

What Zhao Ziyang Tells Us about Elite Politics in the 1980s

Joseph Fewsmith

On the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen crackdown, the posthumous account of politics in the 1980s by former premier and general secretary Zhao Ziyang was published in both Chinese and English. The publication of this memoir follows the publication of several interviews with the former Party leader and marks a continuing effort to speak to history. Publication was apparently intended to remind the world of the tragedy of Tiananmen, but there is little sign in China that the publication is having much of an impact. Although Zhao's various accounts do not contain startling revelations, they do add much detail and nuance to our understanding of politics in this period. Indeed, the role and rivalries of personalities come through very clearly, allowing one to better understand the political meltdown that befell China in 1989.

Zhao Ziyang's recently published memoir, *Gaige Licheng*¹ (The Course of Reform, which has been translated as *Prisoner of the State*²) provides more than a defense of Zhao's actions during the Tiananmen protests, though most attention will inevitably focus on that period. Zhao discusses the course of reform from the time of his arrival in Beijing in 1980 to his dismissal as general secretary in 1989. Although there are a number of useful memoirs by senior leaders, including Bo Yibo's *Reminiscences of Several Important Decisions and Events*, Wu Lengxi's memoir of Sino-Soviet polemics, and Li Rui's recounting of the Lushan Plenum, accounts by top leaders are rare. Former CCP leader Zhang Guotao wrote a lengthy autobiography after he left the Party, but there has been nothing in the Chinese literature comparable to *Khrushchev Remembers*, until now.³

Zhao Ziyang was under house arrest from his detention in June 1989 until his death in 2005, but was granted certain privileges, at least episodically. He was allowed to travel and play golf, until his appearances caught the attention of outsiders. And he was permitted at least some visits with old friends and associates. Although guards were present in Zhao's compound, conversations with visitors were apparently private. The relative laxness of restrictions on Zhao's contact resulted in three interviews being published by Yang Jisheng, a senior Xinhua correspondent, and a series of records of conversations being published by Zong Fengming, an old friend and practitioner of Qigong.⁴ The text of Zhao's memoir is based on tape recordings Zhao made, which were smuggled to Hong Kong after his death. There should be no question of their provenance, given that the tapes are posted on the websites of the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*.

Zhao's memoir is not intended as a well-researched or comprehensive analysis of politics in the 1980s, but given his position in the system, one has to take seriously Zhao's observations not only on the events surrounding Tiananmen but also on how elite

politics functioned throughout the 1980s. Particularly when read in conjunction with other recent works, particularly Deng Liqun's memoirs,⁵ Zhao's account gives us a fuller picture of politics at the highest level. Though nothing in the account will upset previous interpretations, it certainly adds detail that deepens our understanding.

Personalistic Politics

Perhaps the feature of Chinese politics that emerges most sharply from this book is its domination by personalities, particularly those of the elders. Indeed, the discriminating reader can look at the institutional context in which these individuals operate (e.g., Chen Yun's relationship with the economic bureaucracies and Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun's relationship to the propaganda system), but what comes through most clearly are the personalities and the political preferences and allegiances of individuals. Personal relations are critical. For instance, Zhao Ziyang attributes the close relationship between Deng Liqun and Wang Zhen to Deng's working in the Xinjiang propaganda bureau under Wang in the 1950s. Similarly, Deng Liqun was close to Li Xiannian because Deng had worked with Li in the Fifth Department of the State Council and later edited Li's selected works.⁶

Age and relations counted, as did reputations. Li Xiannian was perhaps the most sensitive of the elders because his work as vice premier under Hua Guofeng was most clearly under attack by reform and opening up. He repeatedly complained that the bases he laid should not be forgotten.⁷ And Chen Yun was clearly wedded to the planned economy. Until the late 1980s, Zhao says, Chen continued to think that the Soviet planned economy had lifted a backward country to be second only to the United States. Chen was so fond of this period that when Ivan V. Arkhipov, the Soviet specialist with whom he had worked so closely in the 1950s, came to China in 1984, Deng drew up talking points for Chen, fearing that if Chen went off on his own he would create confusion both domestically and internationally. Chen was unhappy but followed the talking points.⁸ Chen also disagreed with Zhao's 1987 assessment that "in the 1950s we imported the Soviet economic model; in fact, this was a model for a wartime economy."⁹

The importance of career path is most striking in Zhao's narrative of his own evolving understanding of reform and opening. He makes it very clear that his time in Guangdong gave him a clearer understanding of the need and possibility to open the country to foreign trade. And his conversations with Hong Kong and Taiwan business leaders and economists opened his eyes to the possibilities inherent in leasing land and important raw materials (in what would become known as the "great international cycle"). His time in Sichuan was critical for his understanding of the rural economy (Zhao helped pioneer the "responsibility system" during his tenure as Sichuan Party secretary). His local experiences gave him a deep understanding of the flaws of the traditional socialist economy and led him to emphasize "economic efficiency," a quest that inclined him, as premier, to constantly experiment with economic reform.

If Zhao's local experiences were critical in opening his eyes to the realities of life

on the ground, they limited his experience and contacts at the highest levels of the political system. Limited contacts meant limited sources of information, so Zhao was often making political choices without a full understanding of the political currents swirling in Beijing. As Zhao put it, “My information was rather restricted. Because I had worked in the localities for a long time and my time at the center was not long, and because I was extremely busy with work after coming to Beijing, my channels [of information] were rather few. So, even to this day, there are many things that happened behind the scenes that I am still not clear about.”¹⁰

But no personality dominated like that of Deng. Outside observers have long referred to Deng Xiaoping as China’s “paramount leader,” but Zhao’s memoir makes clear precisely how preeminent he was. Deng worked at home and summoned others to meet with him there (were these official meetings? Were notes taken? Zhao does not say). In the whole volume, there is only one instance in which Deng traveled to Zhongnanhai, and that was to preside over a formal Politburo meeting. Deng may have been subject to the pressure of other senior leaders, but there is not an obvious instance of Deng yielding against his own preferences to the will of others. Deng may have been influenced by others, but he made up his own mind.

Relations could be delicate. It was difficult for one leader to contradict another when the first had spoken. Thus, when Chen Yun drafted comments for the Party Representative meeting in 1985 that seemed to contradict the recently passed Decision on Economic Structural Reform. Zhao knew he could not ask Chen to rewrite his comments, so instead asked him to insert a short paragraph that would allow Zhao to reconcile the two documents.¹¹ Similarly, in 1987, at a time when Deng Xiaoping was angry with Deng Liqun, Mao’s former secretary Li Rui wrote Zhao a letter raising the issue of Deng Liqun’s “life style” while in Yanan (a half-century earlier!) and saying such a person should not be in charge of propaganda work. Zhao forwarded the letter to Deng, who quickly instructed that Deng Liqun should no longer take charge of propaganda work and forwarded it to Chen Yun and Li Xiannian. They wrote about Deng Liqun being a good person, but they “could not directly oppose Deng Xiaoping.”¹²

Deng cared about getting the political results he wanted, but, unlike Chen Yun, he did not care for the formalities. At the January 1987 “Party life” meeting called to criticize Hu Yaobang, Chen Yun repeatedly made comments about the legality of the meeting, but Deng only cared about the outcome: the ouster of Hu Yaobang, the grounds on which he was and was not criticized, and the selection of a new leadership. This focus on political effect rather than procedure turned out to be unfortunate for Zhao. Deng was convinced that the ouster of Hu had not carried enough force to stem the tide of “bourgeois liberalization,” so he was uncompromising when it came to penalizing Zhao.

