UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND

THE EMERGENCE OF THE "JIANG ZEMIN ERA": LEGITIMACY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLITCAL THEORY OF "NEO-CONSERVATISM" – 1989-1995

A Dissertation submitted by

David Rolls, BA, Grad Dip Ed (Sec), MA

In fulfillment of the requirements

For the award of Doctor of Philosophy (Asian Studies)

2004

ABSTRACT

This research addresses the establishment of the "Jiang Zemin Era" whereby Jiang Zemin, and the Chinese Communist Party, have attempted to re-legitimise the Party and have attempted to make the Party meaningful to the Chinese populace. What is fundamental to this research is how Jiang Zemin, as the "core leader" of the third generational leadership, incorporated the political thought of neo-conservatism (*xin baoshouzhuyi*) into the framework of Marxist-Leninist-Mao Zedong Thought (MLM) ideology in order to re-legitimise the CCP. The timeframe within the research is from Jiang's appointment as the General Secretary of the CCP in 1989 until 1995. It is important that this was a time period whereby Jiang had to consolidate, and therefore legitimise, his "core leadership", and provide a theoretical platform in order to bring forth his own "era".

The research is predominantly a historiographical narrative, utilising both primary and secondary sources, that examines the mechanisms Jiang utilised in order to create a strong government, with himself as the "core", which pursued increased levels of marketisation.

Indeed, after being appointed General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party in 1989, Jiang Zemin had to achieve two goals in order to sustain and legitimate his position as "*the core of the third generational leadership*". First, he had to secure his position as "the core" through the creation of secured networks and alliances as well as legitimise of his "informal"

and "formal" positions in the CCP hierarchy. In order to achieve this, Jiang had to first create a sustainable power base in order to retain, and therefore legitimise, his formalized positions as General Secretary of the CCP, Chairman of the Chinese Military Commission and the Presidency. In addition, he needed to be able to create alliances with both allies and protégés as well as differing power factions, be they conservative/elder or reformist, and with other leading figures like Li Peng and Zhu Rongji. Second, in order to further reinforce and legitimize his position as "the core", Jiang had to develop his own "theoretical framework" for governing the country – much as Mao and Deng had done previously.

Therefore, the research also examines Jiang's usage of the neo-conservatism as a means of not only legitimising the CCP's ideological framework but also as a means of providing his own "guiding thought", thus enabling him to establish his own "era". Indeed, after establishing himself as the "core" through the aforementioned processes, Jiang had to develop such a theoretical framework that complimented Deng's economic reforms, especially as he was designated by Deng, yet one that retained a smattering of Mao Zedong's "Thoughts" that could be applied pragmatically during the 1990s.

It can be seen that Jiang Zemin successfully incorporated the political thought of "neo-conservatism" within his platform in order to achieve these ends – including the establishment of a "Jiang Zemin Era". This political thought, a successor to the political theory of "neo-authoritarianism", already had several

adherents within the higher echelons of the CCP. Indeed, it would be Jiang's 1995 speech, entitled "Stressing Politics", that would signify the incorporation of neo-conservatism within Jiang's platform of (self) legitimation that would initiate the successful implementation of a "Jiang Zemin Era".

CERTIFICATE OF DISSERTATION

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses, software and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

_____   _____

Signature of Candidate   Date

ENDORSEMENT

_____   _____

Signature of Supervisor   Date

_____   _____

Signature of Supervisor   Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my primary supervisor, Professor Don McMillen, for his support over the many years. Without his guidance, wisdom, encouragement and practical support this thesis may never had eventuated.

In addition, I would like to thank my second supervisor, Professor Colin Mackerras (Griffith University), for his guidance and wise comments over the years.

As well, I would like to thank friends, family and my partner for supporting me in this enterprise, and more so, having faith that I could complete it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought (MLM) is still the official ideology in the People's Republic of China (PRC). However, due to the increasing modernisation of the Chinese economy, with its capitalist orientations under the banner of "socialism with Chinese characteristics", it appears that the elite political actors within the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) no longer adhere to Marxist or Leninist doctrine and are no longer inspired by Mao Zedong Thought. Therefore, although MLM retains its official status as the state's ideology, MLM within contemporary China is viewed as being an "ideological vacuum". As such, there are arguments that the CCP has lost its legitimacy to rule China. Indeed, China observers reacted to the 1989 Tiananmen Incident as an example of the CCP's inherent lack of legitimacy.

Since 1989, however, the CCP has attempted to re-legitimise the Party and has attempted to make the Party meaningful to the Chinese populace. As Fewsmith (2001, p.88) notes: "to state that ideology plays a diminished role in the present era is not to say it plays no role, a mistake frequently made". What is evident is that the CCP has incorporated the political theory of neo-conservatism (*xin baoshouzhuyi*) into the framework of the MLM ideology in order the re-legitimise the CCP, especially during the tenure of Jiang Zemin's "core leadership" of the third generational leadership[1].

---

[1] The "first generation" was based on the leadership of Mao Zedong, the "second generation" was based on the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, the third on Jiang Zemin and the current "fourth generational leadership" under Hu Jintao.

It could be argued that the incorporation of the political theory of neo-conservatism enabled Jiang to legitimise the Party and ensure its survival. Jiang fashioned an ideology that retained Marxism-Leninism ideals, and which could be relevant for China in the new millennium. Furthermore, as Jiang commandeered the three highest positions in China - namely General Secretary of the CCP, Chairman of the Chinese Military Commission (CMC) and the Presidency - it appeared that with the creation of this new hybrid ideology that there was an emergence of a "Jiang Zemin Era"; an era which Sinologists were heralding even before the February 1997 death of the Deng Xiaoping, the unofficial leader of China.

It is important to note that there could not be a "Jiang Zemin Era" without an orchestrated platform of goals. In addition, there could not be a "Jiang Zemin Era" without an incorporation of another political discourse, albeit unofficially, within the framework of the Party's official ideology of MLM.

This was necessary nominally for two reasons. First, as the appointed successor by Deng Xiaoping, Jiang could not adroitly continue Deng's fundamentally economic drive to modernisation without substantial changes. This is because without changes to Deng's pragmatic economic legacy, accusations could arise that Jiang was merely another somewhat ill-fated Hua Guofeng[2]. In addition, after the 1989 Tiananmen Incident, there were still some stalwarts within the CCP who were ideologically against the promotion of the

---

[2] This statement is in reference to Mao's last designated heir who continued to pursue Mao's ambitious, but eventually chaotic, "class struggle" until being overthrown by Deng in 1978-79.

economy over the furthering of China's "politicalisation". For Jiang to initially champion Deng's economic drive would alienate him from the conservative faction within the CCP thus hampering any chance of his securing any power within the factions of the CCP. Second, nor could Jiang characterise his power with a resurgence of Maoist dogma in an attempt to reinvigorate China with ideological themes reminiscent of the "class struggle" experienced during the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976). Purely concentrating only on Marxist politics, it was deemed, would destabilise the successful economic "open-door" and modernisation policies initiated by Deng. Furthermore, as Deng's successor, such a push to the ideological left could not be undertaken whilst Deng was still alive.

Therefore, with his appointment as General Secretary in 1989, Jiang was in the perilous position of harmonising Mao's excessive "leftism", in order to appease the conservative faction within the CCP, with Deng's excessive "rightism", in order to appease the reformist faction. Indeed, it would appear that Jiang successfully oscillated between both camps during the period under study (1989 – 1995). Essentially, to institute a "Jiang Zemin Era", an ideological "balance" needed to be created that absorbed the best features of both Mao and Deng. Therefore a new political discourse was required that incorporated centralism and strong government (which were central elements of the "Mao Era") as well as establishing capitalistic-orientated economic policies and a market economy (which were central elements of the "Deng Era"). Furthermore, Jiang needed to be able to successfully utilise theses features without

undermining the legacies of either Mao or Deng. This is because undermining the legacies of Mao and/or Deng would create a Chinese Communist Party that contradicted its own purposes. It would appear, then, that the most appropriate features, given the demands and "agenda" of the day, of Mao's and Deng's legacies were entwined in the central tenets of the political theory of neo-conservatism.

Indeed, Pye (2001) is incorrect to categorise elite politics in the "Jiang Era" as "contradictory", yet easily label Mao's China as "an essence of sovereignty of ideology", and Deng's China as being "captured by the concepts of pragmatism". Oscillations in policy occurred in the Mao and Deng eras just as much as in the Jiang Era. The Jiang Era encapsulated a period of consolidation and neo-conservatism.

It is an objective of this thesis to examine the influence of the political theory of neo-conservatism in the establishing of a "Jiang Zemin Era", and how pivotal this theory has been in the re-legitimisation of the CCP. The period under study is from Jiang's appointment as General Secretary in 1989 until 1995. The period can be defined as one of "pre-mortem succession" (as defined by Dittmer, 2001), whereby Deng and other elders still controlled power outside the legitimate political institutions, and Jiang had to establish himself as the "core leader", maintain a power base, appease the Party elders, and provide the Party with an ideological outlook. It was Jiang's speech on "Stressing Politics"[3]

---

[3] The full title of Jiang's speech was *Leaders Must Stress Politics*, the terminology of "Stressing Politics" is used for brevity.

that revealed he had provided the Party with an ideological outlook. This speech, neo-conservative in nature, heralded the beginning of the "Jiang Zemin Era".

THE POLICAL THEORY OF NEO-CONSERVATISM

The theory of neo-conservatism emerged as a notable discourse in China in 1989 and constituted the adapted theory of the political discourse of neo-authoritarianism that made inroads in China from 1986-1989. Both theories are quite similar in their central tenets of a strong government and a market economy. Furthermore, both theories follow the developments of Asia's "mini-dragons" before the 1997 Asian economic slowdown, notably in South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore. These countries' economic developments were contrasted with the economic development that was taking place in China during the time, as it was believed that the rapid economic development that had occurred within these countries was a product of authoritarian, or quasi-authoritarian, regimes that were deemed similar to the system of governance in China.

However, there are three fundamental differences between the two discourses. First, neo-authoritarianism, while recognising the importance of a strong government, evidently placed more importance of the creation of a market economy; whilst the political theory of neo-conservatism, being more

"conservative in orientatation", focused more on the creation of a strong (political-ideological) state rather than on market reforms.

Second, neo-conservatism was inclined to incorporate the notion of political reform and political institutionalisation within its structure more clearly than that of neo-authoritarianism. Neo-authoritarianism merely advocated the general proposition that neo-authoritarianism was a means of achieving a semblance of "democracy" in China.

Third, due to the implications of the 1989 Tiananmen Incident and the "major shift in the power configurations within elite political circles" (Sullivan, 1995, p 325), factions within the CCP were aligned to the conservatives/elders faction (with its allegiance to MLM), to the reformist camp (influenced by Zhao Ziyang and other neo-authoritarians), or to a faction that was a coalition of both conservative and reformist factions and influenced by neo-conservatism. Furthermore, neo-authoritarianism was predominantly a political discourse. Adherents utilised the Chinese media and journals to debate the differing ideological theorems of both the Marxists and the reformers, yet neo-authoritarianism did not pivotally shape decisions by the CCP. Neo-conservatism, on the other hand, did not receive the wide and varied debate that neo-authoritarianism received from 1986 – 1989[4], yet the political thought of neo-conservatism was adapted and utilised by Jiang Zemin.

---

[4] See Rolls (1998) for a detailed examination of the intellectual debates on neo-authoritarianism from 1986 1989.

Whilst neo-authoritarianism influenced some within the CCP in the period from 1986-1989, notably the then General Secretary Zhao Ziyang and his faction due to the Tiananmen Incident and Zhao's involvement in it, after 4 June 1989, discussion of the political theory of neo-authoritarianism was subsequently banned.

Neo-conservatism, believed to be originally encouraged by the *taizidang* (or the "Princes Party", those being predominantly sons of the then current CCP leaders), emerged in the place of neo-authoritarianism in 1989. Although discussed in detail in Chapter Two, neo-conservatism influenced the CCP after 1989 and helped establish the "Jiang Zemin Era". Whilst the majority of the current leadership may be deemed to be neo-conservative, the leadership does differ on its interpretation of the theory. The research here suggests that advocates of neo-conservatism have to be divided in to "hard" adherents of neo-conservatism and "soft" adherents. Indeed, it appears that the "hard" adherents of neo-conservatism were under the leadership of Li Peng and the "soft" adherents were under the "quasi" leadership of Zhu Rongji.

Yet it is important to note that implicit in the theory of neo-conservatism is that as China moves into the new millennium, the further momentum of continual, if not eventual, democratisation shall be maintained. Indeed, at the 1997 Fifteenth Congress, Jiang stated that by the middle of the twenty-first century "China will have become a prosperous, strong, democratic, and culturally advanced socialist country" (Oksenberg, 1998, p.30). Jiang, however, avoided specifics; he gave no explanation of what he meant by "democratic" and made clear in his speech that he was committed to preserving the supremacy of

the CCP at all costs, through the continuation of Deng Xiaoping's "Four Cardinal Principles"[5].

Therefore, another objective of this research is to evaluate the factional influences of the "hard" and "soft adherents of neo-conservatism within the CCP after 1989. This is important as this factionalism was utilised by Jiang Zemin in his creation of the "Jiang Zemin Era", and in his attempt to create power bases as a foundation for it. Furthermore, it is important to examine the political theory of neo-conservatism and how it differed from that of its predecessor, neo-authoritarianism, and to examine aspects of the differences between "hard" and "soft" types of neo-conservatism.

ESTABLISHING A "JIANG ZEMIN ERA"

It is proposed that the Jiang "era", after a "formulative stage", began to emerge in 1995, even though Jiang had been the General Secretary since 1989. There are four predominant reasons for this. First, Jiang was Deng's protégé. Indeed, at least until his "Southern Sojourn" in February 1992, Deng was still the "supreme leader" of the Chinese leadership, whilst Jiang was officially the "core". Second, the consequence of the Tiananmen Incident resulted in China being more politically conservative, at least for a time after 1989. In addition, as the communist structures fell throughout Eastern Europe and culminated in the

---

[5] Introduced at the Third Plenum of the Eleventh Central Committee in 1978, the Four Principals are: the affirmation of the leading position of the CCP; the role of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought; the peoples' democratic dictatorship; and adherence to the socialist road.

collapse of Communist system in the Soviet Union, the thought that China could move strongly towards full democratisation was crushed. Third, an essential condition before there could be any emergence of a "Jiang Zemin Era" was that Jiang needed time to develop his own power base. Although appointed General Secretary in 1989, Jiang initially lacked any strong power bases within the Chinese hierarchy, from the military, government or other major bureaucratic bodies. His power was derived from Deng, as Deng's designated successor. Jiang, however, did have the makings of a power base, or at least a network of alliances at this time, due to his work at the First Automobile Plant in Changsha, the Ministry of Machine Building and Electronics (MMBE), and as Mayor of Shanghai. But unless Jiang was able to cultivate additional power bases, his position as the "core" would be weak and he might have been easily removed from his positions. Jiang eventually utilised his "connections" and moved key personnel associated with him to key governmental and Party positions. Fourth, the political differences reflected the "soft" and "hard" factions of neo-conservatism resulted in power constellations within the CCP that Jiang needed not only to manoeuvre between but also to manipulate for his own purposes.

From 1989 until 1995, evidence shows that Jiang attempted to consolidate his power. It was to be Jiang's speech entitled "Leaders Must Stress Politics", delivered at a meeting for the coordinators of the Fifth Plenary Session of the Fourteenth Central Committee of the CCP on 27 September 1995, which was to delineate the beginning of the "Jiang Zemin Era", differentiating this era from the previous ones of either Mao or Deng. Indeed, the

speech appears to be clearly "neo-conservative" in its orientation. This is because the integral notion of "stressing politics" was the issue of political reform within China - "political reform with Chinese politics". Therefore, this speech was one of the first indications that the leaders of the CCP at this time tended to adopt neo-conservative thinking.

It is clear that Jiang did not wish to go down in CCP history as "China's Gorbachev", in reference to the ex-Soviet leader's attempt at political reform ahead of economic reform. It has been the opinion of the CCP that it was Gorbachev's reforms that destabilised the central government of the Soviet Union and was one of the factors responsible for the demise of communist system there.

Essentially, then, Jiang wished to continue Deng's economic reforms, and introduce legislation to protect them, whilst strengthening the Party's control over China's evolving political institutions and central government. This would then legitimise Communist rule in China, at least for the short term. It was seen that this would then further legitimise Communist rule in China, at least in the meantime. In doing so, Jiang would be balancing the legacies of both Mao and Deng whereby ensuring that he could leave a mark - his "era" in China's history.

This ambitious task of Jiang's - stabilising a strong central government whilst pursuing continual economic marketisation – has lead him to be labelled a "neo-conservative" having neo-conservative policies, and enabled him to ensure the stability and legitimacy of the Party for a time.

Another sub-objective of this thesis, then, is to delineate the "Jiang Zemin Era" and establish the neo-conservative elements within Jiang's platform. Therefore, the study examines the mechanisms Jiang employed in order to create a strong government and pursue marketisation, dividing the period into two distinct sections: from the 1989 Tiananmen Incident to the 1992 Fourteenth Congress and from the 1992 Fourteenth Congress to Jiang's 1995 speech on "Stressing Politics".

THE ARGUMENT OF THE STUDY

Essentially, this research evaluates the usage of the theory of neo-conservatism by the CCP, under the leadership of Jiang Zemin, in the ideological foundations and policy framework for creating a "Jiang Zemin Era", and the re-legitimisation of the CCP to maintain its dominance in China in the new millennium.

Therefore, it is necessary to analyse this theory, and compare the basic elements of neo-conservatism with those of its predecessor, neo-authoritarianism. As stated previously, neo-conservatism was splintered into "hard" and "soft" streams within the CCP. It is important to recognise these "persuasions" and their factional groupings and to evaluate them in terms of the roles they had in the establishment of the "Jiang Zemin Era".

These factions, and Jiang's utilisation of them to solidify his power base from the time of his "dubious appointment" as General Secretary in 1989, need to be ascertained. This is because Jiang's success as the "core" can be related

to his ability to "juggle" these factions to create equilibrium, or at least manipulate them for his own needs. Such actions were needed by Jiang in order to begin his "era" in 1995. This is not unlike Deng's necessity of balancing the power and policy stances within the CCP between the reformist and elder/conservative factions from 1986-89 (Chan and Unger, 1990, p.44).

The examination of the period before the establishment of the "Jiang Zemin Era" analyses the mechanisms Jiang utilised, and continued to utilize, in order to create a strong government that pursued increased levels of marketisation so as to enhance China's "prosperity and prestige". This assessment allows a focus on the central element of this thesis: an examination of the development of the theory of neo-conservatism from 1989 - 1995.

It can be asserted that neo-conservatism has assisted in filling the ideological vacuum within the socialist dogma of the CCP and among the Chinese populace. Due to the legitimisation crisis experienced after the 1989 Tiananmen Incident, "there is considerable evidence that China has entered into the phase of cynical rejection" of MLM dogma (Kelly, 1998, p.58). In addition to filling this "ideological void", the political theory of neo-conservatism became an integral component in the re-legitimisation of the CCP. Indeed, though the Marxist-Leninist creed remains the official ideology in China, neo-conservatism (along with nationalism) has become the tool for creating a strong government, pursuing economic reforms and maintaining the legitimacy of the CCP.

Although Sinologists have embarked on an examination of post-Tiananmen China, none have provided an in-depth analysis that clearly delineates the methods by which the government and Party have attempted to re-legitimate the CCP. The problems of legitimisation have been discussed to a limited extent in the literature (see, for example, Kelly [1998], Young [1998] and Yang [1996]). For example, Young (1998) has explored the State's reinterpretation of "socialism", concluding that it is "crucial…to the Party's fundamental vanguard leadership claims". However, Young laments that the contradiction between "socialism" in its current usage in comparison to Mao's interpretation of "socialism" must therefore mean that the CCP has lost its legitimacy. Yang, in his article "Legitimacy Crisis and Legitimation in China", has examined the continuing leadership of the CCP in the nineties, whereby the "survival of the CCP regime against all odds is in itself no small miracle". Yet, neither Yang nor Young (amongst others) have proposed that there has been a reinterpretation of "socialism" by the CCP, or that the CCP has utilised any other ideology or discourse for the purpose of religitimisation. Rather, Yang and Young infer that the CCP has just injected simplistic, capitalistic economic policies to propel economic modernisation.

Kelly (1998), however, has noted that "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought continues to operate as an integral part of a tension-ridden political mechanism of self-legitimation" (pp. 57-58). Kelly (with Gu Xin, 1995) has not only identified the neo-authoritarianism debates between 1986 – 1989, but has also examined neo-conservatism (especially in his capacity as editor of a series

of essays on the topic in *Chinese Law and Government*[6]). However, he was inclined to examine only the "hard" neo-conservatism that was predominant in China from 1989 to 1992 as a result of the discourse initiated be the *taizidang* (see Chapter Two). Sullivan (1995), in his doctoral thesis, *Democracy and Developmentalism: Contending Struggles Over Political Change in Dengist China, 1978-1995*, has stated that neo-conservatism "fell out of vogue". Unfortunately, then, both Kelly and Sullivan have overlooked what is here called the "soft" neo-conservatism that has also evolved from 1989.

Few China observers have suggested that Jiang Zemin has utilised neo-conservatism in his creation of a "Jiang Zemin Era". Those who have (such as Lam, 1995) stop short of providing a detailed examination of how Jiang has utilised the theory to promote the CCP, the legitimacy of the Party and, of course, his leadership.

Therefore the importance of this research resides in identifying, analysing and evaluating how the political theory of neo-conservatism has been adapted into the Marxist-Leninist dogma to help create and sustain a "Jiang Zemin Era".

This research is in some aspects a continuation of Rolls' (1998) thesis, *An Examination of the Promotion and Development of the Political theory of Neo-authoritarianism in the People's Republic of China from 1986-1989*. However, that thesis examined the casual effects of the political reality of the

---

[6] *Chinese Law and Government*[6], vol. 29, no. 2, 1996.

CCP on the development of the neo-authoritarianism. In addition, neo-authoritarianism did not play such an influential role within the CCP as neo-conservatism has since 1989. In his thesis, Sullivan (1995) has come close to proposing this in his examination of neo-conservatism, but dismisses it as a spent force by 1994. In addition, whilst Karmel (1995), in his doctoral thesis *The Neo-Authoritarian Contradiction Developmentalism Dictatorships and the Retreat of the State in Mainland China,* correctly correlates the developments in China in the early 1990s to that in East Asia, he has not yet been able to extend his focus beyond 1995.

It would appear, in addition, that Western observers, exiled Chinese dissidents, and some "China watchers", have been primarily concerned with the prospects of China becoming more democratic. Indeed, journals, such as the *Journal of Democracy*, devote their existence to ascertaining the possibilities of democracy in various countries throughout the world. Whilst some merely hypothesise about this possibility (for example, Metzger, 1998; and Scalapino, 1998), others point to a distinction between prospects for democracy in given countries. Such debates over the process of democratisation emerged from O'Donnell's examination of the process of democratisation in South America in the 1970s[7]. These debates have allowed for a further focus on the economic progress of the "mini-dragons" of East Asia in the 1980s, and the

---

[7] Followed by O'Donnell's and Schmitter's (1986) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions About Uncertain Democracies*, "democratisation" discourse has also been undertaken by others, such as Sahlin (1977), and continued by conservative theorists such as Huntington (1968, revised in 1984) and Shils (1991).

democratisation processes that occurred in South Korea and Taiwan have also swayed advocates of democratisation in China, such as Pei (1994). However, the majority of China analysts note the real differences between these countries and China, such as sizes and populations of the states, and the interactions and trade with Western nations. Although this is helpful to our understanding of the usage of the political theory of neo-conservatism in China, and of other political discourses utilised in the East Asian models, the focus is predominantly on the advent of democratisation. For example, He Baogang (1996) has produced an excellent, and comprehensive, examination of China in his book *The Democratisation of China*, whereby he examines the usage of "paternalism" to describe Deng Xiaoping's leadership. He's book follows his 1994 article, "Democratisation: Antidemocratic Elements in the Political Culture of China" in which he examines the anti-democratic elements of Chinese politics and asks where democratic rules may be adapted. Others, such as Tong Yan (1998) and Oksenberg (1988), also examine the democratisation process in China and provide hypothesises regarding the prospect of democracy in China.

Other China analysts have directed their expertise into specified areas of study. For example, Joseph Fewsmith (1994; 1995; and 1997) has explored the succession crisis following the demise of Zhao Ziyang after the Tiananmen Incident. For a further example, Fewsmith's (1998) article "Jiang Zemin Takes Control" begins to explore, and assert the role of Jiang Zemin as the "core" leader. The article examines his position, which is useful in interpreting Jiang's neo-conservative actions. As with others, such as Bachman (1991) and Lam

(1995), Fewsmith (1994) initially put forward the hypothesis of the "eventual fall of Jiang Zemin" and suggested that other leaders would replace him. Although such interpretations have been shown to be incorrect, they assist in providing an understanding of the mechanisms of the CCP in the 1990s and the "obstacles" Jiang has had to deal with.   Indeed, although these analysts do not predominately focus on the political theory of neo-conservatism, their information provides sources that assist in the evaluation of the research here.

METHODOLOGY

This thesis adopts a historiographical narrative that evaluates and analyses China's political culture in the 1990s. The usage of secondary resources is therefore important in this study. Being archival in nature, the research has examined the literature available. The majority is written by other Sinologists identifying events and situations within China, which is then analysed and interpreted according to the central questions and prepositions set-out for this research.

OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS

Thus this dissertation is essentially an examination of the period beginning with the 1989 Tiananmen Incident. It evaluates the development and impact of the political thought of neo-conservatism, and its role in the creation of a "Jiang Zemin Era".

The second chapter details the political theory of neo-conservatism. It is important that the theory is understood, as it differs from its neo-authoritarian predecessor. One on the objectives of the study is to ascertain how Jiang Zemin has utilised the political theory of neo-conservatism to support the creation of a "Jiang Zemin Era". Pivotal to the creation of this "era" was the need to re-legitimise the CCP. Therefore, it is necessary to have an understanding of the rule, and function, of legitimacy in China, which is contained in Chapter Four. Many China experts contend that since Deng's economic reforms began there has been a vacuum of ideological dogma as MLM has been largely discarded or de-emphasised for economic gain. Indeed, the 1989 Tiananmen Incident appeared to rapidly escalated the need for another political theorem to fill this void. Given that the logic adapted in framing the hypothesis is within the context of the re-legitimisation of the CCP utilising the political theory of neo-conservatism, it is important to understand the requirements of political legitimacy in China. As Yang (1996, p.202) states, "literature has, by and large, neglected the dynamic development in the re-legitimisation process by the CCP and the consequences of that process". Furthermore, the impact of neo-conservatism within the re-legitimisation process has been ignored. The Third Chapter of this study therefore examines the role of legitimacy in a one-party state, and the problems encountered by the Chinese government and Party with its official adherence to MLM.

Chapter Four and Five identify and analyse the processes introduced by the Party that have assisted in the creation of the "Jiang Zemin Era" that occurred after 1995, with its incorporation of the political theory of neo-conservatism. Due to the duration of the period under study, the fourth chapter focuses on the period from the 1989 Tiananmen Incident until the 1992 Fourteenth Congress, which shall be defined as the "pre-mortem" succession period (as termed by Dittmer, 1990 [in He, 1996, p.210]). The fifth chapter, beginning after the 1992 Fourteenth Congress until the Jiang's 1995 speech on "Stressing Politics", examines the beginnings of the establishment of the "Jiang Zemin Era".

