

Democratic Movement and Democratization in Eastern Asian Countries

53.1500: Comparative politics

Final Paper #1

Professor: Asli Peker

Zhaoyu He

Abstract

Democratic movements in South Korea, Taiwan and China (PRC) in the 1980s are interesting cases for comparison. Around the 1980s, Taiwan, South Korea and China broke out huge wave of democratic movement. In late the 1980s and 1990s, although once repressed, democratic movement in Taiwan and South Korea eventually propel their country to democracy but China, after the crackdown of democratization movement, still maintains an authoritarian regime and the claimed political reform is in stagnation. So why did the democratic movements under these three authoritarian regimes have such different results? This article mainly focuses on the factors that affect the outcome of democratic movement in Eastern Asian countries, arguing that a potent of middle class, the establishment of formal democracy and intimate relationship with the US are factors that are contributive to a democratic movement to propel the democratization process of a country.

Key word: democratic movement, democratization, middle class, formal democracy, foreign relationship.

Democratic Movement and Democratization in Eastern Asian Countries

Democratic movements in Taiwan, South Korea and China (PRC) in the 1980s are interesting cases for comparison. Around the 1980s, Taiwan, South Korea and China broke out huge wave of democratic movement. In late the 1980s and 1990s, although once repressed, democratic movement in Taiwan and South Korea eventually propel their country to democracy but China, after the crackdown of democratization movement, still maintains an authoritarian regime and the claimed political reform is in stagnation. So why did the democratic movements under these three authoritarian regimes have such different results? More exactly, under this same cultural base of feudal autocratic traditional, why did the democratic movements in South Korea and Taiwan succeed but in China fail to propel democratization? This article mainly focuses on the factors that affect the outcome of democratic movement in Eastern Asian countries, arguing that a potent of middle class, the establishment of formal democracy and intimate relationship with the US are factors that are contributive to a democratic movement to propel the democratization process of a country.

This topic of democratization is continuously discussed in academic field and I'd like to review some of them. Perhaps the most famous work on democratization is Samuel Huntington's (1991) *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. In Huntington's perspective, he attributes causes of democratization to five factors: the decrease of legitimacy of authoritarian regime, economic modernization, changes in Catholic Church, regional contingency factor and external factors. Although his theory above maybe more general and

applicable when applying to other countries' democratization, here I want to emphasize are sub-reason of powerful middle class caused by economic modernization and external factors. For the cases I select, all these regimes' legitimacy were somewhat decreasing in 1980s. Although the religious factor did propel the democratization in South Korea, it is not obvious in Taiwan and China. Plus, the factor of regional contingency mainly concentrates on revolutions occurred in Eastern Europe, which is little involved in eastern Asian issues. So these three factors above are not significant in cases I want to focus. Paul G. Buchanan and Kate Nicholls (2003) put their concentration on labor force's impact on the democratization process of Taiwan and South Korea, by stating that labor movements is an aspect of resurrection of civil society asserting citizenship rights in both economic and political realm, which makes them to be a potential leading agent for the substantive democratization of civil and political society as a whole¹. The influence exerted by labor force in democratization is apparent, and here, however, I want to attribute this impact as well as the development of civil society to modernization standard. In terms of external factors (international relations), Tao Wenzhao (2007) discussed the role of the US played during democratic movement in South Korea. He stated that the US is both a protector of South Korea's authoritarian government and a promoter of South Korea's democratization process².

