanders identify with the KMT. Furthermore, the mainlander identifiers of the KMT are exceeding their population proportion of about 15%. However, the distinction between the two parties is not so clear cut on provincial origin as to lead one to conclude that the opposition is nothing but a Taiwanese party and the KMT is only a mainlanders' party. Judging from the survey data presented above, the opposition can well be called a "Taiwanese party" since almost all of the opposition identifiers are Taiwanese, but there is no way one can call the KMT a mainlanders' party for about two-thirds of the KMT identifiers are also Taiwanese. As the largest party in Taiwan where the majority of the people are Taiwanese, the KMT cannot just depend on the minority mainlanders.

The demographic variables other than the ones mentioned above do not correlate with party ID very well. The gender variable could only achieve an R correlation of .06, and age only .09. These two variables, in addition to income and education, could not be treated as important factors in determining one's party support. Provincial origin, from

\footnote{The DPP was not formed until 1986, and Tang-wai, the predecessor of the DPP, was taken as if it were a political party in the 1986 election study.}
the analysis on the Taiwanese studies data, is found to be the only variable that has a significant relationship with party identification. This finding, along with the two parties' attempts to enlist broad bases of social support, leads one to conclude that both the ruling party and the DPP in Taiwan are catch-all parties.

V. Summary Conclusion

In order to understand the views of the national political elites, one must understand the system and the role played by the elites first. In Taiwan, the Kuomintang has been an overwhelming force in politics, and the Tang-wai forces have offered some challenge to the ruling party. However, the challenge from the opposition has never really threatened the dominant position of the Nationalist Party in Taiwan. Since the establishment of the Democratic Progressive Party, the traditional Tang-wai forces have become a better organized political group. The electoral competition, in other words, is no longer between the all powerful Nationalist Party and some individual opposition politicians, but between the ruling party and an opposition party.

In previous elections, the Kuomintang undoubtedly has won decisively. In addition to its ability to win a large volume of popular votes, Kuomintang has also been able to win a larger share of the seats than its share of votes.
The main strength of the Kuomintang lies in its strong central party organization. In contrast, the opposition camp has been plagued by factional confrontation between the more radical and more moderate elements. The confrontation has not only reduced the ability of the opposition to challenge the ruling Kuomintang, but has also reduced its ability to win more seats in the elections. In addition, the strategy of winning a large number of popular votes by popular politicians hurt the overall performance of the opposition under the electoral system. For the opposition to win more seats in the elections, it must find a way to distribute the popular votes among its candidates.

Moreover, neither party relies on any particular social group or social class for their popular support in elections. In fact, both parties can be described as catch-all parties in their efforts to vie for popular support. Analysis of election data also indicates that identification with political parties does not correlate well with income, education, gender, or age, the more commonly used demographic variables. This finding corresponds with the catch-all characteristics of the two political parties. However, analysis also shows that the variable "provincial origin" produces a rather significant correlation (.21) with party ID. This finding makes it clear that provincial origin is an important factor in the electoral competition in Taiwan: Whereas both the KMT and the opposition depends heavily on the support from the Taiwanese because they are
the majority of the residents on the island, mainlanders almost without exception give their support to the KMT. It does not make the KMT a mainlander party since two-thirds of those who identify with the KMT are Taiwanese, but there is no doubt that the opposition in essence is a Taiwanese party.
CHAPTER V

A CLASH OF VIEWS:
NATIONAL POLITICAL ELITES ON ISSUES
As discussed in Chapter III, Taiwan has developed advanced socio-economic conditions in recent years. That is, it has not only achieved economic growth, but also egalitarian wealth distribution. Moreover, change has taken place in the society and many people in Taiwan have started to make different demands on the government through various means. But, this socio-economic development did not produce a swift and complete democratization. Many problems remain to be solved before Taiwan can achieve the rank of a full democracy. For the purposes of this study, socio-economic development theory is not sufficient to explain the sluggishness of Taiwan's democratization. Perhaps the answer lies in the national political elites, since without elite consensus on the most important democratization issues, the process of reaching democracy becomes more difficult. This chapter is a presentation of the views of some of the national elites in Taiwan toward the most important issues of democratization, including how the process of democratization should be completed.

As indicated earlier, Chiang Chin-kuo was the most important figure of the government to open up the political system for competition. Chiang led the government to gradual change while the KMT was still the dominant force of the society and, thus, conditions appeared relatively stable in spite of the change. However, since Chiang's death, it is clear that the KMT elites as a group are more important than ever in the continuation of the transition process. No
one in the ruling circle possesses Chiang's power to command or lead. The elite group has to rely on persuasion and negotiation, either with the conservative old guard or with the radical opposition, to have its policies adopted and problems solved.

However, since national political elites have different ideas about what democracy is and how to reach it, the process of democratization moves slowly. On the one hand, some elites consider Taiwan already as a democracy. On the other hand, some other elites think that democratization is impossible under the current regime, and in order for Taiwan to become democratic, the people in Taiwan should overthrow the KMT government. In other words, to many elites, the current struggle between KMT and DPP is still a zero-sum game. Democracy is not likely to take root under such circumstances.

As described in detail in Chapter II, even though significant political changes took place in Taiwan in the 1980s, there are structural issues that must be unraveled before democratization can be completed. Parliament has been the most important and the most controversial of these issues. In the current three branches of the Parliament, about 90% of the National Assembly, 70% of the Legislative Yuan, and 50% of the Control Yuan are senior members who do
not have to run for reelection. The opposition elite unanimously demands the retirement of all these senior Parliament members as a decisive step toward the goal of democracy. However, the government elite argues that the solution to the Parliament issue can only be gradual.

Another structural issue is termination of the emergency decree so Taiwan can emerge from the shadow of national emergency into true constitutional rule. One aspect which makes it awkward for Taiwan to live under the current constitution, though, is that it was created in 1947 in mainland China. The opposition elite considers the emergency decree a smoke screen for the KMT government to maintain its political monopoly. To them, terminating the emergency decree would be a positive step toward democracy. In addition, the opposition wants the Constitution amended so it can be followed with less controversy. According to the government elite, the emergency decree cannot be terminated while the Chinese mainland is occupied by hostile communist forces, and the Constitution cannot be amended before the mainland is reconquered by the Nationalist forces.

-------------------

1 The figures are reducing slowly because of the death of the aging members. Accurate figures do not have any duration.

2 The intensified civil war in 1948 prompted Chiang Kai-shek to issue the "Temporary Constitutional Provision of Mobilizing and Rebellion Quelling Period"—Dong-Yuan Kan-Luan Shih-Chi Lin-Shih Tiao-Kuan. This is customarily called the emergency decree.
In addition to the above two structural issues, there are other important issues of democratization. They include: the selection of the President and Prime Minister by public consent, direct election of the governor and the mayors of the two largest cities, separation of the judiciary from executive branch, and so forth. These issues are related mainly to the issues of Parliamentary reform and Constitutional amendment. For instance, if the National Assembly is composed completely of popularly elected members, the Presidential election by the National Assembly would be a process of public consent. Also, another example is that direct election of the governor of Taiwan would be necessary when the emergency decree is terminated and the Constitution is returned to its true face.

The underlying issue for these structural controversies and the principal source of the problem is the crisis of national identity. In other words, the national political elites in Taiwan have a fundamentally different understanding over whether Taiwan is a province of China or whether Taiwan is, and should be, an independent country. This issue came into existence when the Nationalist government retreated to Taiwan from China in 1949. After 40 years of separation, the chance for a reunification is more distant than ever, and both Taiwan and China are separate and independent political entities. In spite of de facto separation between China and Taiwan and the remote possibility for a reunification, the KMT elite hangs on to
the idea that only the Nationalist government is the true representative of the Chinese people. For the ROC government to continue to be the legitimate representative of China, Taiwan should retain the mainland elected Parliament members and the emergency decree. In other words, national identity is the ultimate issue in Taiwan's democratization, and is the issue of all the issues to be resolved.

In this Chapter, the elite's perception and arguments about national identity, Parliamentary reform, constitutional amendment, and the termination of emergency decree will be compared, contrasted, and analyzed in great detail. In addition, elite perceptions of democracy and views on what needs to be done to make Taiwan democratic will also be carefully studied. As will become clear, the national political elite in Taiwan have dramatically different perceptions toward the issues of democratization and how these issues should be tackled. This lack of consensus keeps these national elite members from building a democratic political system together.

I. The Issue of National Identity

To many of the national political elite in Taiwan, the most important yet divisive issue underlying democratization is the conflicting interpretation of Taiwan's national identity (Personal interviews, 8/11/88; 8/13/88). People in
Taiwan have very different understandings of whether Taiwan is a part of China (and represents the legitimate ruling power of the entire China) or an independent political entity by itself. This difference, as argued by many opposition elites, causes the difficulties and controversies in the reform of the Parliament, in the constitutional amendment, the termination of emergency decree, in the direct election of mayors and governors, and in KMT's continuous monopoly of political resources. Without the problem of national identity, all these other issues might have been solved (Personal interview, 8/13/88).

On one end of this grand debate, those who believe Taiwan is part of China and Taiwan represents the Chinese people on the mainland argue that Taiwan should maintain representatives from mainland China, should not have comprehensive reelection, should not hold direct election for the president, and most important of all, should not amend the constitution or terminate the emergency decree (Central Daily, 4/24/89:2). They argue for this on the premise that Taiwan and China will be reunited someday and the Nationalist government will be the legitimate ruler of China. Although Taiwan has been separated from China since 1949 (and for fifty years under Japanese rule), and the chance for a reunification in the near future is slim, the Nationalist government maintains its claim of sovereignty over mainland China (Central Daily, 4/25/89:2). In order to present the claim as legitimate, the Nationalist government
does not want to dissolve the Parliament, which was formed on the mainland, nor does it want to amend the Constitution, which was written in China. In other words, these symbols of legitimacy (Fa-tung) must be kept alive by the government so that it can have some basis for the claim over China.

On the other end of the debate, those who think of Taiwan as an independent political entity, not any part of China, view the current political setup, including Parliament, governorship, constitution, emergency decree, and so on, as the product of the twisted interpretation of Taiwan's international status. The only purpose of that twisted interpretation, according to the latter elites, is to highlight the myth of KMT's legitimacy so the undemocratic political establishment can be maintained (Personal interview, 8/11/88; 7/13/88).

Dramatically different from the common pattern of fighting for independence from colonial powers in the Third World, Taiwan's experience is unique: the elites are divided over whether the country should enter unification with another country, a much bigger, much more powerful, but much poorer, country. The problem is rather serious, because the Taiwanese still do not have a consensus on the question whether it is an independent country. Without a consensus on Taiwan's national identity, the debate on democratization focuses on nationalism, not the specific structural issues that need to be resolved.
The debate over national identity is one of the most divisive issues facing Taiwan today, and the emotion attached to the issue clearly threatens to polarize the country. To many people, the fundamental problem of Taiwan's political system is this unrealistic sovereignty claim; without such claim, the government has no legitimacy to maintain the emergency decree and an un-reelected Parliament. To solve the problem, many argue, Taiwan should declare itself independent of China (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 9/7/88). However, to many other people, reunification with the mainland is the last hope, and declaring an independent Taiwan is absolutely unacceptable because no one should betray the Chinese nation (United Daily, 4/26/89:1). Adding fear to the anxiety of the Taiwanese on this issue, the communist regime in Peking warns that an invasion from China is inevitable if Taiwan ever declares itself independent of China (Central Daily, 4/21/89:1; 4/26/89:1). This threat appears more realistic in the aftermath of Tienanman Square massacre on June 3, 1989.

The question "Do you prefer unification between Taiwan and China or an independent Taiwan?" is such a sensitive question that no public opinion survey in Taiwan has tried to find an answer to it. As a result of this lack of credible data, it is difficult to ascertain how the general public stands on the issue. Meanwhile, the government continues to preach that unification is a national goal that
cannot be Surrendered (Central Daily, 4/24/89:2). The Democratic Progressive Party states in its party constitution that Taiwan's future should be determined only by the people in Taiwan, a moderated expression of independence.

In spite of the lack of credible public opinion data on the issue, several different versions of the question were administered by various survey organizations, and some of the results provide a clue to the divisiveness of the public on the issue. A survey conducted by Capital Morning Post, a newly established opposition newspaper, is closest to the direct comparison between reunification and independence. The respondents in Taipei were asked by the Capital Morning Post to identify whether they wanted Taiwan to be independent or to be unified by China. The survey show that about 12% of the respondents want Taiwan to be independent of China, and about 40% of these respondents want an independent Taiwan in spite of a Chinese attack. About 5.4% of the respondents want Taiwan to unify China, and another 56.3% would like to maintain the status quo, which is a continuing stalemate between Taiwan and the PRC. Moreover,

A technical twist of the questionnaire is that to be unified by Taiwan is only one form of unification. Other forms include unification by the PRC, federation, confederation, or any peaceful settlement reached between Taiwan and the PRC other than independence. As a result of this questionnaire technicality, the percentage of those believed in unification might be higher that showed in the survey.
about 90% of the respondents does not want Taiwan to be ruled by the Chinese communists (Centre Daily, 7/29/89:2).