Chapter Four, moreover, investigates the "pre-mortem" succession. This period can be deemed "pre-mortem" succession due to the fact that "Deng still dictated the parameters of policy debates and determin[ed] who [was] permitted into the inner circle of power" (Shambaugh, 1993, p.254). Although within this period Jiang was the designated heir, and held the positions of General Secretary and Chairmanship of the CMC, Bachman's (1991, p.252) view holds that:

> To maintain his position as designated heir, the leader-to-be must maintain the trust of the top leader. Yet [during this period] Jiang [lacked] some of his patron's resources, and thus [needed to] develop independent power bases. The dilemma arises from the fact that it [was] all but impossible for the successor to maintain the trust of the top leader and build independent power bases.
> In addition, there was the prospect that the] old guard [would] continue to reshuffle the nominal leadership til [sic] they [died].

This chapter, then, examines the balance-of-power between the reformists and conservative factions in China. Within this period many issues arose: the direction towards "hard" ideology and "hard" neo-conservatism after the 1989 Tiananmen Incident and the fall of the communist systems in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union; Deng's early 1992 Southern Sojourn (*nan xun*), which unleashed a new round of power struggle; and, the Fourteenth Chinese Communist Party Congress in October 1992. Also, in this period, Jiang began to assert his position as designated heir within the hierarchy of the CCP, and as the "core" of the third generation leadership. Jiang formed the "Jiang-Li" axis; began the creation of the "Shanghai Faction", or *Shanghaibang*, which pursued a conservative approach to the ideological line whilst remaining committed to the open door policy; started to create power bases for himself; and began to adopt measures for strengthening the Party.

Chapter Five examines the emergence of the "Jiang Zemin Era". As previously mentioned, although Deng was still alive in 1995, Jiang maintained his position as the "core" with his speech "Stressing Politics". Indeed, it was this speech which marks the beginning of the Jiang Zemin Era. As will be shown, it is during this period the Jiang readily utilised the "soft" formation of the political theory of neo-conservatism. Although Yang (1998, p.111) posits that the Party was then plagued by indiscipline and organisational weakness despite continued efforts at "Party-building", "rectification" and "improving style", Jiang attempted to institutionalise the governance of China, albeit slowly. Unlike Shambaugh's comments in 1993 (p.254) where he states that

> The [Chinese] leadership does not have a coherent vision for the nation's future or a plan to solve its myriad problems, reacting instead to developments in an ad hoc fashion.

Jiang, utilising neo-conservatism, did have a vision for China.

Chapter Six, as the concluding chapter, evaluates the validity of the hypothesis, namely whether or not the political theory of neo-conservatism assisted in the establishment of the "Jiang Zemin Era". As the summative chapter, it also considers the possibilities of continual reform in political theory within the CCP, as well as the possibility of eventual democratisation there.

CHAPTER TWO

THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF NEO-CONSERVATISM

Several China scholars, such as Kelly (1998) and Lam (1999) for example, have posited that many influential leaders of the CCP aspire to the political theory of neo-conservatism. As such, and due to the nature of the research here, it is imperative that the political thought of neo-conservatism is delineated and understood to provide an insight into the key tenets of this political thought within the PRC. In addition, although Kelly (1998) and Lam (1999) have argued that many influential leaders are adherents of the political theory of neo-conservatism, scholars have not clarified that there appears to be two differing branches of neo-conservative thought, that is "hard" conservatism and "soft" conservatism. This is important as differing political leaders within the CCP adhere to different variants of the political theory of neo-conservatism. Therefore, the nature of change and reform within the CCP is dependant upon the variation of neo-conservatism that a certain leader of the CCP aspires to.

Neo-conservatism is based on the political theory of neo-authoritarianism, a political theory that made inroads into academic discourse in China during the period from 1986 to 1989. Yet, as mentioned above, due to the advent of the Tiananmen Incident, and the belief that the former General Secretary, Zhao Ziyang, was a supporter of the theory, after 4 June 1989 all discourse on neo-authoritarianism was effectively banned.

Essentially, neo-conservatism has two central tenets: the maintenance of a market economy and the political stability of China, both of which are backed by the concept of "strongman politics" or "enlightened dictatorship". These central tenets are fundamentally similar to those of neo-authoritarianism. As Kelly (1998, p.70) notes, the central argument for both the neo-authoritarians and neo-conservatives was, at least for the short term, that China would be best served by an authoritarian government. Both schools of thought referred to the experience of East Asian nations, such as Taiwan and South Korea, and Western academics, such as Samuel Huntington, to justify their claims. However, it must be noted that whereas neo-authoritarians were pushing for increasingly radical economic reform and eventual democratisation, neo-conservatives were emphasising the necessity of a politically stable environment, and that the economic reforms needed to be maintained but slowed.

Similar to neo-authoritarianism with its two schools of thought, a "northern" school and a "southern school", neo-conservatism has its "hard" and "soft" variations. For both of these neo-conservative schools of thought, emphasis was placed on re-centralising the authority of the CCP which was deemed to have suffered with the onslaught of economic reforms and decentralisation in the late 1980s. On the one hand, "hard" neo-conservatists, who wished to shape the economic and political policies after the Tiananmen Incident, wanted to limit economic reform. On the other hand, "soft" neo-conservatives, as a result of Deng's "Southern Sojourn" in 1992, wished to continue Deng's more rapid and progressive economic reforms. These two

theoretical factions oscillated, with differing responses, within the higher echelons of power within the CCP throughout the 1990s.

This chapter examines several key issues: the origin of the political theory of neo-conservatism as a result of the Tiananmen Incident, the examination of the central tenets of the theory, as well as a brief examination of East Asian authoritarianism. Furthermore, this chapter differentiates between the "hard" and "soft" forms of neo-conservatism. This is done by utilising two key primary sources: *Realistic Responses and Strategic Options for China After the Soviet Upheaval*, published in 1992 by the *taizidang* (princelings) elite and Jiang Zemin's "Stressing Politics" (1995) speech as an exemplar of the leadership's emphasis on political stability.

THE ORIGIN OF NEO-CONSERVATISM AND CENTRAL TENETS OF THE THEORY

It is assumed by some academics that the theory of neo-conservatism was introduced by the *taizidang*, or princelings – sons of past and present CCP leaders - in the early 1990s (Tsai, 1992; and Kelly, 1996). Their article was published in response to the failed Soviet coup of August 1990, with the title *Realistic Responses and Strategic Options for China After the Soviet Upheaval.* This work is explored latter in this chapter. Although this article does indicate a renewed emphasis placed upon a stable government, neo-conservatives were generally neo-authoritarians who were not associated with the Zhao Ziyang

faction before the Tiananmen Incident. For example, Xiao Gongqin is seen to be a leading academic purporting neo-conservatism, yet Xiao, an associate professor at the Shanghai Normal University, has been credited by many China analysts as having constructed the terminology, neo-authoritarianism, in 1988 (Gu Xin and Kelly, 1995, p.222; and Tsai, 1992, p.3). Gu Xin and Kelly (1994, p.221) state that Xiao Gongqin first used the terminology "neo-conservatism" at an informal conference on "China's traditional culture and Socialist Modernisation" in early 1990. Indeed, whilst this conference was informal, it had a degree of support from the CCP Ideology and Propaganda Department. Ruan suggests that theorists who had called themselves the "southern school' of neo-authoritarianism merely renamed themselves neo-conservatives (1996, p.59; and also in Kelly, 1998, p. 70).

Neo-conservatism emerged in the wake of the Tiananmen Incident, and the banning of neo-authoritarianism. It emerged as an "immediate ideology"; a choice for those who were no longer willing to rely solely on MLMT, but who also, for one reason or another rejected any attempt at political liberalisation. Neo-conservatism offered nationalism and traditional culture as a replacement formula for renewing Party legitimacy. Indeed, Gu Xin and Kelly (1994, p.222) differentiate between neo-authoritarianism and neo-conservatism by the degree to which neo-conservatism accommodates traditional values and Chinese nationalism. Yet neo-conservatism rejects liberal democracy, not on the grounds of any ideological conviction (in their theory, neo-conservatists "allude to democracy's admittedly ideal form") as it is deemed impractical given China's

dire "national conditions" (Gu Xin and Kelly 1994, p.230, and, Kelly, 1998, pp.69-70).

As mentioned above, the two important tenets of neo-conservatism are: one, the political stability of China; and, two, the creation of a market economy. However, unlike neo-authoritarianism, emphasis is upon stability[8], which is evidenced in articles such as the princelings' "Realistic Responses" and Jiang's "Stressing Politics" (which are examined later in the chapter). It must be noted that democratisation is seen to be a distant goal of neo-conservatism. Even though neo-conservatism purports to defuse the threats of liberalism, the theory makes crucial concessions to liberal values and practices (Kelly, 1998, p.70). Xiao Gongqin, and Jiang Yihua, a history professor at the Fudan University, have both argued that the "masses" would require a period of tutelage before democracy could work in China (in Kelly, 1998, p.70; and, Yang, 1996, p.215)[9].

Most neo-conservatives in China believe that democracy would only succeed in China if it were preceded by the development of a market economy and that only an authoritarian government could impose a market on unprepared and unwilling Chinese population (Kelly, 1998, p.70). Therefore, many Chinese scholars have drawn similarities between China's development and that of other Asian nations in the region, and these scholars have used these similarities as a basis for neo-conservatism (as examined further in this chapter).

---

[8] When used in the article "Realistic Responses", the importance of stability was used to illustrate the negative development that occurred in the former USSR and Eastern Europe after democratisation.

[9] The needing of a period of "tutelage" was also used by Chiang Kai-shek in his attempt to retain the Guomindang's monopoly of power in Taiwan.

Many in the CCP, though not endorsing neo-conservatism, appear to welcome this line of thought, as long as it does not challenge the legitimacy of the CCP or become part of a conspiracy to promote "Peaceful Evolution" towards capitalism, along with which would come "democracy" (Tsai, 1992, p.2). Indeed, the appointment of Wang Huning, an associate of Jiang's, to the Central Committee Policy Research Office's Political Group was taken as a return to favour of neo-conservatives amongst the CCP Leadership (see Chapter Five for details). This is because Wang belonged to a "policy faction" which included Xiao Gongqin as a member (Kelly, 1998, p.71).

After the Tiananmen Incident and the Soviet crisis, the dilemma faced by Deng's reformist faction and the conservatives was the question of extending economic reform whilst preserving the unchallenged rule of the CCP (Tsai, 1992, p.19). Neo-conservatives realised that trying to reverse Deng's economic reforms was unrealistic. However, they wanted the reforms to be slowed. Bo Xicheng, a princeling, argued that the only way to maintain the Party's supremacy was to ensure its control over the financial and the business empire, whereby the neo-conservatives claimed that the fusion of party and business would facilitate political reform because it meant that the Party would have to consolidate its power and implement reforms (Lam, 1995, p.70). As Watson states (1996, p.7),

China's economic reform process has been a pragmatic drive to strengthen state power. The economic reforms were not a key goal themselves, but were seen as the means through which the central state might reassert its strengths and ensure social stability.

Efficient economic growth would generate the resources to enable the state (hence, the CCP and its leadership) to become more powerful. In this view, the result was an experimental process of economic reform in the absence of major political change. In the early 1990s, the princelings voiced their concern over accelerating economic reform without re-centralising power and control. These "hard" neo-conservative princelings advocated the strengthening of the SOEs (State-Owned Enterprises), whose taxes supported the central budget; the reinforcement of the government's control over the provinces; and emphasis on nationalism as means to legitimise CCP rule. In addition, some neo-conservative writings opposed corruption and wanted to control peasant migration to the cities (Fewsmith, 1995, p.253).

Therefore, when economic reform was a matter of concern, neo-conservatives came to advocate "gradualism" and oppose "radicalism". They rejected economic or political "shock therapy" which could lead to an "abyss of perpetual chaos" (Lin, 1996, p.79). Indeed, for the majority of Chinese, and advocates of neo-conservatism, the negative developments in the former USSR and Eastern European countries after democratisation have been often used a examples to illustrate the importance of stability (Yang, 1996, p.215). For them, a strong, stable government is necessary for China to further open its economic reforms.

The Issue of the Political Stability of China: A Theoretical Perspective

A core tenet of neo-conservatism is the belief that China needs strong leaders maintain political order and to guide its economic reform from a planned to a market economy. Inspired by the 1986 publication into Chinese of Samuel Huntington's *Political Order In Changing Societies* (1968), Chinese theorists utilised his central theoretical premise: that "the most important political distinction among countries concerns not their form of government but the degree of government" (1968, p.1). Ma (1991, p.4) states that Huntington's emphasis on political order was becoming increasingly relevant in China, whereby central control over local authorities was eroding, the ability of the government to implement policies was being declining, and social unrest was increasing. According to White (1994, p.87), however, while the political rationale for a "new" conservatism was based on an attempt at "hard-headed Huntingtonian realism" about the need to tackle the difficulties of development, the theory would have to be translated into something which was ideologically more palatable to politically assertive and influential constituencies both within and outside China.

Conservative theorists such as Huntington (1968, revised in 1984) and Edward Shils (1991) argue that authoritarianism may be a necessary or inevitable stage on the road to capitalism, and thus democracy. Authoritarianism is widely recognised as a form of state power endemic to capitalist societies prior to the emergence of a cohesive and hegemonic bourgeois (Hewison, Robinson and Rodan, 1993, p.11). However, Huntington

argues that the task of managing economic growth and political order could be best achieved by an authoritarian regime, whereby authoritarianism becomes a functional response to social disintegration and economic malaise. Hewison, Robinson and Rodan (1993, p.13) further argue that authoritarianism creates the basis for capitalism, and in the long run democratic institutions. This is because the political dynamics involved are systemic, with integration necessarily triumphing over disintegration, and authoritarian rule being the appropriate instrument for integration. Authoritarianism does this by developing institutions capable of integrating civil society into the political process without falling into revolution and by providing the conditions for investment and rapid industrialisation. They conclude that the authoritarian regime fulfils its historic mission by eventually integrating all social groups into the increasingly democratic process and eventually relinquishing its role to the middle class.

According to Huntington (1984, p.212), if democracy were to eventuate in China, the process must begin from the top down, although democracy may develop as much from the top-down as from the bottom-up. Thus, for the supporters of neo-conservatism in China, it is held that an "enlightened dictator" is required to force the necessary breakthrough, so the reforms could gain new momentum (Ma, 1991, p.1). The "supreme leader", could, in addition keep in check the political conflicts which would arise due to the reforms.

Production of a Market Economy: A Tenet of Neo-Conservatism

Initially, young intellectuals like Wang Huning and Xiao Gongqin examined the economic success stories of several of the "four" mini-dragons, Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore, to assist Zhao Ziyang in the promotion of his economic reforms.   These scholars noted a correlation between the economic development of these countries under one form or another of authoritarian rule, contrasted with the economic development of many other developing nations. They found that developing countries with strongman rulers had all been able to achieve a much higher rate of economic growth than those ruled by either a democratic government or by a totalitarian regime (Tsai, 1992, p.5).   This led them to conclude that authoritarianism might be particularly applicable in China (Petracca and Mong, 1990, p.1101).

It should be noted that several studies of Latin American nations were also critiqued, especially those by the political writers Sahlin (1977) and O'Donnell (1993), and that Chinese intellectuals utilised this Latin American experience to assist in the development of both neo-authoritarianism and neo-conservatism. Due to the fact that successful neo-conservative states in both Latin America and South East Asia contain the feature of protecting market forces by the state, it was deemed that this system of government was appropriate for China. Woo-Cummings (1994, p.414) posits that the Chinese did not emulate the bureaucratic authoritarianism of Latin American state, but rather the strong states of South Korea and Taiwan and the industrial might of Japan. Woo-Cummings concedes that for the Chinese, openly emulating Japan

is "difficult for anyone to do in post-war Asia, which is why the Beijing leadership has made Singapore the shining example of neo-conservatism and its presumed economic payoffs" (1994, p.414).

Essentially, then, economic modernisation and authoritarianism under an "enlightened dictator" are intertwined. Chinese national leaders must be committed to modernisation and they must advance market-orientated reforms to bring China's economy into line with dominant trends throughout the world. Since the legitimacy of neo-conservatism rests on a dual mixture of nationalism and economic development, political leaders must expand political education, by educating people of the benefits of nationalism and economic development, so as to gain the support of the majority of people (Petracca and Mong, 1990, p.1106).

China is currently in a mix of both planned and market economies. The high degree of control necessitated by such an economy inevitably leads to some dictatorial policies. Neo-conservatives are in favour of replacing the planned economy with a market economy (marketisation) and state-ownership with private ownership (privatisation). They argue that marketisation can bring about the separation between the economy and politics, through preventing the over-concentration of political power in the hands of a small number of individuals thus reducing the tendency towards dictatorship. Additionally, neo-conservatives argue that a market economy reduces the importance of political power and public policy, therefore minimising the number of people who seek to use political power for economic gain; thus reducing corruption.

Theoretically, neo-conservatism will eventually assist in the creation of a more democratic environment in China. There are three reasons for this. First, in a market system, people are more certain about their responsibility. With the creation of mechanisms of popular participation in the affairs of the government, voters will not elect officials who are unable to protect (or not interested in protecting) the best interests of the citizenry. As a result, bribery and corruption in a market economy are thought to be minimised. Second, the growth of a market economy helps to build a differentiated social structure that serves as the basis for a modern political party system, electoral competition and, hence, the existence of mechanisms for democratic governance. The spread of market relationships will establish relationships aimed at mutual benefit, which will improve the tolerant co-existence of members of society, creating the indispensable cultural conditions for democracy. Additionally, marketisation, with its diversity of economic interests, will lay a solid basis for political pluralism and a modern multi-party system. The third reason is that a market economy will give birth to a new society dominated by the middle class.

As all the markets in China cannot be considered "free markets" in the Western sense, an "enlightened dictator" is required to force the separation of politics from the market, to overcome the forces that disrupt the market and guarantee its freedom.

EAST ASIAN AUTHORITARIANISM

Neo-conservatives draw on other forms of East Asian authoritarianism as models to inform China's political and economic development. The political theory of neo-conservatism resembles the initial development of countries such as Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea, and to a lesser extent, Japan. Indeed, the Asian monetary crisis of 1997-1998 did not stop neo-conservatives utilising these East Asian states as models for development (possibly due to China not being as affected by the monetary crisis). As Woo-Cumings notes: "The Chinese have not shrunk from proclaiming that Singapore-style authoritarianism is the formula for political and ideological stability" (1994, p.413).

Several of these East Asian countries have been described as strong "developmental" states, distinguished by high level commitment to economic objectives from powerful leaders. There are four "explanations" of the factors that caused accumulation and productivity to be so strong in East Asia, as identified by Petri (1997, pp. 545-548). These are: one, neoclassical; two, structuralist interpretations; three, cultural explanations; and, four, interaction effects (contagion). The neoclassical approach has emphasised the outward orientation and macroeconomic discipline of these nations. They have invested vigorously in human capital and maintained competitive markets. Structuralist theorists have singled out the type of governance, being typically one-party states or one-party dominate states. Culturalists have focused on both the governance and societal characteristics, based loosely on Confucianism. Most nations in the region emphasise "community" over individual values, and these

nations have also developed meritocratic institutions and legitimised authoritarian rule. The interaction effects, or contagion, focused on the promotion of the initiation of foreign technologies and business strategies, and encourage the initiation of policies, facilitated direct investment and trade (Petri, 1997, pp.545-548).

Academics, such as Robinson (1996), have focused exclusively on the presumption of specific "Asian values" that these nations might possess which have assisted in their economic advancement and political stability. Factors similar to Petri's culturalist explanations (as mentioned above) are raised. However, it is important to note that Asian nations in the region, including China, have utilised the "Asian values" mantra to differentiate themselves from the West, and to stop the "spread" of Western cultural influences, such as democracy. Robinson states that this nationalistic usage of "Asian values" is a combination of an "organic-statist variant of political conservatism with a market economy" (1996, p.313). Furthermore, governments utilising this "pervasive anti-Westernism" within its concept of "Asian values" allows the authoritarian regime to claim the mantle of nationalism and, thus, brand reformers, or those espousing democratic notions, as being "un-Asian" (Robinson, 1996, p.316; and also Min, 1993, p.1).

The interesting notion is that most of these nations followed the path that neo-conservatives in China see as the desired goal: economic reform with a stable (one-party) government. The governments of Japan, South Korea,

Taiwan and Singapore were, at one time, not only either one-party or one-party dominant states which allowed for political stability, but they were also interventionist governments: actively playing an economic and industrial role in their country's development (Dutt, Kim and Singh, 1994; Roumasset, 1992; and Wade, 1992)

As Zheng notes (1994, p.248), a precondition of political development is the provision of very favourable conditions for economic progress, thus, political stability must be given the highest priority. Huntington (1991, p.26) noted that the "interactions of economic progress and Asian culture appears to have generated a distinctly East Asian variety of democratic institutions", whereby the dominant-party states of the region "spanned a continuum between democracy and authoritarianism". As such, the system may have met the formal requirements of democracy, but differed from its Western counterparts. Huntington posits that the East Asian dominant system seems to involve competition for power but not alteration of power; and that there was the participation in elections for all, but only participation in office for those in the "mainstream" party. Essentially, Huntington believes that the system represents an adaptation of Western democratic practice to serve not Western values of competition and change, but Asian values of consensus and stability (1991, p.27)

REALISTIC RESPONSES AND THE *TAIZIDANG* (PRINCELINGS)[10]

Scholars, such as Tsai (1992) and Kelly (1996), posit that neo-conservatism emerged from the *taizidang* (princelings) of the CCP, the children of the leaders of the CCP. Both Tsai and Kelly draw on the article *Realistic Responses and Strategic Options for China After the Soviet Upheaval* published in the *China Spring* (*Zhongguo Zhichuan*) in 1992, and the *taizidang*'s involvement in the creation of this article, as an exemplar of the emergence of the political theory of neo-conservatism.

Indeed, the period from 4 June 1989 to the failed Soviet coup in August 1991 was a "transitional period" (Ruan, 1996, p.60) for the CCP, in which neo-authoritarians were in need of readjusting their policies and forces. Pan Yue, who was the son-in-law of Liu Huaqing, and Yang Ping, the ideology and theory editor of the *China Youth Daily*, drew a number of princeling theoreticians together for a theory conference in late 1990 to discuss China's place in the post-Tiananmen era. The princeling invitees included Chen Yuan, son of Chen Yun, Bo Xicheng, son of Bo Yibo, Chen Xiaolu, son of Chen Yi, and a son of Li Peng and He Xin (Lu, 1996, p.33; and Kelly 1996). Noticeably, the princelings were sons of hard-liners within the CCP.

The article *Realistic Responses* was a result of this conference. In fact, *Realistic Responses* was pushed as an antidote, if not a solution, for the CCP's continual dominance in China. Indeed, *Realistic Responses* was printed by the

---

[10] *Taizidang* is used instead of *Taizi*, as the princelings never represented a monolithic organisation but rather a form of various factions fighting for wealth and power.

CCP Central Office[11] as an internal document (*neican*) for circulation amongst the top leadership (Tsai, 1992, p.16). Chen states that *Realistic Responses* "represents in broad terms the mainstream CCP 'princeling faction's' political philosophy and program of rule" (1996, p.39). Gu and Kelly (1994, p.220) have summarised *Realistic Responses* as:

> An adoption of a philosophy that is somewhat confusingly known in Chinese as "new conservatism", together with "Western rationalistic philosophy". Along with a tough attitude to control the masses and some very Realpolitik specifications in foreign policy, these prescriptions tried to supplement a perceived deficit in the Party's legitimacy, and to ward off the temptation of radical reformism, particularly in the political sphere.

Furthermore, and more importantly, *Realistic Responses* emerged before the Fourteenth Party Congress (1992). *Realistic Responses*' status, even notionally, was as a preliminary document for the Fourteenth Party Congress. It can be assumed that the princelings were jockeying for positions within the Politburo, and utilised the article to show their "ideological" and "performance" credentials. *Realistic Responses*, with its warnings against accelerated economic reform and further decentralisation, could be further used by the princelings if the economic problems that beset China in the 1980s returned.

Chen Yun wrote to the CCP Politburo suggesting that the children of high-ranking cadres should be recruited into the leadership. As he wrote, "with our children [in charge], our hearts are at ease. At least they will not totally deny

---

[11] The article may have also been printed by *China Youth Daily* at the same time.

their own fathers" (Tsai, 1992, p.16). This was because it was believed that students, intellectuals and technocrats were seen to have been "polluted" by Western liberal capitalist ideology, and only the children of the CCP leadership could be trusted to uphold the absolute power of the CCP (Tsai, 1992, p.16).

Ironically, due to swift manoeuvring by Jiang Zemin, the *taizidang* faction linked with *Realistic Responses* failed to be elected to the Central Committee at the 1992 Fourteenth Congress (Kelly, 1998, p.70). *Realistic Responses* was an attempt by the princelings to influence economic and political policy in the lead-up to the Fourteenth Congress. If the economic problems that beset China in the late 1980s had returned to China in the mid-1990s (before Zhu Rongji's introduction of the austerity program in 1993), however, the *taizidang* could have stated that their previous warnings were evidence of foresight, prudence and leadership (Gu Xin and Kelly, 1994, p.219).

REALISTIC RESPONSES AND NEO-CONSERVATISM

An examination of *Realistic Responses* is useful to China scholars as it does provide the earliest theoretical construction of the political theory of neo-conservatism. Furthermore, *Realistic Responses* verifies the differentiation between the theory of neo-conservatism and that of its predecessor, neo-authoritarianism, notably, the inclination of neo-conservatism towards political conservatism, unlike the emphasis placed upon furthering economic reforms in the political theory of neo-authoritarianism. In addition, *Realistic Responses* reveals the advent of the branch of "hard" neo-conservatism that would flourish

in China until 1992, especially when Li Peng was in charge of the economic arena (see Chapter Four). Yet, advocates of "hard" neo-conservatism would continue to make an impact upon political and economic decisions in China.

Kelly (1996) in his editorship of the journal *Chinese Law and Government* (vol. 29, no. 2), has included not only the *Realistic Responses* article, but also critiques of that article by dissident/overseas Chinese. Kelly adds that the authors of the critiques were all living in the United States, but before the Tiananmen Incident were, for the most part, highly regarded and well connected individuals (1996, p.9). It should be noted though, that the exiled Chinese dissidents in the United States were "democrats" and opposed to the political theory of neo-conservatism, which is evident in their critiques.

Chen (in Kelly, 1996, p.9) has analysed *Realistic Responses* to reveal the political conservative direction of the princeling faction. To him, *Realistic Responses* revealed essentially that the neo-conservatives' political framework was: one, for statism to replace communism as the ideology; two, for right-wing autocracy to replace left-wing totalitarianism; three, that the principles of geopolitics replace ideological principles; four, for the romantic egalitarian revolutionary party to be replaced by a ruling party defending its power with *Realpolitik*; fifth, party ownership to replace public ownership by the state; and, sixth, the recentralisation of power.

However, the authors of *Realistic Responses* see neo-conservatism as a:

Reform [that] is distinct [to] that of the traditional diehard conservative forces; [neo-conservatism] calls for using rational elements in both the traditional and the present order, and the gradual introduction of elements of Western institutions to bring about China's modernisation [whereby] we should combine neo-conservatism and Western rational philosophy as targets of the Party's united front in the new era. Western rationalist philosophy advocates proof, instrumental reason, and orderly, gradual process.

[With neo-conservatism] emphasis [is] on nationalism and patriotism…[and] the creative transformation of traditional Chinese culture [which] is a rich spiritual resource for safeguarding the socialist system, protecting the interests of the state and nation, and promoting the cause of modernisation.

Long term strategy (study and development of scientific socialism) should take precedence over short term (repressing rightist ideology) and should be carried out with utmost vigour. [As] neo-conservatism has long existed as an antithesis to radicalism (1996, pp. 21-22).