As related literature and viewpoints mentioned above, three authoritarian regimes, after democratic movements, diverged to different ways. In response to the question I mentioned early, with an excerpt and combination of points I showed, I shall put forward my hypothesis: the

¹ Paul G. Buchanan and Kate Nicholls, "Labor force and democratic transition in South Korea and Taiwan", *Government and opposition*, Vol. 38, No. 2, (2003):203

² Tao Wenzhao, "United States Role in Korean Democracy", *Northeast Asia Forum*, Vol. 16, No. 6, (2007):67

success of democratic movement³ in a particular country is determined by (1) the power of middle class, (2) its establishment of formal democracy and (3) its relationship with the US. To begin with, the strength of middle class is the crucial factor to decide the success or failure of a democratic movement. Demanding more economic and political interests in authoritarian regimes, middle class can be the cornerstone to support the democratic movement. If the middle class is not strong enough, no matter how fierce the democratic movement is, it will lead to the failure of the movement without broad support of middle class. Created by economic growth, middle class and its expansion in Taiwan and South Korea under authoritarian regime would become a power that pursues for political power and advocate for political participation, becoming the base of democratic movement. In contrast, democratic movement without the support of middle class (actually the population in middle class is rare in the late 1980s), like in China, will be unable to mobilize whole society to participate because vast majority of Chinese were peasants who do not care for their political status but for their harvest. The lack of middle class led to the failure of Chinese democratic movement.

Secondly, the establishment of formal democracy is the guarantee for democracy to be implemented. Formal democracy is a state system that has in place superficial forms of democracy but is not actually managed democratically. Before achieving democratization, Taiwan and South Korea had formal democracy. On the surface, all officials are elected, but this election is strictly controlled by elites. However I think, even though the exercise of formal democracy is superficial, this superficial system can provide a legal basis and a justifiable reason for people to pursue and conduct further democratic movements and let the rulers have no reason

³ Here I define the success of the democratic movement as that the movement ultimately results in the beginning or completion of democratization.

to deny them. If the rulers are against the democratic movement, they may lose the moral support and their own legitimacy. Both Taiwan and South Korea established formal democratic system first and then democratic movements promoted countries to democratization gradually. However in China, the organization of political institutions did not comply with the discipline of check and balance but under the rule of “proletariat dictatorship” or one-party autocracy. The lack of legislation of formal democracy gave Chinese authoritarian government the chance to deny democracy and weakened the justifiability of democratic movement in China.

The relations with the US of related countries also affect their outcomes of democratic movement. Taiwan and South Korea are deeply influenced by the United States in their democratization process as they keep close relationship with the US. The US pressure imposed on them accelerated the democratization. On contrast, China followed the Soviet Union’s authoritarian system and kept away from the US. Even though in the 1980s, China improved its relationship with the US, independence is the main foreign policy of China. Unlike Taiwan and South Korea, the influence from the US on China’s domestic affairs is rare.

In order to test my hypothesis, I will use small-N qualitative method to examine the cases of South Korea, Taiwan and China (PRC). The specific method will be comparative history and macro-casual analysis. At first I will review three countries' history context during years of democratization respectively. Then independent variables will be discussed. To analyze the strength of middle class, some descriptive data such as proportion of middle class in whole population will be shown. To see whether there was formal democracy, I will examine the legislation record and political system of related countries. With regard to relationships with the US, I will draw upon government’s diplomatic situation in historical context. Then all these

independent variables will analyzed to find whether it can propel the dependent variable—the success of democratic movement—or not, therefore testing my hypothesis.

Over all, the article will be divided into six parts. The first part is here the introduction. Part 2 will be comparative history of three cases respectively which will introduce democratic movement history of Korea, Taiwan and China during around 1980s in turn. In part 3, factors of the strength of middle class, the establishment of formal democracy and the relationships with the US of the countries will be discussed in each case's literature by macro-casual analysis to figure out the relationship between these independent variables and dependent variable—the success of democratic movement, as I demonstrated in former paragraphs. The conclusion will be drawn in part 4 and meanwhile, according to my findings, some implication of prospective research will be proposed.

Comparative History

From the late 1970s to the early 1990s, the world witnessed a wave of democratization. In East Asia, South Korea, Taiwan and China coincidently stepped on the road to democracy. Although democratization was not the original intention of their officials at that time, in Taiwan and South Korea, it was democratic movement mobilized by citizens that successfully forced their governments to open the door of democracy. However in China, such democratic movement failed to propel the country into democracy. Besides, three democratic movements shared different characteristics and trajectory. To better examine reasons why these movements resulted in opposite outcomes, literatures of history of these three democratic movements should be presented firstly.