Deng and Political Reform

Zhao does not spend a lot of time discussing Deng’s personality and political inclinations, but there are comments here and there that shed light on Deng as a person. Perhaps the

point that comes across most strongly in Zhao's account is that Deng was a disciplinarian by nature; indeed, Zhao says that Deng was the most autocratic of all the elders.¹³ Deng was intensely interested in the issue of "bourgeois liberalization," seeing in lax ideological tendencies the source of liberalization (*ziyouhua* 自由化). In his 1985 meeting with Taiwan activist Chen Guying, Deng said that the "four freedoms" were removed from the constitution precisely because they had encouraged the chaos of the Cultural Revolution. As Deng put it, "At the Third Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee our Party resolved to implement the opening policy, but at the same time we also demanded that the wind of liberalization be stopped. These policies are inter-related. If this wind is not stopped, we cannot implement the policy of opening up."¹⁴

Zhao interprets Deng's famous August 1980 speech on "Reform of the Party and State Leadership" as being, at least in part, an attack on Hua Guofeng. There was, of course, the legitimate concern that another leader might exert control over the Party as Mao Zedong had, but the immediate problem for Deng was the degree of power concentrated in Hua Guofeng as Party chairman, premier, and head of the CMC. Deng thus sought in his speech to rationalize stripping Hua of some of this authority, including the premiership, which went to Zhao Ziyang. Moreover, the Party was at the time drafting a document to sum up the lessons of the Cultural Revolution (which would later be adopted as the Resolution on Party History). In this context, adopting Li Weihan's suggestion that the document criticize the remnants of feudal thought, a way of criticizing the Gang of Four, made sense.¹⁵ But Deng was not interested in the democratic implications of this criticism; his interest in political reform, Zhao emphasizes, was purely utilitarian.

Indeed, Zhao emphasizes this point when he relates how, during the period in which he was supervising the writing of the 13th Party Congress report, Deng repeatedly stressed to him that the document could not even hint at introducing Western-style tripartite governance.¹⁶ In one of the more surprising passages, Zhao recalls Deng saying in the early 1980s that the Politburo in the Soviet Union was able to meet and decide on dispatching troops to Afghanistan. "Could America manage that?" Deng asked. "I think the U.S. can't overtake [*gao bu guo* 搞不过] the Soviet Union," he concluded.¹⁷ This effectiveness of Leninist systems was what Deng liked and sought to enhance.

Although Deng expressed concerns about the overconcentration of power and the abuse of authority by leaders, saying in one of his most memorable passages, "If these systems are sound, they can place restraints on the actions of bad people; if they are unsound, they may hamper the efforts of good people or indeed, in certain cases, may push them in the wrong direction.... Stalin gravely damaged socialist legality, doing things which Comrade Mao Zedong once said would have been impossible in Western countries like Britain, France and the United States."¹⁸ But this seeming concern with system-building and constraints did not lead Deng, in Zhao's opinion, to consider, even for a moment, introducing a Western-style division of power. Deng was interested in administrative reform and raising administrative efficiency, not in checks and balances or in increasing societal inputs. As Zhao puts it, "Deng had points about the operation of the existing political system he was not happy about, and his proposals for reform were real.

But the reform he had in mind was not a real modernization of politics and democratization, but primarily a sort of administrative reform, [including] concrete reforms in the work system, the organization system, the method of work, and the style of work.”¹⁹

For instance, in 1988 Zhao suggested increasing the political participation of the democratic parties, but Deng adamantly opposed any party activities by the democratic parties in the context of the NPC. Individuals from the democratic parties could be promoted to administrative posts, but only as individuals, not as representatives of their parties.²⁰

When Deng raised the issue of political reform again in 1986–1987, it was in the context of the movement to oppose liberalization, so there was no intent to liberalize the political system. Indeed, Zhao maintains that Deng’s opposition to cultural liberalization (“spiritual pollution”) was rooted in his opposition to political liberalization.²¹ Deng’s concern in 1986–1987 and his endorsement of separating Party and State, was in raising the unity and efficiency of the administrative system, not in introducing checks and balances into the Party.²²

Zhao’s Relationship with Hu Yaobang

Zhao’s relationship with Hu Yaobang was critical in their carrying out reform and opening up in the 1980s, and it is clear from Zhao’s telling that the relationship was far from smooth. At the same time, Zhao is very sensitive to any suggestion that he may have undermined Hu or needlessly compounded Hu’s difficulties during the “Party life” meeting in January 1987 that ended Hu’s tenure as general secretary, charges that have been bruited for some years.

From Zhao’s telling, it is apparent that the two leaders had different approaches to economic issues as well as experiencing a variety of misunderstandings that seemingly could have been cleared up, or at least mitigated, with a few face-to-face meetings. Indeed, as a reader, one finds oneself thinking repeatedly, ‘why didn’t Hu and Zhao just get together and talk over these issues?’ There seem to have been no fundamental issues dividing the two leaders, although there were clear differences of opinion and temperament. Apparently the unwritten rules of Chinese politics forbid senior leaders from getting together informally to discuss issues. Such a prohibition is dysfunctional, as the relationship between Hu and Zhao suggests, but it also prevents the formation of factions, or the suspicion of factions, which could be even more debilitating.

The difference in attitudes toward economic development issues surfaced early. In 1981 Zhao gave the government work report emphasizing “economic efficiency,” a term that he hoped would begin to change China’s long-standing emphasis on growth at any cost. Hu Yaobang, however, continued to emphasize production and speed, and the issue was reflected upward to Deng Xiaoping, who sided with Zhao. What is interesting in terms of the ways leaders interacted, or did not interact, is Zhao’s statement that because he was not involved in writing the report for the 12th Party Congress, “I was not clear

about what views Yaobang had of his own and why he disagreed with the tone in my government work report.”²³ Because the issue did not come up at meetings of the Secretariat or Politburo Standing Committee, there was no forum for the two leaders to discuss their views. (Nor does Zhao explain why, despite Deng’s concurrence with Zhao’s views, the 12th Party Congress report called for quadrupling China’s GDP by the end of the century, a view endorsed by Hu).