Realistic Responses appealed to Chinese cultural nationalism and to the maintenance of a market economy. By appealing to cultural nationalism, *Realistic Responses* rejects the universal validity of Western values. Traditional values, especially Confucianism, have been utilised, and the Western model of development has been questioned as to whether it has any applicability to China (Kelly, 1996, p.7). Ruan's response, as a critique of *Realistic Responses*, sees the return to "traditional values systems, ideologues, and authorities as the positive mediators for modernisation" and only because, as Ruan continues, "Oriental despotism is on the verge of extinction and Western democracy and free enterprise [are deemed] so awful [by the princelings]" (1996, p.67).

As Kelly correctly concludes, *Realistic Responses* essentially reveals the neo-conservatives' "break" with MLM, whilst seeking to preserve by other means those aspects of MLM, such as Leninism, that support the Party's claim to legitimacy (1996, p.6). Yin (1996, pp. 77-78), one of the authors of another critique of *Realistic Responses*, states that:

> Neo-conservatism differs from the unchangeable old conservatism that clings obstinately to Marxist dogma and is also opposed to "institutional determinism".
>
> Neo-conservatism is opposed to Marxism-Leninism, but in the development stage, in order to maintain the existing order, it is obliged to agree to make use of 'certain value systems from traditionally revolutionary ideology having an inhibitory function. [Yet] neo-conservatism supports/defends the status quo, defends the authority of CCP domination in politics, supports market reforms in economics and places hope in the growth and strengthening of a middle class

Indeed, for the authors of *Realistic Responses*, economic reforms must not impinge on political stability:

> We must also tactfully tell the people that many problems facing the economy are connected to China's national condition, and not all questions can be solved by reform, raising the popular masses expectations excessively regarding the results of reform is dangerous…as soon as the public's excessive expectations fail to be met, serious political disturbances might develop (1996, pp. 24-25).

Ruan, another overseas dissident, states that neo-conservatism, as presented in *Realistic Responses*, then, seems to display a none too "conservative" radicalism and adventurism (1996, p.67). Ruan further states that "those who describe [neo-conservatism] as a 'moderate' or 'third' force are

mistaken. It is more extremist than the 'political' or 'economic radicalism' to which it is opposed (1996, p.67). "Extremism", according to Ruan, is the emphasis neo-conservatives place on political stability over the economy. Ruan (1996, p.63) states that the authors of *Realistic Responses* are in agreement with their neo-authoritarian predecessor with the notion that "democracy entails chaos". However, they disagree with the neo-authoritarians support for free enterprise which might give rise to aspirations for political participation, thus, leading to calls for democracy. "Radicalism", though, as posited by Wang (another dissident), refers to any school opposed to neo-conservatism (1996, p.83). For Ruan, the *Realistic Responses* call for "strict government" meant to "strengthen ideological control" (1996, p.50). Yet Ruan, in his critique, does not differentiate between the competing "hard" or "soft" neo-conservativism in the lead-up to the Fourteenth Congress.

In the *Realistic Responses* article, neo-conservatism does attack liberal intellectuals and their program for democratic reform, whilst making crucial concessions to liberal values and practices (Kelly, 1996, p.6). Ruan (1996, p.63) states that: "neo-conservatism [as presented in *Realistic Responses*] sets itself up as opposition to 'radical Westernisation reform' since it opposes 'indiscriminate adoption of the Western democratic political system and also the Western free enterprise system'".

In his critique of *Realistic Responses*, Ruan states that the princelings involved in its authorship "lay the blame for the June 4 massacre on the 'democratic romanticism' of the liberal democratic intellectuals and students"

(1996, p.63). Ruan (1996) asserts that neo-authoritarians split into two groups after the Tiananmen Incident; those opposed to the repression, such as Zhao Ziyang and Wu Jianxing, and those of the "pro-killing faction", namely the princelings. It must be noted, though, that this is the opinion of a Chinese democrat dissident.

As aforementioned, the authors of *Realistic Responses* attempted, but failed, to get elected at the Fourteenth Congress. Their failure to get elected did not mean that "hard" neo-conservatism was abandoned, as some analysts such as Kelly (1996) suggest, but rather that it was sidelined. Gu Xin and Kelly have concluded, due to the failure of the princelings being elected, that "the doctrine [of neo-conservatism] is likely to emerge, no doubt updated and altered, in China after Deng and other original revolutionaries [die]" (1994, p.230).

Realistic Responses was the first and most articulate form of neo-conservatism published after the Tiananmen Incident. Yet it must be noted that *Realistic Responses* was published by "hard" neo-conservatives.

JIANG ZEMIN'S "STRESSING POLITICS"

China analysts, such as Lam (1999), assert that Jiang, along with Zhu Rongji (including their political associates, and members of Jiang's "Shanghai Faction") are neo-conservatives. Initially, it was hard to categorise Jiang as either a reformer or a conservative. Yet the ascension of the Jiang Zemin Era in 1995, and his speech delivered at a meeting for the coordinators of the Fifth

Plenary Session of the Fourteenth Party Congress on 27 September 1995,

revealed Jiang's neo-conservative tendencies.   This speech also revealed

Jiang's desire to create his own "theory" armed at developing Deng's thought

and maintaining the legitimacy of the CCP in the post-Deng era (Hong, 1997,

p.90).

A basis of the speech was Jiang's iteration of the "Twelve Guiding

Principles", which was a "general guideline for correctly handling the major

relationships [that the CCP] should adhere to" (Jiang, 1995, p.29).   Jiang

continued by stating that

> [Due to the] new contradictions and problems that have cropped
> up in the modernisation drive being undertaken under the
> conditions of a socialist market economy….the purpose [of the
> guidelines] is to, on the basis of summarising historical
> experiences, strive to master the objective law, to unify the
> understanding of the whole Party, to cater for people of all ethnic
> groups in the country, and to mobilise all positive factors to speed
> up the socialist modernisation drive.

These "Twelve Guiding Principals" consist of: first, the relationship

between reform, development and stability; second, relationship between speed

and efficiency; third, relationships between economic construction and

population, resources and environment; fourth, the relationship between the

primary, secondary and tertiary industries; fifth, the relationship between the

Eastern region and the Central and Western regions; sixth, the relationship

between the market mechanism and macroeconomic regulation and control;

seventh, relationship between the public ownership economy and other

economic sectors; eighth, the relationship between the State, enterprise and the

individual in income distribution; ninth, the relationship between opening up wider the outside world and upholding self-reliance; tenth, the relationship between the central and local authorities; eleventh, the relationship between national defence building and economic development; twelfth, the relationship between material ad spiritual civilisation building (Jiang, 1995, pp.29-36).

As explored by Hong (1997), amongst other analysts, Jiang's speech on "stressing politics", entitled *Leaders Must Stress Politics,* exemplifies the precedence placed on political stability over far-reaching economic reforms. Whilst the first, fifth and tenth "guiding relationships" dealt predominantly with political stability, out of all of the twelve guiding relationships, the most important is the relationship between reform, development and stability[12] (the first "guiding relationship"). This is because the other eleven relationships are conditioned by this overall relationship. In other world, if reform, development and stability were properly dealt with, it would lay a solid foundation and create favourable conditions for the other eleven relationships. In his speech Jiang (1995, p.29) states that

> Stability is the premise for development and reform, and development and reform require a stable political and social environment…Without a stable political and social environment, nothing can be done…[the CCP hopes to] bring about long term political and social stability in the course of promoting reforms and development.

---

[12] The key tenets of the political thought of neo-authoritarianism also promotes the inter-relatedness of political stability and economic marketisation.

Yet, it must be noted, that although the speech does not place importance on economic reform, the reality was that economic reform was again occurring under the leadership of Jiang Zemin, with the assistance of Zhu Rongji.

The key ideals of this speech were reiterated by Jiang when he met high-level officials from the Editorial Board of *Jiefangjun Ribao* (*People's Liberation Army Daily*) on 2 January 1996. Jiang presented a revised version again when he participated in a meeting for CCP leaders of the NPC and the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPCC) on 3 March 1996. This speech was published on 1 July 1996 by *Qiushi* (*Searching Truth*) magazine, which is sponsored by the Central Committee.

The speech was interpreted by most Chinese intellectuals and politicians differently. First, some thought that "stressing politics" referred to the notion of stressing the core of the Jiang Zemin leadership, which was designed to maintain Jiang's power and CCP authority. Second, it was seen as a reaffirmation of many local leaders' political powers. Third, for others, the speech was to signal another anti-corruption campaign. Fourth, some considered it as an anti-reform call. Fifth, some considered it as a hardline stance against Taiwanese independence, Hong Kong democracy and American hegemonism. Sixth, it was deemed a duplication of two old ideas, such as CCP authority and anti-corruption, which were not created by Jiang, but by Zhao

Ziyang's idea of neo-authoritarianism and Chen Yun's theory of CCP construction (Hong, 1997, p.89).

In fact, Jiang's speech revealed his belief that there needed to be a balance between economics and politics, which are core tenets of the theory of neo-conservatism. As Jiang ("On Stressing Politics", *Searching Truth*, 1996, in Hong, 1997, p.90) stated:

> We must learn how to dialectically understand and deal with the relationship between reform, development and stability, between material civilisation and spiritual civilisation, between productive forces and productive relations, and between [an] economic base and superstructure.

Jiang, as the core of the third generation leadership, also had to balance himself between the legacies of Mao and Deng. Hong (1997, p.91). posits that:

> Politically, Jiang is confronting a dilemma in dealing with Mao's and Deng's ideas [at least in 1995]. Jiang does not have enough capacity [at the time of the speech] of overstepping Mao and Deng's philosophy; and Jiang will lose his legitimacy if he just follows and copies what Mao and Deng advocated. Meanwhile, if Jiang follows a policy of pro-Mao and anti-Deng it [would] damage Jiang's credibility because Jiang's current position [in 1995 was] completely based upon Deng's appointment and trust.   By contrast, if he follows an anti-Mao pro-Deng [stance], he [would] lose significant support from conservative forces which [were] still valuable [to assist in 'cementing' his position as the 'core leader']. Being balanced, Jiang's power will be maximised through unifying those who support Mao and those who support Deng, in order to limit and even eliminate any possible attacks from both conservative and reformist factions.

Jiang managed to "politically" balance himself within the CCP; he had not been as "left" as Mao, nor as "right" as Deng. Hong states that most Chinese people prefer accepting reliable, steady, balanced and sophisticated leadership rather than one that polarises society between two extremes (1997, p.91). Jiang's neo-conservative stance, balancing both economics and politics, appeared to assist in stabilising China from the extremes of politics experienced under Mao, and the extreme rightism experienced under Deng's economic reform. Indeed, those who suffered in Mao's era now expect a market economy and democratic practices; and those who have not benefited as a result of the introduction of a market economy under the reformist Deng era, have begun to look for economic stability, purified government and social equality (Hong, 1997, p.91).

Yet, the notion of "stressing politics" and its related policies are not new. Traditional societies, from agricultural societies to industrial economies, engage in "stressing politics". This is because "stressing politics" essentially refers to the stressing of non-economic fields, particularly the legal systems, institutionalisation, moral values, and the rule of economic competition. The construction of a legal system and political institutions is completed first, in conjunction with the reformation of the economy, and political participation is seen as an end result of the latter. This is consistent with the central tenets of neo-conservatism, and it is a model of economic development that has been adapted by other East Asian nations, such as South Korea and Japan (Hong, 1997, p.91)

Jiang's "Stressing Politics" was co-written, if not ghost written, by the neo-conservative academic Wang Huning. Wang's early ideas touched upon at least two issues that later became important to neo-conservatism. The first issue was the political implication of decentralisation. Wang was concerned that the strategy of economic decentralisation pursued under reform was giving localities an economic and political interest and a capacity to resist the centre. This implication of this, in Wang's view, was not the emergence of a more pluralistic society but the impairment of effectual central rule. The second issue raised was that a common value system was required. Thus, while hinting that the communist ideology was in need of reform, Wang also suggested that the central government needed to develop, maintain, and even enforce a certain ideological structure. In short, Wang called attention to the need for the central government to construct and enforce certain structures to uphold the political and ideological supremacy of the centre in an era of economic decentralisation and ideological lassitude (Feng, 1995, p.637). These themes are similar to those presented in Jiang's speech.

It is also interesting to note that neo-conservative think tanks, such as Wang Huning's involvement in the Central Committee's Policy Research Office's Political Group, were also incorporated in the Rural Policy Research of the Secretariat of the CCP and the Institute of Economic System Reform.

After the 1989 Tiananmen Incident, the Chinese intelligentsia were looking for a solution to assist them overcome their (perceived) economic and political difficulties as a means of re-legitimising the CCP. With the intense

political indoctrination after 1989, the *taizidang* introduced their "hard" neo-conservative article, "Realistic Responses", in an attempt to influence policy-making at the Fourteenth Congress of 1992. Unsuccessful in obtaining election, the influence of the *taizidang* and supporters of "hard" neo-conservatism may have lessened but it has not been completely side-lined. "Soft" neo-conservatism, with its renewed emphasis upon the economy, as well as maintaining the hegemony of the CCP, successfully influenced the current leadership of the CCP, especially Jiang Zemin, Zhu Rongji and members of the "Shanghai Faction". Indeed Jiang's speech on "Stressing Politics" can be utilised as an "identification" of the beginning of the "Jiang Zemin Era".

The tenets of neo-conservatism, of building a market economy and maintaining a strong, stable government, are held by the majority within the CCP. The emphasis placed on cultural nationalism within the theory of neo-conservatism, is also used by the CCP as a legitimacy-building device. The difference between proponents of "hard" and "soft" neo-conservatism is the emphasis they placed upon reforming the economy and the maintenance of a market economy. Throughout the 1990s, economic and political policy has oscillated between both "hard" and "soft" advocates of neo-conservatism. This differs from the period 1986-1989, as identified by Rolls (1998), when Deng's policies manoeuvred between the conservative/elders and the reformers. This period still found those in government who advocated the ideals of Marx, Lenin and Mao Zedong. After the Tiananmen Incident, and the deaths of many first generation revolutionary leaders, the impact of MLM on policy-making was not as substantial as in the Maoist era (see Chapter Four). With the CCP's

movement away from absolute adherence to MLM, neo-conservatism has helped shape both economic and political policy in the 1990s. As latter chapters argue, it is Jiang Zemin's support for both "hard" or "soft" neo-conservatism, at differing junctures in his political career, that has helped spawn the "Jiang Zemin era".

CHAPTER THREE

THE LEGITIMISATION OF THE CCP

A major focus for many China analysts since the Tiananmen Incident of 1989 has been the "legitimacy" of the CCP in China. Indeed, scholars, such as Yang (1996, p.201), have declared that the Tiananmen Incident "marked the most serious legitimacy crisis of the CCP in the PRC history" after the failure of the Cultural Revolution. With official adherence to the Dengist "Four Cardinal Principles", and the maintenance of Marxist-Leninist-Mao Zedong Thought (MLM), combined with China's emphasis upon building a socialist-economy; many analysts have stated that China is ideologically void, and therefore the legitimacy of the CCP is vacuous. It appears to some, like Barmè (1994, p.272), that the dynamic, yet explosive, cocktail of MLM and economic marketisation has meant "some authorities have become victims of their own ideological schizophrenia". Academics appear to be split between those who believe that the CCP is facing a crisis of delegitimisation and those who feel that the CCP is relegitimising itself. Those who insist that China is facing a legitimacy crisis centre their argument upon what they perceive to be an unrealistic adherence to MLM as China moves to modernise its economy. For them, China's "legitimacy" appears to be based on the theoretical implications of official ideology of MLM.

A smaller number of China academics have focused on the relegitimisation, or self-legitimisation, of the CCP. As Yang (1996, p.202) notes, "the literature has by and large neglected the dynamic development [of] the [religitmisation] process by the CCP". Yet, it must be noticed, Yang was

concerned with the "consequences" of this process. Relegitimisation within the CCP is focused upon "performance legitimacy": the providing of economic benefits to the populace. Although the official dogma is still MLM, the ideology is slowly "postponing" the "Marxist" and "Maoist" strains, and capitalising on creating a "Leninist-developmentalist" state within a neo-conservative framework.

This chapter reviews the arguments of both "deligitimacy" and "religitimacy". It argues that there is compelling evidence that the CCP is relegitimising itself. The substance of this religitimacy is the adoption of the political theory of neo-conservatism. Indeed, due to the nature of the leaders of the CCP "utilising" the key tenets of this theory (see Chapter Two) in shaping both economic and political policy, the identification of the renewed push by the CCP to religitimise itself as a developmentalist-Leninist state, incorporating elements of performance legitimacy, is important as neo-conservatism has assisted in this relegitimisation. Furthermore, there appears to be a correlation between the adaptation of neo-conservatism by the CCP, the relegitimisation of the CCP, and the establishment of the "Jiang Zemin Era".

DEFINITION OF TERMINOLOGIES

It is important to understand the concepts of "legitimacy", "political legitimacy", "delegitimacy", "religitimacy" and "ideology" in order to fully comprehend and assess the arguments used by various China analysts.

Legitimacy, essentially, is defined as a political relationship between state and subjects (Barker, 1990, p.3). Legitimacy, or political legitimacy, can be qualified as:

> The degree of justifiability of the claim of a particular regime or government in staying in power. Legitimacy is a subjective concept that involves consciousness and awareness. Legitimacy is more of a matter of belief in a mindset than a legal concept. Legitimacy concerns two parties: the governing and the governed. Legitimacy results from the interaction between the government and the general public over the basis of governmental authorities and public obedience. Legitimacy does not require total recognition of government legitimacy claims by the governed (Young, 1998, p.204).

Political legitimacy is derived from other forms of legitimacy, and is one aspect of the justification of an entire social or economic order (Barker, 1990, p.21). Legitimacy, to some, could be the state's ability to maintain peace, order and stability, and to provide basic security, material needs and welfare. Legitimacy, therefore, depends on the performance and efficacy of the government (He, 1996, p.195). Political legitimacy, stated or implied, is the right to govern, to formulate policies, to attend to the general arrangements of a society, and to enforce its commands (Barker, 1990, pp.24-27). However, legitimacy should not be the independent cause of loyalty among a nation's citizens.

Academics further their delineation of legitimacy to include "regime legitimacy", of which, China, and the CCP, should be included. This is because the CCP's authority over China is as a "regime", as distinct from a "state" or "government" (Lawson, 1993, p.183). Fishman (cited in Lawson, 1993, p.183) defines a regime as a more permanent form of political organisation than a

specific government. In addition, a regime penetrates the apparatus of the state further than other forms of government, such as Western liberal democracy (Fishman, cited in Lawson, 1993, pp.185-187). China's form of government, according to political scientists, is a regime due to the CCP being the sole source of all political power which possesses the exclusive rights to legitimise its form of government.

Delegitimation refers to the process whereby the "serious erosion in legitimacy weakens [the regime's] authority and may lead to its demise" (Yang, 1996, p.204; see also, Schmitter, 1985, p.95). For China, Ding (1994, p.21) asserts, the process of deligimitation is a process of constant comparison made by members of the concerned political community, such as the intellectuals or the informal opposition[13]. These comparisons involve: one, the comparison of the power holders' words and promises with their deeds and actions; and, two, the comparison to other countries (what the Chinese term "horizontal comparison" - *hengbi* - which is in contrast with the officially sanctioned "vertical comparison" - *shubi*, comparing "old China" with "New China").

Self-legitimation, according to Kelly (1998, p.23), refers to states whose autonomy from the societies they govern is maintained through the production and consumption of self-images. Religitimation is the renewal of legitimacy, differing from the regime's old claim to political legitimacy.

---

[13] An "informal opposition" in the case of China can refer to those members of the CCP who may be in differing political factions.

Ideology refers to a system of concepts and principles concerning human life in its entirety, including physical, social, intellectual and affective domains. Zhang (1994, p.82) states that in China, "ideology" is often used interchangeably with the term "worldview"; which he sees as "a cognitive paradigm by which individuals make sense of their existence". For Communist states, ideology plays a crucial role in the politics of state socialism. Cheng suggests that in a Communist state, ideology or theoretical formulations confirm the legitimacy and shape the political climate and economic policies (1990, p.52). Furthermore, the change of ideology in its Chinese context means that change in the practical ideology[14] is a reflection on the dominant CCP leaders' values and opinions. Such systems are "idiocratic"; they rely on an explicit and codified system of political ideas derived from Marxism-Leninism which guides the actions of the political elite in the hegemonic Communist party, and justifies the party's monopoly on power and legitimises its proclaimed mission to build socialism. For example, during the Dengist era, White (1995) notes that the official ideology of MLM was enshrined in Deng's "Four Cardinal Principles".

---

[14] A practical ideology is given extreme importance because it guides central policy, which plays a much more innovative and aggressive role in development in China than in the West. A "guide-line" is neither a specific policy nor the overarching Maoist-Leninist ideology but provides a framework for policies and a formula for applying Marxism Leninism. A guideline defines a particular economic and political goal, provides the criteria for legitimising political-economic behaviour and sets the fundamental moral and ideological principles (Chen Weixing, 1994, pp. 45-46).

DELIGITIMISATION: THE DEMISE OF MARXIST-LENINIST-MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT

Those academics who believe that China is facing a legitimacy crisis base this "deligimitisation process" on the "redundant" usage of ideology as a bastion of legitimacy. As an example, Zhang Baoshui, in his article "Marxism, Confucianism and Cultural Nationalism", has stated that: "In the past the Party leadership derived its legitimacy from Marxism, but Marxism has turned out to be an equivocation, if not a total fallacy" (1994, p.93).

Other academics, such as Shambaugh (1993, p.254), state that the leadership does not have a coherent vision for the future or a plan to solve its problems, reacting instead in an *ad hoc* fashion. Feng (1995, p.2) argues that "China's political system remains an ideological one that requires a theoretical basis for all major policies to sustain the system's legitimacy. Young (1998, p.111) declares that despite the continued efforts at "Party-building", "rectification" and "improving style", "the Party is plagued by indiscipline and organisational weakness; it has lost any persuasive ideological position which can justify its claims to 'leadership'". Furthermore, "members are regarded as, at least, self-serving and, beyond that, are enmeshed in pervasive corruption".

For these academics, it appears that the sole criterion they use in the exploration of the CCP's legitimacy in China is its official adherence to MLMT.

Under Mao, China took a dogmatic approach to the writings of Marx and Lenin, as applied by Mao to Chinese conditions. In fact, the early legitimacy of

the CCP and the Communist Revolution rested, in a large part, on an explicit belief that China's future rested with Communism (Kluver, 1996, p.2). In addition, the incorporation of "Mao Zedong Thought", or Maoism, meant that China was in a "continuous revolution", with the attempt at keeping socialist goals and values alive as meaningful guides to social and political action (Meisner, 1989, p.352).

Feng (1995, p.200) notes that communist ideology is a self-enclosed system in that it claims an undisputed superiority over other ideologies. The ruling power within this Communist system convinces society that Communism represents the best alternative to societal development. Marxists believe that there are qualitative differences between belief in a social or economic system, and a belief in a governmental one (Barker, 1990, p.27). Chinese Marxism, then, is a very specific, historically conditioned, ideological system (Kelly, 1998, p.20). The fundamental principles of the CCP's ideology, according to Feng (1995, p.13), serve to: determine the Party's final goal; legitimate the CCP's leading role in society; define the social and political order the CCP wants to maintain; and, provide a worldview framework to evaluate everything from policies to social behaviour.

The legitimacy of the Party is largely based on its role in history as the apex of struggle against oppression (Kluver, 1996, p.38). Since ideological justifications, then, serve as the primary basis for legitimate rule in Communist countries, all policy and personnel decisions need to be framed with an ideological explanation. However, due to the necessity for ideology to be ultimate and unchanging, policy changes or theoretical turnabouts are either

ignored or downplayed (Kluver, 1996, pp.35-37). Marxist nations define identity by the achievement of an ultimate goal, yet, in the case of China, the legitimacy of the CCP rests on a certain vision of China's past and future; a vision, Kluver believes, that has been largely dismantled by the process of Deng's economic reform (1996, p.2).

Scalapino (1986, p.60) states that in China (as in Vietnam and North Korea) the effort to achieve and maintain legitimacy has taken two forms. Firstly, a high premium has been placed upon Marxist-Leninist ideology (that encompasses terminologies such as "the people", "democracy", "class enemies" and "nationalism"). From this ideology emanates a moral authority to rule. Secondly, citizens have been involved in public politics in specific ways: mobilisation for various campaigns; memberships in mass organisations and voting; and the participation in political study sessions. This allowed the population to perceive that they were part of the political process. Scalapino concludes that the available evidence indicates that public support for the CCP was the highest in the years between 1950 and 1956, when memories of the war preceding Communist victory were still fresh (though the low points were in 1960-61 and immediately after the Cultural Revolution)(1985, p.75).

It is commonly argued that China has faced two serious legitimacy crises since the PRC was founded by the CCP. The first occurred in the aftermath of the Cultural Revolution and the death of Mao. To salvage its legitimacy, the CCP shifted its emphasis from Marxist-Maoist ideology, that is,

economic socialism and Mao's charismatic appeal, to economic modernisation and political institutionalisation[15]. This new basis for legitimacy, then, according to some academics, led to the CCP's second legitimacy crisis, which Yang (1996), amongst others, states was epitomised by the Tiananmen Incident.

It is China's modernisation program, with its conflicting ideology to that of Marxism, and, more so, Maoism, which academics believe is leading to the CCP's deligimisation. As Feng (1995, p.20) states, a Leninist state faces a two-fold legitimacy crisis. Firstly, not unlike developmental states, Leninist states can be challenged as non-credible if they fail to maintain sustained economic growth and raise peoples' living standards. Secondly, a legitimacy crisis can occur if the Communist regime achieves economic success in ways that deviate from fundamental ideological principles and therefore undermines the orthodox foundation of that system.

Feng goes on to argue that ideology remains relevant, not because the Party still needs to derive inspiration from it, as in the Maoist era, but because the Party has to present policy changes through the overlay of ideological rhetoric (1995, pp.2-3). Therefore, the concept of deligitimacy extends from the Party's refusal to renounce its ideology, whereby ideology, then, continues to constrain the workings of new ideas and policy manoeuvres (Feng, 1995, pp.2-3). Therefore the Party's survival using unorthodox practical reforms (which are often blatantly capitalistic in nature) have to be carried out within the established ideology.

---

[15] Political institutionalism could include the "re-inventing" of the NPC under Qiao Shi and the desire to establish in China the "rule of law". See Chapter Five for more details.

It is true that China appears to be entering a "phase of cynical rejection", as termed by Kelly (1998, p.58), as a mass phenomenon, which was first characterised in Eastern European nations several decades ago. Young states that the manipulation of the orthodox ideology has reinforced this cynicism (1998, p.118). In China nowadays, political campaigns elicit limited support, perceived anti-social behaviour is constituted as a serious problem, and, importantly, efforts to revitalise the ideological base have run into difficulty (Scalapino, 1986, p.75). "Vertical campaigns", reminding people how miserable their lives were before the creation of the PRC and how much progress has since been achieved have been intensified. Furthermore, it appears that cynicism and indifference are especially widespread among the younger, better-educated Chinese (Scalapino, 1986, p.69). Barmè (1994, p.274) posits that the Maoist worldview that gave the Chinese population a sense of self-worth has been dismantled; what remains, he continues, "is a crude pre-World War I positivism, a faith in science, material wealth, capitalism and national strength".

Young believes that though the new orthodoxy may be effective in countering "leftism" it offers little else, apart from easing the doubt of the Party's vanguard rationale (1998, p.119). Both ideological erosion and economic reform have undermined the relevance of the CCP, according to Young (1998, p.123), as well as throwing into greater doubt cadres' commitment to the Party or acceptance of its prescribed norms and operating procedures. Young views the Party as self-serving (1998, p.119), and that the Party authorities themselves have contributed to the erosion of Party ideology (1998, p.114), especially with widespread corruption amongst CCP officials. Essentially, Young concludes

that "by reducing socialism to economic goals, the Party has effectively rendered irrelevant its unique claim to political leadership" (1998, p.118), especially in terms of the previously articulated orthodoxy.