After the World War 2, government based on democratic discipline was established in South Korea. However, under the situation of Korean War, democracy was not fully enforced. From the 1960s, marches and protests advocating for democracy and freedom started. The first movement in 1960 was caused by the rigged election conducted by President Syngman Rhee pursuing his fourth presidential term. Resentful for dictatorship inclination of Syngman Rhee and election fraud, protestors eventually force Syngman Rhee to claim his retirement. The victory of the movement stimulated following movements. In only eight months of the Second Republic⁴, more than 2000 times of protests occurred, which led to an opener situation in Korean politics. Then the period of 1961-1979, the third and fourth Republic or the so-called “Park Chung-hee Era”, was the period of Korean economy took off which increased the number of middle class. However, in the name of anti-communism, Park Chung-hee implemented authoritarian rule that provoked waves of pro-democracy movement. He himself was assassinated in 1979 due to the wave of democratic movement. Although the death of former dictator gave people in South Korea a gleam of hope of democracy, the following Chun Doo Hwan military regime continued the authoritarian rule by attempting to delay the process of democratization. Consequently in 1980, Gwangju outburst large-scale protest movement calling for democracy but it was later suppressed by government, which caused massive casualties. However, this incident became the catalyst for the democratization process in Korea. In later years, the establishment of non-governmental organizations for vindicating this incident contributed time and time again the struggle for democracy which reached climax in 1987.

⁴ There were five republics and an interim existed in history of South Korea : First Republic (1948-1960), Second Republic (1960-1961), Military rule (1961-1963), Third Republic (1963-1972), Fourth Republic (1972-1979), Fifth Republic (1979-1987). Today is the Sixth Republic.

Meanwhile, the US government warned South Korea not to use military. Due to the impact of the Kwangju incident, the South Korean government in the 1980s implemented some political reform and eventually brought about direct presidential election in 1987 which signals the completion of the process of democratization. Democratic movement leaders Kim Dae-jung and Kim Young-sam later both became elected president.

Similar to South Korea, although the constitution of Republic of China⁵ is democratic, Taiwan was actually directed by *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion*⁶ that made Chiang Kai-shek to be the president five times, which virtually violated the constitution. However, under martial law, the democratic movement of Taiwan was in silent until 1979. Under the authoritarian government of Kuomintang (KMT), Taiwan experienced three decades of peaceful economic development. But in 1979, in Kaohsiung, there broke out large-scale demonstration called Formosa Incident⁷, with people calling for democracy and freedom. Although this incident was settled by KMT government's repression with many activists of the movement sentenced (under the intervention of the US, the sentence was reduced), it has a profound impact on Taiwan's democratization process. After this movement,

⁵ Republic of China was established in 1911 in Mainland China but from 1949, its government virtually occupies only Taiwan and some affiliated islands.

⁶ *The Temporary Provisions Effective During the Period of Communist Rebellion* were a series of constitutional amendments to the Constitution of the Republic of China effective from 1948-1991 and amended four times, which established martial law in Taiwan and curtailed civil liberties. The official rationale for the Provisions was the ongoing Chinese Civil War, but with the demise of the Kuomintang single-party system, the Provisions were rescinded.

⁷ The Formosa Incident, also known as Kaohsiung Incident, was the result of pro-democracy demonstrations that occurred in Kaohsiung, Taiwan on December 10, 1979. The Kaohsiung Incident is well-recognized as a critical and important event in the post-war history of Taiwan and regarded as the watershed of the Taiwan democratization movements. The event had the effect of galvanizing the Taiwanese community into political actions and regarded as one of the events that eventually led to democracy in Taiwan.

the dictator's son, Chiang Ching-kuo gradually changed the status of the KMT's one-party dominance and ultimately he adapted to the situation in 1987 by opening up the party ban, the newspaper ban. Shortly before that, democratic movement activists were gradually released from prison and established one of the largest opposition parties - the Democratic Progressive Party. In the 1990s, in order to achieve, many democratic movements broke out. The most profound one among them was Wild Lily student movement⁸, which led to the establishment of direct presidential electoral system and the termination of *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion*. After some constitution amendment, the first direct presidential election was hold in 1996, which signified the accomplishment of democracy. In 2000, Taiwan achieved its first rotation of ruling parties and the Democratic Progressive Party came to power, with the president and vice president being the previous Formosa Incident activists.