In September 1988, a public opinion survey was conducted by The Journalist and the respondents were asked to answer the question "Do you think, if you go to mainland China, you are going back to the motherland or going to a different country?" 39.4% of the respondents answered motherland, and about 30.5% replied a different country. If provincial origin is held constant, about one half of the mainlanders thought of China as the motherland, and only about 36% of the Taiwanese thought so (SSW, 81:41-2).

In another survey conducted by Yuan Jien (a popular news journal supported by the government) in June 1987, half of the respondents considered themselves "Taiwanese," and 35% considered themselves "Chinese" (Yuan Jien, 7/1/1987:35). In the same survey, only 32% of the Taiwanese respondents thought of themselves as "Chinese," and only 18% of the mainlanders considered themselves "Taiwanese" (Yuan Jien, 7/1/1987:34). Another survey conducted by an independent poll organization asked the respondents whether they supported the idea of an independent Taiwan. It is worth noting that almost 10% of the respondents replied that they supported the idea, even though speaking for an independent Taiwan has been declared illegal by the government (China Times, 8/7/1987).
These indirect public opinion polls further indicate that the society is, indeed, facing an identity crisis over Taiwan's peculiar relations with China. There is no consensus whether Taiwan is part of China, or Taiwan should reunify with China. Not many people support the idea of declaring Taiwan independent, yet the people who identify China as the motherland are not on the side of the majority, either. Furthermore, no one is sure how many of those who think of China as the motherland really support the idea of reunification. Perhaps most of the people in Taiwan want neither of the two goals, both of which threaten to ruin Taiwan's prosperity and relative freedom. The debate among political elites over the issue can be viewed as an extension of public differences over Taiwan's national identity. Political elites may be more informed than the public about the issue of Taiwan's relations with China, but their divisiveness is as strong as the rest of the society.

All but one of the interviewed KMT elites viewed reunification with mainland China as a long term national goal to be achieved by all the people of Taiwan, regardless of the disparity of military power on the two sides of the Taiwan Strait. This point was stressed by President Lee in a written interview (Written interview, 10/6/88):

Unification is a common desire of all Chinese. Many people will think that it would be very difficult for the Republic of China to accomplish "unification" based on its current situation, because mainland China has a much larger area and the Chinese communists control more human and
material power than we do. I personally do not agree with this, because this kind of argument overlooks the efforts and the influence of the people of the Republic of China and the overseas Chinese. It also overlooks the desire and pursuit of freedom, democracy, and prosperity of all Chinese.

The government's policy of reunification with mainland China has been modified significantly since the 1950s and 1960s. Military takeover was President Chiang Kai-shek's only solution, and Fan-Kung Da-Lu (Reconquer the Mainland) was the government's standard slogan in dealing with China during his rule. When Chiang Chin-kuo emerged as the national leader in the early 1970s, strategic planning became defense oriented (Personal interview, 6/27/88). The old slogan of reconquering the mainland was gradually replaced with that of unification.

From journal reports of KMT leaders' views on the issue of reunification, there seems to be little consensus. A very small number of KMT hardliners, on the one extreme, hope for a military victory over the communist Chinese. A small minority, on the other extreme, are willing to unify with the communist regime under any circumstance (SSW, 81:16-25). The irony is that many of those who want unification with the communist regime now are strong advocates of anti-communism (SSW, 81:29).

Nevertheless, the mainstream of the current KMT elites (the liberals) argues that is drastically different from the
above two views. These elites oppose immediate unification with the communist regime, and they also disagree with military actions against communist China (Personal interview, 5/7/88; written interview, 10/6/88). What they propose is basically a "German Model," the essence of it is two separate but equal countries recognizing the possibility of future national unification (Central Daily, 4/22/89:2; 4/23/89:i2). This is expressed by the Nationalist government as a "one country, two central governments" model. The mainstream elites also stress that the relations between Taiwan and China should be peaceful competition instead of military confrontation (Personal interview, 9/10/88). Their objective in the future reunification is a more prosperous and more democratic China, not replacement of the regime (Personal interviews, 5/7/88; 8/2/88).

A high ranking official, who was also the earliest (according to himself) advocate of non-military reunification, made the following statement during an interview (Personal interview, 9/10/88):

In March 1979... I a reported to the Central Standing Committee on the new relations with mainland China. In that report, I made two important points: First, we should talk about reunification instead of reconquering the mainland. Reunification should be a long-term goal. When I refer to reunification, I mean something analogous to the long-term national goal of unification between East and West Germany. We do not need short-term policies to achieve that long-term goal. I was the first and the only person talking about "reunification" instead of reconquering the mainland, and many disagreed with me. The second point was that we wanted the
democratization and liberalization of mainland China, and we hoped for the good of the people there. In other words, we wanted to engage in peaceful competition with mainland China. This theme was hardly acceptable at the time. But I saw the gradual change of our top leaders in their views...

Another official expressed the same hope for the good of the people on the mainland: to bring about democracy, freedom, and prosperity in mainland China (Personal interview, 8/2/88). The written interview with President Lee undoubtedly disclosed the official policy toward relations with the Chinese mainland (Written interview, 10/6/88):

In recent years, the economic miracle in Taiwan created by the Republic of China has forced the communist leaders to call the slogan "learning economy from Taiwan" and to reveal their desire for accelerated and deepened economic reforms. When economic reform has developed to a certain stage, inevitably political reform will be encouraged. It will be not just superficial reform of political institutions, but reform that moves toward real liberal democracy.

Using rapid economic development to stimulate communist China to reform its economy is the first step for the Republic of China to move toward the goal of reunification. The second step is to force communist China to carry out political reforms through our example of enforcing constitutional democracy, raising the standards of education, and moving toward a pluralistic society. As long as our economic development is rapid and our political reform fast and realistic, there is no way that mainland China will not go in this direction, and there is no way that mainland China will not give up the "four insistances." As a result, the reunification of China can be expected to come soon.
This official explanation of reunification, as pointed out earlier, has moved away from unification by military actions. In this brief quotation from President Lee's written interview, a rather blurry picture of unification is drawn based on the political and economic reforms of communist China. This deliberate lack of specifics on how the goal can be achieved coincides with statements made by the other government official, who argued that reunification was a long term goal which did not require a short term policy to achieve it. These statements further suggest that the issue of reunification has been spiritual goal like that between East and West Germany.

No matter how remote the chances are for reunification with China in the near future, all the interviewed KMT elites, with only one exception, recognize the need to uphold the national goal of reunification. From their perspective, the notion of an independent Taiwan is an idea which would lead to disaster, because the communist regime on mainland China fiercely opposes it and threatens to use force if Taiwan ever declares its independence from the motherland (Personal interview, 8/5/88). In the wake of the June 3 massacre in Beijing's Tienanmen Square, the threat of military force from the Chinese communists has become more realistic than ever. As a result, more people may lean toward the idea of independence to avoid being ruled by the communists, yet independence also seems remote because of the willingness of the communists to use force without any
Because of KMT's insistence on reunification and its legitimacy to representing the entire China, the government has a dilemma between the goals of reunification and democratization. In order to reach democracy, the government must have a parliament which is composed of only locally elected members and abolish the emergency decree which retards the power of the Constitution. However, a thorough democratization, with a parliament entirely reformed and emergency decree abolished, would ultimately end the legal and institutional bond between Taiwan and China. Taiwan, with its own national symbol, its own Constitution, its own set of political institutions, would have no more legitimacy to represent the entire China any more and become an independent country in reality. This dilemma has kept the Nationalist government from a rapid and complete democratization.

As pointed out earlier, the current elites' concept of reunification is quite blurry. In pursuing more active foreign relations, the government elites have injected some flexibility into the restrictive principle of one China policy. The "one country, two central governments" model (or German Model) has been pursued vigorously by the liberals after the Thirteenth National Congress of KMT in summer 1988, and it has taken the form of "flexible diplomacy" to replace the stiff anti-communist principle
(Central Daily, 4/21/89). One of the most important and the most striking steps of flexible diplomacy was Shirley Kuo's, Taiwan's Finance Minister, visit to China in early May, 1989 to attend Asian Development Bank meetings (Central Daily, 5/9/89). The visit broke the myth that the communist regime of China was the arch enemy of Taiwan. The visit recognized, although implicitly, the reality of the communist rule in China. The trip was prepared in secret, and the sudden announcement of the event took the country by surprise (Central Daily, 4/7/89). Most of the people in Taiwan, in spite of the surprise, welcomed the decision to break through the diplomatic deadlock with communist China (World Journal, 5/5/89:8).

More recently, President Lee Teng-hui said in the second Central Committee Plenum of the Thirteenth National Congress on June 3, 1989, that Taiwan "should have the courage to face the situation that it is not able to effectively exercise the ruling power on mainland China" (Central Daily, 6/3/89:1). He also said that Taiwan should not be self-grandiose so that the nation's fate is not built on an unrealistic claim, or self-restraint so that diplomacy is restricted by its own ideology (Central Daily, 6/3/89:1). Because of Taiwan's pursuit of "flexible diplomacy," the above passage by Lee or Kuo's visit to China should not come as great surprises. These actions and the "flexible diplomacy" are consistent with what the liberals advocate, that reunification does not mean to replace the government
on mainland China (Personal interview, 5/7/88). The communist regime, no matter how unlikable it is to the Nationalist government, is there to stay; it is unrealistic to ignore the reality of the communist government which has established effective control over the mainland for about forty years.

Although the nationalist government has tried to break through the diplomatic deadlock with communist China, it has no intention of extending this flexibility into domestic arena. After the Minister of Diplomacy Lien Tsan said the government was doing research on the possibility of "one country, two central governments" in the Legislative Yuan, Minister of Justice Hsiao Tien-tsang replied to a questioning legislator that the government could consider the end of the "emergency period" since the government recognized the communist government as another central government effectively controlling the mainland (The Centre Daily, 4/17/89:2). But in the following few days, the government attempted to explain that what Minister Hsiao had said was nothing but a small verbal mistake (The Centre Daily, 4/18/89; 4/20/89). This demonstrates that no matter how much breakthrough there is in Taiwan's diplomatic front, domestic policies over the controversial issues are seldom affected. In other words, foreign and domestic policies are clearly separated by the Nationalist government.

The opposition elites face a completely different set of
dilemma on the issue of national identity. While it was shown that only one of the interviewed opposition elites supports the idea of unification with China, their responses on the issue of independence and unification are divided into two categories. On the one side, members of the radical Shin-chao-lio faction want to see an independent Taiwan, a new and independent country established immediately. On the other side, the moderate opposition elites consider adopting independence would create a large gap between the newly established Democratic Progressive Party and the general public. They believe democratization should be the immediate goal, and independence should be determined in the future by the people of Taiwan.

In spite of the contradictions, the two main factions of the DPP agree that the KMT has used unification as an excuse to delay the process of democratization. They have no interest in the KMT's claim that the Nationalist government can legitimately represent the people on the Chinese mainland. The main concern of the majority of the opposition is that Taiwan should enter some kind of rapprochement with communist China to safeguard Taiwan's prosperity and limited democracy (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/11/88; 9/6/88). The opposition argues that the KMT is not really interested in reunification; it merely uses the slogan of reunification to justify the large number of senior Parliament members and the emergency decree (Personal interviews, 8/8/88; 8/11/88). They further
thought that once KMT gave up the slogan of reunification, it would to give up its special privileges and face the real challenge of democracy (Personal interview, 8/13/88). They challenged KMT's sincerity in reunification by citing government's "three-no policy"—no contact, no negotiation, no compromise—as an irresponsible attitude in dealing with mainland China and in creating a de facto independent Taiwan (Personal interviews, 8/8/13; 8/13/88; 9/6/88).

To some opposition elites, unification with China has only two forms: either Taiwan is swallowed up by China or it defeats China in military actions (Personal interviews, 8/8/88; 8/11/88). They argue that the latter is impossible, and the former would meet overwhelming resistance from most of the Taiwanese who do not want to be ruled by the communist regime (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/8/88; 8/11/88). They claim that the Nationalist government realizes unification is a remote possibility, but it continues to profess its desire so it can justify its continued political privileges (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/8/88; 8/11/88). They further claim that the KMT is the same authoritarian regime today as it was in the past; the only difference is that it is now masked in a smiling face (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/11/88).

Most of the interviewed opposition elites criticized the continuation of emergency rule and the unreformed Parliament, based on the false claim of representing the
Chinese people. To them, the communist party has established firm control over the mainland, and it is ridiculous for the Nationalist government to claim its sovereignty over the whole of China (Personal interviews, 8/13/88; 9/6/88). According to these opposition elites, the source of the institutional evils of Taiwan lies in the government's unrealistic claim of representing China (Personal interview, 9/6/88).