It has also been stated that China's retained allegiance to socialist principles on which it was founded, with its ultimate goal of achieving the perfect Communist state, ignores the global reality of the dissolution of the former Soviet-bloc and its recanting of Marxism-Leninism (Kluver, 1996, p.1). This adds to the embarrassment of orthodox Marxist-Leninism's apparent stagnation and the decline of it as being the "theoretically superior socialist system" (Zhang, 1994, p.82).

Yet most China analysts fail to differentiate the purpose of ideology in the Mao and Deng eras. Sun (1995, p.22) asserts that the one major legacy of the Mao era was "ideological absolutisation" (his definition). He defines this to mean that official doctrine was claimed to be the total truth which grounded "correct behaviour and thinking". Therefore, there was no deviation in theoretical Mao Zedong Thought or Marxism-Leninism and reality. Indeed, Sun (1995, p.120) proposes that the "rethinking of the socialist system first came to the Chinese political agenda [in an] effort to repudiate the policies and ideology of the Mao era".

It needs to be remembered that for China's ideology, like its Soviet equivalent's beforehand, the faith in the classic Marxist-Leninist ideology tends to die out with the revolutionary generation, whereby the avowal of such faith becomes more or less tactical. Schmitter states that the ideological decay of the

orthodox dogma within the CCP involved in the transmission of political values across generations affects the legitimacy of regimes, whereby a secular process of decline and disillusionment abound "once the generation that organised it [passes] away" (1986, p.94).

Furthermore, academics who believe in the CCP's deligimisation as a plausible motive for the demise of the CCPs authoritarianism need to be aware that is quite difficult to prove such claims either logically or empirically. As with the advent of "democracy" in Russia and Eastern Europe, the regime's downfall could be much more closely linked with the desire by the populous for material goods. In addition, as Scalapino (1998, p.37) notes, China currently enjoys more stability, with less coercion, than it has had in most periods in the past.

More divisive than ideological decline, though, is the corruption that has taken hold in the CCP. Corruption is so severe that it threatens the legitimacy of the CCP and it has burgeoned in the reform period because there is no clear line between what is permissible and what is illegal or illegitimate (Hong, 1997 , p.93). Corruption serves to undermine the Party's claim to moral authority, and efforts to address it have included such things as the discipline inspection system and the public drives against economic crime. As such, corruption taints the Party as a "decaying organisation" (as defined by Goldstein, cited in Young, 1998, p.121). It is clear that if the Party were able to tackle corruption seriously, it has the potential to regain a measure of popular esteem (Watson, 1996 p.23)

RELEGITIMISATION

Those academics insisting that China is facing a legitimacy crisis state that if the Cultural Revolution had devastated peoples' belief in Communism and MLM, economic reform damaged faith in traditional morals and values (Hong, 1997, p.97). The government itself has given up its ideological insistence on Communism, though it symbolically retains MLM as the officially ideology in China (Hong, 1997, p.98).

Since 1978, China's economic reform process has demanded a revaluation of China's ideology. The previous "mistakes" of the Cultural Revolution were assigned to Mao; and there was a shift to economic modernisation through the "Four Modernisations" as the criterion by which to judge the CCP's success (Watson, 1996, p.1). Essentially, then, development or "performance legitimacy" has become the sole criterion for evaluating policies and political leaders (Tong, 1998, p.104). Kane (1995) has simplistically explained the usage of "performance legitimacy" as a means of the CCP to "take a momentous leap in abandoning any claims to legitimacy based upon appeals of history or ideals, and that the CCP has come to base its legitimacy on the ability to make China and the Chinese people rich".

These policies are indeed moving away from basic Marxist principles and challenging doctrines, such as the definition of "socialism" long held sacred in Marxist circles. More interestingly, they reject and contradict Mao Zedong Thought (a detailed examination is explored further in this chapter). Yet, ideology is not inelastic; it does contain the potential for theoretical revision.

It should be remembered that Deng was the author of the "Four Cardinal Principles", with its inclusion of the maintenance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, in order to appease the Maoist hard-liners, so that they in return would support Deng's vision of the "Four Modernisations". Essentially, since then, Mao Zedong Thought has been rejected and Marxism has been sidelined. Mao Zedong Thought is now known as a "scientific system", that is, Mao's Thought needs to be taken in the specific context in which it was formulated. As Kluver (1996, p.2) states, "many of the reforms are not only capitalist, but are directly contradictory to the policies of Mao on whom the entire Chinese political structure rested for decades". Leninism, with its rigid structure of Party organisation and rule, remains. Ultimately, China is a Leninist-developmentalist state, or a "market-Leninist society" (as defined by Harding, 1998, p.12). Under these conditions, there are only two lines of effective appeal to the Chinese populace in this period of economic growth and political fluidity: nationalism and material gain (Scalapino, 1986, p.69; and Harding, 1998, p.12) – both of which are incorporated in the political thought of neo-conservatism.

Thus, religitimation of the CCP is predominantly three-fold. First, the CCP's reassessment of socialism and ideology has been an important form of religitimisation, and, second, socialism has been used as a basis of nationalism. This relegitimisation provides a varied role for "socialism" in China. It is an extension of the Party's positive equation of "socialism" with "Party dominance". Together, the reorientation of the ideology and the incorporation of "nationalism" into Chinese "socialism" lead to the third element: the legitimacy of the CCP is

based on "performance legitimacy". That is, the CCP has to "guide" in the economic and technological modernisation of the country whilst inspiring nationalism in the populace.

The Reassessment of Socialism

For Zhang (1994, p.93), the CCP's reassessment of capitalism and the redesign of socialism are signs that the "Party is in a psychotic state, although its ideological coping mechanism is still trying to function [so as] to preserve its institutional existence". Zhang states that "the myth of the Party's monopoly of truth has been shattered completely, even for some of the most loyal loyalists" (1994, p.93). Zhang believes that the Party has an "inability to invoke Marxism for its rescue…talking about exploitation and poverty under capitalism only embarrasses the CCP…predictions of the death of capitalism sound self-mocking" (1994, p.93).

What the CCP has attempted to do, however, is to incorporate capitalistic economic disciplines and terminologies into its official economic ideology (Feng, 1995, p.4). "Socialism" is now defined as the development of productive forces, rather than as a system to guarantee egalitarianism (Kluver, 1996, p.110). Naturally tensions inevitably arose with the merging of capitalist ideas in a system that relied upon socialism for its legitimacy (Feng, 1995, p.4; and Hughes, 1998, p.67). Legitimacy in Chinese socialism, as defined by Dirlik (1989, p.365), is based on the premise that socialism must have a Chinese

colouring and meet the (economic and/or developmental) needs of the Chinese society.

The continual reinterpretation of "socialism" is crucial to the Party's vanguard leadership claim (Young, 1998, p.115). The new economic ideology did contribute to many policy dilemmas, and was a source of political conflict (Feng, 1995, p.4). Yet, as Kluver (1996, p.109) notes, it was Marxism that brought the revolution to China, and Marxist theory that has "assisted" with economic reforms, so there was no reason to consider any other ideological grounding, at least not publicly.

The current ideology does appear similar to capitalism. Intellectuals and policy elites created the new economic system by first flexibly interpreting Marxism and then systematically borrowing capitalist ideas (Feng, 1995, p.4). But it needs to be noted that Marxist ideology fails to provide solutions to China's problems of economic modernisation. This is essentially due to the fact that Marxism, in its original meaning, is more a theory of social transformation based on prescribed material conditions, rather than a practical model of economic development (Feng, 1995, p.198). Indeed, Marxist-led revolutions, such as China's, have been successful in economically underdeveloped countries. This differs to Marx's notion that a socialist revolution would occur in advanced capitalist countries. As such, nations such as China lack the Marxist defined social and material prerequisites for socialism (Meisner, 1989, p.344). Marxism, as a theory, rests on the central proposition that socialism

presupposes capitalism. As Meisner (1989, p.344) notes, "original Marxist theory...championed the historical necessity of capitalism".

Therefore, the incorporation of capitalist economic concepts into the official ideology generated certain profound policy and political predicaments for the CCP (Feng, 1995, p.4). To avoid damaging the ideologically based legitimacy, Chinese policy makers attempted to interpret all reform policies as compatible with the official ideology. China's compromise with capitalism represents, as Dirlik (1989, p.370) states, "nothing but an innovation within socialism to carry socialism to a higher plane". Indeed, the utilisation of capitalism is designed to serve, not subvert, national autonomy and national self-image.

As such, the Party's treatment of "socialism" has been associated with, amongst others, the slogans of "socialism with Chinese characteristics", "primary stages of socialism" (*shehuizhuyide chuji jiedun*), as well as Deng's "criterion of truth". Yet it should be noted, as Sun (1995, p.10) has, that

> The drastic course of change in post-Mao China has often led to the neglect of the facts that there have been serious struggles [by the reformers and the conservatives in the CCP] over the nature and goals of reform and that a particular course of change has only occurred as an outcome of such struggles.

Misra (1998) suggests that Deng's "criterion of truth" played a crucial role in establishing legitimising flexibility and the reorientation of ideology to the demands of economic construction. Used to assist Deng and his followers

overthrow Mao's designated heir Hua Guofeng in the late 1970s, the campaign on "practise is the sole criterion of truth" skilfully employed selective Maoist tenets to discredit other ones. The campaign accomplished the reformist leadership's goal of establishing a new ideological consensus and addressed the crisis of legitimacy brought about at the end of the Cultural Revolution (Misra, 1998, p.27). Misra argues that the usage of the "criterion of truth" was the "first attempt to spell out a new post-Mao stance, which could justify a retreat from leftism and the reorientation of policy towards rapid and sustained economic and technical modernisation". Deng's advocacy of "seeking truth from facts" legitimised (economic) practise over (Marxist-Maoist) theoretical validation (Misra, 1998, p.52); China's opening to the outside revealed the realisation of the gap between reality and theory. In addition, the easing of restrictions on intellectuals assisted in the development of any ideological discourse.

The slogan of "socialism with Chinese characteristics" was essentially a theoretical attempt to deviate from the Soviet centrally-planned command economy. Under the patronage of the then General Secretary, Hu Yaobang, economists associated with the CASS (Chinese Academy of Social Science) Economic Research Institute, headed by Liu Guoguang, examined the socialist economic model of the Soviet Union and other socialist variants (such as the Yugoslav and Chinese models) from late 1983 to early 1984. Sun Yan (1985, p.188) suggests that it was Su Shaoshi's article "Develop Marxism in the Full Scale Reform and Build Socialism with Chinese Characteristics" (1983), supported by such theorists as Yu Guangyuan and Fan Ruoyu, that assisted in the campaign. The purpose of the campaign, then, was to allow the reformers

to launch a major ideological offensive questioning the "essential" nature of planning and, more importantly, the principle of state ownership. This was done in order to decentralise economic planning and move towards economic marketisation. It was in June 1984 that Deng Xiaoping gave a speech titled "Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics" which was used as the "theoretical basis" for the reform from September of that same year.

The thesis of the "primary stages of socialism" was used by Zhao Ziyang, the then General Secretary (after the fall of Hu Yaobang in 1987, due to the student demonstrations late in that same year), to counter his critics on both the left and right within the CCP (Misra, 1988, p.115). Indeed, the theory of the "primary stages of socialism" was adopted at the Thirteenth Party Congress in October 1987. The notion of "primary stages of socialism" was first raised in 1979 by Su Shaoshi and Feng Lanrui at the Theory Conference, which was held under the auspices of Hu Yaobang to assist in ideological reorientation. Their article, "The Question of the Stages of Social Development After the Seizure of Power by the Proletariat" (1979, *Jingji Yanjiu*, no. 5, pp. 14-19), attempted to locate China in a pre-socialist phase whilst retaining a Marxist perspective and remaining ideologically defensible (Misra, 1998, p.185).

As Misra has noted, Su and Feng maintained that socialism in the Chinese context meant that socialism is transitional. They divide the stage of transition from, one, capitalism to socialism by a (i) transition period, that is a seizure of power by the proletariat, and (ii) "underdeveloped socialism", two, developed socialism, that is, the kind of socialist society envisioned by Marx and Lenin, to three, communism (Misra, 1998, p.93). As China's society was not

one envisioned by Marx or Lenin, China could not be called "completely socialist". However, Su and Feng deem, since China's society was a product of a proletarian revolution and one where the means of production was brought under public control, China could be called socialist, albeit "underdeveloped". They also thought that Maoist "egalitarianism" and its opposition to "distribution to work" was premature, and that due to the peasant-agricultural base of China in the Maoist era, China was not sufficiently ready for socialist commune systems (Misra, 1998, pp.91-94). When first presented in 1979, the conservatives were against any notion that the CCP had captured power before "socialist" conditions had been met (Misra, 1988, p.56). The version of the thesis presented by Zhao Ziyang did not emphasise China's "unsocialist" nature or the unfeasibility of socialism but highlighted China's weak material base (Sun, 1995, p.195).

The reinterpretation of socialism throughout the 1980s was consolidated, for example, as the Party finally settled on the goal of building a "socialist market economy" and introduced the theoretical notion that China had entered its "second revolution" at the Fourteenth Party Congress in October 1992 (Watson, 1996, p.2).

To build a "socialist market economy", "relations of production" should be adjusted, then, to meet the demands of growth. Indeed, almost any economic practises could be regarded as "socialist" if they contributed to growth (Young, 1998, pp.115-116). Furthermore, as long as the public sector is greater than the private sector, it was deemed, that that nation was socialist (Kluver,

1996, p.111). Also, the "socialist market" doctrine asserts that capitalism can thrive under socialism, to the enrichment of both (Kluver, 1996, p.112).

Analysts have been using the phrase "second revolution", at least since the mid-1980s, to explain China's modernisation program. However, Chinese leaders were slow to use the phrase as it implied a drastic set of changes, something the reformers did not want to acknowledge. It was in Jiang's speech at the Fourteenth Party Congress (1992) that the proclamation was made that Deng's economic reforms begun at the 1978 Plenum was a "second revolution". It was argued that just as historic progression established the inevitability of the first revolution, that is the founding of the CCP in 1949, historical progression demanded the second revolution, that of the modernisation of the economy (Kluver, 1996, p.106). The usage of the terminology of "second revolution" to explain the importance of the economic modernisation is due to being a Leninist party, the CCP needs to uphold its revolutionary momentum in order to keep socialism vital and, thus, maintain its legitimacy (Feng, 1995, p.199).

Kluver (1996, p.94) notes that after the 1987 Thirteenth Party Congress, the CCP was forced to continue its search for ways to justify both the continuance of the reforms and the legitimacy of the Party. The concepts of "second revolution" and "primary stages of socialism", presented at the Fourteenth Party Congress (1992), meant that a new theoretical paradigm had been devised to release China from the orthodoxies of Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought. The hegemony of the CCP, though, was not to be questioned;

the maintenance of political stability is used as a tool for the Party's legitimacy to rule.

Indeed, in Jiang's speech there was no condemnation of Mao, and any mention of Mao was relegated to his revolutionary legacy without endorsing any of his policies. By arguing that Mao had brought about the first revolution, the creation of the People's Republic of China, and, therefore, Deng the second, the "Four Modernisation's" policy, Jiang was able to exclude Mao's economic policies from impacting upon current policy. In addition to this, though Deng was praised for initiating the reform program, the program was beholden to the Party. Therefore, it would appear, by de-emphasising individuals and emphasising the Party, Jiang's speech reinforced the legitimacy of the Party as the guiding force in society (Kluver, 1996, p.106).

The current focus is not on building "socialism" *per se*, but on the construction of the necessary economic foundations (Meisner, 1989, p.356). With the emergence of the "primary stages of socialism", the CCP has postponed the "real" (or "genuine") socialist society to a very distant and unpredictable time in the future (Meisner, 1989, pp.355-356).

According to Kluver (1996, p.59), the Party's recourse to MLM, although weakened by dialectical materialist line, allows "practise" to be the external criteria. Although the unique role of the CCP is immune from ideological questioning, its position, or legitimacy, should be based on economic performance (Kluver, 1996; and, Young, 1998). As such, it should be noted that the introduction of this new economic ideology has resulted in the renewed

legitimacy of the CCP (He, 1996, p.196). Socialism, then, has come to mean little more than economic growth (Young, 1998, pp.115-116).

Feng (1995, p.15) identifies what he terms "instrumental principles" that have influence the fundamental principles contained in the official orthodoxy. These instrumental principles are "dogmatic", "pragmatic" or "divergent". Dogmatic principles are directly derived from, and serve to actualise, the orthodox ideology, for example Mao's communal systems. Pragmatic principles are loosely grounded on ideology but are grounded on practical needs; therefore, they represent and serve to fill the gap between ideology and reality, for example communal systems being incorporated into capitalistic Town and Village Enterprises (TVE) under Deng. Divergent principles actually come from another ideological source but are defined in terms of the existing ideology, for example, the capitalistic reinterpretation of "socialism".

Therefore dogmatic principles reflect the pre-reform Maoist years of the CCP. The pragmatic type has been used extensively during the reform years, especially in the Dengist era. The divergent principles emerged in the late 1980s. This was when the reform was demanding bold policies beyond the existing ideological framework.

Essentially Deng has generally been viewed as a pragmatist by China analysts. Pye (in He, 1996) has identified four means employed by Deng to counter the changes in ideological orientation. First, the maintenance of political stability was (and is still) used as a tool for the Party's legitimacy to rule.

Second, ideology was used to legitimate the Party, yet also to protect (or "stifle") the discussion of politics that could lead to factional strife. Third, Deng managed to keep order through fear, expedience, fatalism (lack of alternatives) and sheer discipline. Fourth, the usage of pragmatism to legitimate the CCP (pp.194-195).

It is ironic, though, that Deng's pragmatism contradicts his emphasis upon the "Four Cardinal Principles". This is because ideological legitimisation implies the source of the legitimacy from the top, while Deng's pragmatism, which entails performance legitimisation, is based on material gains and is therefore open to popular scrutiny. The dilemma that faced China, especially in the 1980s, was that it was caught within a set of contradictory imperatives: if the CCP responded to ideological requirements, it undermined the rationality of the market economy; and if it responded to economic rationalism, it undermined the ideology. Therefore, the leadership "swung" between the two; they vacillated between ideological and pragmatic rationale (He, 1996, pp.195-196).

From pragmatism, divergent principles under capitalistic auspices arose. Yang (1996, p.202) states that the CCP modified and shifted its legitimacy mode to economic nationalism and traditional Chinese political conservatism to provide a crucial part of the answer to the stability of the current regime. Yang's assessment is similar to that of the political theory of neo-conservatism that currently pervades the current leadership's ideology.

The reforms have focused upon the forbidden realm of orthodoxy, "creating an exciting intellectual environment where a new ideology or ideologies may gradually coalesce while interacting with the old" (Zhang, 1994, p.82).

Goldman (1996, p.49) states that "the waning of overarching ideology and weakening Party controls allows room for intellectual exploration and individual creativity without reference to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, or any thought". But, it should be noted that there is a movement whereby high-ranking leaders blame subordinates for poor governmental performance and corruption, thereby shifting the focus of popular resentment from the system to incumbents (Ding, 1994, p.21).

Ideological considerations have given way to practical concerns. The barriers to marketisation are no longer ideological but social and structural (Tong, 1998, p.103). Leadership ideas are influenced by intellectuals and policy elites. "Ideas from above" perform a significant function of forming and redefining political discourse and ideology in which new policy proposals could emerge (Feng, 1995, p.3).

While still relying on ideology for legitimacy, the CCP has no longer been sure that this ideology can generate "legitimacy as believed" (as defined by Feng, 1995, p.18), thus, the advent of "performance legitimacy". In addition, though some of the processes towards modernisation have caused the erosion of state authority (though the policies were intended to strengthen the party-state) (Shambaugh, 1993, p.253), even if the ideological apparatus was actually dismantled the CCP would undoubtedly retain bureaucratic elements of a Leninist political culture (Kelly, 1998, p.37).

Young (1998, p.114) states that the CCP's new ideological definitions of "socialism" and other Marxist creeds have been a response to the declining

significance of the official ideology within the Party and Chinese politics. It needs to be noted, though, that the CCP's public ideology is not usually for just the public's consumption, nor does the CCP expect public adherence to the ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Relegitimisation, or self-legitimation, though designed for public consumption, is more designed for the CCP's political hierarchy. It reinforces the regime's self-confidence by presenting a "mirror" in which its virtues are enhanced and faults hidden. MLM crucially contains, as part of its own theory, the view that control of the ideological system in itself provides a token of legitimacy (Kelly, 1998, pp.57-58).

Essentially, ideology is used to identify power groups within the CCP, and is used as a resource in elite conflicts in China (Kelly, 1998, p.60). For example, the speeches that arise from Party Congresses and other important meetings are important not so much as to persuade the nation, but to reveal the new political line and the compromise/consensus of top Party officials, thus providing clues of acceptable belief and behaviour, ultimately to create the political reality (Kluver, 1996, p.130).

"Socialism" as a form of "Nationalism"

"Socialism" has also been successfully used by the CCP due to its linkage with historical and nationalistic appeals, in the notion that "only socialism can save China…" (Young, 1998, p.116). Scalapino (1986, p.69) asserts that China is moving in the direction similar to that of the former Soviet Union, by

laying claim to the allegiance of the people. This is done by abandoning class struggle in favour of a united front of the whole people and injecting nationalism into all important pronouncements and policies. Nationalism, and internationalism, has always been a priority for Communist regimes. Most communist regimes, like the CCP, came to power in the context of wars against external forces and were therefore connected with the struggle for independence (Scalapino, 1986, p.60). Essentially, as Dirlik paraphrases, "Chinese socialism is nationalistic in orientation" (1989, p.365).

Since 1989, there have been numerous indications that there is a growing disenchantment with the West, and a belief that the West, its values and systems, have not made much difference to post-Communist countries (Barmè, 1994, p.273). Indeed, the CCP plays on the fear of chaos held by the Chinese. The leaders point to the former Soviet Union, where the market, civil society and democratisation have not led to economic advancement, improved welfare and political freedoms for all but rather to the rise of economic Mafia, a drastic fall in living standards, collapse of welfare nets and the brooding shadows of a resurgent Russian nationalism (Saich, 1998, p.261). In fact, the social and economic chaos that followed the Soviet Union's and Eastern Europe's revolution has led the Chinese to cherish their current stability (Liu, 1993, p.244).

Scalapino states that with the ideological decay amongst the populace, nationalism - which has always been embedded in China's Communist movement - has been surging (1998, p.37). However, Zhang (1994, p.82) asserts that the contention between the official cultural nationalism and the

cultural nationalism of the Chinese populace will intensify, to the disadvantage of the Party orthodoxy. For Dirlik , (1989, p.369)

> Chinese socialism has been but a disguise for, or instrument of, the national quest for wealth and power to which socialism as an ideology in its own right has been largely irrelevant.

The Advent of "Performance Legitimacy"

As a Leninist-developmentalist state, China is pursuing economic reform whilst undertaking slow political change. As Harding (1998, p.12) notes, the principle objective of the CCP is to promote economic modernisation, not Maoist "class struggle". Apart from nationalism and economic rationalism, other important areas where ideology is still invoked are to defend the CCP leadership in politics and state ownership of major industry. Zhang (1992. pp.92-92) surmises that China's leadership realised it was impossible to keep its people content without adapting to a market economy that not only promises deliverance of economic goods but also requires far-reaching social and political change. For Zhang, China has had to initiate its own "peaceful evolution".

It appears, then, that the Chinese government is utilising "performance legitimacy" as a basis for its legitimacy claims, based on China's economic performance and nationalism. Performance legitimacy has been utilised extensively in nations where the government has been maintained by either a one-party state or a one-party dominant state. Huntington (1991, p.27) indicates that Western democratic states are less dependent on performance legitimacy

that authoritarian states. This is because in the Western democratic systems, failure is blamed on the incumbents instead of the system, with the ouster and replacement of the incumbent to renew the system through the use of an opposition in government. Singapore, amongst others, is an exemplar of the Asian region's one-party dominant states. In such a political system, the Singaporean Peoples' Action Party (PAP) dominates the legislature and much of the political life. Although the existence of other political parties is tolerated, they are weak and ineffectual. In fact, the relative weakness of the opposition parties in Singapore is one of the reasons for the PAPs continual political domination (Lee, 1986, p.207).

East Asian states rely heavily upon performance legitimacy, and thus, provide a good example of the function of "political legitimacy". Johnson's (1987, *Political Institutions and Economic Performance: the Government Business Relationship in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan*, in Feng, 1995) analysis was that the East Asian states are "ultimately legitimised not by their ideological pretensions" but "by their results". Furthermore, these nations do not have a strong ideological commitment to equality and social welfare; they simply define growth, productivity, and competitiveness as the foremost and even single-minded priority of the state. In addition, unlike Communist nations, they do not have a goal culture, that is, a pronounced commitment to an explicit program of social transformation (Feng, 1995, pp.19-20). Lee (1986, p.202) states that the political, social and economic life in Singapore has been influenced by the PAP's political ideology of survival and the concept of achievement.

An examination of these Asian one-party dominant states reveals that "performance legitimacy" is not based on economic development alone. The "performance legitimacy" of the nations has been enhanced by being accompanied by slow political institutionalisation, and with the emergence of the rule of law (Pei, 1995, p.66). Indeed, as shall be verified in later chapters, China has begun a process of political reform through political institutionalisation - although China has not yet begun the moves to democratisation as was achieved in Taiwan. For the time being, "performance legitimacy" is based on China's economic expansion, modernisation and nationalism.

By the 1992 Fourteenth Congress, the CCP had attempted to religitimise itself[16]. Although some China analysts deem that the CCP's deviation from the Marxist-Maoist creed has effectively meant that the party will continue to face a legitimisation crisis, they ignore the substantial undertakings by the CCP to renew the ideology to allow for China to mount its transformation into a burgeoning giant. The irrelevant notion of "socialism" fashioned under Mao's "ideological absolutisation" has been discarded. With the reinterpretation of Marxist texts, the CCP has used "practice" as the criterion in which to judge the sustainability of the party. Theoretical re-evaluation has allowed the introduction of such slogans as "socialism with Chinese characteristics" and "primary stages of socialism" which befit China's modernisation program. In addition, the CCP has successfully intertwined the concept of socialism with that

---

[16] This was achieved by the Congress affirming China's "socialist market economy" and that the theory of "socialism with Chinese characteristics" was to be its guiding principal. See Chapter Five for more information.

of nationalism. The Chinese Communist Party has effectively become a nationalist party (though this should not be confused with the Nationalist Party in Taiwan, the Kuomintang).

With MLM reduced to a Leninism-developmentalist framework, incorporating the thesis of neo-conservatism, the CCP has looked towards "performance legitimacy" as the basis of its legitimacy. Not unlike other nations in the Asian region, the advent of "performance legitimacy" assists the CCP in retaining leadership in politics and directing the economic modernisation necessary in that country.

Politically, democratisation is '"officially" outside public discourse, although, at times, it had been a topic tolerated and somewhat encouraged by reformist leadership of Zhao Ziyang and his encouragement of the political theory of neo-authoritarianism in the late 1980s (Tong, 1998, p.103). As part of the framework underlying he neo-conservative evolution of the "Jiang Zemin Era", Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought will continue to lose ideological viability: orthodoxy will be based on Leninism and developmentalist modernisation within a neo-conservative framework. The system does need some semblance of democratic legitimacy, although it is unlikely that the current leadership will initiate an end to authoritarianism and introduce a democratic system (He, 1996, p.211). Indeed, neither the existing authoritarian system nor Western liberal democracy seems practical in China's near future.