Unlike South Korea and Taiwan, mainland China never has a democratic government, but it did not prevent the democratic fervor of Chinese people. After the Cultural Revolution, in the late 1970s, with the beginning of the reform and opening up, the democratic movement in China also began to flourish. Beijing Spring⁹ in 1978 exerted a positive impact on thought liberation. However, with the emergence of the attack toward Communist Party of China, one of the signs of the Beijing Spring--Democracy Wall (people post various kinds of words advocating for

⁸ Wild Lily student movement was a six-day student demonstration in 1990 for democracy. The Wild Lily demonstrators sought direct elections of Taiwan's president and vice president and new popular elections for all representatives in the National Assembly, as well as terminating *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion*.

⁹ The Beijing Spring refers to a brief period of political liberalization in the People's Republic of China which occurred in 1977 and 1978. During the Beijing Spring, the general public was allowed greater freedom to criticize the government than the Chinese people had previously been allowed under the government of the People's Republic of China. Most of this criticism was directed towards the Cultural Revolution and the government's behavior during that time; it was made public with the Democracy Wall Movement.

democracy) -- was banned by the government. With continuing economic development, in 1986-87, the first wave of student movement was suppressed. During April to June 1989, as a result of the death of Chinese Communist Part (CCP) reformist Hu Yaobang, the nationwide mass democratic movement occurred, and ultimately the government used military to open fire on demonstrators to suppress the movement, followed by mass arrests of dissidents. In the 1990s, after the movement, the democratic movement in China went into silence. Impact of Tiananmen Crackdown was considerable that destroyed the democratic fervor of Chinese. Although some of the democratic movement emerged, such as the establishment of China Democracy Party, Chinese Jasmine Revolution, none of them had substantive impact on democratization and China is still under authoritarian regime and its political reform is in stagnation.

The outcomes of democratic movements in three countries were diverted into different roads due to different conditions of some key factors. In following section, reasons that lead to these different outcomes will be specifically discussed.

Factors Decisive to the Success of Democratic Movement

Through comparative history, some commonalities and differences in democratic movement process of three countries can be concluded. In these three cases, democratic movements came after the boom of economy which led to a potential boom of middle class. Politically, South Korea and Taiwan had democratic foundation but China not. Plus, in the crackdown actions of Taiwan and South Korea, the US had a positive effect on democratic movement in both countries. Using its intimate relationship with two countries as leverage, the US exerted great impact on decisions of local government. However China did not have an

intimate relationship with the US. Thus although the US had condemned the Tiananmen Crackdown, authoritarian regime in China still stands firm. Obviously, factors of middle class strength, establishment of formal democracy and diplomatic relations are key factors to the outcome of democratic movement.

The Strength of Middle Class

The middle class is a class of people in the middle of a societal hierarchy between the working class and upper class. Although the common measures of what constitutes middle class vary significantly between cultures, it is undeniable that the role of middle class in democratic movement as well as the whole process of democratization is critical. Huntington (1991) attributed the bourgeoning of middle class as one of reasons of the third wave of democratization. Walsh, Jennings, and Stoker (2004) found that middle-class individuals usually support democratic principles and take action in support of the rise and/or maintenance of a democratic system and against a nondemocratic system.