Following the 12th Party Congress, when Hu Yaobang toured localities, as he frequently did, he sympathized with local leaders, supporting their plans and encouraging them to develop their economies quickly. They would then appeal to the State Council and State Planning Commission for funds and other resources, putting Zhao in a difficult position.²⁴

The greatest tension came in 1983 when Hu “used the methods of mass movements” to encourage economic development, such as promoting Baoding’s call to increase per capita rural income by 100 yuan per year. When Zhao went to Africa in early 1983, Hu Yaobang gave a report on urban reform, calling for implementing the contract responsibility system of the countryside in the cities, something Zhao felt was premature and wrong-headed. When Zhao returned from Africa he stopped these efforts, emphasizing that economic reform should undergo a process of trial implementation and incremental expansion. While Zhao was trying to calm things down, Hu Yaobang went to Hainan over the spring festival and scolded local leaders, saying, “What do you mean impulsive? You try to create a furor, but you can’t get one going!” (*yihong erqi? Shi hong ye hong bu dong* 一哄而起? 是轰也轰不动).²⁵

At the same time, Hu frequently criticized the economic work of the State Council, letting everyone know that he and Zhao had differences of opinion. This problem was quickly picked up by Deng, who on March 15, 1983, called Hu and Zhao to his house. After listening to Zhao and Hu, Deng agreed with Zhao, telling Hu that he talked too much about economics and was not sober enough in his pronouncements—a serious fault in a general secretary.²⁶ In order to prevent different views on economics within the Party, economic work should be managed by the State Council and the Central Finance and Economics Leadership Small Group (which Zhao headed).

This did not resolve all the tension, however. When major economic decisions were decided upon by the State Council, they still had to be ratified by the Politburo Standing Committee. Hu would consent, but afterward he complained to Hu Qili that he was forced to sign. Zhao says that he tried to improve communication by inviting Hu Qili and Hao Jianxiu from the Secretariat to attend meetings of the State Council and Finance and Economics Leadership Small Group and suggested that Hu Yaobang send people to these meetings. But Hu did not.²⁷

Hu Yaobang and “Bourgeois Liberalization”

Hu Yaobang and Zhao obviously had different views on economic work, but there was generally a division of labor between them, with Zhao focused on the economy and Hu

running the Party. Perhaps one area in which outside observers have been off in their judgment was the degree to which Deng opposed ideological or political liberalization. Certainly conservatives within the Party would provoke Deng by sending him materials about “bourgeois liberalization,” and, by Zhao’s telling, Deng was easily persuaded by such reports. But that was because Deng was himself ideologically conservative. He saw no contradiction between economic liberalization and maintaining tight controls ideologically.

Hu Yaobang knew Deng extremely well, their relationship dating back to the 1950s, so even if Hu disagreed with Deng over the issue of liberalization, as he apparently did, it is hard to imagine that he would repeatedly ignore Deng’s warnings. For instance, in 1984, Deng called Hu Qili in for a talk, saying that he wanted to discuss Hu Yaobang’s problem. Deng criticized Hu’s failure to deal decisively with such people as Guo Luoji, Hu Jiwei, and Wang Ruowang, and Hu’s overall failure to uphold the Four Cardinal Principles and oppose bourgeois liberalization. This laxity, Deng told Hu Qili, was a fundamental weakness in a general secretary. Deng asked Hu Qili to convey his message to Hu Yaobang, but the latter paid Deng’s warning no heed.²⁸

Certainly it did not stop Hu from allowing the Fourth Congress of the Writers’ Association (*zuo xie* 作协) to elect its own leadership without regard to Party preferences.²⁹ This congress, held in December 1984, was convened in the wake of the campaign against spiritual pollution and the writers were still resentful of that campaign. But Hu Yaobang nevertheless decided that the Organization Department would not interfere; the writers would be allowed to elect whomever they liked. Under these conditions, the writers threw out conservative leaders and elected a liberal slate, including investigative reporter Liu Binyan. In Zhao’s view, this congress was an opportunity for liberals to express their discontent with Deng’s campaign against bourgeois liberalism and made Deng think that Hu had tolerated or even encouraged it. As Zhao put it, “You simply cannot sing a tune contrary to Deng’s.”³⁰

Accordingly, in July 1985, Deng called in Hu Qili and Qiao Shi, telling them that they needed to pay attention to the question of liberalization. He went on to say that people like Wang Ruowang were waving the flag of Hu Yaobang to oppose the Party’s policies (in other words, the policies of Deng himself), and told them to tell Hu Yaobang to speak out more on the issue of liberalization.³¹

Zhao felt that, given Deng’s repeated admonitions, the Secretariat should have discussed the issue, with Hu then going to Deng’s house to confer on it. But after he suggested this to Hu, Hu simply went off to Xinjiang, and the suggested meeting never took place. Zhao concluded that Hu “never took this matter seriously.”³² Nevertheless, Zhao does hazard one guess as to Hu’s motivations. He suggests that perhaps Hu thought that if he had gone to talk with Deng, Deng would not have accepted his views, making Hu’s position even more untenable.³³ It was better to ignore Deng than to directly contradict him.

Zhao’s analysis seems on the mark. It is apparent that there was a deliberate effort

at the highest level to avoid personal confrontation. Deng did not call in Hu to express his views but asked others (Hu Qili and Qiao Shi) to convey them, and, similarly, Hu appears to have not wanted to talk directly with Deng and be put in the position of either accepting Deng's views or defying them. Apparently avoidance seemed like the best alternative to Hu. Zhao's tone, however, seems to suggest that he felt Hu was being simply not being politically smart; agreeing with Deng on opposition to bourgeois liberalization seemed a small price to pay for staying in office and pursuing the goals of reform and opening up—an implication that makes one wonder all the more about Zhao's own actions in 1989.

The other issue that seems to have influenced Deng's attitude toward Hu was Hu's 1985 interview with veteran journalist Lu Keng. When Deng met with Hu Qili and Qiao Shi in July 1985, he also pointed out that Hu's interview was really ridiculous (*buxiang yangzi* 不像样子).³⁴ Deng was incensed about the light tone that Hu adopted; Hu's apparent agreement with Lu Keng about the conservativeness of Chen Yun, Wang Zhen, Hu Qiaomu, and Deng Liqun; and his willingness to discuss the leadership of the Central Military Commission. Deng was incensed enough that he not only wanted Hu Qili and Qiao Shi to convey his feelings six months after the event, but also brought it up again with Yang Shangkun during the Beidaihe summer meetings in 1986.³⁵

Hu's Ouster

The decision to oust Hu, according to Zhao, was made by Deng Xiaoping while at Beidaihe in the summer of 1986. Deng told Yang Shangkun and others that he had made a serious mistake in his judgment of Hu Yaobang and said that Hu would step down as general secretary at the 13th Party Congress. Deng told Hu of this decision, but apparently presented it not as an ouster of Hu but rather as a rejuvenation of the leadership. At least when Hu told Zhao about it, he portrayed it as Deng retiring and Hu moving to the Central Advisory Commission. Hu, Zhao tells us, was not the least bit upset.³⁶