For Jiang Zemin, whilst the CCP endeavoured to create terminologies of "socialism" to meet economic challenges, neo-conservatism has enabled him to

not only strengthen and legitimise the CCP but to also legitimise his position as the "core" of the third generational leadership. Socialism in China, under Jiang, incorporated those two central tenets of neo-conservatism: the movement towards a market economy, and the continuation of an "enlightened dictator". Furthermore, socialism in China, as does neo-conservatism, uses "nationalism" in order to unify the populace. Furthermore, as the following chapters shall reveal, neo-conservatism has provided Jiang with a platform to orchestrate a "Jiang Zemin Era".

CHAPTER FOUR

PRE-MORTEM SUCCESSION:

JUNE 1989 TO OCTOBER 1992

Before 1992, Western academics rarely commented on the role of Jiang Zemin within the Chinese hierarchy. Indeed, within the echelons of power in the CCP, Jiang did not commandeer significant political clout in comparison to the likes of Chen Yun or Li Peng. Nor did Jiang consume as much attention in Western journals as did Deng Xiaoping, who was still clearly the "anointed helmsman" by the West. In fact, during this time some Western analysts[17] were already predicting the downfall of Jiang Zemin and assessing "rightful" replacements to the position of General Secretary. It is true that Jiang did not evidence much control within the mechanisms of the CCP[18], but this was ultimately due to the fact that he was Deng's protégé and also because he originally had a minute power base as General Secretary[19] during the time. He did, however, clearly utilise the time to manipulate power relations in such a way in which he would not only retain, and legitimise, his position as General Secretary, but also to strengthen his position by being selected the Chair of the CMC and eventually being appointed the President of the People's Republic of

---

[17] Such comments are reiterated by Chang (2001)

[18] Furthermore, upon becoming Secretary General, Jiang was referred to as "Flowerpot" due to his "penchant for standing around and looking pleasantly idle" (Gilley, Bruce, 2000, "Jiang Zemin: The Great Autopilot", *International Herald Tribune*, 27 September, in Pye, 2001, p.45).

[19] Indeed, Chang (2001, p.37) argues that immediately after the Tiananmen Incident that the position of General Secretary was not that of a "real" leader but more of a "clerk who had to please several elderly bosses".

China. It should be noted that Jiang was successful in achieving the latter during a period in which the conservatives controlled not only the political and economic realms, but one when Deng's economic authority waned (as did that of the reformers) in the CCP.

In order to thoroughly examine Jiang's ability to oscillate between the conservative and reformer factions during this period, it is important to understand the political environment in which he had to operate. Therefore, this chapter discusses his elevation to the position of General Secretary, examines the political climate of the period and traces the rise of the princelings. It also discusses the political implications of Deng's "Southern Sojourn" during the Chinese New Year of 1992, which culminated in a "changing of the guard" at the Fourteenth Party Congress in October of that same year. Finally, this chapter reviews the course of action undertaken by Jiang during this period that enabled him to strengthen and legitimise his position as the "core of the third generational leadership" in the CCP.

THE "ELEVATION" OF JIANG ZEMIN

Due to dissatisfaction with Zhao Ziyang's handling of the students in the lead-up to the Tiananmen Incident of 1989, Deng Xiaoping and other elder conservatives were determined to replace Zhao as the General Secretary of the CCP, even before 4 June 1989. Indeed, the lead-up to the Tiananmen Incident witnessed a conflict between Li Peng and Zhao Ziyang, which reflected the conflict between the reformer and conservative policy perspectives (Teiwes,

2001, p.72)[20]. Furthermore, orthodox Maoists within the CCP were unhappy with Zhao's, and therefore Deng's, advocacy of economic reform and believed that if they were to get rid of Zhao that they would also reduce the influence of the reformers within the CCP. Indeed, Deng learned that there was an anti-Zhao group that consisted of Yang Shangkun, Bo Yibo, Peng Zhen, Chen Yun and Li Xiannian.

Indeed, the elders and contending political power cliques that were responsible for the suppression during the 1989 Tiananmen Incident, would also hold political power after the Incident, including those who wanted to take advantage of their political clout by rolling back Deng's reforms. After the Tiananmen Incident, the elders consisted of Chen Yun, Yang Shangkun, Wang Zhen, Bo Yibo, Li Xiannian, Peng Zhen and Song Renqiong. Lam (1995, p..333-334) states that the latter, with the inclusion of Deng Xiaoping, were collectively referred to as the "Gang of Elders", the "White Eye-browed Cabal", or the "Eight Immortals". The cliques, many of whom were beholden to the elders included: the "Soviet Faction", led by Li Peng and other graduates of the Eastern European bloc universities; the "Beijing Faction", represented by the State Council planners and ideologues in the capital such as the then Beijing Secretary LI Ximing and the Beijing Mayor, Chen Xitong[21]; and the "Gansu Faction", a group of conservative Party functionaries under Organisational Chief, Song Ping.

---

[20] Unlike during the Maoist era, as the "loser" of the internal CCP conflict, Zhao Ziyang was shown remarkable leniency.

[21] Chen Xitong was expelled from the Politburo and as Beijing Mayor on 28 September 1995 for corruption. His demise meant that Jiang had more chance of securing his position as the core.

However, in order for the Chinese populace, and the Western world, to accept a new General Secretary, he (due to the fact that males are the usual recipients of such political positions within China) could not be "tainted with the blood of Tiananmen", unlike Li Peng (Lam, 1995, p.334). Another consideration, for Deng at least, was that the new General Secretary must have some economic reform credentials[22].

Jiang Zemin, in the short term, fulfilled these requirements. Hailing from his political power base of Shanghai, as the Mayor of Shanghai, he was one of the Shanghai-related cadres. As such, these Shanghai cadres were not "tainted" and, equally important, they were practitioners of Deng's open-door policy. They were also less "Westernised" and independent-minded than their counterparts from Guangdong, Fujian or Hainan. In addition, the Shanghai cadres were considered more amenable to central control than the regional "warlords" from the southeast of China, including many affiliates of Zhao Ziyang, whose power base was in Guangdong (Lam, 1995, p.334).

For, Deng, his original expectation of Jiang was merely to hold the Party, nation and army together and to continue with economic reform[23]. Indeed, with Deng's retirement as head of the CMC in November 1989, it is

---

[22] Hu Shaoming believed that Deng choose Jiang because he had to choose someone as General Secretary before Chen Yun or Li Xiannian recommended their own subordinates (FBIS, 1989, August 2, p.13)

[23] In a scathing attack on Jiang's appointment, one China commentator believed that there were four reasons to why Deng chose Jiang as General Secretary. First, that Jiang was a "yes-man", who was "obsequious" to the higher authorities. Second, when Deng went to Shanghai, Jiang deferred to him; third, when Deng asked Jiang, in his capacity as Mayor of Shanghai, to contribute more funds to the central government he hastily agreed. Fourth, Jiang quelled the 1986-1987 student demonstrations in Shanghai without much difficulty. It should be noted the author of this article was a staunch "democrat" and not in favour of Jiang's appointment (FBIS, 1989, July 3, p.23).

evident that his retirement marked the emergence of a shift in power from the "generation that had fought and won the revolution to the first post-revolutionary generation" (Fewsmith,2001, p.53). Chang (2001, p.39) adds that Deng's resignation from the post of Chairman of the CMC not only revealed his self-rebuke at the failure to forestall the Tiananmen Incident, but also, and more importantly, to signal to the other leaders to leave the political stage for the third generational leadership and Jiang.

Although Jiang had a power base in his position as Mayor of Shanghai and his positions at the Ministry of Machine Building and Electronics, as well as at the First Automobile Plant in Changchun, he clearly had less of a power base than any previous successor since Hua Guofeng. He had less status than not only Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang, but also his Standing Politburo colleagues Li Peng and Qiao Shi. Teiwes (2000, p.73) argues that, paradoxically, Jiang's notional weakness actually bolstered his position.

It was to be just five days before June 4 that Deng asked the two political brokers, Li Peng and Yao Yilin, to throw their support behind Jiang, whom Deng had already identified as the new General Secretary (Fewsmith 1997, and Wu Anchia, 1994). Their support was necessary due to the fact that Jiang was more junior in party ranking than either Li or Yao, and that Jiang's "meteoric" rise might provoke opposition. Deng told Li and Yao that on choosing Jiang as the "core":

> The people see reality, if we put up a front so that people feel that it is an ossified leadership, a conservative leadership, or if the people believe that it is a mediocre leadership that cannot reflect the future of China, then there will be constant trouble and there will never be a peaceful day (Fewsmith, 1997, p.474).

In order to assist Jiang, Zeng Qinghong, Jiang's Chief of Staff whilst Mayor of Shanghai, moved with Jiang to Beijing in 1989. Zeng was promoted from Vice-Chair of the General Office of the CCP to Chairman, and eventually an alternate Politburo member. Zeng Qinghong was to become Jiang's confidant, "ideas" man, public-relations specialist and trouble-shooter.

POLITICAL CONSERVATISM

The post-Tiananmen political climate brought about renewed political conservatism which enveloped all aspects of Chinese life: political, cultural and social. As Fewsmith (2001) explains, after the Tiananmen Incident, the dominant objective within the CCP was the need for stability and unity. With Tiananmen as a clear warning of what could eventuate if differences were not contained, the lesson put to the leaders was simply that "we all hang together or we hang separately" (Fewsmith, 2001, p.72).

The strength of the conservatives within the Party in the winter of 1989-1990 was indicated not only be the directness of the challenges to Deng's ideological authority, but also a major effort to restore at least a significant measure of State planning to the economy (Fewsmith, 1997, p.480). For the

conservatives, they had two main aims: one, to lay past blames on Zhao Ziyang; and two, to manipulate both the economic and political spheres for their own, and, as they perceived, the CCP's, political preservation.

For the CCP, the case against Zhao Ziyang was to become an ideological "football". The Fourth Plenary Session of the Thirteenth Central Committee (23-24 July 1989) was convened after a three-day enlarged Politburo meeting, but this Plenum failed to conclude a case against Zhao Ziyang[24]. This alone reflected the depth of division within the Party. At the Fifth Plenary Session of the Thirteenth Party Congress in November 1989[25], however, the Plenum laid out a systematic, albeit implicit, critique of Zhao Ziyang's management of the economy. Furthermore, during the campaign against bourgeois liberalisation, it was impossible to separate criticisms of Zhao from issues of ideology and Party line.

In addition, whilst in the early months after the Tiananmen Incident most economic commentaries published in the *Peoples' Daily* and the *Guangming Daily* were written by unknown reporters or economists, after the Party's Fifth Plenum, these newspapers again intensified serious economic and pro-conservative editorials. For example, a number of well-known economists, including Ma Hong, Zhang Zhouyuan, LI Chengrui and Wan Jiye, all argued in

---

[24] At the 1989 National Day speech, Jiang was reported to have said that Zhao Ziyang had "committed the serious mistake of supporting the turmoil [of the Tiananmen Incident] and splitting the Party" (FBIS, 1989, October 2, pp.17-21).

[25] It was at this Plenary Session that Jiang was appointed the Chairman of the CMC.

measured economic terms the case for the Fifth Plenum calling for continued economic retrenchment (Fewsmith, 1997, p.481).

The retrenchment of the reformist economy began under the slogan of "controlling the economic environment and consolidating the economic order" (Liu, 1994, p.342), which was held in conjunction with the renewed political direction of the *she xiao* education campaign (which is detailed below). By September, even Jiang called for a renewed emphasis upon ideological education and Party building, stating that:

> China will resolutely carry out reforms of both economic and political structures, but these reforms [will] help enhance and improve the Party leadership (*FBIS*, 1989, September 22, p.7).

Liu states that this campaign policy "succeeded only too well", as it caused thousands of factories to go bankrupt and pushed more than thirty million people our of work (1994, p.342). Interestingly, Li Peng[26] and the conservatives could not provide nor implement a successful economic program within this period. As Fewsmith (2001, p.53) states, "after years of carping about the various failings of reform, conservatives at last had a relatively free hand to implement their preferred policies". In fact the continued economic vitality of the township and village enterprise (TVE) systems underscored the success of market-orientated reform rather than the so-called double guarantee system (which restored greater control and planning over two hundred major industries) (Fewsmith, 2001). Therefore, with the Tiananmen protests still fresh

---

[26] At this time Li Peng was concurrently the Premier as well as being the minister of the State Commission for Restructuring Economy of the State Council.

in the minds of the leaders of the CCP, the Party began to gradually de-emphasise the economic austerity and continue economic reform.

In the Chinese political realm, after the Tiananmen Incident, China embarked on the socialist ideology education campaign (*she xiao*) in the rural areas. This campaign represented an attempt by the CCP to link the double track development of "socialist material civilisation" and "socialist spiritual civilisation". Indeed, the reformers within the Party were forced to join the conservatives to present a bipartisan approach accepting the campaign[27], whereby *she xiao* was first announced in a joint circular issued by the CCP Central Committee and the State Council in December 1990. Essentially, the goals and tenets of this campaign were: one, to make the peasants believe in the "truth" (for example, that socialism is superior to capitalism); two, to make the peasants adhere to a correct political orientation; three, to strengthen Party building and the CCP leadership in the countryside; and, four, consolidate capitalism and combat the threat of "peaceful evolution".

It would appear that, by the summer of 1990, there had been a relaxation of the hard-core conservative ideology, as Li Ruihuan, whom Deng had put in charge of ideology, called for a campaign against pornography[28] (Fewsmith, 1997, p.477). Yet, due to the influence of the father-son combination of Chen Yun and his son, Chen Yuan, who was the Deputy Governor of the

---

[27] See also Chen Weixing (1993, pp.70-73).

[28] Campaigns against pornography had begun earlier in late 1989.

Peoples' Bank of China, Li Ruihuan was only a formal figurehead of the ideology leading group. Conservatives had dominated the top levels of the Propaganda and Organisation Departments, as well as those responsible for economic policy making, since the Tiananmen Incident. Indeed, after the Tiananmen Incident, the *Peoples' Daily*, the *Guangming Daily*, *Xinwen Chuban Bao* (*News and Publication*) all tried to actively promote the "struggle against peaceful evolution" in an attempt to restore Mao's ideas and to discredit Deng's reform policy (Zhao Suisheng, 1993, p.744). Deng Liqun, who had returned to power in the academic and cultural spheres, with conservatives attempted to revitalise Mao worship, foment class struggle, and to reindoctrinate Marxism-Leninism (Goldman, 2000, p.115).

Fewsmith, (2001, p.37) argues that the reason the *she xiao* campaign did not last was that the bureaucratic interests and departments reasserted themselves. Indeed, the campaign reveals the nature of Chinese politics whereby informal politics (that is, the elders "retired" to the CAC) can sometimes overrule the formalised political base within the CCP. In addition, Fewsmith notes, this campaign and its predecessor, the campaign against bourgeois liberalisation in 1987, could be manipulated by the formal realm due to the ideological component incorporated into the campaigns.

In order to pacify international opinion and the demands of the Chinese intellectuals after the Tiananmen Incident, the CCP appeared to be bringing about the political adjustment as notably evidenced in the elevation of Jiang

Zemin to the position of General Secretary. After 1989, all senior members of the CCP were careful to point out that political reform in China needed to take place in the context of stability and the "political reform [would] have Chinese characteristics" (Lam, 1995, p.243). Lam clarifies this by revealing several quotes by high officials within China. For example, the then President, Yang Shangkun, was quoted as saying:

> The political system of a country should be determined by actual conditions in that country and not copies from other countries…China resolutely opposes the bourgeois-liberal concept of attempting to copy the Western system, and to change China's existing system (*China News Service*, May 9, 1991).

Deng continually repeated the need for stability (coining the phrase "stability overrides everything", *wending yadao yiqie*, which was first used in his 31 October 1989 talk with Richard Nixon). In addition, Li Ruihuan remarked that "the construction of Chinese democratic politics must be based upon the premise of unity and stability" (*NCNA*, 1993, May 21; in Lam, 1995). Jiang Zemin also stated that "[we] cannot transplant to China the parliamentary democratic system, the multi-party system, and other political systems of the West" (*CNS*, 1990, June 12; and *Ming Pao*, 1992, March 23, in Lam 1995). Reflecting Jiang's political adroitness (to be detailed below), Jiang has on several other occasions stressed that political reform consisted of no more than the "perfection of the socialist democracy". Jiang had also hinted that the Western ideals of democracy and freedom were not compatible with China's "national conditions" (*CNS*, 1990, June 27; in Lam, 1995). In an address in July 1991, Jiang made it very clear that only a very limited degree of the old "let a

hundred flowers bloom" would ever be revived in the cultural arena: "We will never allow bourgeois liberal things to poison the people or society, or counter socialism" (Jiang, in the *Peoples' Daily*, July 2, 1991; in Lam, 1995). Indeed, due to the political climate of the time, Jiang echoed the hard-conservative stance of the elders and Li Peng. As will be detailed further in this chapter, the period directly after the Tiananmen Incident was a period in which Jiang attempted to form alliances with Li Peng and to placate the elders in order to maintain his position as General Secretary.

This period also witnessed the collapse of a succession of Communist parties and the collapse of the Soviet Union. As a result, the CCP's siege mentality intensified, resulting in a further tightening of Party controls over the PLA and the state security organs. The leadership reconfirmed its conviction that it had responded appropriately to the Tiananmen Incident. In addition, the leadership concluded that the Eastern European and Soviet authorities had erred in embarking on the path of political reform and in losing control of their armed forces. On the other hand, neo-conservatism states that political reform needs to be undertaken after the opening up of the economy.

Tian Jiyun, a member of the Politburo and a Vice-Premier of the State, said that:

> The root cause of the Soviet collapse was the people's dissatisfaction with the Soviet-styled socialism, which proved to be inferior to capitalism in creating social productivity (although mistakes of past Soviet leaders should not be overlooked) (Wu Anchia, 1993, June, pp.3-4).

Shambaugh (1992, p.258) also supports the view that it was the collapse of the Soviet Union that convinced Deng to undertake his *nan xun* (also known as Deng's "Southern Sojourn", which is detailed later). Furthermore, by the spring of 1991, Deng simply lacked the political clout to fully reinstate his vision of reform. Fewsmith (1997, pp.491-492) states that there could be various reasons for this. First, Deng failed to win over (or intimidate) his opponents, and also failed to win the support of the "silent majority" of Party elders who seemed "neutral" in the period. Second, it could be assumed that Deng, faced with opposition, chose to bide his time until a more opportune moment. Third, the swift victory of the United States in the Gulf War may very well have renewed fears in Beijing that the world was becoming increasingly unipolar, and that the US would apply new pressures on China. Indeed, this period would see increased pressure from the "princelings", the sons of the CCP elders, to become part of the CCP hierarchy.

THE RISE OF THE PRINCELINGS[29]

It appeared that from late 1990, a top priority of the leadership was to ensure that positions of influence in the Party, government and the army remained in the hands of cadres who were "totally trusted by the CCP". The aim of the "princelings" was to seize as much power as possible at the 1992 Fourteenth Party Congress. Therefore they targeted their attacks at Deng

---

[29] Li (2001) provides an interesting clarification of current members of the *taizidang* in his book *China's Leaders.*

Xiaoping, and his nominated core, Jiang Zemin, especially in their article *Realistic Responses*[30]. Ruan (1992, p.30) suggests that the "theory" within *Realistic Responses* was aimed at negating the guideline of reform and opening adopted at the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Party Congress. Headed by Chen Yuan, Chen Yun's son, the social foundation for the "princelings" was, according to Ruan (1992, p. 31):

> Merely comprised of those political and economic upstarts obsessed with the lust for power and money among children of senior officials, and a small number of "young thinkers" who regard themselves as [being] "more intelligent" than ordinary people.

The "princelings" were supported by not only Chen Yun, but also by Wang Zhen and Deng Liqun, as well as their own protégés such as He Jingzhi and Wang Renzhi.

As of 1991, the contenders for succession were all members of the CCP Politburo Standing Committee. This group was comprised of Jiang Zemin, Prime Minister Li Peng, law and security expert Qiao Shi, Propaganda Chief Li Ruihuan, Party Organisational Chief Song Ping, and Yao Yilin (although he was in poor health). Other influential candidates included: Yang Baibing, Secretary General of the CMC, Zhu Rongji, former Mayor of Shanghai and recently appointed Deputy Minister of the State Council, Ye Xuanping, the son of Ye Jiangying, a former leader of Guangdong Province, and Zou Jianying, Chairman of the State Planning Commission. At this time, the elders, such as Hu Qioamu, Deng Liqun and Zhao Ziyang, could not be discounted, although the patronage

---

[30] See Chapter Two for more information about the article *Realistic Responses.*

provided by the elders was also of assistance. Therefore, Deng supported Jiang, Li Ruihuan and Zhu Rongji; Chen Yun tended to support Li Peng, and to a lesser degree Yao Yilin and Song Ping, who were both in their seventies; Yang Shangkun supported both Li Peng and his half-brother Yang Baibing (Bachman, 1991, p.252).

In order to ensure a position of influence, one would need to possess military support, "image" and political skill. With emphasis on "stability and unity", the leadership was keen to avoid unchecked power struggles that would weaken its rule and disturb the current succession order. An overt power struggle could have possibly split the Party, brought about another "Tiananmen", and threatened Party rule (Bachmann, 1991, p.253).

THE 1992 "SOUTHERN SOJOURN" (*Nan Xun*)

It is here that Deng's "Southern Sojourn" (*nan xun*) assumes added significance so far as these power struggles at the centre are concerned. Essentially, the aim of Deng's "Southern Sojourn" was to end the prolonged policy and ideological debates that had constrained his efforts to revitalise the reform of the economy. Due to the nature of the period from 1989 to Deng's sojourn during the Chinese New Year of 1992, and the movement towards "orthodox leftism", Deng's tour was the most dramatic political event to occur between the Tiananmen Incident and the 1992 Fourteenth Party Congress. Whilst the tour may have been "the most dramatic political incident" during this time, the sojourn can also be deemed "an act of frustration" by Deng

(Shambaugh, 1992, p.257) in order to attempt to reverse the direction in which the orthodox conservatives were leading the country. It is apparent that Deng's pre-emptive attack was against "leftism"; a reference to holding onto orthodox Marxist ideology. Indeed, during his sojourn, it is reported that Deng:

> Blamed [the] leftists for talking too much about "countering peaceful evolution" and not enough about reform and the open door policy (Lam, 1992, January, p.25).

This attack by Deng, Zhao (1993, p.746) posits, was an implicit attack on Chen Yun and the orthodox ideologues. Shambaugh concurs with Zhao's assessment by stating that "'leftism' was Deng's code for his obstructionist opponents in Beijing" (1992, p.258). As a result, the "southern sojourn" allowed the moderate reformers to regain the political initiative, which Baum (1996, p.154) eulogises as the creation of a "new mood of buoyant optimism, reminiscent of the pre-Tiananmen period". However, it must be noted that whilst Deng's sojourn did reignite economic reform with a vengeance, it also unleashed heightened power struggle. This power struggle was to be largely resolved at the Fourteenth Party Congress that was held in October the same year.

As mentioned previously, after the Tiananmen Incident of 1989, Deng Xiaoping had at first agreed to allow orthodox conservatives such as Chen Yun, Yao Yilin, Song Ping and Li Peng, teamed up with a series of other hardliner and military conservatives, to control the economic, cultural, social media and military policies. During this time, Deng remained out of public view, but it needs

to be noted that he was unwilling to shed all the vestiges of formal authority and rule solely through informal means. Deng had given up his last major position, as head of the CMC, in November 1989. Yet, the Thirteenth Party Congress passed a secret resolution that allowed for the referral of all major decisions to Deng as the "helmsman of the Party", even though the role of "helmsman" was not a formal position. Furthermore, although Deng's opponents may have reduced Deng's capacity to exercise authority, they did not directly challenge Deng's position as the "core" of the Party (Fewsmith, 1997, p.498).

However, by late 1990, Deng concluded that conservatives had gone "too far" and that it was time for a re-appraisal of the policies, and a redirection towards further economic reform. His first attempt to reign in the conservatives was during the 1991 Chinese New Year when he used the Shanghai newspaper *Liberation Daily* to call for bold reform. Yet Deng was unable to get the national media to renew the economic reform campaign. This inaction by the national media to renew economic reform revealed that Deng's self-imposed "retirement" after the Tiananmen Incident brought about two realities. First, Deng had indeed lost control of the propaganda apparatus to Chen Yun. Second, as evidenced by the first, he had lost control of the Politburo itself to the orthodox conservatives.

In an attempt to salvage his pre-Tiananmen reforms, Deng decided, as Mao had often done in the past when faced with political opposition to his own policies, to take his case directly to the populace by visiting an economic model, predominantly the Special Economic Zone (SEZ) of Shenzhen, in January 1992.

Essentially, Deng, like Mao before him, apparently concluded that if he could not

work through normal bureaucratic channels, he would need to circumvent them.

Essentially, then, the central leadership had been bypassed as Deng went to the

"masses" to advocate the deepening of reform. As Fewsmith notes (1997,

p.503),

> During 1991, Deng had complained that many of the CCP leaders were "merely going through the motions" of supporting reform and that they were in danger of losing their jobs. It is also interesting to note that Deng specifically signalled his support for Zhu Rongji, whom Deng had sponsored to become a Vice-Premier in March 1991. Deng, remarked on Zhu as "quite capable in economics" , revealing his desire to once again kick-start economic reform.

Deng's sojourn, and its delayed coverage by the national media,

reinforced not only his lack of control over the national propaganda organs, but

also, and more importantly, the opposition Deng faced in Beijing from Chen Yun

and his allies in his attempt to further economic reform. Zhao Suisheng (1993)

delineates the non-media coverage, and the Deng-Chen Yun conflict into three

policy and ideological issues: one, disputing the Party's central objectives, with

Deng promoting market-orientated reforms and economic opening to the outside

and Chen favouring a more orthodox planned-economy approach emphasising

Marxist ideology; two, their conflicting views on capitalism; and, three, their

different perspectives on the roles of the SEZs. Zhao Suisheng (1993, p.743)

concludes that:

> [With the collapse of the USSR], Deng argued that the CCP needed to learn from the experience of the Soviet Communist Party (CSPU) which ha become divorced from the people, had run counter to the interests of the state, and had failed in its attempt to

promote economic development. For Chen, the principle lesson for China was that the CPSU had failed to grasp class struggle. Thus Deng insisted on economic reform while Chen stressed the need to fight "peaceful evolution"[heping yanbian].

Indeed, just weeks before Deng's sojourn, Chen Yun presented a paper discussing "Six Points of View and Opinions" at the Eight Plenary Session of the CAC, which was convened on the last day of the Eight Plenary Session of the Thirteen Party Congress. Essentially, Chen's six points stated that the Party was straying from Marxism and engulfing reform through "overzealousness".

Zhao Suisheng (1993) furthers his argument by stating that both Deng and Chen had clear allies during this period. Zhao (1993, p.743) states that Deng's allies included Yang Shangkun, Yang Baibing, Liu Huaqing, Qiao Shi, Li Ruihuan, Zhu Rongji and Tian Jun. Chen's allies included Li Peng, Yao Yilin, Song Ping, and those in charge of the major ideological organisations which included the CCP Central Propaganda Department, the Ministry of Culture, and major Beijing newspapers.

Fewsmith (2001) states that the reason as to why the Chen Yun-Deng Xiaoping conflict did not fracture the Party was due to Chen Yun's belief in not expressing political differences. Therefore, whilst Chen would comment on reform measures he did not agree with, he did not openly criticize Deng, nor did he openly challenge Deng for the "core" position. On the other hand, Deng tolerated Chen's criticism and the inference by the State Planning Commission in the implementation of reforms. Overall, Fewsmith, (2001, p.54) concurs that there may have been a "mutual recognition" between the two that the Party could not survive another struggle to "win all" like that which occurred in 1978.