The interest of middle class relies on market and is rooted in the development of market economy. Under authoritarian regimes with market economy, although middle class benefits from the prosperity of market economy, it was politically alienated. As a result, this increasing power will struggle for its political benefit. This benefit is linked with Market-based political pluralism¹⁰. Thus at this time, democratization will become its goal to achieve the political pluralism. In addition, only when middle class takes part in the democratic movement as a whole, powerful social group can the democratization process begin in a real sense. In our cases, all three countries have long-time tradition of authoritarianism. Democratic movements in such

¹⁰ Li Luqu, "Middle Class, Civil Society and Political Transition in East Asia", *Modern Asia-Pacific*, 2011(11):46

countries, if they are only led by students and intellectuals, can be suppressed by government without worries, because the negative outcome of repressing dissidents is not evident. However, if the middle class becomes the major social stratum that is the backbone of the economic and social life of a state, its participation in a democratic movement will increase the possibility of success to force the authoritarian government launch democratization. Since, if government chooses to suppress the movement, it suffers huge risk that may destroy the economy of the nation, then government had better handle it carefully that even consider whether to compromise.

South Korea and Taiwan were fortunate that they had strong middle classes that supported their democratic movements. For South Korea, the prosperity of middle class resulted from the economic take-off since the 1960s, known as “Park Chung-hee Era”, when the authoritarian government advocated for developing market economy. By the year of 1987, the peak of Korean democratization process, the proportion of middle class in total population was 67%¹¹, which was considered as the major body of total population. Throughout the democratic movement over time, middle class combined the strength of students and workers, forcing the authoritarian government to complete the democratization. Taiwan shares a same story with South Korea. The economic development from the 1970s laid the foundation of increasing number of middle class. In the year 1981, two years after the Kaohsiung Incident, a survey showed that more than 56% of Taiwanese identified themselves as middle class¹². Although it is a subjective description, it still meant that the major part of population felt themselves having gained the economic benefits

¹¹ Cho Lee-chee, Kim Yin-hun, *South Korea: the Economic Takeoff and Policy analysis*, (Wuhan, Press of HUST, 1996): 433-434

¹² Jin Hongfan, Dong Yuhong, Lin Gang, *Democratic Transition in Taiwan: From Chiang Ching-kuo System to Lee Teng-hui System*, (Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Social Science Press, 1998): 6-9

from economic development. Thus, democratization was the next goal. Like the circumstance of Korea, the authoritarian started the process of democratization in 1987. In Wild Lily student movement of 1990, middle class advocates for democratic position of students, which led to the ultimate compromise of KMT government.

But the story of China was different. Ending the Cultural Revolution in 1976, China had just launched its economic construction as an underdeveloped country in 1978. In addition, the initial reform did not enable China to implement market economy, which prevented the development of middle class. In the year of 1988, one year prior to the Tiananmen Demonstration, the proportion of middle class in China was no more than 1%¹³. The rest of population was mainly peasants. Living in poor rural area, peasants had not benefited from the economic reform, let alone to have incentives to join in the democratic movement. After the 1989 democratic movement, some parents in rural areas even blame their sons and daughters who took part in the demonstration and asked them why they were not satisfied with the government. Obviously, the major weakness of this movement was that it did not involve social groups, especially middle class, other than students and intellectuals. As a result, the movement was suppressed by CCP government and authoritarian regime continued.

As showed above, the strength and participation of middle class in democratic movement was essential to determine the outcome of the movement. When middle class was strong, the movement was more likely to succeed.

The Establishment of Formal Democracy

Formal democracy is a state system that has in place superficial forms of democracy but is

¹³ Li Chunling, "The Growth and Present Situation of the Chinese Middle Classes", *Jiangsu Social Science*, 2008(5): 68-77

not actually managed democratically. Evelyne Huber, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John D. Stephens (1997) categorized democracy into three levels: formal democracy, participatory democracy and social democracy¹⁴. In their article, four major characteristics of formal democracy was regular free and fair elections, universal suffrage, accountability of the state's administrative organs to the elected representatives and effective guarantees for freedom of expression and associations as well as protection against arbitrary state actions. However, the formal democracy does not guarantee the universal equality for all classes, gender or ethnicities, which prevent it from advancing to higher level of participatory and social democracy. Generally, formal democracy contains institutions and election process based on democratic discipline, ensuring the basic political right of citizens, but does not provide enough equality access for all members of society to participate in making public decisions. Only when equality and participation was enlarged to allow all members of society can the formal democracy advance to higher level of democracy.