Even though the opposition elites agree that KMT's sovereignty claim over China is the source of the problem, they are divided on the possible solutions. Only one interviewed opposition elite, legislator Fay Shih-ping, considered reunification with mainland China as the national goal of Taiwan (Personal interview, 7/20/1988). But, his idea of reunification is substantially different from government's argument. While the government sees reunification as automatic when China becomes economically prosperous and politically democratic, legislator Fay's condition of reunification is for a comparable standard of living between China and Taiwan (Personal interview, 7/20/88). Fay's views are distinctive in the opposition camp and the more radical DPP leaders barely tolerate his viewpoints. In fact, he finally withdrew from the Democratic Progressive Party on December 19, 1988 (Central

-----------------------------

* Mr. Fay Shih-ping is a senior member of the Legislative Yuan and is a mainlander.
Contrary to legislator Fay's argument, other opposition elites do not think unification, based on the current conditions, is a good idea. Legislator You Ching bluntly stated (Personal interview, 8/26/88):

I don't think there will be any one so stupid as to agree with the argument that unification with China is a historical rule. Let me illustrate to you the reason why Taiwan does not want to unify with China. The average annual income of the people on mainland is only about $250, but that of the Taiwan people is about $5,000, and China has one billion people and Taiwan only twenty million. What is Taiwan's annual income going to be when it is unified by China? Maybe less than $500. If you think it is a good thing to change from annual income of $5,000 to $500, you must have serious mental problems.

The interviewed DPP elites were easily divided into two camps concerning whether Taiwan should declare independence. On one side of the dichotomy, the moderates argue that the opposition party should pursue democracy as its highest priority and avoid the emotional issue of unification versus independence. They see no immediate solution to the issue, and it only causes the polarization within the opposition camp and among the general public (Personal interviews, 8/12/88; 9/6/88).

Although most of the opposition elites do not want unification with the communist China, they recognize the fact that China is a powerful and close neighbor and, therefore, the DPP has to be cautious of China's attitude
toward the issue. Disregard of China's reactions to Taiwan's international activities might cause irreparable damage to the prosperity and freedom of Taiwan (Personal interview, 8/12/88; 8/26/88; 9/6/88).

Lin Chen-jieh, the leader of the *Chien-chin* faction, further points out that there are other solutions to Taiwan/China relations than just the two extremes of unification or independence. To Lin, federation, confederation, and so on, could be the kind of compromise that would pacify the ego of the Chinese communist regime and preserve the prosperity of Taiwan (Personal interview, 8/12/88). Chang Chun-hong, current general secretary and spokesperson of the DPP, considers friendly relations with China as essential for Taiwan's survival (Personal interview, 9/6/88). Taiwan could not afford a war against its neighboring military giant; only cooperative relations in the economics and politics will benefit both China and Taiwan (Personal interview, 9/6/88).

Basically, legislator You Ching's comments on the issue are similar to the above two opposition elites (Personal interview, 8/26/88):

I would argue that we should talk about independence later, and only when we reach democracy... Under the National Security Law, there is an article dealing with the goods smuggled in from China, and the ruling is that it is treated as an ordinary smuggle. You can see that Taiwan and China are geographically separated by ocean, and you have laws recognizing China as another country. Therefore you do not have to
worry about whether to pursue independence or not... We do not have to be hostile to China. We should retreat from Keelung and Amoy year by year in order to reduce the hostility between the two. We should also strengthen the cultural and economic relations with each other to reduce the possibility of a military confrontation.

The moderates revealed that under the current conditions of Taiwan, the blind pursuit of independence may cause more harm to the opposition party than good. Chang Chun-hong, the DPP's general secretary, summed it up in the following passage (Personal interview, 9/6/86):

An independent Taiwan is a very good idea, and is the final solution to the Taiwan problem. But the KMT, together with communist China, is making the term a terrible concept among the people in Taiwan. The people in Taiwan, including the KMT's own members, are all frightened by the KMT's interpretation of Taiwan independence. The meaning of an independent Taiwan has been twisted and it has become a symbol of terror. The KMT will not put you in prison if you uphold the slogan of Taiwan independence, but it makes the middle class believe that if you pursue the concept, then there will be turmoil in Taiwan and the existing interests will be jeopardized. This has become a very complicated psychological problem.

Chang further points out that the concept of an independent Taiwan has turned from a "good medicine" to a "poison" for the DPP, but has turned from a "poison" into a "good food" for the KMT. His conclusion was that the opposition party should not blindly pursue independence (Personal interview, 9/6/88).

The other side of the debate is a radical perspective that Taiwan should pursue independence from China. The
radical elites of the DPP unequivocally and unanimously argue that independent Taiwan should be the immediate national goal. Chiou I-jen, deputy general secretary of the DPP at the time of interview and one of the top leaders of the Shin-chao-lio faction, made the following observation (Personal interview, 8/11/88):

It is necessary to have a thorough change of the government system and institutions in order to bring about democracy in Taiwan. But unfortunately, the problem of structural change in Taiwan is intermingled with the problem of national identity. The larger structural problems, such as Parliamentary reform, the debate on presidential system and cabinet system, independence of judiciary, etc., are all mixed up with the question of national identity. This does not happen in any other Third World country. If we really want to have democracy, then we will need to have all members of the Parliament elected here in Taiwan, right? But the result is that the Parliament will become a Taiwanese Parliament. In the eyes of the KMT, this is not acceptable because it still claims that it represents all of China and this claim is the base of the legitimacy of the KMT's rule. Even though the claim is a myth and people might not take it seriously, once you destroy it, the regime no longer has a legitimate base and will crumble. Therefore, it is not likely that the KMT will be willing to give Taiwan a real democracy. It is really difficult to discuss about reforming the Parliament and the election of all Parliament members without dealing with the question whether Taiwan is an independent country or just a part of China. We should therefore deal with the problem of structural change and the problem of national identity at the same time. If you only want to talk about structural change without touching on the issue of national identity, I think it is just not realistic. We have to think whether the new structure should be based on Taiwan only or whether the new structure should be based on China as a whole.
Chiou's remarks on independent Taiwan as a prerequisite for democracy were further articulated by another leader of the Shin-chao-lio faction, Mr. Liu Fong-song, who put it very strongly that there would be no democracy until Taiwan was declared independent from China. He argued "everything will be solved when Taiwan is declared independent," and "it is impossible for the DPP to become a democratic party until then" (Personal interview, 7/13/88). The position of being a revolutionary party until the independence from China keeps the general public worried about possible social chaos and military actions from China. The moderates also view this position as most dangerous to the growth of a strong opposition party and the democratization of the country (Central Daily, 6/19/89:7).

However, the radicals are very persistent on the idea of independence. They argue that people's fears of an independent Taiwan are caused by KMT's propaganda campaigns. In order to reduce the fear among the people about the idea, the radicals suggest that the DPP should launch its own propaganda campaigns and explain to the people that it is the only solution to Taiwan's mounting structural and diplomatic problems; when people understand the idea of Taiwan independence, their fears will diminish (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/11/88).

The moderates claim the pursuit of independence contradicts with the pursuit of democracy because majority
of the people in Taiwan cannot accept the idea of Taiwan independence. The radicals, however, assert that there is no basic contradiction between the two ideas. Yao Chia-wen, the DPP's chairman at the time of the interview, suggested the following (Personal interview, 8/8/88):

I don't think you can really compare the two goals... The greatest obstacle to the democratization is the problem of national identity. If Taiwan is not independent, no matter how you reform, the parliament will still be a Chinese parliament, not a Taiwanese parliament. Therefore, without independence, full democratization is just a castle built on sand... The reason why Taiwan has no democracy today is because the KMT government thinks that it is a Chinese government, not a Taiwanese government. In order to have democracy, we should recognize that we want a Taiwanese parliament. That is to say, Taiwan should be independent so that democracy can be achieved.

Taiwan independence might be consistent with democracy in some sense as Chairman Yao said, but to pursue independence as a higher goal than democracy may very well jeopardize the future of democratization. The emotion attached to this issue may also lead to political polarization, and make democracy unattainable (Central Daily, 6/19/89:7). Moreover, those who articulate the idea of independence do not accept election as the final judge of party competition, because they want independence no matter what the outcomes of the elections are. Despite the fact that the majority of the people in Taiwan do not support the idea of Taiwan independence, the radicals believe in mass movements to overthrow the KMT government to achieve their goal of
independence (Personal interview, 7/13/88; 9/7/88). In a speech delivered by Hong Chi-chang, a Shin-chao-lio leader, stated that he needed only 50,000 loyal followers to overthrow the KMT regime and build a new and independent Taiwan (Speech by Hong, 5/14/89, Columbus, Ohio).

The radicals' insistence on the use of "people's power," Philippines style, to overthrow the current government and to reach the goal of democracy keeps the two opposition factions at odds with each other. Their distrust and distaste for each other has been displayed on several occasions: the DPP party constitution amendment in early 1988, chairman election in late 1988, and party primaries in 1989. National identity, because of drastic interpretation of the problem, represents a potentially explosive issue among the opposition elites.

II. The Controversy over Parliamentary Reform

One of the most important yet controversial issues in Taiwan's democratization is the reform of Parliament, in which about 80% are senior members who do not have to run for reelection. By most standards, 80% permanent seats in Parliament does not qualify a political system as a democracy. For a country to be called democratic, all members of its parliament or Congress must be popularly elected. Any compromise on this principle takes the country out of the ranks of a democracy. Therefore, the complete
reform of Parliament is one step Taiwan must take in the process of democratization.

Public debate on the issue of Parliamentary reform has been intense since the lifting of martial law in July 1987. Many political protests, incidents, and demonstrations have centered around this issue (See Chapter III). However, the government does not share the eagerness of the general public and the opposition camp to resolve the issue. The main difficulty of the government on this issue is, again, the problem of national identity. The basis of legitimacy of the government is through establishment of the notion that it represents all of China, and that the communist regime is but a rebellious group.

The problem of the Parliament emerged in 1949 when the Nationalist government retreated from mainland China to Taiwan. As the term of the first Parliament expired, the government amended the emergency decree (see Chapter II) so that the term of Parliament members would continue until the Chinese mainland was recovered by the Nationalist government. For forty years, the Parliament, though its members aging and the number shrinking overtime, has become one of the most important symbols of the government's legitimate claim to China.

The dilemma for the government is that senior Parliament members have accumulated a great deal of leverage over the issue. For example, the emergency decree cannot be
terminated without the approval of the National Assembly, and the necessary legislation must go through the Legislative Yuan for adoption. Yet no one would expect these senior incumbents to vote for the end of their political life and financial privileges. The consequences of this are that in order to have the Voluntary Retirement Act adopted without provoking the senior legislators, retirement is entirely voluntary, and in order to have the president elected without heckles from senior assemblymen, the government cannot consider termination of the emergency decree, which legalizes the unexpired term of the Parliament. In other words, as long as the government thinks the Nationalist Party is the legitimate representative of all Chinese people, the emergency decree is likely to continue and the problem of Parliament linger.

Although the Voluntary Retirement Act was formally adopted by the Legislative Yuan on January 26, 1989, the problem of retirement remained after the legislation (SSW, 99:60). The Voluntary Retirement Act did not specify a deadline for the senior members of the Parliament to retire, nor did it provide any negative incentive if they refused. In addition, the generous pension guaranteed upon retirement offers the senior members strong material incentives to remain until the final stage of their lives, while they receive ministerial level salaries. The Voluntary Retirement Act could not pave the way for a faster democratization process, despite the government's claim that
it would be "the engine of the train of political reform" (China Times Weekly, 206:18).

The day after the Act was adopted by the Legislative Yuan, Central Daily, a KMT newspaper, predicted that Parliament would be entirely renewed by 1999 (Central Daily, 1/27/89:1). This estimate was based on the premise that senior members of the Parliament would agree to retire. Judging from the fact that many refused to retire under any circumstance, the prediction of a ten-year grace period may be optimistic. According to the Central Daily, at least one hundred of them "would absolutely not retire under any circumstance" (Central Daily, 1/29/89:2; 1/31/89:2). Without any doubt, these refusals have become a troublesome embarrassment to the government and a serious obstacle to Taiwan's democratization.

The presence of a large number of un-reelected members in Parliament has been the focal point of conflict between the KMT and the DPP, because the majority of these senior members are affiliated with the Nationalist Party. Some of the largest demonstrations in Taiwan held by the DPP were specifically on the issue of Parliamentary reform (China Times, 6/13/87; 12/26/87; 3/30/88). Moreover, the potential for confrontation continues because the issue was not solved by the adoption of the Retirement Act. In fact, government and opposition elites have contrasting views about how the problem can be solved, which was revealed in the interviews.
The demand of opposition elites is quite straightforward, that all senior members of Parliament resign and the government hold a comprehensive general election (Chuan-mien guy-shuan). The motives of the opposition elites for such demands are easy to understand. First of all, it is unfair that only about 20% of the Parliament is elected. The government cannot embrace democracy and leave the great majority of Parliament members in office without having to run for reelection. Second, as a large number of senior members persist, there is no chance for an opposition party to become a majority in any branch of the Parliament, even if it can get a majority of the popular votes and most of the popularly contested seats.