Whilst the Hong Kong media organisations were quick to cover Deng's trip, which began on January 19, 1992, in Shenzhen, by publishing timely reports[31], it took nearly two months before Deng's sojourn was reported in China. At first, a few regional newspapers in Shenzhen, Guangdong and Shanghai had begun reporting the event and publishing photographs by early March. It was not to be until March 31, that the *People's Daily* would publish a long detailed account of Deng's activities in an article titled, "East will bring Spring all Around: On the spot report on Comrade Deng Xiaoping in Shenzhen" (Fewsmith, 1997, pp.500-501). However, Shambaugh (1992, p.257) states that it was not until 28 April, 1992, that Deng's sojourn was reported in the national print media, the *People's Daily*. Yet, it should be noted that Fewsmith (1997, p.499) states that on 22 February, the *People's Daily* published an authoritative article that called for strengthening reform. The tour was also televised in an unscheduled documentary developed by the China Central Television station on 31 March (Zhao Suisheng, 1993, p.741). Before the *People's Daily* reported Deng's sojourn, and indicating a new power alignment, the 4 April editorial of the *People's Daily* called for faster economic liberalisation but omitted the usual reference to it being a "leftist deviation". Furthermore, on 8 April, in a small story on its back page, the *People's Daily* openly backed the recent call, by Deng, for faster reform. This was to be the first time since the 1989 Tiananmen Incident that the paper made a public stance on Deng's instructions.

---

[31] It was rumoured, by officials in the SEZ of Zhuhai, that the Hong Kong press "bought" illegally taken photos of Deng in the economic zone.

However, it is interesting to note, as Liu (1994, p.242) has done in his assessment of Den's sojourn speeches, that Deng "pandered" to provincial and local government officials in a bid to gain support for furthering economic reforms. Another interesting focus of Deng's speeches was his contention that without the previous ten years of reform, the CCP would not have survived the upheaval caused by the Tiananmen Incident of 1989 (Fewsmith, 1997, p.497).

Although Deng's sojourn was not reported in substantial detail in the Chinese national media[32], this does not mean that Deng's opponents were not discussing the implications of Deng's trip and his recorded speeches. Within the highest echelons of power within the CCP, it would appear that Deng's trip garnered both support and opposition. Indeed, both Qiao Shi and Yang Shangkun separately accompanied Deng on his sojourn, as Deng had to be accompanied by at least one member of the Politburo. Jiang Zemin also visited Deng in Shanghai on 5 February 1992,

In fact, upon Jiang's return to Beijing, a special Politburo meeting was convened on 8 February[33] in order to consider the trip. At this special Politburo meeting, Deng's emphasis on adhering to the one centre (in other words, for Chen Yun to stop destabilising the Party), accelerating reform and opening up, and counter attacking Chen Yun's dogmatic theory was aired. It was decided to relay the content of Deng's talk orally to cadres at and above the ministerial,

---

[32] The Chinese media still discussed the importance of a Marxist planned economy. For example, the *Dangdai Sichao* (*Modern Ideological Trends*), a theoretical journal of the Propaganda Department, published an article entitled "Erroneously Targeting a Political Trend Will Capsize the Boat", which favoured the struggle against rightism.

[33] Fewsmith (1997) dates this first meeting on 12 February 1992.

provincial and army ranks. Fewsmith does add that he believed this Politburo meeting took place under "obvious pressure from Deng" (1997, p.499). It was not until 2 March that Deng's speeches were officially disseminated within the Party in the form of the "Central Document No. 2", which was a reworked version of Deng's statement during his trip to Guangdong, for study by all Party and military cadres. The document represented Deng's assessment of China's current condition and implications for China's future. The document not only offered a vigorous defence to economic reform undertaken in the 1980s, but also called for further borrowing and learning from "capitalism". Reinforcing Deng's desire for economic reform only, the document did not call for any political reform or political liberalisation, rather the document reaffirmed Deng's belief in continuing the "dictatorship" of the CCP, one of the Four Cardinal Principles of CCP in China. In addition, Deng indirectly criticised a number of conservatives (such as Chen Yun) in his speeches[34]. When his speeches were circulated later, and then included in his Selected Works, these remarks were deleted (Fewsmith, 1997, p.498). As Miles (1996, p.99) states: "to name names in this way meant serious business in a country where veiled attacks are the norm". Also, due to Chen Yun's influence over the propaganda apparatus, this document was limited in circulation.

At an enlarged meeting of the Politburo, 10-12 March, several members demanded that the body endorse Deng's economic thought, including Yang

---

[34] Miles (1996, p.99) identifies these conservative elders as: Deng Liqun; Hu Qiaomu (member of the CAC); Wang Renzhi (head of the Propaganda department); He Jingzhi (acting Minister of Culture); and, Gao Di (editor of the *People's Daily*).

Baibing, the Vice-Chair of the CMC. As an implicit rebuke of the conservative assertion that maintaining ideological purity and combating subversive elements was the most important priority within China, the Politburo agreed that economic development remained China's highest priority.

During this Politburo meeting, Jiang offered a self-criticism for his laxity in promoting reform. For Jiang, with his overt reliance on the conservative elders for support, and the Jiang/Li axis, his slowness in promoting Deng's push for further reform was to be his first major challenge. Jiang was left with little choice but to distribute Deng's speeches. Fewsmith (2001, p.71) states that in response to Deng's criticism of Jiang during his *nan xun*, Yang Shangkun and Qiao Shi apparently joined forces in an effort to oust Jiang. Teiwes (2000, p.74) states that regardless of Deng's criticism of Jiang's reluctance to push economic reforms, Deng never relinquished his support of Jiang as the "core".

Afterwards, Jiang had no difficulty in following Deng's call to push economic reform further. As, Zheng (1997, p.36) states, "by following closely to Deng's reformist line, Jiang secured his position as the legitimate heir and defeated challengers [such as the Yang brothers]". After this time, and realising that there was a movement away from staunch conservatism, various members of the Chinese government and military officials a the central and regional levels began to endorse Deng's remarks and the accelerated reforms that he advocated. For example, Yang Baibing, the Vice-Chairman of the CMC, declared that the PLA would "escort and protect" (*baojiahuhang*) the reform, and the army's mouthpiece, the *Liberation Army Daily*, repeatedly ran articles in support of the reform (Fewsmith, 1997, p.501).

However, Chen Yun and his protégés who opposed the shift towards economic reform were still attempting, throughout the spring of 1992, to manipulate public opinion and generally undermine Deng's counterattacks against "leftism". At the annual meeting of the NPC in March, Li Peng's annual report, as the then Prime Minister, failed to mention the threat from the "left" and the need to "emancipate productive forces", themes utilised by Deng during his sojourn[35]. Rather, he concentrated on continuing the socio-political environment created by Chen Yun by placing emphasis upon "opposing bourgeois liberalisation", attacking hostile forces", "resisting imperialist peaceful evolution", and so forth (Shambaugh, 1992, p.258). However, the NPC delegates refused to accept the Prime Minister's report, instead forcing Li through five unprecedented redrafting sessions, and over one hundred and fifty amendments, before finally adopting a different document that was more compatible with Deng's view.

After his tour, Deng again criticised critical leftist ideology and proposed the introduction of capitalist elements for further economic reform and opening up of the Chinese economy. Deng clarified this by stating that following points:

---

[35] However, in the 8 April *People's Daily*, an extract of Li's work report was published which did include "references to attacking the left". This evidenced a strong change in the People's Daily editorial direction, whereby the power of the conservative editor, Gao Di, was increasingly diminishing.

> [Firstly] while it is necessary to be alert against rightist tendencies, more attention should be paid to guarding against leftist one; [and, secondly] emphasis on a planned economy or on a market economy is not the essential distinction between socialism and capitalism (Wu An-chia, 1993, June 2).

THE FOURTEENTH PARTY CONGRESS (October 1992)

Thus, one goal of Deng's "southern sojourn" was to place a renewed emphasis on economic reform. It also meant the disintegration of the role of Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought within the ideology. Another goal was to begin fashioning a new political leadership, with Jiang Zemin as the "core", that would continue those economic reforms that would be announced at the Fourteenth Party Congress in October 1992.

At the Congress, Jiang hailed Deng as the "chief architect" of China's reforms and modernisation who had displayed enormous political courage" in the framing the political theorem of "building socialism" (Miles, 1996, p.117). Ideological restructuring has always been given the highest priority at the Party Congresses, especially during period of power succession. During the Fourteenth Congress, following Deng's call for a "second liberation of thought", Jiang established the theory of the "socialist market economy" as the core CCP ideology.

It should be noted that before the commencement of the Fourteenth Party Congress Deng succeeded in completing the majority of his power succession arrangements from the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Plenary Sessions of

the CCP's Thirteenth Central Committee through to the Fourteenth National Congress (Wu Anchia, 1993, June, pp.3-4). Indeed, the major success for Deng occurred in the spring of 1991 when he was able to elevate Zhu Rongji to the position of Vice-Premier during the annual session of the NPC (Fewsmith, 1997, p.489). It needs to be noted, though, that Zhu's succession to Vice-Premiership was balanced by the simultaneous selection of the conservative Zou Jiahu to the Vice-Premiership as well. Another interesting elevation to the Politburo at the Fourteenth Congress was Wu Bangguo, a protégé of Jiang Zemin, who would, by 1997, influence the day-to-day mechanisms of the economy.

The majority of the factional strife and manoeuvring took place largely behind the scenes in the first half of 1992, after Deng's *nan xun*, which culminated in the unveiling of the new leadership at the Fourteenth Congress and the Eight NPC in March 1993. Indeed, the Spring of 1992 would reveal that Deng had enough authority to force nominal compliance with hi wishes, but he did not have enough authority to subdue opposition altogether. Ultimately, Deng wished to create a leadership base that would ensure the stability in China after his death.

It should be noted that the majority of the changes at the Fourteenth Congress was a concise effort undertaken by Deng and his allies to consolidate, and further legitimise, Jiang's position as the leader of the Party. The changes can be simply paraphrased as a six-pronged attack, which is detailed below.

First, Zhao Ziyang's closest followers were expelled from the central leadership. Hu Qili, Yong Rudai and Rui Xingwei lost seats on the Politburo and

the Secretariat and Yan Mingfu failed to be elected to the Central Committee (due to the Ninth Plenum of the Thirteenth Central Committee which closed the case against the Zhao Ziyang, and confirmed its original verdict that he had "supported the turmoil and split the Party" during 1989). Zhao's deputy, Bao Tong, however, was imprisoned without charge for three years, was tried and then convicted for "counter-revolutionary incitement" and for leaking state secrets. The dismissal of Zhao Ziyang's associates would reduce Zhao's influence within the CCP and also increase Jiang's legitimacy as the "core".

Second, Jiang's position was bolstered by the ouster of such veteran leaders as Wan Li, Yang Shangkun, Song Ping, Yao Yilin and Qin Jiwei. This, in turn, led to the third of the six-pronged attack: the CAC was scrapped. Although the CAC was established in 1982, Deng was explicit in stating that the CAC was a "transitional body", which would last no longer than a decade. Chinese sources said that at a Politburo meeting in late 1991 the CAC would continue to function until the Fifteenth Congress of 1997. Modifications of the CAC were suggested, for example, that there would be no new inductees, and that it might be downgraded to a less powerful advisory committee that would be headed by Yang Shangkun. The scrapping of the CAC can be seen to be a way to further reduce the elders' influence and facilitate a transfer of power from the "second" to the "third-generational leadership", especially the influence of Chen Yun, who headed the organisation. It needs to be noted, though, that although the CAC may have been officially disbanded, the elders had many followers and/or protégés, and still wielded political influence. This is why the new leadership remained obliged to consult them when making major decisions (Wu

Anchia, 1993, June, pp.5-7). As an example of the latter, in an attempt to obviously pacify and win over the elders, Jiang received senior Party members and cadres in Beijing on 11 January 1992 and asked them to offer opinions and suggestions (Wu Anchia, 1993, June, p.8).

The fourth reason was that a number of influential conservatives were ousted from the Central Committee, including Gao Di, the hardline former editor of the *People's Daily*, Weng Renzhi, director of the Central Committee's Propaganda Department, and He Jingzhi, the acting Minister of Culture. However, unlike the political purges under Mao, the purge of leftists was minimal.

Fifth, two senior military officers, Liu Huaqing and Zhang Zhen, were installed in the Politburo Standing Committee and the CMC, respectively, in order to give added protection to Jiang, thus providing a "imperial/military escort" for further reforms (Wu Anchia, 1993, p.70). This was to assist Jiang in his dual role as General Secretary and his Chairmanship of the CMC. The Fourteenth Party Congress resulted in the removal of General Yang Shangkun, and his half-brother Yang Baibing, from their influential positions in the CMC. Until the falling out between Deng and the Yang's in late 1992, the Yangs were instrumental in providing "imperial/military escort" for Deng's reforms (Lam, 1995, p.251). For Jiang's survival, it would become clear that the support from the military was necessary for Deng to implement his reforms and it would also be necessary for Jiang to garner support form the army in order to become the "core" of the Party in reality as well as in name (Fewsmith, 1997, p.501). The removal of Yang Baibing as Vice-Chairman of the CMC reduced Yang Shangkun's authority

within the CCP. As Yang Baibing, who lacked any military professional experience, was placed in the position due to flagrant nepotism by Yang Shangkun, his removal was not seen as a challenge to Jiang's position as General Secretary. Rather, the removal of Yang Baibing was due to his promotion of his own loyalists, and this undercut Jiang's authority as the Chairman of the CMC. As Fewsmith (2001, p.73) states, Yang "attempted to freeze Jiang out of military affairs on the grounds [that] he was a novice". It has been reported[36] that Jiang had previously appealed to Deng that he could not function in his position as Chairman of the CMC under those circumstances[37].

Sixth, none of the "princelings", the authors of *Realistic Responses*, were elected to the Politburo Standing Committee, thus reducing their influence gained in the period from 1989 to late 1992.

As a result of changes at the Fourteenth Congress, it should be noted, nearly half of the Central Committee members and more than half of the Politburo were replaced (as in the Party Secretariat, Discipline Inspection Committee and the CMC). Interestingly enough, Qiao Shi was removed from the post as Secretary of the Party's Discipline Inspection Commission and removed from the Central Committee Secretariat at the Fourteenth Congress. However, at the time he was still a member of the Politburo Standing Committee and President of the Central Party School (Wu Anchi, 1993, p.72). In addition,

---

[36] See Fewsmith (2001, p.73).

[37] During this time, the armed forces experienced its most extensive purges since 1949. The movement within the CMC since has been to recruit professional military personnel who have usually received their education at the National Defence University in Beijing and/or key command staff centres, such as those at Shijiazhuan, Nanjing and Xian (Shambaugh, 2001, p.108).

Qiao's appointment as the head of the NPC upgraded the standing of this "rubber-stamping" legislative body as it had never previously been headed by a member of the Politburo Standing Committee[38]. Qiao's appointment would also reveal Deng's abandonment of his long term strategy of separating the government and the Party. However, in the future, Qiao Shi's role in the NPC would conflict with Jiang's desire to control all governmental organs.

Following the Congress, it would appear that the political tide returned to Deng's favour. From the 1989 Tiananmen Incident until October 1992, the Propaganda Department, the *People's Daily*, the Central Party School, the Party History Research Office, and the journal *Contemporary Thoughts*, were the key organisations in the ideological/political conflicts that were bastions of the conservatives (Shambaugh, 1992, p.259). By June 1992, Qiao Shi and Li Ruihun had gained control of these organs from the conservatives and were proceeding to root-out Deng's opponents. *Contemporary Thoughts*, headed by Marxist ideologue Deng Liqun, was closed for a period of time for openly challenging Deng's sojourn speeches. Gao Di, the director of the *People's Daily,* came under intense criticism by Lui Ruihuan for obstructing the reporting of Deng's trip. Gao Di was also accused of amending key articles to be published. Indeed, the Party School's study group for senior cadres moved from studying "anti-peaceful evolution" to Deng's thought (Shambaugh, 1992, p.259). Yet by September 1992, the Propaganda Vice-Chair, Wang Renzhi, amongst others,

---

[38] In addition, Li Ruihuan became the Chairman of the CPPCC, casting of the CPPCC's image of being a "political vase".

had organised an "anti-peaceful evolution" study group at the Central Party School which warned that peaceful evolution could be boosted by "pragmatism" in the leadership. The conservatives within this group denounced Li Ruihuan as "a person who wants to be Gorbechev" and called Qiao Shi a "fence sitter" (Fewsmith, 1997, p.494).

The Fourteenth Congress was also an attempt to codify Deng's ideas into an official doctrine: "Deng Xiaoping's Theory of Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics". Baum states that the heaping of praise upon Deng's theory of building socialism assisted in its elevation to canonical status (1998, p141). Previously, on 12 May, 1992, the Politburo passed the "*Changfa* (1992) No. 4 Document" demanding that the reform process proceed at a faster rate (Wu Anchia, 1993, June, p.12).

Intellectuals, acknowledging the more open political atmosphere, also raised their voices in protest against leftism. A collection of essays called *Historical Trends* by such famous intellectuals as Wang Meng, the former Minister of Culture, and Sun Changjiang, former editor of the *Science and Technology Daily*, criticised leftism. However, due to the conservative-controlled Propaganda Department, the book was eventually banned (Fewsmith, 1997, p.504).

JIANG ZEMIN 1989-1992

Rather than pursue economic reform, Jiang tended to lean towards the conservative side shortly after he became General Secretary. Indeed, it would appear initially that Jiang gave, as Lam states (1995, p.336), "more time jockeying for position and 'vote buying' than tending to affairs of the state". However, the period from 1989 to early 1992 reveals Jiang's fluidity in the Chinese political context and his ability to gauge political winds. It also reveals that Jiang was not naïve about the tenuous nature of his position, that is, without support from power holders from all political spectrums within the CCP, both reformers and conservatives alike, his tenure as General Secretary would indeed by brief. Therefore, whilst Liu (1994, p.242) states that "the fact that even Jiang went over to the hardliners side [after the Tiananmen Incident] reflects the hardliners' arrogance and Deng's weakness at the time", this statement also reveals Jiang's knowledge of the political necessity to curry favour with the conservatives, as well as Deng's allies. It also reveals that Jiang's position as the "core of the third generational leadership", during this time, was not yet consolidated.

In fact, until 1995 the majority of Western academics rarely mentioned the position of Jiang Zemin, and even posited that Jiang Zemin achieved very little in his tenure as General Secretary from 1989 through to the Fourteenth Party Congress of 1992. Furthermore, several academics, in this same period, were predicting Jiang's downfall. However, these academics failed to note that, unlike his predecessors, Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang (who were replaced due

to the student demonstrations in late 1986 – early 1987, and mid-1989, respectively), Jiang had commandeered strategic posts to consolidate each of the four types of power bases in the Chinese political system: credentialist; personal; institutional; and regional (Garvey, 1997, p.28)[39].

Initially, it was believed by academics that Jiang would not survive politically as Deng would not live long enough to secure Jiang's position. Fortunately for Jiang, Deng's longevity allowed him to solidify power bases, expanding from the power bases that he had already established before his appointment to Beijing. These included the First Automobile Plant (in Changchun), the Ministries of Machine-Building and Electronics (MOMB), and Mayor of Shanghai. From these bases he used his position as General Secretary to install loyalists; thus beginning what academics would declare to be the emergence of the *Shanghaibang* (the Shanghai Faction).

Due to Jiang's lack of ties/allies in the first years after his promotion as the General Secretary, he moved "cautiously and refrained from rushing to any conclusion or precipitous actions" (Chang, 2001, p.41). Jiang successfully, and skilfully, developed ties with the elders and advanced an alliance with the then powerful Li Peng[40]. Indeed, due to Li Peng being the "adopted" son of Zhou Enlai, Li had close ties with the revolutionary elders.

---

[39] See Shambaugh, 1993, for a detailed discussion on these types of power bases.

[40] Interestingly, it took Li Peng more than three months after Jiang was appointed General Secretary to "profess his loyalty" to Jiang as the "core" of the third generational leadership.

Jiang's efforts to establish his "legitimacy" to rule involved first developing ties with the revolutionary generation (or "second generational leadership"), keeping good relations with the elders who were still alive and creating the impression that he was a worthy inheritor of their achievements[41]. With the assistance of Wang Daohan, who was Jiang's patron at the MOMBE, a previous Mayor of Shanghai, and also an associate of Deng's, Jiang had earlier established ties with the conservatives Liu Shaoqi, Peng Dehuai, Ye Jianying, Wei Rongzhen and Chen Yun (Lam 1999).

One of first major speeches given by Jiang was at the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the CPC. Interestingly, Deng was absent at this forum. However many of the conservative elders were present, including Song Ping, Bo Yibo and Song Renqiong. Speaking last after these revolutionary elders[42], Jiang reinforced his movement towards aligning himself with these elders by stating that he extended his "highest respects and cordial regards to the proletarian revolutionaries of the older generation". During this speech he also reinforced the leadership role of the Party core (FBIS, 1989, July, p.12).

It is interesting to note that in late June 1989, the then Vice-Chairman of the CAC, Song Renqiong said: "The existing young leadership with Jiang Zemin as its core is doing a very good job; we old comrades are very supportive of their work" (Lam, 1995, p.249). Implicit in this remark was that if the third

---

[41] Even before being appointed General Secretary, Jiang wisely encouraged Party elders to come to Shanghai to inspect work, or to rest, whilst Mayor of Shanghai.

[42] The speakers at this forum included Wang Houshou, Chen Pixian, Wu Kiuquan, Hu Qiaomu, Huang Huoqing, Lu Dingyi, Gen Biao, Wang Shoudao and those previously mentioned above.

generational leadership, or indeed if Jiang, did not measure up, the elders were ready to withdraw their blessings.

In another clearly calculated move, and reflecting Jiang's ties with the conservative elders, Jiang then formed an "alliance" with the then powerful Li Peng, in what is termed the "Jiang/Li Axis", which further cemented his position as General Secretary. It is undeniable that Li Peng, during this period, assumed paramount economic and political power.   Without the assistance, or the "utilisation", of Li Peng, Jiang would have had no support from the conservatives in his role as General Secretary[43]. Indeed, it could be surmised that the Jiang/Li axis fell apart with the deaths of several conservative elders within this period. With the passing of CPPCC Deputy Secretary Wang Renzhong in March 1992, former President and CPPCC Chair Li Xiannian[44] in June 1992 and former Mao secretary Hu Qiaomu in September 1992, Jiang may not have felt so compelled to continue with his reliance upon Li Peng and the conservatives for support. With the axing of the CAC at the Fourteenth Congress, together with the deaths of several of the elders, the informal role of politics in China was weakened.

Jiang also stressed the importance of Party building during this period. After his appointment as General Secretary, China's propaganda organs began to distribute articles purporting to have been written by Jiang whilst he was the

---

[43] For Jiang, being allied with Li was safer than being a recipient of Li's opposition to further reform.

[44] Li Xiannian was Jiang's closest political supporter at the time.

Mayor of Shanghai, detailing the need to "build a stronger party" (*FBIS*, 1989, July 24, p.28). From 1989, Jiang realised that speaking about the needs to "rectify the Party" or "Party building" not only endeared him to the conservative elders[45], but also gave him the appearance of being a "strong" and credible "core leader".

Jiang's concurrent position as Chairman of the CMC allowed him to influence the military apparatus[46], whilst his other powerful position as President allowed him to influence the running of the government apparatus. The positions of General Secretary and Chairman of the CMC bestowed Jiang with the opportunity for power, control of the political agenda, and patronage. Therefore, Jiang became head of the Party, the government and the army, which was contrary to the principle of separating the Party leadership and government administrations put forth at the 1987 Thirteenth Party Congress. As a result, Jiang could endeavour to build a power base considerably independent of Deng[47].

---

[45] Indeed, many of his speeches took place in the company of the elders. His 29 December 1989 speech on Party building had Li Peng, Qiao Shi, Yao Yilin, Song Ping, Li Ruihuan, as well as members of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau. Deng was noticeably absent.

[46] In his capacity as Chairman of the CMC, between 22 – 25 December, he inspected military bases in the key Fuzhou Military region. At the famous Minxi Revolutionary Base Area, Jiang told Red Army veterans and officers that they should live up to the "revolutionary ideals" of the "Great Helmsman" Mao Zedong by "promoting army ideological work" (Lam, 1990, p.1). In the previous year, he had made "pilgrimages" to "revolutionary meccas", including Yan'an, JInggangshan and Minxi.

[47] Many Sinologists, such as Garvey (1997, p.2) support the view that Jiang could then begin to use his formalised positions in order to build a power base independent to that of Deng.

When Jiang was first notified of his move to Beijing a month prior to the Tiananmen Incident, he lost no time in trying to transfer favoured Shanghai aides to the capital. Indeed, as previously mentioned in Chapter Three, Wang Huning, the possible "ghost writer" of Jiang's 1995 speech "Stressing Politics" was moved to Beijing. It was announced on 4 August 1989, that Zeng Qinghong, previously a Deputy Secretary of the Shanghai Municipal Party Committee in charge of ideological work, was to be appointed the Deputy Director of the General Office of the Central Committee. Quite clearly, Jiang was intentionally moving loyal staff from Shanghai to key positions in Beijing. By 1990, Jiang attempted to augment his power base by requesting that a few dozen of his former associates were posted to the Party and the State Council headquarters.

However, Jiang had serious flaws that might have precluded him initially from becoming a *true* helmsman, in the spirit of Mao and Deng. He had dubious credentials as a reformer (Lam, 1995, p.339), especially in his position as Mayor of Shanghai. However, he was able to win over the elders with his uncompromising stand against "liberalisation". Initially, Jiang was "lukewarm" in carrying forward reformists' ideas, particularly during the anti-leftist campaign which had been raised by Deng during his sojourn. At his speech to the Central Party School on 9 June 1992, Jiang repeated the orthodox viewpoint that "leftism" was a matter of cognisance whilst "rightism" was a matter of political statement (Lam, 1995). According to Jiang, leftism manifested itself in taking an orthodox, bookish" approach to certain Maoist tenets, and sticking to

"unscientific and warped" interpretations of Marxism. Rightism, on the other hand, meant the negation of the Four Cardinal Principles. Yet, by 14 June 1992, Jiang ceased making any reference to "anti-leftism" (Lam, 1995, p.340).

Deng, though, did continue to champion Jiang's cause throughout the period[48]. Whilst continually championing his role as the "core" of the Party in his role as General Secretary of the CCP, he also elevated Jiang to the Chairmanship of the CMC, and the Presidency.

Jiang further extended his influence within the government *kou*, a bastion of Li Peng, in 1992, with the appointment of Wang Mengkui as head of the Research Office under the State Council. This weakened Li's influence as Wang Mengkui replaced Li's ally, Yuan Mu (Garvey, 1997, pp.18-19). Indeed, Jiang moved loyalists to positions of influence just a month after becoming General Secretary, therefore establishing his own patron-client relationships.

Jiang, in the early stages, did not concern himself with the economy because he had learnt from his predecessor, Zhao Ziyang, that if he failed in the economic realm that is could cost him his position. Jiang let Li Peng, and later Zhu Rongji, run the economy, simply because if anything went wrong Li or Zhu would be the scapegoats – although Lam asserts another reason: that Jiang

---

[48] The championing of Jiang as the "core" by Deng was required for several reasons. As a successor hand-picked by Deng, Deng had to "save face" and support Jiang, otherwise it could have been deemed that Deng had chosen the wrong person to be the General Secretary of the CCP. Deng's previous successors, Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang, had been stripped of their positions as General Secretary. Furthermore, Jiang did represent a "new" orientation of the CCP and he did possess more economic reform credentials than Li Peng.

was not interested because he knew nothing about the economy[49]. Indeed,
Jiang showed little interest in the economy until the Fifteenth Congress,
preferring to consolidate his power and extend his influence in other
governmental and Party positions. However, during the time he did encourage
the continuing of Deng's open door policy.