Although formal democracy does not provide citizens full right and opportunity to take part in political life of a state, it cannot be denied that formal democracy is the foundation and the first step on the road of democratization. To social movement, specifically, the establishment of formal democracy provides a protection screen for it in both legislative and political level. Legislatively, according to Huber, Rueschemeyer and Stephens, the major characteristic of formal democracy includes effective guarantees for freedom of expression and associations as well as protection against arbitrary state actions as constitutional provisions. Thus, it provides a legal foundation for citizens to conduct movements pursuing democracy. That is to say, since the

¹⁴ Evelyne Huber, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John D. Stephens, " The Paradoxes of Contemporary Democracy: Formal, Participatory, and Social Dimensions," *Comparative Politics*, vol. 29, no. 3 (1997): 323.

freedom expression and associations was protected by law, democratic movements should not be repressed by governments under formal democracy. With this legal foundation, governments dare not to suppress the movement, which increase the likelihood of success of democratic movement. Secondly, in political realm, even though it is just in formal level, democracy is the ultimate goal of a government once it established itself by principal of democracy. Therefore, since democratic movement complies with the spirit of democracy, government has no reason to suppress it. Once suppressing the movement, government will lost its legitimacy and the movement may turn into a revolution to overturn this illegitimate government. In order to preserve its legitimacy as well as ruling status, authoritarian government may give in to compromise with democratic requirements of the movements, thus propelling the process of democratization. Whether government originally and ultimately pursues the spirit of democracy or not affects its reaction toward democratic movement.

Among our cases, governments of South Korea and Taiwan are founded based on the spirit of democracy, which own characteristics of formal democracy. Political institutions in both countries were established based on “separation of the three powers”¹⁵ like the US government. They are all presidential system with Parliament and Judicial ministry to counterbalance the power. The right of expression and association is guaranteed in constitution¹⁶. It is also stated in their constitutions that state legislature¹⁷ and President¹⁸ will be elected directly by entire

¹⁵ The setting of political institutions has little difference with that of South Korea and the US. Except for Executive Yuan as cabinet, Legislative Yuan as Parliament and Judicial Yuan as usual “separation of three powers”, Examination Yuan and Control Yuan are also main body of Taiwan government. However, its essential spirit is according to the “separation of three powers”.

¹⁶ Constitution of Republic of China, Chapter 2, Article 11&14. Constitution of Republic of Korea, Chapter 2, Article 21.

¹⁷ Additional Articles of Constitution of Republic of China, Article 3. Constitution of Republic of Korea, Chapter 3, Article 41.

¹⁸ Additional Articles of Constitution of Republic of China, Article 2. Constitution of Republic of Korea, Chapter 4, Article 67.

populace of country. More importantly, both constitutions state that democracy is the basic principle to function the state. Obviously, all content above show that both countries have formal democracy. However, in authoritarian period of both countries, democratic principles were not truly implemented in the name of anti-communism. Elections were strictly controlled by elites of ruling parties. For South Korea, military regime prolonged the presidential tenure by amending constitution. For Taiwan, Chiang Kai-shek used *Temporary Provisions Effective during the Period of Communist Rebellion* to get elected five times. These dictatorship actions eventually provoked democratic movements. Although early movements were suppressed by governments, democracy desire had no reason to be rejected in formal democratic countries. Under huge domestic and foreign pressure, authoritarian governments accepted democratic requirement proposed by demonstrations, enacting the process of democratization.