But the fact that Deng conveyed his decision to others changed the atmosphere in Beijing. Zhao notes that the attitude of senior leaders such as Yang Shangkun and Bo Yibo changed in obvious ways.³⁷ And this had ramifications for the drafting of the Resolution on Building Spiritual Civilization by the Sixth Plenary Session of the 13th Central Committee, which was held in September 1986. When the draft of the plenum resolution was circulated at Beidaihe, the elders objected vociferously. Deng Liqun even countered with his own draft. The initial draft was voted down by the elders. Finally, after much revision, a draft was produced that was at least minimally acceptable.³⁸

The controversy over the draft of this resolution led to a fascinating exchange showing that as tired as he was with Hu Yaobang, Deng Xiaoping was equally weary of Deng Liqun and Hu Qiaomu. The day before the plenum opened, the paramount leader called Deng Liqun to his house. Deng Liqun had several objections to the draft resolution, especially its dropping of the formulation "taking Communist ideology as the core,"

which had been used in the 12th Congress report. At one point, Deng Xiaoping said point blank, “You are trying to drag the document to the left,” which the younger Deng quickly denied.³⁹ Later Deng Xiaoping admonished, “You and Hu Qiaomu should not try to increase the differences and contradictions between Chen Yun and myself.”⁴⁰ Finally, Deng Xiaoping says, “Tomorrow, when the meeting opens, you should say only one sentence, that you completely approve of this draft.” Deng Liqun, always one to quibble, replies, “Is it all right if I say nothing?” to which the elder Deng agrees.⁴¹

The plenum itself was a disaster as Lu Dingyi, head of the propaganda department in the 1950s, suggested dropping the formulation “bourgeois liberalization” on the grounds that the Soviet Union had accused China of bourgeois liberalization in 1956 when it had adopted the “hundred flowers” policy.⁴² Hu Yaobang half-agreed with Lu, saying that indeed some people in the Party had abused the label “bourgeois liberalization.” This prompted Deng Xiaoping to say, “I have spoken most often on opposing bourgeois liberalization” and insist that the formulation stay in the resolution.⁴³ Deng may have already decided to remove Hu Yaobang as general secretary, but this episode must have made him even less patient.

Deng Loses His Temper and Hu Loses His Job

It was a bad time for Deng to lose patience. A disagreement over a people’s congress election in Anhui in November 1986 set off student demonstrations that swelled to over 50,000 in Shanghai. Deng was furious, and called leaders together (at his home, of course) to tell them that the student demonstrations were the result of years of laxity on the ideological front. Hu Yaobang’s position became untenable, and he returned home to write a letter of resignation.⁴⁴

Assuming that Zhao is correct that Deng had determined to remove Hu as general secretary at the 13th Party Congress, then Deng’s decision to remove Hu immediately appears more as a result of Deng’s anger than a thought-through decision that took into account the political ramifications. Prior to this moment, the “left” wing of the CCP was gradually losing momentum. The campaign against spiritual pollution had lasted only 28 days; economic reform was being implemented with good success, despite some inflation; and Deng Xiaoping had declined to see Hu Qiaomu in a long time.⁴⁵ This is confirmed by Deng Liqun, who notes that Hu had been “treated coldly” since 1985.⁴⁶ And, as we just saw, Deng was sharply critical of Deng Liqun and Hu Qiaomu. It was without question the decision to remove Hu and the ensuing campaign against bourgeois liberalization that revived the left and led, over time, to the tragic events of Tiananmen.

Zhao and the Ouster of Hu Yaobang

Zhao was long sensitive to suggestions that he unnecessarily added to the criticism of Hu Yaobang at the Party life meeting called in January 1987 to dismiss Hu as general secretary. The suggestion gained wide circulation with the publication of Wu Jiang’s *The*

Ten-Year Road (Shinian de lu 十年的路) in 1995, which says that Zhao had written a letter to Deng accusing Hu of various things. Zhao, obviously sensitive to his reputation among reformers, denied undermining Hu in his interview with Yang Jisheng, in his talks with Zong Fengming, and in his recently published memoir. Yet there are still questions about what Zhao said and what he meant. In his interview with Yang Jisheng, Zhao says, “I wrote one letter (and only one letter), and in it I merely discussed, in a general sense, issues related to the Party’s leadership system. I did not discuss matters related to Yaobang.”⁴⁷ The letter, which does not mention Hu, is reproduced in that interview, Zhao’s memoir, and elsewhere. It starts by saying, “Comrade Xiaoping: I am sending you a proposal by Heilongjiang province’s Chen Junsheng. Please read it.” What is curious is that in none of Zhao’s various discussions of this letter does he discuss the content of Chen Junsheng’s proposal, which is obviously critical to understanding Zhao’s letter. Was Chen critical of Hu? Did he call attention to receiving different instructions from Hu as general secretary and Zhao as head of the State Council? We do not know, but, since Zhao’s letter urges Deng and Chen Yun, who was copied on the letter, to “focus more of your energies on . . . [formulating] a leadership system essential to our Party, and personally supervise and urge the implementation of that system,”⁴⁸ Chen’s proposal must have had something to do with the lack of stability in relations in the Politburo Standing Committee.

Indeed, concerns over Hu’s behavior as general secretary, both at that moment in time and possibly in the future, must have prompted Zhao to discuss this letter at the Party life meeting. As Zhao recalls, he told Hu in his criticism that Hu “liked to startle people with his unconventional and unorthodox behavior, and refused to be restrained by organizational principles.” Zhao went on saying “you are already like this while the older people are still around. This may become a serious problem when, in future, the situation changes and your authority grows. . . . We are working together well today, but it is very difficult to say whether we will work together well if such a situation occurs in the future.” Zhao says that when he reached this point in his criticism he referred to the letter he had written Deng in 1984.⁴⁹ So Zhao’s 1984 letter must have been in the context of concerns over Hu’s behavior as general secretary.

Deng Liqun’s account largely parallels Zhao’s own telling, repeating that Zhao said that Hu was unrestrained by Party discipline, and that if Hu were like that now, then in the future, when Deng Xiaoping and Chen Yun were no longer around, “no one would be able to control him [*shei ye meiyou banfa* 谁也没有办法], he could do whatever he liked.” One need not accept Deng Liqun’s conclusion that Zhao was suggesting that Hu had dictatorial tendencies to accept his view that Zhao’s criticism of Hu Yaobang was more personal and critical of Hu than Zhao’s account would lead you to believe.⁵⁰

Zhao Ziyang as General Secretary

The Politburo meeting that formally accepted Hu Yaobang’s resignation also appointed Zhao as acting general secretary and set up a five-person group (Zhao Ziyang, Bo Yibo, Yang Shangkun, Wan Li, and Hu Qili) to take the place of the Politburo Standing

Committee in the months prior to the 13th Party Congress. The question, which Zhao's account does not adequately address, is why Zhao, having been critical of Hu's political acumen in not criticizing "bourgeois liberalism" and in needlessly offending conservative leaders, repeats many of Hu's mistakes and, indeed, was much more reckless as a leader than Hu. The answer must lie in Zhao's own confidence of his abilities and in his belief that he had Deng Xiaoping's full support.