To the opposition legislators who face senior legislators daily, the presence of a large number of un-reelected legislators is the number one problem, because, as the opposition elites argue, even if the DPP could win 100% of the popular votes and 100% of the contested seats, the DPP would still be a tiny minority in the Legislative Yuan (Personal interviews, 8/13/88; 8/26/88). The desire to reform Parliament as soon as possible is revealed by Dr. You Ching (Personal interview, 8/26/88):

Right now the biggest problem is the overall reelection for the Parliament. Without overall reelection, democracy is just impossible... If KMT is sincere in making changes, it should hold an overall reelection at least for the Legislative Yuan. Among all issues in Taiwan's democratic transition, the issue of overall reelection is the most important...
Right now KMT is making all kinds of excuses for these old members, such as the authorization of the emergency decree or the explanation of Supreme Court justices. But these are all nonsense. It is so clearly stated in the Constitution that there should be election for the Legislative Yuan every three years and for National Assembly and Supervision Yuan every six years. There is no excuse for not having elections.

Dr. You also suggested that if Parliament was replaced by locally elected representatives, all other problems could be eased. Kang Ning-hsiang, a moderate legislator, argues that Parliamentary reform is one of the most important steps toward democratization. He claims that he has been leading the opposition to fight for reform for years, but the unwillingness of the government makes it impossible to change the system (Personal interview, 6/13/88).

Government's desire to reform Parliament is highly suspected by opposition elites. The Voluntary Retirement Act, which the government adopted, was taunted by Lin Cheng-jieh, the leader of the Chien-chin faction, as "God's reform," because the Act did not set forth a deadline for retirement and senior members did not have to retire until their death (Personal interview, 8/12/88). Two high-ranking DPP officials contend that since the KMT has no desire to solve the problem, the DPP should look beyond Constitutional means for a solution. They believe the real problem lies with national identity, and only through declaring the independence of Taiwan from China could the reform of the Parliament be completed (Personal interviews, 8/8/88;
They further argue that the DPP should promote the idea of a single branch Parliament because of the ineffectiveness and numerous scandals surrounding the National Assembly and the Control Yuan (Personal interviews, 8/8/88; 8/11/88). This would be a dramatic break from the current system of three Parliament branches.

The responses of opposition leaders on the issue of Parliamentary reform, in the personal interviews, correlate with popular sentiment on the issue. In a public opinion survey conducted by The Independence Evening Post in April 1987, 51.4% of the respondents would like to see Chuan-mien guy-shuan (comprehensive reelection of the entire Parliament body) as the solution to the Parliament problem. In the same survey, if the birth place variable was controlled, the desire of the people born in Taiwan for a general election went up to 54.1%; those who did not agree with Chuan-mien guy-shuan were only 28.9% of the survey sample (The Independence Evening Post, 4/14/87:2).

However, opposition elites are powerless in dealing with the issue because the Nationalist Party is the only force that has the power to solve the problem. There is nothing opposition elites can do if the government does not want reform. The last, and perhaps the most effective, means of dealing with the issue is to demonstrate on the street. But as pointed out earlier, demonstrations have not moved the government forward on the issue (Hwang, 1988b). With utter
despair and frustration, two of the interviewed opposition elites sarcastically said that these old folks in Parliament would all die sooner or later anyway, and then reform would be completed (Personal interviews; 7/13/88; 9/6/88). Indeed, Parliament will be composed entirely of the members who have gone through periodical elections when all of the aging members perish. The average age of the senior members now is about 83, which means time is on the side of democratization, if people in Taiwan can wait a few more years (Personal interview, 9/6/88).

Contrary to the opposition elites who unanimously demand overall reelection to reform Parliament, the interviews show that the KMT elites cannot agree with one another on the issue of Parliamentary reform. There are basically two contradictory views among the KMT elites. The more liberal government elites think that the government should move faster to resolve the problem, while the more conservative ones think the dignity and welfare of the senior members should be maintained. The official policy is a crystallization of the latter view, and it may take ten years, if not longer, to completely retire all the senior members of Parliament (The Central Daily News, 1/27/89:1). The ten-year period may be longer than most of the opposition hope, and the prolonged stay of the senior members will prohibit the process of democratization.

Sharp but indirect criticism on the aging Parliament came
from two government officials and a legislator, who all commented that there is a limit to people's lives and even if the senior members of Parliament refused to step down, the years ahead of them would be very limited (Personal interviews, 8/5/88; 6/27/88; 8/2/88). Therefore, to these KMT elites, Parliament will be reformed in spite of all the hassles about legislation. To them, since the problem is going to be solved anyway, it would be wise for the government to retire the senior members as soon as possible so that Taiwan could become democratic sooner.

One respondent stated some forceful measures for retirement are necessary; this view was the most liberal among all of the respondents (Personal interview, 7/26/88). Overall, three KMT elites prefer a general election to replace all senior members; this position was contradictory to the government's stand on the issue (Personal interviews, 6/27/88; 7/26/88; 8/2/88). Another official criticized the government for not moving fast enough on many reform programs and allowing the opposition party to take credit for opening up the political system. That official also said that the government should be one step ahead of the opposition and solve the problem of Parliamentary reform in a very fast tempo (Personal interview, 8/2/88).

Dr. Ma, former Deputy General Secretary of the KMT and the current Commissioner of Research, Development, and Evaluation Commission of the Executive Yuan, was very
optimistic about a solution to the problem. He said since the recently enacted Voluntary Retirement Act was very reasonable and was taking care of the financial needs of the senior Parliament members, they have a dignified way to retire and they are very willing to retire. He further said that KMT could obtain a general election by encouraging the senior members to retire while supplementing the Parliament with elected members (Personal interview, 8/16/88). Dr. Ma was appointed by the KMT Central Standing Committee to draft the legislation for Parliamentary reform, and he was also responsible for communicating the ideas of the party center to the senior Parliament members. He reportedly faced senior members' blatant criticism in the National Assembly (SSW, 51:61-3), but he denied the report and said there were only a handful who opposed the retirement legislation (Personal interview, 8/16/88).

President Lee's answer to this question gives the official position on the issue:

The government understands the eager hope of the people for the reform of the Parliament. However, public opinion surveys show that the majority of the people agree with what the government is doing right now. Reform should be the art of making possibilities, and politics is a continuing process of solving problems. Democracy is about compromising in order to obtain the agreement of the majority of the people and to maintain and to pursue the greatest welfare of the greatest number. We do not exclude the possibility that there will be some senior representatives who refuse to voluntarily retire. But we believe that a large number of senior representatives will retire voluntarily and that the goal of supplementing the Parliament will be reached if
the government makes rational, reasonable, and legal regulations for the senior representatives to follow (Written interview, 10/6/88).

Contrary to the majority of KMT elites who are willing to see Parliament reformed and are optimistic about the final outcome, the more conservative KMT elites do not want Parliament reformed. To them, Parliament represents all of China. If all the senior members from mainland China resigned as a result of the reform, then Parliament would be Taiwanese, not Chinese. This would mean Taiwan was independent from China, and is not acceptable at all (Central Daily, 7/20/89:2). This analysis was verified by one government official during an interview, in which he said the system would become very problematic for the country if the Parliament was completely reformed (Personal interview, 7/26/88).

To the liberal KMT elites, the above position held by the conservatives is misleading. They prefer a reunification between Taiwan and China, and argues that Taiwan should represent all of China on the issue of reunification, the same position as the government. But, they contend that the un-reelected senior members of Parliament represent neither people of Taiwan nor people of mainland China. In order to present Taiwan as an attractive model to the people of mainland China, Taiwan should have a thorough democratization, and senior members should retire (Personal interview, 6/27/88). These liberal elites also seriously
questioned the claim of the senior members that they represent the legitimacy of the Nationalist government to the Chinese people by asking "are we really going to lose legitimacy when these old guys all die in a few years" (Personal interview, 8/2/88)?

Based on interview results, those elites who thought the government should move faster on this issue were either among the minority, or they could not insert their views effectively into the top circle. The most powerful elites in the KMT center only want a gradual reform in order to preserve the current stability within the KMT. The above analysis demonstrates a deep gap exists between the KMT and DPP elites on the issue of Parliamentary reform. This gap hampers the process of reform of the problematic Parliament.

III. Constitutional Amendment and Emergency Decree

The constitution is the codification of government institutions and basic rules for government operations in a democratic country. The constitution is the highest law, and no other laws can contradict it. The Constitution of Taiwan was officially enacted on December 25, 1947 in Nanking, China, by the first National Assembly. But an intensified civil war forced the Nationalist government to decree Temporary Constitutional Provision for the Mobilizing and Rebellion Quelling Period (or emergency decree, Dong-Yuan Kan-Luan Shih-Chi Lin-Shih Tiao-Kuan) in May 1948 (SSW,
Consequently, some important constitutional provisions were frozen. The most important among these include the term limit of President, the establishment of local self-government, and Parliament elections. As a result, President is not limited to two terms, Parliament does not have to hold general elections, and the governor becomes an appointed position. The emergency decree also authorizes the President with emergency power to command the military and implement policies without the consent of Parliament. The original constitutional design of checks-and-balances was severely handicapped by the emergency decree.

When the government retreated to Taiwan in 1949, the Constitution and the emergency decree remained. The emergency decree also gave birth to numerous other laws and regulations, including martial law, which could legalized the unchecked power of the executive branch of the government. Other laws and regulations derived from the emergency decree included Mail and Telephone Checking Regulations, Management of Prisoners Regulations, Electoral and Recall Law, Electoral Candidate Evaluation Regulations, Inspecting and Arresting Hoodlums Regulations, National Security Law, Civil Organization Law, and Assembly and Demonstration Law. All these laws are still in effect and all have "Emergency Period" as part of their formal titles (SSW, 17:13). In other words, Taiwan is literally under a web of emergency laws and regulations, and the entire nation
is legally still in the situation of national emergency. Without returning to a "normal" period, democratization is very difficult because the government assumes an enormous amount of unchecked power over the people.

However, the issue of terminating the emergency decree and amending the Constitution might put KMT in a very awkward position. The power of doing so rests in the hands of the National Assembly, which is composed of about 90% of senior members. First of all, these senior members will not terminate the emergency decree which is the constitutional law legalizing their existence (Personal interview, 7/13/88). Moreover, the senior members of the Assembly were legalized by the claim that the Nationalist government represented the whole of China and would, one day, recover the lost mainland. If the Nationalist government does not have sovereignty over mainland China, the Parliament will be forced to hold a comprehensive reelection and abolish the emergency decree. Furthermore, even if the senior members of the National Assembly are willing to terminate the emergency decree and then amend the Constitution, the legitimacy of that constitutional amendment will be in serious doubt because it would have been done by the assemblymen who were not elected by the people. Therefore, a constitutional amendment by the current National Assembly will plant more seeds for political controversy than resolve the problems. At this time, the government is not prepared for either terminating the emergency decree or amending the
The issue, again, is closely related to the conflict of national identity. The government claims that since the Chinese mainland is occupied by the communist rebellion, the country should still be ruled under the emergency decree (Personal interview, 8/5/88). In addition, the government argues that since the Constitution was made on the mainland, it should not be amended until the mainland is recovered and the second National Assembly can be called (Personal interview, 8/5/88). On the 1988 Constitutional Day, President Lee Teng-hui criticized those who thought that Taiwan should terminate the emergency decree because there was no war between Taiwan and communist China (SSW, 95:66). He also argued that amending the Constitution based on the people from one province would be irresponsible to the Chinese nation (SSW, 95:66). This announcement made it clear that the government had no intention to either amend the constitution or terminate the emergency decree. But without doing so, Taiwan continues to live under a national emergency, and the realization of democracy remains in serious doubt.

Since martial law was lifted in summer 1987, the issues of constitutional amendment and the termination of the emergency decree have been publicly debated. Some politicians, KMT and DPP alike, claim the Constitution was made in China for China, and does not suit Taiwan's
situation. Therefore, it should be amended (Personal interviews, 6/27/88; 8/13/88). A KMT elite even suggests that the entire Constitution should be rewritten except the first provision, which specifies the Republic of China is a democratic republic of the people, by the people, and for the people (Personal interview, 6/27/88). Other politicians, particularly those who were educated in West Germany, say Taiwan should learn from West Germany, whose 1949 constitution states the long term national goal of reunification of the entire Germany but it has preserved West Germany as an independent country pursuing its own welfare and happiness (Personal interview, 8/26/88; Chu, 1988:4). One leading opposition elites argues that Taiwan do not have to give up the national goal of reunification to free the Constitution from the bondage of the emergency decree, and Taiwan's democratization need not be conditioned by its historical relations with China (Chu, 1988:4).

While the government argues for the need to retain the emergency decree, the opposition elites, without any exception, would like to see it end. They consider the existence of the emergency decree and the freezing of constitution as KMT's grand design to expand and maintain its political monopoly (Personal interviews, 9/6/88; 8/26/88). A leading DPP legislator made the following observation on the situation (Personal interview, 8/13/88):

A serious problem that we need to solve now is to establish a new system, which is normal and
democratic, and to make an environment that will allow democracy to take root. For example, a provision in the Constitution states that the Legislative Yuan has to make basic principles for provincial and county level self-rule so that provincial and county governments can have legal basis for their establishment. This is clearly stated in the Constitution, and a normal political system will follow. But as of today, the government has not enforced this Constitutional provision. It not only did not enforce the provision, but also created an emergency decree to prohibit the enforcement of the provision.