However in China, the organization of political institutions did not comply with the discipline of check and balance but under the rule of “proletariat dictatorship” or one-party autocracy. Although the constitution of People’s Republic of China emphasizes so-called socialism democracy, political life of the state is not rule by constitution but by the party. People only have right to vote to appointed candidates. The lack of legislation of formal democracy gave Chinese authoritarian government the chance to deny democracy and weakened the justifiability of democratic movement in China. The typical instance was crime of counter-revolution. Although the freedom of expression and association is also guaranteed in Constitution, if expression and association are about criticizing socialism, related people will be convicted as crime of counter-revolution. Almost every democratic movement in China during the 1980s was suppressed by the reason of “A handful of people with ulterior motives attempt to

subvert the socialist system”.

In general, formal democracy can provide democratic movement a favorable domestic environment. In authoritarian countries with formal democracy, the aim of both citizens and governments is democracy, which increases the justifiability and possibility of success of democratic movement. Otherwise, the movement may be suppressed by any kind of pretext.

The Relationship with the US

According to Huntington (1991), one of factors to stimulate the third wave of democratization is external effect which can hasten the process of democratization. More specifically, there is no doubt that without the continuing fervor and aspiration of America toward promoting democracy, fewer countries would complete the transition from authoritarianism to democracy. As a result, countries which have an intimate relationship with the US are much easier to be affected by American democracy spirit than those do not. Besides the democracy spirit, the US also used other leverages to urge those intimate countries to launch the process of democratization. Among them were economic and military assistance. Accordingly, in countries that accepted assistance, words from the US became more powerful; this made democratic promotion of the US easier and more effective.

Obviously, used as outposts of anti-communist in the beginning of the Cold War, South Korea and Taiwan own a more intimate relationship with the US than China. For South Korea, the impact from the US is comprehensive. In military realm, more than 30,000 US soldiers are stationed in South Korea today. Economically, the assistance from the US to a large extent resulted in the economic recovery and boom of South Korea. In 1957, for instance, assistance

from the United States accounted for 52.9% of the South Korean government's general fiscal revenue¹⁹. These assistances that South Korea gained from the US gave great leverage to the US to affect domestic affairs of South Korea including democratic movement. Initially, it was the US that helped South Korea establishing the democratic regime. In the first democratic movement in 1960, the role of the US was on the side of democracy that it pressed Syngman Rhee who had dictatorship inclination to retire. In the period of Park Chung-hee, the US urged the dictator to return the power to people for several times. Although the US indulged the government of South Korea to suppress the Gwangju Democratization Movement to control the situation, in the decisive year of 1987, the US congress passed the Resolutions calling for free and fair elections in South Korea, exerting pressures on Korean military regime to implement democratization and publically support the democratic movement. For Taiwan, it's a same story. From 1950 to 1965, Taiwan received a total of \$1.5 billion in economic aid and \$2.4 billion in military aid from the United States²⁰. Like it did in Korea, the US also indulged the Chiang Kai-shek authoritarian regime in the beginning. But when the Chiang family sought for Hereditary in its third generation, the US publically said no. In September 1985, the US House of representatives passed the proposition of urging Taiwan to end the Martial Law and Party Ban through voice vote. Under the pressure from the US, the KMT government dared not to deny the democratic movement. The initiative of Taiwan democratization process was then controlled by democratic movements.

Opposite to the political position of South Korea and Taiwan in the Cold War, China was one of major objectives that the US attempted to block in the communist world until 1972, the

¹⁹ Tao Wenzhao (2007), "United States Role in Korea Democracy", *North East Asia Forum*, 16(6):67-71

²⁰ Chan (1997), "Taiwan as an Emerging Foreign Aid Donor: Developments, Problems, and Prospects", *Pacific Affairs* 70 (1): 37-56,

normalization of Sino-US relationship. However, the normalized relationship did not bring large assistance from the US, even after two countries establish diplomatic relationship in 1979. Without the leverage of assistance, the US was unable to exert effective impact on Chinese domestic affairs. Therefore, when democratic movement occurred in China, there was no substantive help by the deep concern of the US toward the protest, because pressures from the US like it had on South Korea and Taiwan had no effect on China. After the Tiananmen Massacre, negative consequences for China were only sanctions and weapons embargo, which also failed to affect China.