During the years from 1989 to 1992, many Sinologists referred to Jiang
as a "transitional figure" or a "Hua Guofeng-like figure", in other words, "basically
an incompetent leader whose power depended exclusively on the words of
Deng" (Li, 2001, p.29). These Sinologists failed to identify that Jiang actually
represented the powerful political force of the technocrats.

Also during this time, the most catalytic episode was Deng's *nan xun*.
This is because in Jiang's attempt in currying favour with the elders and Li Peng,
and Jiang's strengthening of his position as General Secretary, and as Chair of
the CMC, he positioned himself as a conservative and not a reformer. With the
manoeuvrings that occurred at the Fourteenth Congress, and due to the
assistance of Deng, Jiang was able to lessen the influence of the princelings,
slowly distance himself from the elders and begin the deployment of associates
and affiliates who would hold key positions in government and Party
organisations. Jiang would be able to embark on the establishment of the Jiang
Zemin era. As the following chapter shows, it was during this time that Jiang

---

[49] Lam (1999, p.78) also supports the view that Jiang's knowledge of the Chinese economy was
limited.

fully utilised the political theory of neo-conservatism in order to provide a platform for his "rule".

CHAPTER FIVE

ESTABLISHING THE "JIANG ZEMIN ERA":

LEGITIMISATION AND CONSOLIDATION

In order to establish himself as the real core of the CCP hierarchy, Jiang had to take the initiative in building new institutions and rules by which the Party and the government could be effectively governed[50]. As stated in Chapter Three, for Jiang legitimacy did not rest on emphasising the ideology of MLM, rather legitimacy was based upon "performance legitimacy"; that is, the providing of economic benefits to the populace. Indeed, Jiang could not rely on any "contributions to the revolution" as a basis of his legitimacy[51]. Furthermore, Jiang had to utilise differing Party and governmental positions[52] (that is, General Secretary, Chairman of the CMC, and the Presidency) as forms of legitimacy. Additionally, as discussed in Chapter Two, towards the end of 1994 Jiang began to assert a political platform for legitimacy based on his tenet of "stressing politics", a simplification of the political thought of neo-conservatism.

From the onset of Jiang's tenure as General Secretary, there was a consistent notion that he would not survive in that position. Indeed, it would appear that existing leaders with more secure positions were expected to object

---

[50] A view subsequently supported by Zheng, 1997, p.36.

[51] As part of the third-generational leadership, Jiang had no claims to any pre-1949 revolutionary activities, unlike members of the second-generational leadership that included Deng Xiaoping.

[52] Indeed, until the end of 1992, Jiang held no posts in the government work *kou* (department), which was under the control of Li Peng.

to his accession[53], that Deng would not live long enough to secure Jiang's position, or that Jiang's limited abilities would limit his tenure at the top. Interestingly enough, it would be Deng's longevity that would enable Jiang to secure his legitimacy. In fact, with Deng's passing in 1997, after the 1992 Fourteenth Congress and before the 1997 Fifteenth Congress, Jiang was able to consolidate power by ensuring that his allies and protégés were promoted to key governmental and Party positions.

Furthermore, Jiang's ability to bolster his legitimacy during the period from the Fourteenth Congress until his 1995 "Stressing Politics" speech, would allow him to orchestrate the 1997 Fifteenth Congress. The particular Congress would eventually test whether or not Jiang could initiate new institutions and rules to govern, thus creating a new era associated with his name and leadership, and, more importantly, independent of Deng, albeit, with Deng's blessing. In contrast to the Fourteenth Congress, Jiang had to first establish himself as the core leader independent of Deng, yet with Deng still "on-side". From the point of view of the Party, Jiang's second task went beyond simply consolidating a centred leadership to deal with the emerging fourth generation leadership: Jiang also had to convince the Chinese people that he could meet China's domestic and international challenges (Zheng, 1997, pp.37-38).

The period from the Fourteenth Congress would reveal, as Bachman (2000, p.57) notes, that Jiang "continued to show that he is perhaps the luckiest

---

[53]Those who were deemed to object to his accession are Li Peng and Qiao Shi, both of who shall be discussed further in this chapter.

politician in recent Chinese history". The key concept that Bachman identified was defining Jiang as a "politician". While Jiang displayed neither the helmsman capacity of Mao, nor the charisma and pragmatism of Deng, he possessed attributes that enabled him to promote allies, members of the Shanghai Faction and created an axis of coalitions[54] in order to promote the economy and, at times, ideology. Furthermore, Jiang the "politician" was able to produce statesman-like policies that displayed his leadership abilities, his goals and his legitimacy, as exemplified by his creed of "Stressing Politics", which was first outlined at the 1994 Fourth Plenum.

During this period, Jiang needed to be able to position himself into the centre of the political system, and to make the system revolve around him. The 1992 Fourteenth Congress presented Jiang with an opportunity that would assist in the confirmation of his legitimacy. This Congress saw the increased elevation of central technocrats, Party apparatchiks, military professionals and provincial administrators, especially those who would support Jiang's agenda. So successful was Jiang throughout this period that he was able to build a stable position of power for himself (for example, being elected President in 1992) and positions of power for his supporters, many of them heading key organisations, both Party and governmental.

Indeed, the period after 1994 witnessed more stability, with less coercion, than had been the case in the majority of the previous periods.

---

[54] Jiang created a coalition first with Li Peng and then with Zhu Rongji, which shall be further detailed in this chapter.

Usually after Chinese political transitions, such as the 1992 Fourteenth Congress, a "period of great fluidity with unexpected issues or political coalitions burst upon the political scene" (Fewsmith, 1995, p.636).

For Chinese intellectuals, as Goldman states (1996, p.49), the Deng and Jiang regimes resemble the authoritarian Guomindang period, with its weak Leninist-Party State and watered down ideology. This period tended to leave intellectuals alone as long as they did not challenge the Guomindang. As the CCP leader, Jiang may have wanted to impose tighter controls on intellectual life, but he neither had the capacity nor the will to do so.

This chapter, then, explores the tactics/strategies employed by Jiang in order to legitimise and consolidate his position in the Chinese hierarchy and thus place himself as the "core of the third generational leadership". In order to legitimise his position, Jiang managed to successfully accomplish many things. First, after the Fourteenth Congress, he was able to move away from the Jiang/Li axis, which was created in order to preserve Jiang's position as General Secretary, and instead form a coalitional axis with Zhu Rongji, who was also from Shanghai[55]. Second, although Jiang began to create a network of allies and protégés before the Fourteenth Congress, it was after this Congress that he was able to expand his control over various governmental and Party organisations through his "Shanghai Faction" connections, and the building of new ties with emerging leaders. Third, Jiang had to balance the burgeoning

---

[55] Although Zhu Rongji also had connections with Shanghai, and is closely affiliated with Jiang, most Chinese analysts deem that Zhu has created his own "faction" of allies and protégés which is commonly referred to as the "Zhu Rongji clique".

power of Qiao Shi, who was appointed the Chairman of the NPC at the Fourteenth Congress. Fourth, in order to appease the populace, Jiang had to be seen as taking a stand against corruption, which was rampant within the CCP. Fifth, towards the end of the period under study, Jiang began to consolidate his legitimacy by providing a "platform" by which he could lead the CCP into the twenty-first century. This "platform", neo-conservative in nature, was outlined in his "Stressing Politics" speech.

DENG, IDEOLOGY, "SOCIALISM WITH CHINESE CHARACTERISTICS" AND JIANG

The CCP central document, "The Main Points of Propaganda Work in 1993", stressed Dengist Thought and called for the latest volume of Deng's work to be published within the year. Also on the ideological agenda were "study programmes", a "simple reader" for grassroots-level Party members, two national meetings on propaganda, two national theoretical conferences based on the summary of Deng's theory contained in Jiang's report to the Fourteenth Congress, and seminars for provincial department level cadres and propaganda department heads.

Following the resurgence of Deng's popularity, both amongst the populace at large and within the CCP, after his "*nan xun*" in early 1992 and culminating at the Fourteenth Congress in October 1992, there was an

explosion of a "Deng cult" the following year[56]. Lam (1994) states that the

"Deng cult" reached a highpoint due to two publications that year, namely, Deng

Rong's *My Father Deng Xiaoping*[57], published in September 1993, and, more

importantly, the third volume of Deng's *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping.* The

latter seemed to confirm that Deng Thought had replaced Mao Zedong Thought.

Yet no leader dared to openly admit any deviation from Mao Zedong Thought,

which still remained a theoretical basis of the CCP's legitimacy. This does not

mean to say that the leaders of the CCP have not been selective when it comes

to inheriting" Mao's doctrines, as both Deng and Jiang have done. Mao's theory

of class struggle, the usage of political movements to promote economic

development and Mao's xenophobia largely became discarded. What was

preserved were nationalism, self-reliance and "seeking truth from facts" theory.

Mao's theories, now "narrowed down", were increasingly applied in a pragmatic

way, and in particular came to be used as a rallying point for safeguarding

national sovereignty and dignity (Wu Anchia, 1994, p.39). The leadership, under

Jiang, had attempted to link Deng's theories with Mao's thought. However, the

bankruptcy law and stock markets, for example, could be seen to be negations

of Mao's ultra-leftism. What Deng shared with Mao was the ideals and goals of

socialism; a conviction of the need to maintain state sovereignty and to keep the

military under Party control, and a belief in grooming successors. It is

interesting to note that whilst the Party stressed Deng's theory of "Building

---

[56] This year also marked the increased pronouncements of Deng's pending death. By May 1993, there were reports that Deng Xiaoping was suffering from Parkinson's disease.

[57] With Deng Xiaoping suffering from Parkinson's disease, his daughter, Deng Rong, who worked in the Army General Political Department, became his "eyes and ears", especially in the Army.

Socialism with Chinese Characteristics", the Four Cardinal Principles, which had played a prominent role after Tiananmen, were played down, yet not abandoned. In addition, Deng was convinced that the CCP would stay in power if the Party could continue to upgrade peoples' living standards. This attempt at performance legitimacy could only continue if the economy continued to expand, and opportunities for people to *xiahai* (dive into the sea of business) through "sustained, high speed and healthy development" (Lam, 1994, p.2.4). Indeed, in order to emphasise his philosophy of reform, Deng placed the *nan xun* talks as the last chapter in his *Works*. Reinforcing Deng's philosophical legacy, Jiang called Deng's teachings "a scientific theory that integrated socialism with patriotism", and a "great ideological driving force" that bound the nation together (Lam, 1994). In addition, propaganda, cultural and media organisations churned out a series of patriotic campaigns aimed at solidifying the *ningju* (centripetal) powers of the leadership. The main theme for this stepped-up indoctrination was laid down by Jiang in a mid-year conference on political work for workers:

> The more that we develop the socialist market economy, the more we should, on a comprehensive basis, strengthen and improve ideological and political work for the entire Party and society (Jiang, in Lam, 1994).

Deng's concept of reform, "the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics", has since been incorporated into China's ideology. Capitalist elements in the reform program have been given legitimacy in the Party's constitution under the heading of "Socialist Market Economy"- a formula devised by Jiang in his report to the Fourteenth Congress. The formula consists of three chief elements. First, concerning planning, as a market economy is not always

capitalist and socialism can have markets. Both planning and market forces are considered useful ways of regulating the economy. Second, a variety of ownership types would be allowed to exist as long as the main body of the economy was under socialist public ownership. The third important element of the socialist market economy formula was that it enabled China to make use of capital, technology and administrative expertise from capitalist countries as so to further develop socialism (Wu Anchia, 1993, pp.68-69).

The CCP adopted the "Decision on Some Issues Concerning the Establishment of a Socialist Market Economic Structure" during Third Plenary Session of the Fourteenth Congress (11-13 November 1993). The "Decision" reiterated that the theory of "Socialism with Chinese Characteristics" was to be the guiding principle, and "the emancipating of people's minds" and "seeking truth from facts" were to be central in the guiding ideology (Wu Anchia, 1994, pp.1-2). This came into effect after eight revisions. In order to establish Deng's theory as the guiding principle for all reforms, the key ideas and policies advanced by Deng since 1978 were written into the revised constitution adopted at the March 1993 session of the Eight NPC, although Deng was not referred to directly. Then, at the 1993 Third Plenary of the Fourteenth Congress, Deng's theory of "emancipating people's minds" was reaffirmed as the guiding principle for reform and opening up (Wu Anchia, 1994, p.38). The constitutional revision at the Fourteenth Congress did reiterate the commitment of building a "communist social system", in reference to the continuation and maintenance of CCP rule.

Lam (1995) states that Deng's game plan after the Fourteenth Congress was seven-fold. One, Deng "propped-up" the moderate technocrats, including the Shanghai Faction, as they could be counted upon to pursue cautious market reform while putting a "freeze" on political liberalisation. Two, Deng assisted Jiang in promoting a younger generation of politicians and cadres who were "expert" and "red". Three, Deng, with Jiang, sidelined the leftists and Maoists within the CCP. Four, the tools of the proletariat dictatorship, such as the police and the army apparatus were reinforced. Five, Deng carefully reserved a role for radical modernisers who had worked under the patronage of both Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang. Six, a balance of power between the central and provincial authorities was to be maintained. Seven, Deng sought to ensure that a power struggle would not emerge after his death.

Whilst the Congress saw the removal of several conservatives and the elevation of a relatively large number of young technocrats, Deng's overriding concern was to maintain stability through the balancing of the various factions. Indeed, due to the support the reformers had from the army, regional leaders as well as the intelligentsia, entrepreneurs and international opinion, Deng probably could have "wiped out" the leftists (Lam, 1995, p.326).

For the leftists, the influence, although limited, of Deng Liqun and his allies was confined to the ideological and propaganda establishments or units, such as the Party's Propaganda Department, the Policy Research Office of the Central Committee, the *People's Daily* and other journals. The protégés and allies of Zhao Ziyang were relegated to second line positions. For example,

whilst Tian Jiyun retained his Politburo membership, he was transferred to the NPC as Qiao Shi's deputy (Lam, 1998, p.25).

The Congress revealed, however, the Party's abandonment of the ideal of the separation of the Party and government[58]. Thus a major step was taken towards the pre-Liberation concept of the fusion of Party and government, now called "cross leadership", a reference to the fact that Politburo members and other top cadres could concurrently take up positions in the Party, government, legislature and the CPCC (Lam, 1995, p.247). In an internal speech shortly before the13-31 March 1993 NPC session, Deng explained why he had given up his cherished goal of the separation of Party and government. Deng said that he had instead opted for "cross leadership" because of the "lessons of the European bloc". Indeed, according to an astute analysis of the Communist world, a major reason for the fall of the USSR was due to the Party being "divorced" from the government, the army and other sectors, including the economy. As Lam (1998, p.34) observes, the "ultimate expression of the *yiyuanhua* [Unitarian] nature of the leadership was the many hats bestowed onto Jiang".

A full meeting of the Central Committee was convened to prepare for the post-Deng era. At that meeting a twenty-point document on Party building was issued that focused on the need to rejuvenate the Party organisation with Jiang as the "core". None of this made Jiang's position impregnable, but it did make it

---

[58] The 1987 Thirteenth Congress raised the slogan of separating the Party from the government (*dangzheng fenkai*). This would have meant that Party committees within each government agency would have to be abolished (Oksenberg, 2001, p.32).

very difficult for him to be challenged in the short term. His long-term future, however, was to be determined by his success in establishing prosperity and stability within the nation and in building a substantial power base of his own.

Jiang came to understand why some degree of political reform was imperative for the Party: political reform was needed for competition, power succession and political participation. Yet, without a national election system, and a free press it is hard for people to convey their demands and complaints to the leadership. In contrast to Zhao Ziyang's time, Jiang and the other leaders did not talk about political reform ideologically, focusing instead on "implicit political reform"[59], meaning that changes needed to be introduced into China's political practises rather than to its political discourse. While elections continued to become an increasingly important method of selecting the party elite, Jiang had no intention of expanding Chinese democracy in terms of the relationship between the state and society[60]. Nevertheless, he did call for consolidating grass-roots democracy. Furthermore, he also proposed the "rule of law". Here the "rule of law" means that the law must be applicable to every individual in a given society, "the rulers must follow the laws just the same as the ruled do, and the rulers behaviour should be predictable" (Zheng, 1997, p.55). Political reform was to focus upon the perfection of the system of People's Congresses, the system of multiparty cooperation and political consultation under the leadership

---

[59] "Implicit political reform" is a terminology which was defined by Zheng (1997, p.54).

[60] Nor did Jiang erode the Four Cardinal Principles.

of the CCP, as well as the legal system, and the reform of administrative, organisational, personnel and labour systems (Wu Anchia, 1993, p.10).

By early 1993, the degree of support for Jiang was unclear, although he had been working to strengthen his ties with the military, inspecting military regions and promoting associates from his time as Mayor of Shanghai. These people included Yu Yongbo, Director of the PLA General Political Department; Wang Chengbin, commander of Beijing Military Region; Shi Yuxiao, Political Commissioner of Guangzhou Logistics Department; and Ba Zhongyan, commander of the People's Armed Police Headquarters. In an effort to win the support of veteran cadres, Jiang organised various activities to commemorate Peng Dehuai, and, with the assistance of Deng, purged Yang Shangkun and Yang Baibing and emphasised that the PLA had a duty to safeguard the social system (Wu Anchia, 1994, pp. 7-8).

JIANG AS THE "CORE OF THE THIRD GENERATIONAL LEADERSHIP"

At the Fourteenth Congress, the CCP was to be under the collective leadership of the seven Politburo members. In order of seniority (and ages as of 1993) these were: Jiang (66), General Secretary, President and Chair of the CMC; Li Peng (64), in charge of the State Council; Qiao Shi (68), Chair of the NPC and in charge of public security, procuratorial, legal and intelligence work; Li Ruihuan (58), Chair of the CPPCC; Zhu Rongji (64), assisting Li Peng; Liu

Huaqing (76), responsible for military work; and Hu Jintao (49)[61], supervisor of

the Party's organisational work, especially the promotion of younger cadres[62].

Deng decreed that the vote of the seven Politburo members carried

equal weight, and that policy decisions were to be passed by a majority. This

consensus-based "core" revealed his concerns about a post-Deng leadership

arrangement. Jiang took his place in conceptual terms as the successor to Mao

and Deng (Teiwes, 2000, p.74), that is, as the "core" of the CCP. On the one

hand, Deng was convinced that investing Jiang with helmsman-like prerequisites

would best guarantee stability. On the other hand, Deng was aware of Jiang's

limitations at this time (Lam, 1998, p.25). Lam states that the Politburo Standing

Committee was less democratic than ever as it incorporated even less "non-

mainstream" elements into the decision making process. Indeed, even though

equal voting rights had been formalised in the Politburo, in actual terms of power

the members were unequal, depending on age and experience and depth and

breadth of their career backgrounds, amongst other factors (Dittmer, 2001,

p.59).

Furthermore, Scalapino (1998) stressed that collective leadership runs

against the traditional grain of CCP political culture. This is because up until the

formation of the collective leadership there had always been one "supreme

---

[61] As the current successor to Jiang, before his appointment to the Politburo in 1992, Hu Jintao has an unremarkable career as Party Secretary of Guizhou and Tibet, respectively.

[62] The remainder of the Politburo consisted of: Tian Jiyun (63); Li Tieying (56); Ding Guan'gen (63); Li Lanqing (60); Yang Baibing (72); Wu Bangguo (50); Zou Jiahua (66); Chen Xitong (62); Jiang Chunyun (62); Qian Qichen (64); Wei Jinxing (61); Xie Fie (60); and, Tan Shaowen (63). Those who stepped down from the Politburo in March 1993 at the First Session of the Eight NPC were Yang Shangkun (85); Wan Li (76); Qin Jiwei (78); Wu Xueqian (71); Li Siming (65); and, Yang Rudai (65).

power" that held the commanding authority. The designation of "core leader" that was bestowed upon Jiang reflected Deng's and other elders' beliefs that the ambiguity of the consensus leadership was a destabilising factor, whereby assigning Jiang as the "core" would symbolically align him more closely with the leadership and, more importantly, facilitate Jiang's amassing of additional constitutional/institutional powers. Jiang's "core status" would, as a result, become his precious political asset (Teiwes, 2001, pp.74-76). Indeed, in 1993, units in the propaganda, culture and media realms churned out a series of patriotic campaigns aimed at solidifying the *ninju* (centripetal) powers of the leadership. Furthermore, the Fourth Plenum of the Fourteenth Congress (25-28 September 1994) passed a stern resolution on the "construction" of the Party by strengthening democratic centralism. Brosseau (1995, p.1) conceded that this declaration was made due to the prospects of Deng's sudden death and warranted a gesture confirming that the contingency measures were complete and that the process of generational succession was being institutionalised by a set of contrived procedures.

There was also a shake-up of the Central Committee Secretariat, with Hu Jintao, Ding Guan'gen, Wei Jianxing, Wen Jiabo and Ren Jianxin being elevated to key positions within the CCP. The "top morality squad", the Central Commission for Discipline Inspection (CCDI), was taken over by the Secretariat, which was responsible for running the Party apparatus and issuing major documents. Hu Jintao replaced Qiao Shi as the head of the Secretariat, which runs the Party apparatus and issues major documents. Indeed, with Hu's elevation in 1992, he was deemed, by China analysts, to be the front-runner in

the "fourth generation leadership"[63] (even before being appointed General Secretary in 2002).

Excluding Jiang, until 1995, fifteen of the nineteen members of the Politburo, all seven of the Secretariat, and twenty of the thirty Provincial First Party Secretaries had been appointed since 1989. In addition, Jiang began to appoint people from the Shanghai region, thus contributing to the rise of the Shanghai Faction, and the continuation of Jiang's consolidation of power through the appointment of allies and protégés to key Party and organisational positions. Indeed, of the fourteen new appointees to the Politburo since 1990, Zhu Rongji, Wu Bangguo and Huang Ju were Jiang's immediate successors as Mayor of Shanghai. Wu Bangguo and Jiang Chunyun were also elected to the Party Secretariat. After the Fourth Plenum of the Fourteenth Congress, seven Politburo members, one-third of the total, were either born in or had connections with Shanghai: Jiang, Zhu Rongji, Wu Bangguo, Huang Chu, Qiao Shi, Qian Qichen and Zuo Jiahua[64]. It would appear that Jiang wanted Zou Jiahua to "groom" Wu Bangguo to succeed him as vice-Premier in charge of industry. Indeed, Wu's rise would also be seen as a means of checking Zhu's power in the economic field. Other members of the Shanghai Faction included Li Lanqing

---

[63] The Fourteenth Congress, in order to institutionalise the succession procedures, an agreement was reached that there was to be a reduction on term limits, that is, no more than two terms or ten years in office (Oksendberg, 2001, p.30).

[64] Zou Jiahua was born in Shanghai but his career was in the northern regions and is more conservative.

and Ding Guan'gen (natives of the neighbouring Jiangsu Province who undertook studies in Shanghai).

Indeed, Jiang also continued to recruit former associates of the MOMB, where he had served for more than ten years. Among the top officials with MOMB credentials were the Party Secretary of Fujian, Jia Qinglin, Director of the State Administration of Exchange Control, Zhou Xiaochun, and Vice-General Secretary of the Shenzhen Party, Huang Liman.

It could be said that the rise of the Shanghai Faction, and those associated with MOMB, reflected the relatively narrow power base of Jiang.

After the Fourteenth Congress, Jiang surrounded himself with a Party Leadership[65] whose members were better educated, younger, more reform-orientated and more pragmatic than their predecessors. Indeed, seven of the fourteen new appointees to the Politburo were engineering graduates, like Jiang. Thus, with the elevation of so many Shanghai Faction protégés, Jiang obtained the advantageous position of having these protégés playing off/against each other. This, in turn, would create the potential for intense competition in the post-Jiang leadership of the Party.

---

[65] In *Jiang Zemin Counsellors* (see Li 2001, p.29), it has been stated that Jiang's four closet political friends/allies are: Wang Daohan, former Mayor of Shanghai; Zeng Qinghong, Chair of the Organisational Department; Chen Zhili; and Liu Ji.

SHIFTING ALLIANCES: THE JIANG / ZHU RONGJI AXIS

The one of the most salient features of this period (from 1992 until 1995) was the replacement of the Jiang-Li axis with the Jiang-Zhu Rongji axis. During this period, Jiang was at the centre of a system that was defined by Bachman (200, p.57) as "an inner triumvirate of leaders"; consisting of Jiang, Li Peng and Zhu Rongji. Indeed, although there had been tensions amongst the three, Jiang successfully utilised axis "arrangements" in periods as required. For example, from 1989 until 1992, the Jiang/Li axis helped Jiang retain power, and curry favour with the conservative elders[66], whilst the Jiang/Zhu axis, formulated during the austerity plan of 1992, helped push reform once again into the mainstream arena. The three managed to work together, together forming the nucleus of the leadership, regardless of the other members within the Politburo Standing Committee. All three appointed protégés to positions in their key Party and bureaucratic "domains", although Jiang attempted to limit Li's involvement in the Party and government after 1992. However, Jiang held key advantages that made it unlikely that Li Peng or Zhu Rongji would ever been able to topple him. These "advantages" are discussed below.

The worst case scenario for Jiang would have been if Li and Zhu had worked together to oppose him. Bachman's (2000, p.59) assessment was that "neither Li nor Zhu trusted the other enough to work in concert against Jiang", and that "neither could live as co-leader with the other". To avoid this, Jiang

---

[66] Indeed, on many occasions Chen Yun highlighted Jiang and Li Peng's relationship, and spoke highly of it. For Chen, this relationship was favourable to his faction's conservative line.

"dumped" difficult assignments on both Li and Zhu. For example, Zhu Rongji was placed in charge of the economy whereby if anything went wrong, Zhu would suffer the consequences. On the other hand, when the economy improved, Jiang could "claim" the glory. Furthermore, as with Jiang's usage of coalitions with both Li and Zhu, he could have easily played them off against each to further limit a united front against him (Bachman, 2000, p.59).

Pye (2001), however, too easily dismisses the considerable power both Li and Zhu did wield. Pye states that by performing their tasks/portfolios well, neither of them needed to worry about their personal (or political) security, unlike during the earlier Mao and Deng eras whereby covertly building or strengthening factional power bases was imperative for political security. However, during this period, they both further consolidated their own power bases through the recruitment of allies and protégés. Yet it must be conceded that their power bases could not rival that of Jiang's, largely due to the success of Jiang's tactics to limit their influence.

About the same time as the March 1993 NPC, the Central Committee Leading Group of Finance and Economics (LGFE) was revived with Jiang as its head and Li Peng and Zhu Rongji as vice-heads (although Li Peng was replaced by Wu Bangguo in 1994). Indeed, Miles (2000) indicates that for Zhu to also be appointed deputy head of the LGFE meant that both he and Li Peng were on "equal footing". Although the LGFE was practically dissolved after 4 June 1989, and therefore did not meet regularly, it remained the Party's highest authority on economic policy-making. Jiang expanded the establishment of the LGFE to

include research, coordination, supervision and executive functions. Jiang strengthened his hold on this organisation by appointing his own allies to key positions: Wen Jiabo was made General Secretary of the organisation, and Zeng Peiyan its Vice-Secretary. In addition, Huang Qifan was put in charge of the industrial enterprises subgroup of the LGFE, a previously unheard of post (Garvey, 1997, p.18).