The termination of emergency rule will be an important step toward the normalization of national politics in Taiwan, because only under normal non-emergency circumstances democracy can function without the control and domination of a unchecked executive. As this study shows, government and opposition elites have dramatically different views toward the issue. The opposition demands the termination of emergency decree so the Constitution can be amended to conditions suitable to Taiwan, and the Parliament can hold a comprehensive reelection. The government elite has taken the issue beyond mere constitutional dimension. They relate it to the national identity problem, and will not give up the claim to representing all of China.

IV. Conflicting Perceptions of Democracy

These drastically different positions of the national political elites on the central issues of democratization are, indeed, significant. The lack of consensus on national
identity, the reform of Parliament, constitutional amendment and termination of the emergency decree has kept the country from reaching solutions to these issues. In addition, as this study has illustrated, the national political elites have very different perceptions of what democracy means, even though all of the respondents stated that they would like to see democracy realized in Taiwan. Because of these differences, the elites have very different ideas about where Taiwan would be placed on a continuum of democratization and how Taiwan should proceed.

As described in Chapter I, a definition of democracy contains at least the following principles: universal suffrage, basic freedoms, elections, eligibility of the most important offices for competition, and lack of political persecution. This definition of democracy involves different elements and dimensions, ranging from mere freedom to oppose the government to a periodical electoral procedure to choose and replace government officials and parliament members. Those who pursue democracy without this definition in mind are in fact pursuing only a partial democracy. Conceivably, if one thinks that democracy means only freedom of speech, then it would be easy to assume Taiwan has democracy already. But if one strictly defines democracy in institutional and structural terms, Taiwan would lag far behind that goal. In other words, different perceptions of democracy lead to different conclusions as to where Taiwan stands on a democratic continuum and whether Taiwan needs to
pursue democracy further. This is what happened among the Taiwanese elites.

This study indicates different perceptions of democracy, ranging from basic freedom to self-determination, on the part of Taiwan's national political elites. These definitions fall into six categories: first, freedom of speech and rights to oppose government; second, election and majority rule; third, fair and free elections which determine the leader of the government and the entire body of the Parliament; fourth, the system is normal, not exceptional; fifth, rotation of the ruling party; and sixth, freedom from foreign rule and self-determination. The distinctions between the government elites and the opposition elites are quite clear on most of these patterns, but there is substantial overlap between them on the second and third patterns.

A. Freedom of Speech and Rights to Oppose Government

The first definition of democracy is the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, and criticism of government (Personal interview, 8/5/88; 7/4/88; 8/16; written interview, 10/6/88). In other words, if a government allows its citizens to express their opinions and to form political parties, then that government is a democratic government, and vice versa. Compared to a sophisticated definition, this definition of democracy painted a partial picture of a full democracy. A full democracy involves not only the
basic freedom to speak against the government, but also includes a government bound by the results of popular elections. Without major government positions directly elected by, and responsible to, the people, a political system might have a fairly high degree of liberalization, but not full democracy.

According to this definition, Taiwan has achieved a substantial degree of democracy. Many political journals published in Taiwan carry sharp attacks on the government, officials, and public policies. Political parties also have been permitted, since the move by the Teng-wai opposition to form the Democratic Progressive Party in September 1986. Altogether there are thirty-two registered legal political parties in existence in Taiwan. People in Taiwan can also participate in political rallies and demonstrations without the fear of being penalized by the government. Because the degree of freedom is so high in Taiwan, the elites holding this limited definition argue that Taiwan has achieved a great deal of democratization.

Three elites in this category fear that Taiwan might have too much democracy, because criticism of the government has gone beyond the permitted level and protest activities have threatened basic social tranquility (Personal interviews, 8/5/88; 8/16/88; written interview, 10/6/88). To these elites, in order for democracy to function harmoniously, the concept of "the rule of law" must be strengthened so the
society can have law and order, not chaos and turmoil. Those who stress that Taiwan needs "the rule of law" might not think it necessary to pursue further democratization. Instead, there is a possibility that they might reverse the trend of democratization to ensure law and order.

B. Elections and Majority Rule

Another set of elites argue that elections and government according to the results of those elections are the essence of democracy. To these political elites, electing government officials and members of Parliament is the most important activity in a democracy because it determines the person or the party that forms the government. Indeed, elections are the most peaceful and appropriate means to determine who is among the majority. This definition of democracy is somewhat more subtle than the first definition because it stresses the institutional and procedural functions of a democratic political system.

One official directly stated that democracy means majority rule (Personal interview, 5/7/88). Another government official pointed out that democracy has two main elements, popular representation and periodical reelection. He explained that this definition means the head of the government and parliament members are subject to public consent and periodical competition (Personal interview, 8/16/88). President Lee also pointed out that fair, free, and open elections are one of the requirements of democracy.
(Written interview, 10/6/88). A similar response was given by an official who stated that democracy means the head of the government and the members of parliament are directly elected by the people (Personal interview, 7/26/88). The majority rule definition was echoed by two other KMT elites, who thought it a democratic norm to let a political party rule if it could win a majority in national elections (Personal interviews, 8/3/88; 6/27/88).

By defining democracy in terms of elections and majority rule, these elites find that Taiwan has a fairly high degree of democracy, even though some minor defects should be corrected. Elections have been regularly held in Taiwan since the Nationalist government retreated to Taiwan in 1949. These elites consider that the Kuomintang is the legitimate ruling party because it has won a clear majority in every important election, including the elections for the Legislative Yuan, National Assembly, and Provincial Assembly. The KMT should continue to rule as long as it wins major elections.

The defects of Taiwan's democracy, according to these elites, include scandals in the elections and senior members who are not required to run for reelection (Personal interviews, 8/16/88; 7/26/88). However, they find these defects minor because the government of Taiwan is based on the results of election and majority rule. Roughly 70% voted for the government party in every major election, and,
according to these government elites, the KMT's rule was the majority rule. Some elites are more concerned with the problems in Parliament, and they argued that the government should move faster so that it could be free of the attacks from the opposition (Personal interviews, 7/26/88; 6/27/88; 8/2/88).

C. Parliament by the People

The majority of the opposition elites defined democracy as "all members of the parliament elected by the people in fair, free, and open elections" (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/12/88; 8/26/88; 9/6/88). They said elections are truly important, but the composition of the parliament in a democratic country also must reflect the results of the national election. That is, parliament is the necessary institution in a democracy, and all members of the institution must be popularly elected, without exception.

Indeed, parliament is a necessary institution in a contemporary democracy. However, as a sophisticated definition of democracy would point out, there are other principles and institutions that a democracy must have. Overemphasis of a democratically elected parliament might lead to the neglect of other political institutions such as the presidency and the prime minister. But pursuing democracy based on this definition will certainly lead one to conclude that Taiwan needs significant improvement.
According to this definition, the elites found Taiwan lagging behind in democratization. The current Parliament still has about 80% of the un-reelected senior members, violating these elites' basic definition of democracy. They said that the purpose of elections is to provide regular opportunities for other political parties to become the ruling party. But under the current situation, no opposition in Taiwan could become the ruling party in Parliament even if it did win a clear majority of the popular votes (Personal interview, 8/26/88).

Based on this perception of democracy, the opposition elites' first priority in democratization is the immediate and complete reform of the current Parliament in Taiwan. They strongly argue that the reform of the Parliament is important in Taiwan's move toward democracy. Without the complete retirement of the senior members from Parliament, Taiwan remains in an authoritarian stage.

D. A Normalized System

Two leading opposition politicians defined democracy as "a political system under normal operations, not in exceptional or an emergency situation" (Personal interview, 8/13/88; 9/6/88). In other words, they do not specify what democracy is, but what democracy is not, a way of defining democracy similar to Satori's (1987). Under this definition, democracy does not exist when martial law, emergency decree, and other extraordinary laws exist that
give the ruling party and the military enormous amounts of extra-constitutional power to limit political freedom and political participation. Moreover, there is no democracy, if the constitution is superseded by an emergency decree, if freedom of expression is twisted by government controlled mass media, if the opposition party cannot compete with the ruling party fairly, and if the elected Parliament members only represent a small minority in the institution (Personal interview, 8/13/88).

Although it does not clearly specify what democracy includes, this definition is in accordance with the sophisticated definition in a subtle way. While the sophisticated definition specifies that democracy requires freedom of speech, the political elites holding this definition argue that in a democracy, the government cannot violate the freedom of speech by controlling the mass media. Similarly, the sophisticated definition specifies that democracy requires periodic elections to determine the top office holders and parliament. This definition asserts that there cannot be any twist to the principle by having any unreelected parliament member. In other words, this definition of democracy finds the elements in a political system and points out what is not in accordance with the principles of democracy.

These opposition leaders argue that Taiwan cannot be called a democracy until the Nationalist Party is willing to
compete with other political parties. In their view, the KMT has been making different kinds of excuses to perpetuate the emergency rule and fixing the rules of the game to its advantage. One legislator provided a few concrete examples of the KMT's tampering with the laws for their advantage. One example was that the Constitution clearly specifies that the Legislative Yuan should adopt "General Rules for Local Self-government" so the election of the governor can take place. However, the KMT uses the emergency excuse to keep that constitutional provision from being enforced. He claims this does not qualify the government as a democratic government. He and another DPP leader argue that the KMT should immediately declare an end to the emergency period because the country has faced no immediate threat from without or within. These leading opposition politicians also argue that only when the government ends the emergency period can the political parties compete fairly, can Parliament be reformed without further delay, and can the freedom of speech be guaranteed without distortion (Personal interviews, 8/13/88; 9/6/88).

E. Rotation of Ruling Party

Two opposition leaders perceived the essence of democracy as "the regular alternation of the ruling party (Liang-tang lun-chen)" (Personal interviews, 9/6/88; 9/7/88). They said that in major Western liberal democracies, no ruling party rules forever, and opposition parties are always given
chances to become the ruling party. Without specifying the appropriate means and measurement for the ruling party alternation, this definition of democracy suggests forceful change of political power.

This definition does not coincide with a sophisticated definition of democracy as that outlined in Chapter I. In a democratic political system, the ruling party changes according to the results of general elections. It is true that the ruling party changes from one to another in most of the contemporary democracies, but democracy does not require a ruling party to step down after a certain period of time. On the contrary, if a political party continues to receive majority popular support, just as the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan, there is no reason for that ruling party to be forced out. Democracy cannot function if the ruling party is not a majority party. Therefore to require the rotation of the ruling party may not lead to a true democracy. Instead, the pursuit of democracy with this definition in mind may hinder the process of democratization because it disregards the electoral results.

Using this definition to judge Taiwan's political development, these two opposition elites argued that Taiwan is a long way from becoming democratic because the KMT has ruled Taiwan for forty years, and it is unlikely that the KMT will turn its power over to the DPP. Also using the same definition, these two opposition elites demand that the
Kuomintang step down and let the DPP rule, if it has any intention of truly achieving democratization (Personal interviews, 9/6/88; 9/7/88). One of these two DPP elites went on to say that the people of Taiwan should take the issue to the streets and demand the immediate transfer of power (Personal interview, 9/7/88).

F. Self-Determination

Four opposition elites defined democracy as self-determination and freedom from foreign rule (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 7/13/88; 8/11/88; 8/8/88). This definition excludes the possibility for a country to become democratic while it was under the control of foreigners. Foreign rule implies the exclusion of the local population from meaningful participation and important political decision-making because political power is largely in the hands of foreign rulers. To become democratic, the local population must stand up and expel the foreign intruders.

Using their definition of democracy to judge the condition of Taiwan on the scale of democracy, these opposition elites found the KMT government to be a foreign regime, superimposed on Taiwan in 1949. They deny any democracy in Taiwan because the government is a "Chinese regime," not a "Taiwanese regime" (Personal interview, 7/13/88; 8/8/88). To them, the minority foreign immigrants from China were expelled from China and went to Taiwan in 1949, and established themselves as the rulers of Taiwan by
force (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/8/88). This foreign
regime, even though it has ruled Taiwan for forty years, has
refused to become part of Taiwan. Instead, the regime
continues to call itself a Chinese government, not a
Taiwanese government (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/8/88;
8/11/88).

The opposition elites who perceive democracy as freedom
from foreign rule feel that the only way for Taiwan to
become democratic is to expel the foreign regime and
establish a government that is truly Taiwanese. They
emphasize that the struggle in Taiwan is not only a struggle
to establish a democratic government, but also a
nationalistic "zero-sum" struggle to establish a government
of the Taiwanese, by the Taiwanese, and for the Taiwanese
(Personal interviews, 8/8/88; 8/11/88). These opposition
elites argue that the struggle against the KMT should be in
the form of "people's power," as in the Philippines, because
there is peace and power in fighting against authoritarian
foreign rule (Personal interviews, 7/13/88; 8/11/88).

Even though it is conceivable that self-determination
might be a precondition for democracy to take place, it is a
matter not to be confused with democracy itself. Pursuing
self-determination and freedom from foreign rule does not
necessarily imply pursuing democracy. Moreover, pursuing
democracy defined in this manner might be inconsistent with
real democratization. Achieving self-determination and
freedom from foreign rule often takes revolution and some political violence. But revolution and political violence seldom achieve stable democracy because violence often results in a vicious cycle of more violence and bloodshed, which paves the way for a strong authoritarian rule instead of democracy. In other words, those who define democracy as self-determination might themselves possibly become a stumbling block to the process of democratization.