To conclude, close relationship with the US has positive effect to the democratic movement of a country. The reliance of authoritarian countries to the US made it easier for US to impose political impact to support the democratic movement. In contrast, China has a relatively distant relationship with the US, which decreased the odd of success of its democratic movement.

Conclusion

The democratic movements in South Korea, Taiwan and China diverged into different roads: in South Korea and Taiwan, democratic movements ultimately led to the democratization of countries; but in China, the authoritarian regime remains. Reasons of this difference can be concluded into fundamental cause and environmental causes. The fundamental cause of the success of democratic movement is the support of powerful middle class. In the premise of having a powerful middle class as the majority part of population, the participation of middle class forced authoritarian government to handle the movement cautiously, daring not to suppress the movement in case it destroyed the interest of middle class and cause the collapse of economy.

There would be a great possibility for government to compromise with proposition of democratization. If middle class was absent from the movement, the outcome would easily be the suppression. Environmental reasons consist of domestic factor and external factor. Domestically, the establishment of formal democracy can provide a legal and justifiable position for movement to advocate for democracy that cannot be denied by government, because the goal of protestors and government who established the formal democracy is consistent—achieving democracy. Otherwise, government would have various pretexts to repress the movement. External factor can also affect the outcome of democratic movement. Specifically, an intimate relationship with the US was contributive to the success of democratic movement. By offering economic and military assistance to authoritarian countries, the US used it as leverage to exert pressures upon their governments to compromise with protestors, helping them approach the democratization. Oppositely, the distant relationship with the US may cause the authoritarian government to deny the spirit of democracy as well as the movement.

The topic of democratic movement and democratization is considerably broad that cannot be fully articulated in a twenty-page article. The major limitation of article is that lots of details to support my arguments are still yet to be presented. Additionally, there may be some other reasons that are critical to influence the outcome of democratic movement that I fail to put them out. Finally, my arguments still need more cases to be strengthened. If I have chance to continue my research on this topic, more cases should be included and I will conduct a large-N analysis. Moreover, three independent variables had better be analyzed empirically, using data to conclude a statistical result, which is contributive to theoretical conclusion.

Reference

1. Samuel Huntington, 1993, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press.
2. Paul G. Buchanan and Kate Nicholls. 2003. "Labor force and democratic transition in South Korea and Taiwan". *Government and opposition*. Vol. 38, No. 2.
3. Tao Wenzhao. 2007. "United States Role in Korean Democracy". *Northeast Asia Forum*. Vol. 16, No. 6.
4. Li Luqu. "Middle Class, Civil Society and Political Transition in East Asia". *Modern Asia-Pacific*. 2011(11)
5. Cho Lee-chee, Kim Yin-hun, South Korea. 1996. *South Korea: the Economic Takeoff and Policy analysis*. Wuhan: Press of HUST.
6. Jin Hongfan, Dong Yuhong, Lin Gang. 1998. *Democratic Transition in Taiwan: From Chiang Ching-kuo System to Lee Teng-hui System*. Hong Kong: the Hong Kong Social Science Press.
7. Shi Tianjian. 1990. "The Democratic Movement in China in 1989: Dynamics and Failure", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 30, No. 12.
8. Li Chunling. "The Growth and Present Situation of the Chinese Middle Classes". *Jiangsu Social Science*. 2008(5)
9. Evelyne Huber, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John D. Stephens. 1997. "The Paradoxes of Contemporary Democracy: Formal, Participatory, and Social Dimensions". *Comparative Politics*. Vol. 29, no. 3.
10. Chan. 1997. "Taiwan as an Emerging Foreign Aid Donor: Developments, Problems, and Prospects", *Pacific Affairs*. 70 (1).