**Research Purpose and Summary**

This dissertation aims to historically explore the internal strife known as "Controversy on Two Lines" between moderates and radicals inside the political opposition Tang-wai and then its successor Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) in Taiwan during the 1980s. It analyzes the Controversy's development and the structural factors affecting it, and interprets it against the backdrop of Taiwan's political development. For analytical purpose, the decade of the 1980s is subsequently divided into three phases (I〜III): Phase I (1980〜1983), Phase II (1984〜1986), and Phase III (1987〜1989).

The author argues that the Controversy means more than debates concerning two different kinds of society's responses to the state; neither should it be simply reduced to the opposition's internal factionalism. It is rather argued that the advent and transformation of the Controversy itself represents history of Taiwan's political development, because it is shaped by and therefore reflects interactions between organized groups within the opposition, between competing elites in government, between state and society, and between domestic politics and international relations, over the course of Taiwan's democratization.

To analyze the complexity of these interactions, an analytical framework is designed, which incorporates theoretical concepts pertaining to (1) state-society interactions and (2) interconnectedness of domestic and international politics. For (1), the author adopts A. Hirschman's categorization "loyalty / voice / exit" and borrows J. Linz's concept of "semi-opposition" to refer to heterogeneity
within the opposition. The author shall call it “limited loyalty” in this study to highlight its being both “loyalty” and “voice.” For (2), “linkage politics” and “level of analysis” concepts are applied. Based on this framework, the Controversy is analyzed as follows.

The period prior to the 1980s contrasts with them in that the Controversy hardly existed then. Non-existence of Controversy witnesses the impossibility for radical measures to be undertaken in a highly authoritarian regime with the Martial Law serving to silence or exile radicals.

Phase I begins with the aftermath of the "Kaohsiung Incident." Major oppositional leaders were jailed for the incident, leaving moderates like Kang Ning-hsiang to play a mainstream role in the opposition. Ensuing white terrors angered especially oppositional editors (known as “New Generation”) who distasted Kang’s soft stance towards government. They started a series of criticism against Kang and his partners: The “Criticizing Kang Campaign.” Besides labeling Kang as “connivance,” this Campaign ignited thematic debates like “Inside or outside the establishment should reforms be conducted?” “Which is more important for democratization: Electoral competition or mass movements?” and “Should the incumbents be given priority for electoral nomination only to ruin Tang-wai’s inner democracy, or not?” Radicals take the former position; moderates the latter. The Campaign subsided after it led to Kang and his partners’ defeat in the 1983 election.

Phase II is a period when moderates and radicals established “Tang-wai Association of Public Policy Studies” (TAPPS) and “Tang-wai Writers and Editors Alliance” (TWEA) respectively. This time, radicals were upset by moderates’ softness on government’s threat to suppress TAPPS and, considered TAPPS Secretariat Fei His-ping’s overture to KMT an act of connivance. The next wave of criticism erupted when TAPPS members attended KMT-planned negotiations opposed by radicals. Besides, unstoppable white terrors seemed kept arousing international concerns. Radicals finally ceased fire and stood with moderates for the election after joining hands in forming DPP in 1986.

The Controversy at Phase III happened between these two DPP factions “Formosa” and “New Tide,” which transform from TAPPS and TWEA respectively. New Tide attacked Formosa for softness on government, maintaining “Mass Line” or “Street Line” was an effective way to push political reform, while moderates held “Parliament Line” and asserted that opposition should be conducted through elections. Surprisingly, however, with formation of political parties legalized, New Tide vowed to field candidates for elections in
1989, actually turning to “Parliament Line.” New Tide’s decision means a departure from their long-held “People’s Power” principle. Equally surprising is that Formosa began to take to the streets during this Phase. Neither New Tide nor Formosa has ever formally renounced demonstrations as means of expressing protest.

The above examination of the Controversy can be summarized as follows.

Phases from I to III represent a process of growth of the political opposition in the sense that the two sides of the Controversy evolved from two subgroups to two civil organizations, and finally to two factions of a legal political party. This evolution, in contrast, highlights an authoritarian regime increasingly weakening, allowing political room for the political opposition and transforming into an electoral democracy. The direction of change rightly represents Taiwan’s path to democratization.

Also worth noting is the change in both society and state owed greatly to international pressure, to which Taiwan as a small state is inevitably vulnerable..

Contents of the Dissertation

This dissertation comprises 6 chapters, including an introduction and conclusion.

Introduction includes an indication of the research purpose, and a review of relevant literature.

Chapter 1 addresses the theoretical perspectives and concepts for historical examination and analysis.

Chapter 2 addresses the period prior to 1980s. During this period, radical thoughts and deeds were hardly feasible, for Taiwan’s politics at this time was highly authoritarian and society was still haunted by major white terrors.


Chapter 4 (Phase II, 1984～1986) addresses how the Controversy developed with the establishment of TAPPS and TWEA, highlighting the latter’s attack on the former. It also addresses how white terrors prompted US government into enhancing pressure on KMT government for more political freedom.
Chapter 5 (Phase III, 1987~1989) address how the Controversy was staged with the fore-mentioned two organizations developing into two factions of DPP, moderate Formosa and radical New Tide. It examines why moderates again were exposed in criticism by radicals, and why the demonstration-prone New Tide found itself in elections while Formosa figures did not hesitate to take to the streets finally.

Chap 6 is the conclusion.

**Implications of the study**

This study is supposed to have the following research implications.

Firstly, it supposedly brings a meaningful convergence of political sociology and IR theories to the study of Taiwan’s politics. Its analytical framework can hopefully inspire case studies of other countries on similar issues. Beside, this study supposedly enriches Taiwan Studies as a social sciences field by promoting understanding of Taiwan’s political opposition in the authoritarian era.

Moreover, with the fall of DPP from power in 2008, this study hopefully offers in the future a new perspective to observe how it acts again as a political opposition, and one may see if history repeats itself one way or another.