As this study indicates, there is sharp contrast in the elite perceptions of democracy and how this goal can be reached. The perceptions of the elites range from freedom of speech to freedom from foreign rule. Because of these perceptual differences, the elites have very different understandings of where Taiwan stands on the scale of democracy. On the one hand, some elites think that Taiwan already has achieved full democracy. To these elites, the problem Taiwan faces is not insufficient democracy but too much democracy, which leads to chaos and disorder. Taiwan needs law and order, according to these elites. On the other hand, some elites argue that Taiwan has no democracy at all, because the Parliament is full of senior mainlander members and the KMT is a foreign regime which has no intention of turning political power to the native population. To these elites, the total dismantling of the KMT regime is the precondition for reaching democracy.
V. Summary Conclusions

One may reasonably conclude that these different perceptions of democracy keep Taiwan's elites from reaching a political settlement for a long lasting democracy. Before that political settlement is reached, some elites will continue to engage in zero-sum struggles. However, there is substantial common ground for the national elites to reach a political settlement. A majority of the ruling elites and a significant portion of the opposition define democracy in similar terms. They perceive that democracy requires regularly held elections to determine the ruling party, the head of government, and the members of Parliament. Their differences lie in their proposed solutions to the composition of the current Parliament. Some KMT elites want gradual retirement for the senior members, but other KMT elites and virtually all opposition elites want their immediate and complete retirement. Political settlement is possible if the two sides locate their common denominator, i.e. that the government and Parliament should be determined by periodic elections.

As this study demonstrated, the national political elites in Taiwan have significantly different positions on the issues of democratization and different perceptions of democracy. They also differ greatly on how democracy can be achieved. Moreover, there are not only inter-group differences, but also intra-group differences. The
differences can be linked by one underlying issue: the problem of national identity. All of these differences and conflicts over the basic issues keep the elites from reaching consensus on how to pursue democratization. Also because of these differences and conflicts, basic democratization issues are not settled and Taiwan's democratization process cannot move forward rapidly.

A great part of the issue of national identity is determined by the attitude of the People's Republic of China toward Taiwan. China has periodically threatened that it would use force if Taiwan declares independence. The threat is particularly realistic in the wake of the Tienanmen Square massacre on June 3, 1989. China's threat to use force has invoked different responses in Taiwan. Many people, as well as many political elites, think that the declaration of independence is the only measure to overcome the various obstacles to democratization, such as the Parliament and the emergency decree. However, it is possible that an official declaration of independence might provoke a communist invasion. In other words, a solution to the problem of national identity based on independence might be an unattainable goal in the minds of many Taiwanese.

One survey indicates that 90% of the Taiwanese do not want to be ruled by the Chinese communists (Centre Daily, 7/29/89:2). The same survey shows that only about 12% of the Taiwanese want Taiwan to be independent from China, and
less than half of them want independence regardless of a communist attack (Centre Daily, 7/29/89:2). This suggests that the majority of the Taiwanese fear a communist invasion. Most of the Taiwanese may want to overcome these obstacles in order to reach democracy, but they do not want to go so far as to exert too much pressure on the government or to cut Taiwan off from the mainland for fear of inviting a communist attack. To the majority of the Taiwanese, Taiwan may not be very democratic at the current stage, yet there is much more freedom in Taiwan than in China, and democracy in Taiwan at least seems very likely in the future. Resolving the national identity issue based on reunification, therefore, is also unattainable to many people.

The June 3 massacre provides ample evidence that the communist regime of China does not hesitate to use force to accomplish its goals. The People's Republic of China, under such circumstances, poses a difficult dilemma for the people in Taiwan. The end result of Taiwan's democratization almost predictably is a country very much independent from China but short of an official declaration: The Parliament and the President (or Prime Minister) elected by the people in Taiwan, and a Constitution and a flag of its own. Yet it is uncertain how the People's Republic will accept this end result. The possibility of a communist invasion might force many people to rethink the path of democratization. They do not want to be too hasty in the process of political reform.
That hesitation is evidenced of the small magnitude of Taiwan's political protests when compared with those in South Korea and the Philippines.

As one might expect, the attitudes of the PRC will continue to play an important role in Taiwan's national identity issue. China is also likely to continue to cast a shadow of uncertainty over Taiwan's democratization, because many important issues cannot be resolved because of the conflict over national identity. Since the national identity issue is not resolved, the elites will continue to hold drastically different positions on the emergency decree, Parliamentary reform, and constitutional amendment.

The following two tables (Tables 5.1, 5.2) summarize the elite perceptions and positions on various issues of Taiwan's democratization. As the tables signify, the differences among elites are drastic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1. KMT Elites on Democratization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Taiwan Have Enough Democracy or Should It Go Faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not yet democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What More Needs to Be Done in order to be democratic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parliamentary Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Legalize party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local level Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obey Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Parliamentary Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strong critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Solve as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Most Difficult Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Not tolerating opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2. Opposition Elites on Democratization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Radical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. On Parliamentary Reform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General Election</td>
<td>1. A single branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amend Constitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They'll all die soon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. What Should be Done to Make Taiwan Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Democratic education and culture</td>
<td>1. Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parliamentary reform</td>
<td>2. Solve national identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Constitutional change</td>
<td>2. DPP rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A Normal system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. KMT provides democratic environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Should the DPP be a Loyal Opposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Loyal Opposition</td>
<td>1. Opposition Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Democratic party</td>
<td>2. Not until independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. &quot;Parliament Line&quot; vs. &quot;Street Line&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Two are together</td>
<td>1. Street as major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parliament as major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Should the DPP Pursue Democracy or Independence Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Democracy</td>
<td>1. Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the elite interviews, the views of government elites can be categorized into "conservative" and "liberal," and those of the opposition elites can be classified into "radical" and "moderate." The position of the conservative KMT elites is that Taiwan has sufficient democracy already; what it needs is law and order so that basic social
tranquility is not destroyed in the name of democracy. To these conservative KMT elites, political reforms, including the reform of the Parliament, the termination of emergency decree, and amendment of the Constitution are not necessary at the current stage. They argue that the Nationalist government represents China, and if those problems are resolved Taiwan would become an independent country, which is not acceptable.

The liberal KMT elites recognize that Taiwan faces some problems and obstacles in the process of becoming a full democracy. The existing problem in the Parliament is a serious concern to them, and they would like to see it tackled soon. The liberal KMT elites also suggest that Taiwan and China should be reunified in the future, because the artificial separation violates the wishes of the Chinese people on both sides. However, they agree that reunification at the current stage is not likely because it is not advantageous to the people in Taiwan. The liberal KMT elites want to set the idea of reunification aside as a long term ideal, so that Taiwan can proceed gradually in the process of democratization.

Moderate opposition elites conceive that there are serious obstacles Taiwan need to solve before democracy can be reached. These problems include the complete and immediate reform of Parliament, the termination of the emergency decree and return to constitutional rule, and the
amendment of the existing Constitution. But to them these problems are not insurmountable, therefore they rule out the need to use extreme measures of revolution to overthrow the government in order to accomplish democratization. To the moderate opposition elites in Taiwan, national identity is a problem faced by no other country, and it is an issue polarizing not only the opposition camp, but also the country as a whole. But they consider trying to find immediate solution to the issue is unwise, because it only polarizes the country even further. Most of these moderate opposition leaders believe that Taiwan is, in fact, independent from China, and the declaration of independence is not essential to democratization and political development in Taiwan. They think that the Democratic Progressive Party should set aside the issue of national identity and concentrate on democratization.

The radical elites of the Democratic Progressive Party, however, are persistent that the problem Taiwan faces is the national identity problem. They think it is meaningless to fight for the reform of Parliament before the national identity issue is resolved, because the KMT government is not likely to completely resolve the issue of the Parliament if it continues to consider itself as the only legitimate representative of China. They argue that attacking KMT on the national identity issue by bringing it into the streets is the only effective means to accomplish democracy. To them, declaring the independence of Taiwan from China is the
The foremost solution to all Taiwan's political problems. The radical elites argue that the KMT government would be overthrown if Taiwan becomes an independent country, because there would be no more legitimate basis for its authoritarian rule. When Taiwan becomes independent, moreover, the Parliament must be composed solely of the people of Taiwan, the emergency decree must be terminated, the constitution must be rewritten, and the President or the Prime Minister must be chosen according to the consent of the people. In short, the radical elites consider national identity as the source of the problem. When the source of the problem is resolved, there will be no more problems.

As pointed out in Chapter IV, the most powerful group of these elite groups is the liberal KMT elites, who are currently the mainstream of the entire KMT establishment. They are the majority in the Central Standing Committee, which is the equivalent of the Soviet Politburo, and they occupy almost all important administrative positions in the central government. The conservative KMT elites currently do not have significant decision-making power in the center. However, they are heavily concentrated in the three branches of Parliament, and they occupy this strategic position of the democratization process. Without their cooperation, the complete reform of Parliament, the termination of emergency decree, and the amendment of the Constitution would be difficult.
Because of the large number of conservative elites in Parliament, the liberal elites must compromise with them so that government bills can be easily adopted and the President and Vice President can be selected without conflict. The compromise between the two sides in 1986-9 hampered the momentum of political reform beginning in 1986. The most drastic example of the compromise was the adoption of the Voluntary Retirement Act in early 1989. In order to be adopted by the senior members of the Legislative Yuan, who were among the absolute majority, the bill not only provides a handsome pension upon retirement, but also makes the retirement entirely voluntary. As of July 1989, only four members of the Legislative Yuan and ten members of the National Assembly had resigned (SSW, 123:56; Central Daily, 7/15/89:2); That is less than 2% of the total number of the senior members of Parliament. The Voluntary Retirement Act shows no positive effects on the reform of Parliament. In other words, even though the conservative KMT elites are among the minority within the government establishment, their position enables themselves to interrupt the process of continuing political reform of the country.

On the side of the opposition elites, the moderate and the radical elites are about even in both the Central Executive Committee and the Central Standing Committee. The two principal factions, Mei-li dao and Shin-chao-lio are constantly involved in conflict and cooperation. In order to deal effectively with the Nationalist government, the two
sides frequently enter intense negotiations so that compromise can be made on a unified front. For instance, as a result of the compromise on the contradiction over "street line" and "parliament line," the unified strategy was that both were equally important in the struggle for democracy (Personal interviews, 8/13/88; 8/26/88). In another instance, the conflict over national identity and whether to pursue independence or democracy as an immediate goal was compromised into "self-determination by the residents in Taiwan" (Personal interviews, Personal interviews, 8/26/88; 8/12/88). This kind of vague compromise leaves plenty of room for individual opposition elites to offer their interpretations.

As stressed earlier, the Shin-chao-lio faction emphasizes street demonstrations against the government to accomplish democratization. Indeed, occasional protest activities might remind the government that many people disagree with the government. Yet over-emphasizing street mobilization may run into some dangers, as political violence in Northern Ireland, the occupied Palestine, and South Korea amply demonstrates: violence may feed more violence, polarize the society, and turn the street fighting between riot police and demonstrators into ritualistic event of confrontation. Moreover, social chaos as a result of political violence might provide the military an opportunity to step in with the excuse of establishing law and order. In other words, the militancy and insistence on street demonstration of the
radical opposition in Taiwan might complicate democratization by adding uncertainty to the process.

As pointed out in Chapter IV, the radical Shin-chao-lio faction has the strength of nearly half of the DPP decision-making positions. With that strength, the moderate opposition elites were often forced to modify their positions in the face of strong radical challenge. The most dramatic example is that Kang Ning-hsiang, the leader of the dissolved Mainstream faction, was forced to accept that "street line" was as important as "Parliament line" in the confrontation against the KMT government (See Chapter IV). The factional conflict in the opposition camp, consequently, makes the peaceful settlement between the ruling party and the opposition party a more difficult task.

Despite the fact that compromises were often made by the two opposition factions on some issues, the interviews show that deep differences between the radical and moderate elites persist. The continuing process of struggle and compromise radicalizes the moderate elites somewhat, and it also keeps the radical elites in check. As pointed out in Chapter IV, the moderate opposition politicians need the radical professional party workers to mobilize the public for their electoral advantage, and the radical elites need the popularity of the moderate professional politicians to score in elections. Without each other, they would fight losing battles against the all powerful KMT. However, there
have been several crises that threatened the unity of the DPP (See Chapter IV), and the potential of a split continues to exist because of the differences underlying both factions. The factional politics in the opposition camp, with their deep-rooted ideological differences, may likely to continue to complicate the possibility of an elite settlement necessary for the establishment of a long lasting democratic political system.