Zhao started by restricting the scope of the campaign against "bourgeois liberalization" that unfolded following Hu's ouster. There was nothing Zhao could do to protect Liu Binyan, Fang Lizhi, and Wang Ruowang, who were made the targets of the media campaign. And some officials close to Hu Yaobang were certain to fall, including Zhu Houze, head of the Propaganda Department, Wei Jianxing, head of the Organization Department, and Ruan Chongwu, Minister of Public Security. As Zhao comments, conservatives were not comfortable unless such portfolios were in the hands of those familiar to them.⁵¹

But conservatives also went after Wang Meng, the liberal minister of Culture, and Zhao refused. Certainly the purging of Wang would have led to widespread concern both domestically and abroad about the direction of reform, but had not Zhao been suggesting that Hu had been naïve in protecting liberal intellectuals? He must have been conscious of the parallels between his own behavior and that of Hu before him. And yet he worked to protect a number of other liberal intellectuals as well, including Yu Guangyuan and Su Shaozhi. Zhao says he did this to prevent the leftists from expanding the scope of the movement, but in doing so he earned the enmity of the left, as he clearly understood.⁵²

In discussing this period, Zhao talks of how leftists would go places and say things like "Central Document Number Four [which outlined the scope of the movement] is a box tying our hands in opposing liberalization; it stifles the fighting spirit of activists and adds to the worries of those opposed to liberalization." Such criticism was intended to "create public opinion" and "apply pressure" on Zhao.⁵³ Clearly the "public opinion" being created was not among China's citizens, who have no role in the political system, but rather among high-level cadres, both retired and active, who, if given the chance, would try to create a movement that could change the direction of policy. The notion of "creating public opinion" suggests that there are networks that can be mobilized and potential allies who can be enlisted if they believe the political situation is trending in one direction or another. Such an image conflicts both with notions of ideological lines of divisions (perhaps implied in our common use of the terms "conservatives" and "reformers"), since mobilization presumably is aimed at those not already of one ideological bent or another; and with notions of factional conflict, since factions are presumed to be fixed rather than potentially mobilizable opinion groups. So, China's political system may have been a top-down authoritarian system, but clearly there was scope for opinion among high-level cadres to be mobilized, thus confronting top leaders, including Deng, with potentially irresistible pressure. One of Zhao's jobs was to curb such activities and resist such pressures so that they would not build unstoppable momentum.

The way Zhao did this was, first and foremost, by gaining Deng's support. On April 28, he had a long talk with Deng in which he reported (*huibao* 汇报) on the campaign against bourgeois liberalization. Zhao stressed that the atmosphere had already changed and that liberalization was no longer dominating. Then he added that some people were using the campaign against bourgeois liberalization to oppose reform, and this atmosphere was incompatible with the stress on reform and opening up that was to be adopted in the upcoming 13th Party Congress. Having secured Deng's support, Zhao gave a talk on May 13 at a conference of propaganda, news, and Party School cadres that emphasized the success the Party had had in changing the atmosphere and the need to push forward reform and opening up.⁵⁴ The essence of Zhao's remarks was summarized in two editorials that appeared in *People's Daily*, signaling to the Party that the focus of Party propaganda was changing.⁵⁵ This was a way of announcing that the issue had been decided at the top, and thus stopping the mobilization of opinion.

Although there is every reason to believe that Deng would have recognized the need to have a Party congress that would support reform and opening up, Zhao was clearly putting himself in the conservatives' crosshairs.

The 13th Party Congress and After

In the preparatory work for the 13th Party Congress, Zhao suggested that Deng Liqun enter the Politburo, "to give him a voice, a place to air his views,"⁵⁶ but not be allowed to enter the Secretariat or to take charge of ideological work. In response to Li Rui's letter mentioned above, Deng decided to remove Deng Liqun from control of propaganda and announced this decision in a July 7th meeting of the five-person group (held in his house, of course). The meeting also dissolved the Research Office of the Secretariat that Deng Liqun had long used to collect material to be used against others and to produce material casting doubt on reform. Deng Xiaoping still supported Deng Liqun's entering the Politburo, but it would have been a much diminished Deng Liqun.⁵⁷

When the 13th Party Congress met in October, Deng Liqun failed to be elected to the Central Committee (the 13th Party Congress, in a first, had more candidates for the Central Committee than seats). Deng then failed to be elected to the Standing Committee of the Central Advisory Committee. Zhao's memoirs suggest that he had nothing to do with the rejection of Deng Liqun—"for many years he [Deng Liqun] had set a tone opposed to reform and opening up and it did not appeal to people, so in the preliminary election for the 13th Central Committee, Deng Liqun lost"⁵⁸. But Deng Liqun says that the abolition of the Research Office was intended to muddy his reputation and he accuses Zhao of sending people to Hubei, Liaoning, Shanghai, Guizhou, and elsewhere to encourage people to vote against him.⁵⁹

Deng Liqun feigns disinterest in holding office—"I had no reaction or unhappiness to losing the election [for Central Committee] at all"—but he argues that the abolition of the Research Office ended up helping his cause. With Song Ping's help he was able to place his people in influential positions in such places as the Party Building

Research Office of the Central Organization Department and the CCP Policy Research Office.⁶⁰

Zhao's actions—the abolition of the Research Office, preventing the election of Deng Liqun, the closing of Red Flag—angered elders like Chen Yun, Wang Zhen, and Li Xiannian. As Zhao recalls, “They thought that I did what Hu Yaobang only thought about doing, but never did. . . . Therefore, they turned their opposition to me.”⁶¹ Zhao comments that “at the time, I did not think these things would have such a big impact.”⁶² If he really thought that, he was incredibly naïve. More probably, he carried out these measures with Deng Xiaoping's full support—as Deng Liqun comments, “Deng Xiaoping was not happy with me”—and expected that support to be sufficient to stifle the anger of the other elders.