Indeed, the negotiation and compromise necessary for building a long lasting democracy is hampered by the conservative KMT elites and radical opposition elites. Nevertheless, judging from the positions of the national political elites, one can find that the liberal KMT elites and moderate opposition elites have some common ground for a national settlement. The two sides agree that there are problems to solve and barriers to overcome. They set aside the polarizing issue of national identity to concentrate on the issues of democratization such as Parliamentary reform and public policies, such as peasant insurance and public health. They cannot agree, however, on the termination of emergency decree and the amendment of the Constitution. Yet the issues they do agree on may provide a substantial common denominator for the two sides to negotiate and reach some compromise so that the process of democratization can accelerate. Lack of consensus is indeed an important barrier to swift democratization, but there is also common ground on which that many contending national elites can
build, as this research has found. An important task lies ahead of Taiwan's national political elite is to find a compromise between the government and the opposition that would satisfy even the conservatives and the radicals.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

WHERE TO GO FROM HERE
I. Research Findings

The first major finding of this dissertation research is that the socio-economic development theory of democratization does not fully explain Taiwan's process of democratization. Taiwan in the past few years has reached a fairly high level of socio-economic development, including both growth and egalitarian wealth distribution. In addition, economic development has also transformed Taiwan into a pluralistic society which makes participatory demands on the government. As a simplistic socio-economic development theory might call for, Taiwan has passed the threshold of socio-economic development and democracy can be expected to take place. However, Taiwan's democratization is still far from complete, and there are many obstacles and barriers Taiwan needs to overcome before it can become a full democracy.

The second major finding of this project is that national political elites are a crucial factor in the process of Taiwan's democratization. The national political elites have no consensus on the meaning of democracy and do not agree on the necessary steps to make Taiwan a full democracy. The elites also sharply disagree on the issue of national identity, the reform of Parliament, the amendment of the Constitution, and the termination of the emergency decree. The process of democratization is seriously
hampered because these important, yet controversial, issues have not been properly settled.

Socio-economic development does not automatically produce a democratic political system. One crucial factor which needs to be clarified by the socio-economic development theory of democratization is that many countries remain politically undemocratic in spite of their relative economic successes. That is to say, the explanatory power of the socio-economic development theory falls short of the reality that socio-economic development does not guarantee the successful development of a democratic political system, as can be seen in the case of Taiwan. There are other intervening variables between socio-economic development, on the one hand, and the establishment of democracy, on the other. This research project demonstrates that political elites are a very important intervening variable in the process of democratization.

Socio-economic development theory, as analyzed in Chapter I, is still the most important theory in explaining the development of a democratic political system. However, the over-simplified view that socio-economic development will inevitably produce democracy does not fully explain the political development everywhere in the world. Taiwan is a case that one may reexamine to modify the socio-economic development theory of democratization. This study found that in the 1980s, Taiwan has developed fairly rapidly on
different aspects. It's economy, represented by US$6,700 expected GNP per capita in 1989, is one of the highest in the Third World. Moreover, unlike most other Third World countries, Taiwan's national income is well distributed among its citizens; the level of distribution is close to that of the Netherlands and Japan (Chapter III). In addition, because of the rising level of education and the literacy rate, people in Taiwan are exposed to modern mass media for information. Rapid urbanization movement also brings people out of traditional, closed, agricultural, and feudalistic villages.

Besides socio-economic advancement, population in general has also undergone fairly rapid social and attitudinal changes. People, increasingly, are more eager to participate in politics, and they are more willing to make their demands known to the government. They use different means to express their demands. Because of a growing literate population, people in general also are very interested in politics and political discussions. In short, Taiwan, in recent years, has acquired advanced social and economic conditions. However, this socio-economic development has only brought about changes of mass attitudes toward politics. The political system does not yet reflect large scale economic and social transformations.

Since the mid 1980s, Taiwan has brought much greater degrees of political freedom; in fact, political freedom is
the highest in the contemporary history of China and Taiwan. Moreover, change seems to have gone beyond mere liberalization, and the push for more democracy has gathered momentum. At the current stage, Taiwan has yet to complete the entire process of democratization. There are about 80% of the so-called senior members in Parliament (National Assembly, Legislative Yuan, and Control Yuan), who were elected in mainland China in 1947-48 and have never faced reelection. Furthermore, neither the President, nor the Prime Minister, are directly elected by the people. In addition, both the governor and the mayors of the two largest cities are government appointments. The Constitution, which was written in mainland China in 1947, has many of its provisions frozen by the emergency decree. In other words, the process of democratization in Taiwan is neither complete nor certain of an outcome.

Since socio-economic development theory of democratization falls short in explaining Taiwan’s political development, this research project examines the elite factor in detail. The research, based on the intensive interviews, supports the hypothesis that without basic consensus among national political elites on key constitutional and democratization issues, a democratic political system is difficult to establish. Taiwan’s national political elites, both KMT and opposition, not only share no basic agreement over what democracy entails, but also disagree with one another over what needs to be done in order to make Taiwan
democratic. The research also finds that both the government and the opposition elites are divided internally on these issues.

This study also found that the interviewed elites differed drastically with one another on the three most important issues in Taiwan's democratization, namely, the reform of Parliament, the termination of emergency decree and constitutional amendment, and the crisis of national identity. One set of elites thought that it was necessary to completely retire the senior members of Parliament and terminate the emergency decree immediately, yet another set of elites did not see drastic change in Parliament as essential or termination of the emergency decree as necessary. One set of elites considers Taiwan as part of China, thus China and Taiwan should be reunified some day. But another set of elites rules out the possibility of reunification and insists that Taiwan declare its independence from China. Taiwan's national political elites cannot build a mutually acceptable system and a set of rules to regulate political competition without basic consensus on key issues and on what needs to be done in order to bring about democracy.

Chapter V points out that conflicts not only exist between the two main elite groups, but also within each camp. The intra-group conflict, in all respects, is as severe as inter-group conflict. Nevertheless, there is some
common ground between the liberal government elites and the moderate opposition elites on some key democratization issues. They both recognize that in a real democracy, elections must take place and Parliament members must be elected. They are also willing to set aside the polarizing issue of national identification as a long term national goals, in order to deal with democratization as an immediate objective.

The chances for successful negotiations between the liberal elites and the moderates depend, to some degree, on the willingness of the extreme elites to cooperate and accept the outcome of the negotiations. It would be easier for government elites to cooperate since the liberal KMT elites are in the mainstream of the top decision-making body. Moreover, the KMT has a very centralized party command system. The top KMT leaders have the organizational ability to impose their decision on their party followers. Chances for successful negotiations would be greatly enhanced if the top KMT leadership decides to disregard the extreme positions within the party. The decisions by the leaders of the Spanish Communist Party to moderate their program proposals and to demobilize the party in 1977 provide a good example of how a centralized political party can be maneuvered to benefit the process of democratization (Gunther, 1986:69).

A potential obstacle for a peaceful elite settlement
might come from the factional conflict in the opposition. As described in Chapter IV, the DPP has been plagued by vicious internal struggles between the radical *Shin-chao-lio* faction and the more moderate *Mei-li-dao* faction. The radicals at the current stage control almost half of the party positions. Their strength in the party organization and their refusal to seek reconciliation with the KMT might prevent far-reaching compromises between the ruling party and the opposition from taking place. Therefore, chances for successful negotiations, necessary for further democratization, between the KMT and the DPP can be improved if the two opposing factions in the opposition camp can come to terms with each other and work out their concerted programs for accomplishing the goal of democracy.

In sum, the most important finding of this dissertation research is that socio-economic development theory overlooks other important factors in the development of a democracy. One of these factors is national political elites, who's perception and attitudes can affect the course of democratization. National political elites, by definition, are those who occupy strategic decision-making positions and whose decisions may affect the course of the country. Their decisions, willingness, and ability to reach national settlement on important democratization issues will have profound impact on the development of a democratic political system. In other words, socio-economic development theory of democratization should be modified to include at least
the elite factor so that the process of democratization can be better explained.

After presenting these major findings, the six hypotheses proposed in Chapter I will be reexamined here. The first hypothesis of the dissertation research, chances for a successful transition into democracy are correlated with the level of affluence among population in a given country, is supported by previous political science inquiries and the additional research of this project in Chapter III. Through cross-sectional comparison on the levels of wealth and democratization, this project reaffirms the significance and the explanatory power of socio-economic development theory.

The second hypothesis of the research project, political stability correlates with egalitarian distribution of national wealth, is also supported by the cross-national data in Chapter III. Through the comparison of the level of equality and the level of democratic development in Chapter III, it was found that the countries with egalitarian economic distribution generally have a higher degree of political stability, while countries with low egalitarian distribution have experienced a higher degree of political change.

The third hypothesis, the scope and depth of democratic transition is correlated with the scope and intensity of political violence on the mass level, could not be properly
tested by this study. The aggregate and interview data gathered for this project were not conclusive to support or to reject this hypothesis. The initial comparison between Taiwan and South Korea in Chapter II did not support the hypothesis, either; South Korea has experienced far more political violence than Taiwan has, yet the process of South Korea's democratization has been faster and more thorough than that of Taiwan. Although the hypothesis seems analytically plausible, it requires different data and a different undertaking to properly test it.

The fourth hypothesis is national political elites' willingness to reconcile with one another and enter negotiation tables does not correlate with the development of socio-economic conditions. The case of Taiwan is found to be supportive of the argument that political elites are independent actors capable of calculating their interests with the overall socio-economic outlook of the country. Taiwan's socio-economic development has reached a fairly high level compared to many other Third World countries (Chapter III), but the national political elites in Taiwan cannot reconcile with one another or reach compromises in order to establish a democratic political system (Chapter IV). South Korea, however, supports the hypothesis because it has not achieved as much in socio-economic development as Taiwan, but it has democratized much faster.

Hypothesis Five states the willingness of political
elites to negotiate and compromise with one another is correlated with the degree and pattern of social cleavages. The case of Taiwan shows that ethnic cleavages between the Taiwanese and the mainlanders are obvious but not absolute (Chapter IV) and they are gradually diminishing (Chapter II), but ideological cleavages between the government elites and the opposition elites are profound (Chapter V). On the most important issues of Taiwan's democratization, the elites contradict one another in their proposed solutions. Taiwan's ruling party, moreover, still considers itself the state's founding revolutionary party and a party above all other parties. A large segment of the opposition party considers itself as a revolutionary movement destined to overthrow the government so democracy can be established. Neither side is willing to negotiate or compromise with the other.

The sixth hypothesis of the project is the scope and depth of democratization is associated with the extent of elite consensus on the constitutional laws. The evidence collected and analyzed in this research supports the hypothesis to a great extent. For example, the national elites could not reach the necessary compromises on constitutional issues, including the termination of emergency decree, the formation of the Parliament, and the amendment of the existing Constitution. Without basic consensus on the rules of the political game, intense political conflict continues and the process of
democratization is severely impeded.

To sum up, the study findings support the thesis statement of the research that socio-economic development may transform a traditional society into a modern society, but the possibility for a modern society to be transformed into a democracy depends on the ability and the willingness of the national political elites to create a democratic political system. No matter how mature or advanced a society has become, the attitudes and views of the political elites remain a powerful factor in determining the outcome of the democratization process. Except in the situation of a mass revolution, there will be no democratization when elites do not agree on the necessary steps of democratization. When there is basic consensus on what needs to be done to bring about democracy then the transition into democracy can be peaceful. National political elites, by definition, are those who occupy key positions in a country and make decisions that affect the rest of the society. Without conditions in which national elites agree on the basic issues, problems cannot be resolved and the completion of the process of democratization is slow.
II. Suggestions for Future Democratization

To political scientists, making policy suggestions or proposals is a risky business, because politics is frequently more complicated and politicians more capricious than what political scientists predict. Yet society expects political scientists to propose intelligent solutions to political problems. Making suggestions, therefore, is a difficult responsibility for any in-depth political inquiry.

As established in this study, a crucial barrier to Taiwan's democratization is the clash of views of the national political elites toward critical issues of democratization. To overcome this barrier, then, is to bridge the gap between the government and the opposition on those issues. The best way to overcome these differences is through serious dialogue and negotiations among the main political actors. In order to reach mutually acceptable measures for democratizing the system, the main political actors should meet in national reconciliation meetings and deal face-to-face with the critical issues. The case which can illuminate the argument is Spain, whose main national elites met to resolve constitutional issues so a democratic transition could be accomplished peacefully (Gunther, 1981; 1985). In Surviving to 3000, Prosterman (Prosterman, 1972:356-7) observes the following:

One important way of improving the chances for the
successful outcome of negotiations, regardless of substantive issues, would thus be to pinpoint and combat sources of mutual mistrust. Participants in all negotiations could well make special efforts to get into the open the psychological sources of mutual misunderstanding and mistrust that operate out of awareness, including conflicting habits of thought and ways of proceeding, and above all, the universal difficulty in really hearing what the other fellow is saying...

Indeed, if Taiwan's national elites meet and resolve their differences on the critical issues, the chances for a faster and more complete democratization will be greater. Nevertheless, face-to-face meetings have occurred before, but the manner in which the meetings were conducted prevented mutual understanding or a consensus on critical issues. Since May 10, 1964, face-to-face Gou-tong have taken place and they are the most important means of interactions between the ruling elites and the opposition leaders (SSW, 10:41). These irregularly scheduled talks, although held often between the two parties, do not produce a general agreement on the country's democratization.

The Gou-tong between the KMT and the DPP took three

---

1 There is no word or phrase in English that can accurately translate the meaning of Gou-tong. In the Chinese-English dictionary, the term is interpreted as "to bring about unobstructed interflow of (feelings, ideas, etc.); to act as an intermediary for promotion of mutual understand or bridging the gap of differences." In other words, the term depicts informal face-to-face conversation to understand each other's views. It is not formal negotiations which are designed to come to mutually acceptable results (SSW, 38:15).
forms. The first form was general talks which the public urged to reduce political tension between the KMT and the opposition. Three major rounds of general talks were held after the government made the decision to lift martial law: once in 1986, and twice in 1988 (Independence Evening Post, 5/11/86; China Times, 5/25/86; Central Daily, 2/11/88; Central Daily, 3/18/88). These talks were not issue specific. Instead, they were held merely to let each other know their views on different issues. The second form of Gou-tong was the talks called for by KMT before DPP demonstrations. The aims for KMT in these talks were very specific: to persuade the DPP to cancel the demonstration plan, and if the persuasion failed, KMT would request the DPP to limit the scope, restrain the participants, set specific routes, and obtain non-violent promises (SSW, 10:33; SSW, 11:29; SSW, 41:9; SSW, 42:13).

The third form, the most common as well as the most controversial one, of talks between the two parties was the Gou-tong during the legislative process in the Legislative Yuan. Some of the most noticeable negotiations between the two parties took place during the making of the National Security Law, the Assembly and Demonstration Law, the Civil Organization Law, and the amendments on the Election and Recall Law. The negotiations between the two sides showed that both sides were capable of making compromises. Some specific provisions in the above law drafts were significantly altered through the bargaining between KMT and
DPP legislators (SSW, 16:10-7; Central Daily, 1/12/88:1; SSW, 39:47; Central Daily, 11/25/87:2; SSW, 44:26-31; Central Daily, 1/15/89:2; Central News, 1/7/89:2; SSW, 99:61; China Times Weekly, 206:18-21; China Times Weekly, 197:55-7). The most important example was to modify the requirement for a political party from "permission by government" to "registration only" in the Civil Organization Law. Another visible example is the permission to demonstrate in front of the three Parliament chambers in the Assembly and Demonstration Law. However, on the Voluntary Retirement Plan, which was expected to be one of the most important steps of the reform of Parliament, communication between the two sides was severed, and the law was adopted amid chaos (China Times Weekly, 197:55-7).

Although there were various meetings between the government party and the opposition, they failed to produce the necessary consensus for building a democratic constitutional government for the following five major reasons. First, the meetings that took place were often designed to exchange ideas, not to reach compromises on specific issues or to build national political consensus. General Gou-tong did cover most of the fundamental issues, including the reform of Parliament, a national reconciliation meeting, and constitutional amendment, all of which affect the tempo and scope of democratization. But the participants in the general Gou-tong had mutual understanding before formal talks began, they were merely
expressing their ideas with each other, not to hammering out any disagreements on the issues. The general Gou-tong that took place between the two parties were the product of public pressure to decrease political tension, instead of a spontaneous call by the elites themselves to deal with fundamental issues (Peng, 1986:86-7). Truly, general Gou-tong was important in reducing the possibility of violent political confrontation, but they were inadequate in providing the consensual basis for building a democratic structure of government.

Second, the meetings were sometimes designed to "defuse" political crisis and tension, not to solve the real problem behind the crisis. As exemplified by the talks before the DPP's demonstration plans, the KMT's negotiation team contacted the DPP legislators and tried to obtain mutual understanding so the demonstrations would not get out of control (SSW, 40:24). In other words, the meetings and negotiations were incremental efforts to avoid violent street confrontation instead of a grand design to reach a political settlement. The real problems that have prompted the DPP to demonstrate on the street, such as Parliament reform, are seldom resolved, and the potential for more, and perhaps larger scale, demonstrations still exists.

Third, occasionally the gap between the two sides was so wide on specific issues that they gave up talks. Terminating emergency decree, for example, is an important
step for Taiwan to have a long lasting democratic political system. The KMT's stand on the issue is that while the Chinese mainland is occupied by a hostile communist regime, it cannot be called off. The DPP's stand is that the emergency decree is a KMT smokescreen to reaffirm its social and political hegemony over any other contending group (See Chapter V). Parliamentary reform is another issue on which the two sides cannot find any common ground for agreement. The DPP's stand has been loud and clear, that all senior members of the Parliament, including the National Assembly, the Legislative Yuan, and the Control Yuan, should resign without any precondition. But the KMT's position is that a comprehensive reelection as the DPP wants is impossible (See Chapter V). The middle ground between the two positions seems very narrow, indeed.

Fourth, the top decision-makers in the KMT have not been directly involved in the process of negotiation. The positions of KMT in Gou-tong on many issues did not reflect the perception of the ruling elites. Most of the policy-formulation within KMT did not go through CSC for detailed discussion. Instead, the policy drafts were formulated by the second-highest level party organization or government divisions which were often controlled by conservative elites. For example, the amendment of the Electoral Law on electoral districts was proposed and drafted by Guan Chong, the Deputy General Secretary of KMT and director of the KMT Organization Committee, and the draft of the Voluntary
Retirement Act was recommended by the National Security Council. Lack of direct involvement of CSC members in the drafting of bills and in the negotiations kept them from understanding the core of the problems, and kept their true opinions from becoming the official policies.

Fifth, the major negotiators on the KMT side are the factional leaders of the senior legislators such as Lin Dong and Liang Su-zong; they are not always in the mood to listen to the DPP's arguments. When the negotiations on three major bills for the 1986 session came to a standstill on November 24, KMT Chairman Lee Teng-hui and General Secretary Lee Huan intervened in the process by summoning some popularly elected members of the Legislative Yuan and authorizing them to negotiate with the DPP legislators (China Times Weekly, 197:57). The outcome of the negotiation after this special authorization allowed the Legislative Yuan to continue with its regular schedule and avoided a possible political crisis. However, since top KMT elites avoided any direct contact or participation in the meetings with the opposition leaders on important issues, the process of negotiation was largely arranged by senior party officials who were considered conservative compared to the newly elected legislators or many CSC members of KMT. When the more liberal KMT elites or popularly elected legislators were not in charge of the negotiations, compromise became difficult.
If Taiwan is to achieve a necessary constitutional consensus which will provide the basis for a stable democracy, a national reconciliation meeting on key constitutional issues seems essential. A negotiated democratization is not unprecedented: Spain in the late 1970s is perhaps the best example in the Third World of democratization through successful elite negotiations (Gunther 1981). The negotiated democratization of Spain illuminated political scientists' understanding of an otherwise complicated matter and provided inspirations for many Third World countries which strive desperately to join the ranks of liberal democracies.

In contrast to Spain's constitutional change in 1977-8, Taiwan has problems with elite interaction. While the leaders of principal Spanish social and political groups joined together in constitutional meetings to hammer out their disagreements (Gunther, 1981:384), the interaction and negotiation processes in Taiwan broke down because opposition politicians were excluded from National Security Council's formulation of KMT's major reform policies. Opposition legislators were not contacted until the major bills, such as the Voluntary Retirement Act, were about to be formally adopted by the Legislative Yuan. Indeed,

the inclusion of all significant groups in the decision-making process may be necessary in order to convince them that they have a stake in the existing political system. Conversely, exclusion may lead groups to deny the legitimacy of the system and to reject the outcome of the decision-
There are many issues of fundamental importance to be resolved as mentioned earlier. In order to resolve these issues satisfactorily and have the outcome respected by all major contenders of the political system as legitimate, the foremost requisite is that main opposition leaders and government elites of CSC level talk face-to-face on the issues with determination to reach compromises.

In Spain's transition to democracy, all constitutional issues were negotiated in national meetings, even though some issues were deliberately left ambiguous (Gunther, 1985:56). But in Taiwan, the ruling elites have refused to hold a national reconciliation meeting to discuss the constitutional issues with the opposition. Without any serious attempt to resolve the difficult issues, the controversies are not likely to perish by themselves. As shown earlier, both sides of Taiwan's elite groups are capable of making compromises on some controversial issues, such as the registration of political parties and demonstrating in front of Parliament. Similar meetings on more fundamental issues should be held and compromises sought.

Although the KMT and the DPP legislators held Gou-tong on various occasions to exchange their views, only a few concrete matters have been resolved. As mentioned earlier,
the Gou-tong meetings between the two sides were merely to exchange ideas, and both sides entered the negotiation tables without intentions to compromise. If the two sides want to have a concrete and comprehensive outcome from a national constitutional meeting, reaching compromise must be set as their goal. When both sides are determined to reach long lasting results, not just to exchange ideas, compromise will be found for the constitutional issues.

As noted in Chapter V, differences between the radical opposition and the conservative government elites are very drastic. However, the liberal government elites and moderate opposition elites could utilize their common interests in Parliamentary reform as a common denominator for negotiations and compromises. Compromise may not be accepted by the conservative and radical factions because they have very different, and perhaps extreme, views, perceptions, and objectives on democracy as a national goal. Moreover, the conservative KMT elites occupy a majority of the seats in the Parliament, which is a strategic position to block any reform legislations. Additionally, the radical faction in the DPP control about half of the Central Executive Committee and Central Standing Committee. Attempts by the moderates and the liberals to negotiate and compromise may come, after great efforts of the involved elites.
As was stated earlier, the most important conclusion of this research project is that without the willingness and the ability of the national political elites to reach consensus on key democratization issues, socio-economic development is not a sufficient condition to produce full democracy. Socio-economic development is important in that the general population, under more advanced socio-economic conditions, will demand more political freedom and participation. Those who are educated and mobilized may participate in national politics in meaningful ways. Yet popular demands for political freedom and participation cannot be directly transformed into democracy: There are factors, such as the willingness and the ability of the political elites, which may be very important to the process of democratization.

Taiwan's experience of political reform, beginning in 1986, can serve as a good example for the Third World. It is true that there is still far to go before full democracy can be realized in Taiwan. Indeed, the process seems to have slowed down after the death of Chiang Chin-kuo. Nevertheless, the scope of change, taking place in a relatively short period of time (1986-89), is, in itself, a tremendous achievement. Taiwan today is no longer a rigid authoritarian system as it was under Chiang Kai-shek and
during the early years of Chiang Chin-kuo. People in Taiwan are now permitted to form opposition parties, travel to mainland China, criticize the government, and hold demonstrations and rallies in public. These significant changes are partially due to the advancement of socio-economic conditions, as well as being partially due to the decision of the top decision-makers to open up the system.

Taiwan's economic growth and egalitarian distribution of wealth has created a large and stable urban middle class. This group has become affluent, educated, mobilized, and interested in politics. They protest the matters that affect and violate their interests. Their demands for more political participation and a more open political system have forced the government to reconsider the cost of suppressing the participatory demands. In addition, because of the continuing advancement of the economy and society, the majority of the population might have a stake in preserving the prosperity and the limited democratic system. As a result, few would opt for the violent overthrow of the government. In turn, the society wants change but not violent change, and the political reforms can be processed peacefully.

A dilemma that all authoritarian states which strive for economic growth must confront is that socio-economic development will inevitably produce popular demands for a more open political system. This is true not only in Third
World countries which adopt a market economy such as Brazil, Argentina, Korea, and Taiwan, but also in countries with planned economies such as the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and communist China. As the economy grows, the costs for an authoritarian regime of suppressing popular pressures for political reform also grow.

Another positive lesson from Taiwan's experience is the response of the top KMT elites to the popular participatory demands. As discussed in Chapter II, as the society became relentless in driving for more political freedom and chances for participation, the KMT could have gone either way. The KMT newspaper, for example, was calling for the punishment of the opposition leaders who formed the DPP in defiance of martial law orders. But Chiang Chin-kuo, at this critical historical juncture, not only tolerated the actions of the opposition, but announced further reform programs. In other words, the decisions made by the top political elites at this critical moment affected political change.

However, one can also learn from Taiwan's experience that the slow and sluggish process of change after Chiang Chin-kuo's death was caused by the lack of elite consensus on critical democratization issues. Political elites, by definition, are those who are in important decision-making positions in the government or national organizations which can affect the rest of the country, provide the key to the mystery of democratization. One way of building far-
reaching political reform and long-lasting democracy is that political elites come to terms with one another on the basic rules of peaceful political competition and the necessary steps to establish political institutions which incorporate different interests in the country. In the case of Taiwan, the elites have drastically different perceptions of both democracy and means to resolve critical issues of democratization. That perceptual conflict has handicapped Taiwan's democratization.

Negotiations and compromises are perhaps an effective means to reach consensus among the national elites; this is especially true when no elite is able to play the powerful and charismatic role of Chiang Chin-kuo. The contrast between Taiwan and Spain provides an illustration: while the Spanish political elites met and discussed the constitutional issues affecting regime transition, Taiwan's elites, after Chiang's death, remained severely divided over the critical issues of democratization and the Constitution. No high level meetings took place between the government and the opposition to resolve those issues. The comparison between the successful democratization-through-consensus-building of the Spanish elites in the late 1970s and the difficult or sluggish democratization due to lack of consensus of Taiwanese elites point to a possible way out for the rest of the Third World: National political elites must meet and resolve their differences over key national issues for successful democratization.
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