At the time preparations were going on for the 13th Party Congress, Deng Xiaoping decided that Zhao would continue to head the Finance and Economics Leadership Small Group (*caijing lingdao xiaozu* 财经领导小组) so that he could continue to lead economic work after Li Peng took over as premier.⁶³ But this plan ran aground as inflation forced the government to adopt a policy of “rectification and reform” (*zhili zhengdun* 治理整顿) in the fall of 1988. Li Peng and Yao Yilin were then able to concentrate power in the State Council, undercutting Zhao's ability to lead the economy. In addition, some elders argued that Zhao was now general secretary and should not interfere in the economy, so the State Council was able to successfully hollow out (*jiakong* 架空) Zhao's authority.⁶⁴

By the fall of 1988, Zhao's position was precarious. The inflation of the summer and the implementation of reform and rectification suggested that there were major problems in the economy (Zhao felt the problems were not so severe) and questions were raised about the responsibility for the economic problems (suggesting that Zhao bore responsibility). Several elders wrote to Deng demanding that Zhao be removed⁶⁵, and there was soon a full-bore effort to dump Zhao (*dao Zhao feng* 倒赵风).⁶⁶ Despite this effort, according to Zhao, Deng continued to support him. Deng said on many occasions that the personnel arrangements could not be changed and even that Zhao should serve two terms as general secretary.⁶⁷

Tiananmen

The politics leading up to Zhao's ouster during the spring student movement has to be understood against the background of political contestation since Hu Yaobang's ouster and particularly since the Third Plenary Session of the 13th Central Committee that implemented the policy of reform and rectification and touched off the movement to topple Zhao. Zhao's political position was weak as China entered the new year. Li Peng and Yao Yilin were effectively able to exclude Zhao from economic work (much as Zhao had previously done to Hu Yaobang), and conservatives were accusing Zhao both of pursuing bourgeois liberalization and of mismanagement of the economy. Zhao claims he still had Deng's support—Deng told Li Peng in early 1989 that Zhao should serve two

terms as general secretary⁶⁸—but the rest of the political establishment was increasingly lined up against Zhao.

Zhao might have been able to maintain Deng's support and control over the government's response to the student movement if he had not had to go to North Korea, but not going would have signaled political crisis in China. Prior to his departure, Zhao raised three points regarding the handling of the student movement:⁶⁹

Following the memorial meeting [for Hu Yaobang] social life should return to normal; we should discourage (*quanzu* 劝阻) students from demonstrating and let them resume classes.

We should use persuasion to guide (*shudao* 疏导) the students, opening up multiple channels and various forms of dialogue (*duihua* 对话), mutually communicate, and listen to their views. The students, teachers, and intellectuals should be allowed to air whatever views they have.

No matter what, we should avoid bloodshed. But unlawful behavior such as beating, smashing, looting, and burning, should be punished according to law.

Zhao makes a point that these views were accepted by all members of the PBSC, including Li Peng, and that they were put into writing.⁷⁰ Zhao repeated these views to Li Peng when Li accompanied him to the train station on April 23rd to leave for North Korea. Li Peng reported these views to Deng Xiaoping, who reportedly agreed.⁷¹

Of course, no sooner had Zhao left Beijing than hardliners began to take over. The evening of Zhao's departure, Beijing Party secretary Li Ximing and Beijing mayor Chen Xitong appealed to Wan Li, chairman of the People's Congress, to convene a meeting of the PBSC to listen to their report. Wan, whose views on the student movement paralleled Zhao's, was taken in by Li and Chen, and forwarded their request to Li Peng. Li, who was acting in Zhao's place in the latter's absence, convened a meeting on the evening of the 24th. It was this meeting that defined the nature of the student movement as an "anti-Party, anti-socialist conspiracy that was organized and planned."⁷² And it was that view that was accepted by Deng Xiaoping in a meeting the following night and subsequently written into the infamous April 26th editorial.

Deng had previously accepted Zhao's moderate response to the student movement but then readily accepted the harsher characterization of the movement favored by Li Peng. Why? Zhao attributes this about-face to Deng's fundamentally agreeing with the hard-line views of Li Peng and others. Deng had accepted Zhao's views on the 19th, but he had "always advocated hard tactics" against the student movement, so needed little persuasion to agree with Li's views. The presentation of some of the student attacks on Deng only aggravated him more.⁷³ It was Zhao who was pushing against Deng's nature, and without him there, constantly presenting his case, Deng reverted naturally to his hard-line views.

Zhao returned to Beijing on April 30 and worked to moderate the government's hard-line approach. He sought a meeting with Deng, but Deng was not feeling well and wanted to rest before his meeting with Gorbachev.⁷⁴ So Zhao was on his own. On May 3rd he talked with Yang Shangkun. Yang thought that convincing Deng to change the April 26th editorial would be very difficult, so they agreed that it would be better to calm things down by simply not talking about the editorial anymore. Zhao's May 4th speech to the Asian Development Bank (ADB), in which he affirmed the students' love of China and support for reform, was written in this vein. Wan Li, Yang Shangkun, Peng Zhen, Hu Qili, and Qiao Shi all supported Zhao's efforts.⁷⁵

The critical turning point occurred sometime between May 4th, when Zhao's efforts still had an outside chance of succeeding, and May 17th, when he met with Deng Xiaoping and other leaders. Two things happened in this period. First, the student movement—which had begun to wane—took on new life as the hunger strike was launched on the 13th. This would lead to conservative charges that it was Zhao's speech to the ADB that had precipitated a new upsurge in the movement because of its lax attitude. The second, clearly decisive event came on May 16 when Zhao met with visiting Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. On a live television feed, Zhao told Gorbachev that the First Plenary Session of the 13th Central Committee had resolved to refer important issues to Deng Xiaoping. Zhao argues in his memoirs that he did this because Deng had reminded him two days earlier that it was his (Deng's) meeting with Gorbachev that marked the restoration of party-to-party ties and because he routinely told foreign leaders that Deng's role as the major decision-maker in the CCP had not changed.⁷⁶

By all accounts, including Zhao's, this public comment deeply angered Deng, who felt Zhao was putting the responsibility for the student movement on Deng. Even those sympathetic to Zhao have been at a loss to explain this comment. In his memoir, Zhao tries to explain his actions and argue that he was trying to protect, not hurt, Deng. Whatever Zhao's intent, there is no question that Deng was deeply angered and that this marked a final turning point in their relationship.

Thus, when Zhao met Deng on the 17th in a final effort to explain his views, Deng was adamant. Although Zhao had hoped for a private audience, Deng had summoned the other members of the PBSC as well as Yang Shangkun. As Zhao notes, this was obviously not a meeting simply to listen to Zhao's views.⁷⁷

Zhao articulated his views, including his request that the April 26th editorial be changed. He could see that Deng's expression was impatient.⁷⁸ When Zhao was finished, Li Peng and Yao Yilin stood up and criticized Zhao, blaming the worsening situation on Zhao's May 4th speech. Zhao comments that "from the no-holds-barred attack of these two on me it can be seen that they had already reached a secret agreement with Deng."⁷⁹ Hu Qili supported Zhao, and Qiao Shi made no clear expression of his views. Yang Shangkun did not agree with changing the editorial and raised the possibility of martial law, a proposal that he had previously opposed. Finally Deng decreed that the April 26th editorial was correct and that the problem lay in Zhao's May 4th talk. Martial law would be declared and Li Peng, Yang Shangkun, and Qiao Shi would take charge of

implementing it.⁸⁰ From that moment on, Zhao was effectively out of power.

Conclusion

Zhao's account of his time as premier contains no startling revelations about political twists and turns that were not evident at the time, but his testimony about life at, or near, the top of the political system does provide new detail and a better sense of how power worked in China in that period.

The Deng Xiaoping who emerges from these pages is a stubborn person, at least when he had his mind made up. In one of his interviews with Yang Jisheng, Zhao says of the critical May 17th meeting that "Deng might have imposed military control even if all five [Politburo Standing Committee (PBSC) members] had disapproved." It might have been possible to push Deng, but only so far. And that, generally speaking, was a good thing for reform. Most of the "eight immortals" (Chen Yun, Peng Zhen, Li Xiannian, Wan Li, Yang Shangkun, Bo Yibo, Wang Zhen, and Deng Xiaoping) were conservative. Wan Li was easily the most open-minded—so much so that the others opposed his joining the PBSC in 1987—and Yang Shangkun was moderate (but mostly just close to Deng). The others were quite conservative, and their influence in the economic system was extensive. They also supported Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun, who oversaw the ideology system. And there were many indications that the Party organization as a whole was quite conservative. For instance, after Zhao gave his May 4th speech, He Dongchang, with apparent support from Li Peng, told university Party secretaries that Zhao had been speaking for himself. As Zhao explains, "university Party committees had been quite despondent after the demonstration, and they too wanted to stick adamantly to the line of the April 26 editorial." In short, this was a very conservative leadership and political system, and Deng's dominance and stubbornness were critical to the continuing deepening of reform and opening up throughout the 1980s.

To say that the system was dominated by Deng and that he could be a very stubborn person is not to say that there was not room in the system for other views, much less political maneuvering intended to shape the political system. Indeed, much of Zhao's memoir describes personal alliances and efforts to change the political dynamic. Long-standing alliances, such as that between Deng Liqun and Wang Zhen, could be mobilized at later points in time, and new alliances could be created, such as when Deng Liqun used the research office of the Central Secretariat to propagandize Chen Yun's economic thinking in 1980. Networks could be mobilized on behalf of causes, such as Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun trying to push the 1987 campaign against bourgeois liberalization farther than Zhao (and apparently Deng Xiaoping) wanted. The effort was intended, as Zhao puts it, to "create public opinion."

Indeed, the irony that Zhao's memoir underscores is the tension between Deng Xiaoping's insistence on a hierarchical, efficient, autocratic system and the reality that China's system was riddled with political tensions. Deng clearly despised the checks and balances built into Western political systems, but he nevertheless accepted the rivalries

that existed throughout the upper reaches of the Chinese political system. Indeed, these competing interests may have been accepted by Deng as part of an effort to include and balance different personalities and views. But the oligarchical array of interests represented at the highest level meant that those tensions would be replayed at lower levels. Hu Yaobang was general secretary of the Party, but the Secretariat, which oversaw the implementation of Politburo decisions, had a research office dominated by Deng Liqun, who rarely, if ever, agreed with Hu Yaobang. If that were not enough, even Deng Liqun had to put up with rival camps in his own research office. The tensions between Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang appear to have been structurally determined, at least in part. After all, the premier and the State Council have primary responsibility for overseeing the economy, but the Party is in charge of everything. So it is hardly surprising that Hu Yaobang wanted to be involved in economic management, whether through calling for using the contract system in the cities (when Zhao was in Africa), through demanding reports from various ministries, or through granting resources to local authorities when he toured the provinces, which he did often. These problems were exacerbated by personality differences, and of course had to be mediated by Deng Xiaoping.

Even as general secretary, Zhao Ziyang could not decide on the people surrounding him. As he told Yang Jisheng, “People at my level could not decide important personnel matters. . . . Matters could be decided once Xiaoping and Chen Yun reached unanimity of opinions. Deng Xiaoping would move a person up if the latter pleased him. If not, he would take him down. . . . When I was general secretary, could I touch the chief of the Organization Department? Could I touch the chief of the Propaganda Department? No, I couldn’t. I was highly dissatisfied with Wang Renzhi, head of the Propaganda Department, and I even scolded him once. But I could only scold him, not replace him, because he had some people’s support.”⁸¹ So the “checks and balances” that Deng disliked about democratic countries were incorporated into the bureaucratic structure of China’s highest-level decision-making bodies. Unfortunately for China, these rivalries resulted in tragedy in 1989.

Although Zhao’s account of politics in the 1980s and the events surrounding the Tiananmen crackdown add detail and nuance to our understanding of these events, his account sheds surprisingly little light on his own personality. Certainly we get insight into Zhao as a person who constantly learns as he oversees China’s economy, and we see him in his post-Tiananmen life arguing tenaciously about the restrictions he is under, but he never comments on how he finds himself following Hu Yaobang’s path of supporting liberal intellectuals and making enemies of the left. Zhao clearly understood Deng’s conservative ideological views and was critical of Hu’s political naïveté, but he never comments about the tensions he might have felt in keeping economic reform going on the one hand and efforts to curtail liberal thought on the other.

Perhaps this lacuna is related to Zhao’s presentation of self in the narrative. In the years Zhao was under house arrest he gave numerous interviews to friends and associates and then made the tape recordings this volume is based on. There is no doubt that in these various talks Zhao is speaking to history. He wants to present his side of the story, and he

would be less than human if he did not present himself in a favorable light. The story of Zhao is a good one; his contributions to Chinese economic reform are enormous, and someday he will be remembered well in China. But he was also a politician, operating at the highest levels of the Chinese political system, and, as his memoirs amply show, there were lots of maneuverings going on. In his memoirs, Zhao is largely above such maneuverings, presenting himself as always trying to do the right thing. But there are areas that will continue to be questioned. One is his criticism of Hu Yaobang in January 1987. It appears that Zhao's role was not as innocent as he presents it to be. Another is his remark to Gorbachev about the Party's "secret resolution" to refer decisions to Deng Xiaoping. Zhao vigorously denies any intent to pressure Deng, but many observers in China read his statement as precisely that (as did Deng, who was apparently furious at Zhao's remarks). And there are the omissions in his memoirs. Zhao touches on but does not give details of his call in May 1988 for a "new socialist order," something that seemed to have a much more authoritarian content as it was reported by the Hong Kong media at the time than anything Zhao mentions. And there is the intriguing near absence of discussion of "neo-authoritarianism," which Zhao clearly supported in 1988–1989. A discussion of neo-authoritarianism might make Zhao appear less eager for political reform than he does in his book.

Finally, Zhao's *Gaige licheng* was published in Chinese and English on the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen crackdown. Presumably those involved in compiling and publishing the manuscript hoped that it would re-ignite discussion in China about those events and about political reform. To the extent that this observer can determine, there has been almost no interest in Zhao's memoirs among Chinese intellectuals. Perhaps there will be someday, but such a re-evaluation will have to await a time when political reform has greater and more urgent saliency.

Zhao, perhaps naturally, resents Deng's lack of flexibility, particularly on the issues of political reform and his handling of the Tiananmen demonstrations, but Zhao was well aware of Deng's disciplinary nature long before the spring of 1989. After all, he depicts Hu Yaobang as naïve in his failure either to read Deng's concerns about bourgeois liberalism or at least to yield to those concerns (by expelling a few people from the Party) in the interest of the larger cause of reform and opening up. However, almost as soon as Zhao replaces Hu, he begins doing much the same thing. He curtails the 1987 campaign against bourgeois liberalization, he protects intellectuals, he abolishes Deng Liqun's research office, he allows (or orchestrates, depending on one's interpretation) Deng Liqun not to be elected to the 13th Central Committee, and, worst of all, pushes for price reform at a time of inflationary pressures (perhaps trying to please Deng). By the time the spring of 1989 rolls around, Zhao is in the uncomfortable position of either taking a hard-line approach, which would have encouraged a new and more virulent campaign against bourgeois liberalization and slowed down if not stopped the reform program, possibly making him irrelevant or even the latest victim of a political purge, or of trying a more liberal approach, which he must have known from the outset would be going against Deng's nature. Perhaps Zhao really did morally abhor the idea of calling in the troops—there is no reason to question his principled stand on this—but his political position perhaps made taking this moral stand easier.

Notes

¹ Hong Kong: New Century Media and Consulting, Ltd., 2009. For purposes of tone, this paper relies exclusively on the Chinese edition. All citations from it are my translations.

² *Prisoner of the State: The Secret Journal of Premier Zhao Ziyang*, trans. and ed. by Bao Pu, Renee Chang, and Adi Ignatius (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2009).

³ Bo Yibo, *Ruogan zhongda juece yu shijiande huigu* [Reminiscences of several important decisions and events] (Beijing: Zhongyang dangxiao chubanshe, 2 vols., 1991 and 1993); Li Rui, *Lushan huiyi shilu* [Veritable record of the Lushan plenum] (Hong Kong: Chuanqiu, 1989); Wu Lengxi, *Shinian lunzhan* [The ten-year polemic] (Beijing: Zhongyang wenxian chubanshe, 1999); and Chang Kuo-t'ao, *The Rise of the Chinese Communist Party, 1928–1938*, 2 vols. (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1971–72).

⁴ Yang Jiseheng, *Zhongguo gaige niandai de zhengzhi douzheng* [Political struggles in the age of reform in China] (Hong Kong: Excellent Culture Press, 2004); and Zong Fengming, *Lixiang, Xinnian, chuiqiu* [Ideals, beliefs, and strivings] (Hong Kong: Liqiu shiye, 2005).

⁵ Deng Liqun, *Deng Liqun zishu: Shi'er ge chunqiu (1975–1987)* [Oral account by Deng Liqun: Chronicle of twelve years, 1975–1987], 2 vols. (unpublished edition for the solicitation of comments).

⁶ Zhao Ziyang, *Gaige licheng*, p. 224.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ *Gaige*, p. 133.

⁹ *Gaige*, p. 224.

¹⁰ *Gaige*, p. 265.

¹¹ *Gaige*, p. 135.

¹² *Gaige*, p. 222.

¹³ *Gaige*, p. 276.

¹⁴ Deng Liqun, *Shi'er ge chunqiu*, vol. 2, pp. 535–536.

¹⁵ *Gaige*, p. 276.

¹⁶ *Gaige*, p. 274.

¹⁷ *Gaige*, p. 275.

¹⁸ Quoted in *Gaige*, p. 316. See also *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping (1975–1982)* (Beijing, Foreign Languages Press, 1984), p. 316.

¹⁹ *Gaige*, p. 271.

²⁰ *Gaige*, pp. 275 and 279.

²¹ *Gaige*, p. 274.

²² *Gaige*, p. 276.

²³ *Gaige*, p. 127.

²⁴ *Gaige*, p. 128.

²⁵ *Gaige*, p. 129.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ *Gaige*, pp. 130–131.

²⁸ *Gaige*, p. 184.

²⁹ *Gaige*, p. 185.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ *Gaige*, p. 184.

³² *Gaige*, pp. 184–85.

³³ *Gaige*, p. 185.

³⁴ *Gaige*, p. 188.

³⁵ *Gaige*, p. 189.

³⁶ *Gaige*, pp. 187 and 191–192.

³⁷ *Gaige*, p. 189.

³⁸ *Gaige*, p. 190.

³⁹ Deng Liqun, *Deng Liqun zixu: Shi'er ge chunqiu*, vol. 2, p. 614.

⁴⁰ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 615.

⁴¹ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 616.

⁴² Ibid., vol. 2, p. 622.

⁴³ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 625.

- ⁴⁴ *Gaige*, pp. 192–193.
- ⁴⁵ *Gaige*, p. 220.
- ⁴⁶ Deng Liqun, vol. 2, p. 530.
- ⁴⁷ Yang Jisheng, *Zhongguo gaige niandai de zhengzhi douzheng* (Hong Kong: Excellent Culture Press, 2004), Appendix One, “*Yi fang Zhao Ziyang*” [First interview with Zhao Ziyang], p. 577.
- ⁴⁸ *Gaige*, pp. 198–199.
- ⁴⁹ *Gaige*, p. 200.
- ⁵⁰ Deng Liqun, *Deng Liqun zixu: Shi'er ge chunqiu*, vol. 2, pp. 681–682.
- ⁵¹ *Gaige*, p. 216.
- ⁵² *Gaige*, pp. 213–216.
- ⁵³ *Gaige*, 210–211.
- ⁵⁴ *Gaige*, p. 218.
- ⁵⁵ The editorials were published in *Renmin Ribao* on May 17 and 22. The text of Zhao’s May 13th speech was subsequently published in *Renmin Ribao* on July 9. See “Speech at a Meeting of Propaganda, Theoretical, Press, and Party School Cadres,” *Xinhua*, July 8, 1987, trans. FBIS, July 8, 1987, pp. K1–8.
- ⁵⁶ *Gaige*, p. 221.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁸ *Gaige*, p. 222.
- ⁵⁹ Deng Liqun, *Deng Liqun zixu*, vol. 2, pp. 720–721.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 718.
- ⁶¹ *Gaige*, p. 223.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*
- ⁶³ *Gaige*, pp. 235 and 257.
- ⁶⁴ *Gaige*, pp. 246, 257–258.
- ⁶⁵ *Gaige*, p. 259.
- ⁶⁶ *Gaige*, pp. 261–265.
- ⁶⁷ *Gaige*, p. 265.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁹ *Gaige*, p. 25.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁷¹ *Gaige*, p. 26.
- ⁷² *Gaige*, p. 28.
- ⁷³ *Gaige*, pp. 29–30.
- ⁷⁴ *Gaige*, p. 37.
- ⁷⁵ *Gaige*, pp. 38–39.
- ⁷⁶ *Gaige*, pp. 66–67.
- ⁷⁷ *Gaige*, p. 47.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁰ *Gaige*, p. 48.
- ⁸¹ Yang Jisheng, *Zhongguo gaige niandai*, Appendix 2, “*Zai fang Zhao Ziyang*” [Second interview with Zhao Ziyang], p. 592.