It is important to note that there are numerous Leading Groups[67]: the Leading Group on Finance and Economics, the Leading Group on Ideology and Propaganda, the Leading Group on Foreign Affairs and the Leading Group of Taiwan Affairs. These entities make the final decisions on major issues. Due to these groups' extremely secretive operations, the Leading Groups were not accountable to senior cadres, the NPC or the public (Lam, 1998, p.34). Indeed, neither the Chinese Constitution nor the Communist Party Constitution has made provisions for the establishment of these Leading Groups. Their activities were never reported in the Chinese media either. Interestingly, by 1992, Jiang headed the Leading Group on Taiwan Affairs (the CCP's topmost policy-making body on Taiwan) and the Leading Group on Foreign Affairs (LGFA), as well as the LGFE. As Chair of the LGFA, Jiang has reserved for himself the power to make China's major foreign policy decisions[68], eclipsing the influence of both Li Peng and Zhu Rongji (Chang, 2001, p.40). Furthermore, as head of State, Jiang

---

[67] In Chinese, Leading Groups are referred to as *lingdao xiaozu*.

[68] It should be noted that the position of Secretary General allowed Jiang the right to have the final say in Foreign Affairs (Bachman, 2001, p.98.

was able to use the Presidency to attend summits and State visits to enhance his visibility, his prestige, and his legitimacy in China.

Whilst it may be assumed that other leaders may have advocated key policies, without Jiang in the key positions of power, and willing to act as the key consensus-builder in scenarios that required political consensus, those policies would not have been pushed.

In addition, with the physical and political "illness"[69] of Li Peng that occurred throughout 1993, Jiang also took on responsibilities concerning foreign affairs (most notably, the "Taiwan issue"). In addition, Zhu Rongji became responsible for performing Li's duties as Premier, although in an "unofficial" capacity[70]. Indeed, 1993 saw the inexorable decline of the conservative and Maoist planners, led by Li Peng and the retired vice-Premier Yao Yilin, both of whom were replaced by Zhu Rongji. It must be noted, though, that this power shift took place gradually, and Zhu's influence did not supersede Jiang's. In addition, Wang Mengkui was appointed Head of the Research Office under the State Council, which weakened Li Peng further, as Wang replaced a key Li ally, Yuan Mu (Garvey, 1997, pp.18-19). However, with the demise of the CAC, the

---

[69] Hong Kong newspapers reported that Li Peng had been criticised by Party elders, including Song Renqiong and Bo Yibo, before his April 24 mild heart attack. The *South China Morning Post* stated that the elders had written an "anti-Li petition" that criticised Li for being "now left, now right" and for failing to "cure and restructure the economy", which means, failing to limit the rapid growth (*FBIS*, 1993, May 25, p.10). Political analysts believed that Li Peng contracted a "physiological" illness because of the political problems.

[70] As the seriousness of Li Peng's illness was not made public, Zhu could not use the title of "acting premier". Officially Li Peng was suffering from a "bad cold". After Li Peng's second heart attack in mid June 1993, it was announced that Zhu Rongji would temporarily oversee the State Council (which included being in charge of the economy, industry, agriculture, monetary affairs, finance and taxation). Li Peng would be limited to receiving foreign dignitaries.

conservative elders formed semi-official groupings to influence policy. For example, a "five man group of elders" made up of Chen Yun, Yao Yilin, Yang Shangkun, Bo Yibo and Wan Li, was reported to have been set up in mid 1993 to "provide economic advice" to Zhu Rongji.

Li Peng and his pro-Soviet[71] clique did, however, retain formidable positions within the CCP. Until late June 1993, it was Li who had the dominant say in finance and banking. Indeed, key leaders within this area, including the Finance Minister Liu Zhongli and the then People's Bank of China head, Li Guixian, were deemed to be allies of Li Peng. However, Li still remained unpopular with elements of the Party and much of the Chinese populace, due to not only his involvement in the Tiananmen Incident, but also his lack of understanding of market-oriented reform and his movement towards State planning in 1990. Indeed, Jiang could have easily "reassessed" Tiananmen, blaming the incident on "a manipulative Li", amongst others (Bachman, 2000, p.59), especially if Li tried to dominate the "core" too much.

It was to be the onset of the austerity program, Zhu's "unofficial" capacity as acting-Premier (and thus having control over the State Council) and Zhu's assumption in July 1993 of the Governorship of the People's Bank of

---

[71] The terminology "pro-Soviet" refers to the conservative preferences of a government controlled economy, similar to that employed by the Soviet Union.

China that marked a shift in the tug of war between Li and Zhu to Zhu's favour[72]. The placing of the moderate Zhu in the position as Governor of the People's Bank of China broke the tradition of central planners, from Chen Yun and Li Xiannian to Yao Yilin and Li Peng, having a dominant presence over the financial portfolio (Lam, 1995, p.331). In addition, the "Zhu-clique" expanded with Zhu's appointment of two close colleagues from Shanghai as the bank's Vice-Governors, Dai Xianlong and Zhu Xiaohua. By the end of 1993, it was evident that Zhu had collated a think tank not unlike those previously assembled by Zhao Ziyang. Furthermore, Zhu placed key allies in the Ministry of the Economic and Trade Commission (Wang Zhongyu) and the State Planning Ministry (Chen Jinhua).

The Jiang-Zhu Rongji axis worked out particularly well for Jiang. Even though Deng played the key role in Zhu's elevation to positions such as Vice-Premier, Jiang recognised his talents and employed them effectively (Bachman, 2001, p.97). While Zhu frequently took the flak for pushing through the unpopular retrenchment (austerity) programme of late 1993-1994, Jiang took the credit for the reforms introduced[73]. Indeed, the Third Plenary Session of the Fourteenth Congress (11-14 November 1993) took up the task of translating the Fourteenth Congress' goals of "building a socialist market economy" into a concrete program of reform. In June 1993, Zhu Rongji's sixteen point-plan,

---

[72] Lam (1993, p.9) states that Li Peng's allies still controlled up to a third of the State Council ministries and departments, and these allies were in a position whereby they could sabotage Zhu's economic policies.

[73] Zhu Rongji took a high political risk in maintaining the economy as he would have been held responsible if he failed to restore fiscal order.

where Jiang presided over a "Central Financial and Banking Work Conference", in order to slow economic growth and restore financial order was soon to be reported as having achieved "initial results"(Fewsmith, 1994, p.26). This was in order to "cool down" the problems of inflation and the runaway money supply, whereby economic concern was usually driven by socio-economic considerations to keep reform and development going at full speed (Lam, 1994, p.2.5).

By 1994, the Jiang-Zhu axis had nearly collapsed. With the reforms Zhu had introduced at the 1993 Thirteenth Plenum having slowed the economy, Jiang began to parcel out bits of Zhu's portfolio. Wu Bangguo was named Vice-Chair of the LGFE, replacing Li Peng, and thus would share the leadership with Zhu Rongji under the supervision of Jiang. More importantly, Wu Bangguo, who was also appointed to the Secretariat of the Central Committee, was placed in charge of reforming the SOEs, which was designated as the focus of economic reform in 1995. Furthermore, at the March 1995 NPC, Wu Bangguo was made Deputy Prime Minister. Jiang Chunyun was given the task of overseeing agriculture, another task which Zhu Rongji had been previously responsible for (Fewsmith, 1997, p.519). In addition, apparently in return for his support, Jiang helped Hu Jintao gain the additional title of Principal of the Central Party School in mid-1993, which therefore displaced Qiao Shi.

Indeed, Jiang's position as General Secretary allowed him to have extensive control over key Central Committee offices and the Leading Groups.

Jiang could put people, that is, his associates and protégés if need be, in charge of the General Office, the Organisation Department and other key bodies.

By late 1993, it was clear that Jiang had co-opted into his inner circle two new members of the Politburo. Ding Guangen and Hu Jintao. This was despite the fact that until 1992, neither Ding nor Hu were linked to Jiang from a factional prospective. Originally a reformist in orientation, Ding became the Chair of the Propaganda Department, where upon he slapped a "straight jacket" on the media and cultural fields (Lam, 1995, p.335). Liu Ji and Zeng Qinghong were both elevated in 1993 due to their affiliation with the Shanghai faction. Liu Ji[74] was elected to the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), and Zeng Qinghong was appointed the head of the Party General office.

Working closely with Jiang's Shanghai Faction was the Zhu Rongji Faction, which was also made up of ideologically conservative technocrats. There was a certain degree of overlap with the Shanghai Faction because many of Zhu's protégés had come from Shanghai (for example, Dai Xianlong, the Governor of the People's Bank of China; Zhu Xiaohu, former Director of the State Administration of Exchange Control; Li Jiange, Vice-Chair of the China Securities Regulatory Commission; and, Lou Jiwei, Vice-Governor of Guizhou).

The Shangdong group was also closely linked to the Shanghai Faction. Since the early 1980s, the Party Organisation Department was in the hands of

---

[74] Liu Ji was the Vice-Chair of the Shanghai Department of Propaganda before his elevation to CASS. He was instrumental in the shaping of Jiang Zemin's draft documents, including the Political Report of the Fourteenth Party Congress.

the Shangdong group members, which might account for the fact that a relatively large number of faction affiliates were posted to senior positions from the regions.   This faction's influence was particularly strong in the PLA (for example, through senior Generals Zhang Wannian, Chi Haotian, Wang Ruilin, Zhang Lianzhong and LI Lizhu)(Lam, 1998, p.37).

In addition, at this time, Wu Bangguo was rumoured to be soon appointed the Director of the Organisation Department, the largest department under the control of the Central Committee. Having a member of the Shanghai Faction there would have increased Jiang's political clout (Wu Anchia, 1994, October, p.132). Indeed, by 1994, Hu Jintao was overseeing all Party Affairs, Wu Bangguo, within the Organisation Department, was overseeing propaganda, Yu Jianxing was supervising government administration, Wen Jibo was overseeing agriculture, Ren Jianxin was in charge of security, and Jiang Chunyun was overseeing the Party's overseas relations (Wu Anchia, 1994, October, p.133).

QIAO SHI AND THE NATIONAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS (NPC)

The strengthening of the legislature and the authority of the law in general was the only meaningful thing Beijing had done in terms of political reform in 1993. Under Qiao Shi, the NPC committed itself to promoting the "rule of law"[75]. Since assuming the NPC Chairmanship in 1993, Qiao had turned the legislative body into a formidable institution overseeing the Party and the

---

[75] Laws (*falu*) and regulations (*guiding*).

government. In addition, he made much of the fact that the market economy was in many ways an economic system based on law. The exposure of corruption in 1993 also provided legislators at all levels to urge the perfection of laws, especially laws concerning the economy and trade, and the supervision of civil servants. Qiao thus boosted the law drafting apparatus and power of the NPC. In spite of its long-standing status as the "organ of the highest power", the NPC had never been a law-drafting team, and most of the bills had been drafted by Party administration departments for routine rubber-stamping by the NPC. Both the NPC and the CPPCC, under the leadership of Li Ruihuan, became more active in "supervising the government" (Lam, 1994, pp.2.16-2.17).

As Fewsmith (1994) states, the most important institutional outcomes of the institutionalisation of the NPC were the State Planning Commission and the establishment of a new State Economic and Trade Commission. Fewsmith surmises that Qiao Shi had been quite active in making the NPC Standing Commission his "bully pulpit", promising to speed up the formation of laws by which to govern the country.

Qiao's appointment as Chair of the NPC Standing Committee enhanced the status and visibility of the NPC, due to him being a Politburo Standing Committee member who had successively occupied various posts in Beijing. However, Qiao's appointment did not cause basic changes in the functions of the NPC or its Standing Committee. These functions are determined by the CCP's perception and theoretical explanation of a Parliament under socialism and its operational arrangement for the system of People's Congresses based on these perceptions which had not been adjusted since the economic reform of

1978. The most important function of the People's Congresses was the need to support the legitimacy of the CCP.

Democracy, within these Congresses, is practised through the election of deputies. Indeed, when Qiao became Chairman of the NPC, he declared that "democracy must be institutionalised and codified into laws so that the system and its laws [would] not vary with a change in leadership, not with a change [in individual leader's] viewpoint and attention"(Fewsmith, 1995, p.257; and Fewsmith, 1997, p.522). This was to be a viewpoint that Qiao reiterated many times. Indeed, Qiao represented the "liberal" persuasion in the Party, calling more explicitly and continuously than any other Party leader for institutionalising the rule of law (Fewsmith, 2001, p.73).

Thus, the leader who seemed to have the greatest likelihood of challenging Jiang's position as the "core" was Qiao Shi. Quite simply, Qiao had the potential to restrain, if not challenge, Jiang's "core"" status. As Fewsmith (2001, p.73) argues:

> Qiao's public statements certainly did champion the rule of law, but it had be come increasingly apparent that, whatever might be his feelings about law per se, [Qiao] was using the issue to distinguish himself publicly from Jiang, who continued to emphasise democratic centralism and obedience to the 'core' [in other words, to himself].

It has been stated that Jiang's perceived contempt of Qiao Shi was due to the fact that Qiao was his superior in the Shanghai Student underground. Therefore, being higher ranked in the Party echelon, Qiao Shi was a real contender for Jiang's position.

Whilst Qiao Shi was removed from his positions as Chair of the powerful Central Political and Legal Commission, and as Head of the Party School when he took over as the Chairman of the NPC in 1993, he continued to have much influence in the security apparatus in which he had built his career.

NEO-CONSERVATISM IN THE CCP

The Fourteenth Congress revealed a movement towards the conservative technocrats, nominally the Shanghai Faction, who adopted a hard ideological line while remaining committed to the open door policy. Unlike the Zhaoists, who could be described as free marketeers, the neo-conservatives believed in the coexistence of market forces and fairly rigid State planning controls.

Lam (1998) argues that on the Politburo Standing Committee, Jiang, Li Peng and Zhu Rongji could all be deemed neo-conservatives, although they differed in their personal interpretation of "neo-conservatism". Those whom could not be deemed to be neo-conservative consisted of the two heads of the moderate liberal cabal, Qiao Shi and Li Ruihuan. The political affiliation of the remainder, Hu Jintao and Liu Huaqing, at this point in time, was intriguing. Hu Jintao, whose patrons included the conservative Song Ping and the ultra-liberal Hu Yaobang, adopted a neutralist stance. Liu generally spoke for the army, and insofar as Jiang could exercise influence on the General from his position as

CMC Chairman, Liu could be considered closer to the neo-conservatives than to any other faction.

By early 1994, the contours of the mainstream faction, which was built along a Jiang/Zhu Axis, had become clear. The mainstream clique consisted of moderates, middle of the roadsters - that is, cadres who were neither "leftists" (remnant Maoists) nor "rightists" (that is, bourgeois liberals). This clique was dominated by modernisation-minded technocrats not given to all-out Westernisation, and who were relatively liberal in economic matters but conservative in the ideological realm. In terms of factional affiliation, these moderate leaders, as well as their protégés, were neither followers of conservative patriarchs Chen Yun and Deng Liqun, nor protégés of the ousted General Secretary Zhao Ziyang. In addition, while they favoured market reforms in general, they also heeded the imperative of increasing the powers of the Party centre. Also, while they were convinced that the Stalinist command economy should be dismantled, and that most economic activities should be guided by the market, they also believed in the preservation of indirect macro-economic control by the State (Lam, 1995, p.332).

After the Fourteenth Congress, Jiang began to make an effort to formulate his own way of governing the country. While Deng consistently insisted on decentralisation, Jiang had placed higher emphasis on recentralisation. In Jiang's view, there was no contradiction between "letting Deng's flag fly" and developing a "non-Deng theory" (Zheng, 1997, p.43).

Indeed, the strategy of decentralisation had a negative impact on the State's capacity[76] to harness the activities of the provinces. With the economic changes in the CCP's ideology, the leftists remained afraid that a shrinking State sector would change the socialist nature of the CCP. For the "new leftists", the rise of the middle class meant the possibility of the CCP regime becoming ultra-rightist, as economic growth/reform had resulted in a strong bureaucratic bourgeoisie[77]. Furthermore, whilst privatisation at this stage was still small, the slow reforms of the SOEs resulted in a strong bureaucratic State sector, including collectives, which has been slowly linked to the "loss of State properties". Yet the *guangshangs* (literally: official businessmen) have been a major force behind China's rapid growth, with the CCP becoming increasingly dependent upon them. "New leftists" were nostalgic, appealing to Maoism and calling for their own version of economic and political democracy. For them, economic democracy means that the government needs an egalitarian-orientated distribution policy, and political democracy should be achieved through the institutionalising of communist ideology (Zheng, 1997, pp.41-43).

The Fourteenth Congress did not discuss opportunities for greater political reform, therefore the pressure for political reform was decreased. Social and political forces were geared more towards the "new leftists" interpretation of "political democracy".

---

[76] This is because improvements in the economy leads to regional power, especially in the southern and coastal areas, as the more developing economies where situated in the coastal regions, such as Guangdong, Fujian and Shanghai. This lead to income disparities amongst regions, whereby the central government could not effectively coordinate local activities.

[77] On the other hand, the rise of the middle class could be viewed as a major threat to CCP dominance, as previously the Party had relied on a large worker and peasant class.

The need for unity was a major theme at the Fourteenth Congress, and at the following year's NPC session. The Party centre tried to achieve "unity" by intensifying ideological indoctrination. Indeed, in the years following the Fourteenth Congress, the dictum in ideological and propaganda sessions was "patriotism, socialism and collectivism".

On the fifth anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen Incident events, the complete transcripts of a speech by Zhao Ziyang in which he gave his own defence at a Politburo meeting five years previously, suddenly surfaced in *Xin Bao*, a highly respected Chinese language newspaper in Hong Kong. This was an important signal for Jiang as the document must have been leaked by a faction within the CCP that was sympathetic to Zhao. The timing of the release of the transcripts, on the anniversary of Tiananmen, was to provide Zhao with the greatest possible advantage in the any forthcoming struggle for power.

1994: THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE JIANG ZEMIN ERA

Thus, by 1994, there were several factors affecting the unity amongst the leadership. These included: the political attitude of Yang Baibing's followers, the relationship that Jiang had established with Liu Huaching and Zhang Zhen, the relationship between Jiang and Zhu Rongji, Qiao Shi's relationship with Zhu Rongji, the relationship between Jiang and Li Peng and Li Peng and Zhu Rongji.

Fewsmith (2001) is probably the only published Sinologist who had declared that "Jiang became his own man in 1994-1995", and this was notably

due to the reduced influence of Deng Xiaoping and his reluctance (or incapability, due to sickness) to intervene in Chinese politics. Indeed, Jiang's "Stressing Politics" revealed his ability to begin shaping his own "era", without the necessity of Deng's patronage.

The conservative forces, however, were still influential. The first important group of conservatives consisted of certain Party cadres, such as Li Aiming, Vice-Chair of the NPC, Wang Banqian, Vice-Chair of the NPC, Li Guixian, State Councillor, Yang Rudai, Vice-Chair of the CPPCC, and a number of retired veterans, including Deng Liqun and Yao Yilin. This group wrote a joint letter to the Politburo and the State Council complaining that "mistakes" committed by the Party centre and individual leaders had resulted in an overheated economy, financial disorder, and the rise of local strongholds. The second group of conservatives consisted of cadres at central and local levels who had a vested interest in the old system and therefore feared the reforms. The third group was composed of the employees of the SOEs who feared for their jobs (Wu Anchia, 1994, p.10).

Before the Fifteenth Congress, the CCP initiated a so-called "third liberation of thought", which entailed "letting Deng's flag fly" and reaffirming the theory of "primary stages of socialism". This theory was proposed earlier by Zhao Ziyang, in order to defend his reform policies and rationalise various "negative" consequences resulting from them.

Propaganda and the Media

After Jiang became Secretary General, the Secretariat's duties were expanded to include Party organisation, propaganda, ideology and discipline. Indeed, Jiang promoted his Shanghai allies to the main propaganda apparatus. Gong Xinhan and Zhou Ruijin were made Deputy Head of the Propaganda Department and Deputy Chief of the *People's Daily*, respectively. Xu Guangchun was promoted to editor-in-chief of the *Guangming Daily*. This gave Jiang some control of the popular mediums of the time.

By 1994, two thousand newspapers were being printed, and new journals were a focal point for the "intellectual factions". The most common term used to describe this phenomenon in Chinese was *la shantou* (literally: to occupy a mountaintop). The term denoted the fortress mentality of groups that occupied a certain intellectual/political position. The groups used the print media to propagate their view, launching various offensives against members of competing factions. A number of new journals that appeared in Beijing, such as *The East* (*Dongfang*), *Excellence* (*Jingpin*), and *Chinese Culture* (*Zhongguo Wenhua*) were semi-independent. In some cases these journals were funded by wealthy individuals or groups from the south. Most provided honorary editorial positions for officials, or State leaders, as a form of political insurance (Barme, 1994, p.271).

In 1994, Xiao Gongqin, the author of the theory of neo-authoritarianism, issued warnings against the dangers of weak central government control,

pointing out that local mafias, corrupt police, and economic cartels would soon have the country in a stranglehold that would leave the central government increasingly incapable of imposing its will. Like most other factions, Xiao wrote for one of the newer publications, namely *Strategy and Management* (*Zhanlue Yu Guali*), a Beijing-based magazine. It should be noted, though, that *Strategy and Management* could be considered a bastion of neo-conservative supporters (Kelly, 1998, p.69). *Strategy and Management*'s image was to be one of "enlightened nationalism which sought to promote a rational view of China's national interest, and in the process headed off the temptation for rabid chauvinism" (Kelly, 1998, p.72). The book, *Looking at China through a Third Eye* (*Dianzhi Yangjing Kan Zhongguo*), published in 1994, was also representative of the neo-conservative view (Goldman, 2000, p117). Although the book was marked for "internal circulation", meaning that it should not be sold to foreigners and ordinary members of the public, pirated editions were available. Miles (1996, p.277) states that his Chinese sources revealed that Jiang spoke highly of the book to Party colleagues.

THE 1994 FOURTH PLENUM AND "STRESSING POLITICS"

By late 1994, the Jiang's central task was to maintain political stability[78]. This was achieved mainly by two goals: boosting the "Marxist purity" of the Party, particularly that of the leadership corps at the Central and regional levels;

---

[78] As late as August 1994, Deng was reported to have met with the Politburo and four key veterans, Bo Yibo, Wan Li, Qin Jiwei and Li Dengsheng, to reiterate his endorsement of Jiang and stress the need for the PLA to support Jiang.

and strengthening the police-state apparatus, which included the army and various kinds of law enforcement units (Lam, 1998, p.27).

In the fall of 1994, as Deng's health further declined, Jiang dropped economic issues from the agenda of the forthcoming Fourth Plenum in order to concentrate on Party-building issues. The severity of organisational problems demonstrated at the Fourth Plenum of the Fourteenth Congress in September (25 – 28) 1994 dealt specifically with Party building. It referred to the corrosion of the CCP due to corruption and the decadent lifestyle of the leaders, and inner circle democracy of the Standing Politburo members; and to member rights of participation in Party affairs.

The problems concerning democratic centralism became apparent when "some places and departments" were not executing central decisions energetically enough and/or orders were ignored. Furthermore, it was deemed by Jiang that discipline within the Party needed to be tightened.

As a result, the "Decision of the Central Committee of the CCP concerning some major issues of strengthening Party building" was adopted by the Plenum in October. This "Decision" stressed strengthening "democratic centralism", essentially referring to the "subordination of lower levels to higher levels, the part to the whole, and everything to the Party centre" (Fewsmith, 1997, pp. 518-519). What Fewsmith (2001) surmised as "Jiang's political strategy to try and carve out a 'middle course' that encompassed a fairly wide spectrum of opinion within the Party but nevertheless isolated both the ideological hardliners and bourgeois liberals", was essentially Jiang's adoption of the political thought of neo-conservatism.

The Fourth Plenum proved to be an important victory for Jiang. The *People's Daily* noted that "the second generation central leading collective has been successfully relieved by the third generation central leading collective" (Fewsmith, 1997, p.519). Not only did the "Decision" reaffirm Jiang's position as the "core", it also promoted to Huang Ju (Mayor of Shanghai) to the Politburo, and Wu Banggou and Jiang Chunyun to the Party Secretariat. The promotions served not only to shore-up Jiang's personal support at the centre, but to also diminish the authority of Zhu Rongji, who could be seen by Jiang as a potential rival.

Following the Fourth Plenum, and continuing his "Stressing Politics" theme, Jiang was continually defining his legitimacy and his usage of neo-conservatism. In a series of internal speeches, Jiang distinguished Marxism from anti-Marxism in seven areas. These areas included: socialist democracy versus Western democracy, developing a diverse economy with predominant public sector versus privatisation, and studying what is advanced in the West versus fawning the West. Fewsmith (2001, p.136) states that:

> [These] distinctions would reveal that Jiang was searching for a formula that would permit him to move pragmatically beyond the ideological structures of the Old Left without leaving him open to the charge of being 'lax' on 'bourgeois liberalisation' that had toppled his two immediate predecessors, Hu Yaobang and Zhao Ziyang.

After the Plenum, one theme taken up in the official press was that the establishment of a "socialist market economy" could endanger Party discipline, by encouraging "apathy" and "anarchism" and thus lead to the undermining of the supremacy of the Party centre. The claim was that a "socialist market economy" would in fact increase the need for democratic centralism. This was explained in terms of the need for coordination and integration of national policy, and the role of the central authority in representing the highest interests of the whole Party and people (Young, 1998, p.122).

In 1995, even as Jiang tried to reinforce his personal strength through the strategic promotion of protégés, to rein in centrifugal tendencies by re-emphasising democratic centralism, to rein in factionalism, and to steer a course of "stability and unity" by curbing inflation and slowing down the pace of economic reform, he also made a dramatic bid to win public support by finally embarking on a campaign against corruption and by preventing worker peasant unrest from undermining the status quo. Jiang also wanted to prevent bourgeoisie liberal elements within and outside the Party from throwing out the socialist system (Fewsmith, 1997, p.520; and Lam, 1998, p.27).

By 1995, the State had so far been unable to find a mechanism to centralise authority without undermining reform. Jiang needed to define a coherent policy line that was identifiable as the programme of his leadership – a programme that was distinguishable from both its predecessors and its

competitors – that would legitimise Jiang's leadership[79]. Fewsmith (1997) observed that a leader without a policy line was unlikely to be able to rally support either from within the Party or from the society at large in order to legitimate their own position.

In addition, by this time, neo-conservatism was not a coherent socio-economic political program. In fact, as political debates evolved, neo-conservatism could further evolve and split into different strains, not unlike its political predecessor, neo-authoritarianism. Yet, neo-conservatism was gaining support due to the ideological vacuum occurring resulting from the changing needs of the populace, the irrelevance of the Marxist-Mao Zedong tenets within MLM, the growth of nationalism, the economic malaise of the SOEs, and the conception that the government should stand up for the common person (Fewsmith, 1997, p.645).

Furthermore, another important issue facing Jiang and his leadership was to establish the fourth and the fifth generational leadership. At previous Party Congresses, the old guard were powerful enough to choose their own successors. Without the old guard, the Politburo Standing Committee had to play the role of guardians in selecting the next generation of leaders[80].

Progress had been made in building consensus about China's economic reform, and even though reformist leaders' economic policies had come under

---

[79] Chang (2001) deems Jiang's January 1995 speech on China's relations with Taiwan, Jiang's "Eight-Point Policy" towards Taiwan, as a powerful indication of Jiang's security of command.

[80] At this stage, deciding on the fourth and fifth generational leadership was important, especially due to the limitation of two terms in office. Therefore when Qiao Shi announced his impending "retirement" at the Fifteenth Congress, it allowed Jiang to set up a procedure for old leaders to "exit" gracefully from their positions of power when they became old.

attack by leftists, major "economic theories" had always been offered. Political reforms had been more about power redistribution among major leaders and different Party and/or State organisations. While economic reforms had often resulted in win-win situations, political reform could be described as a zero-sum game, as resistance to any kind of political reform could be strong from those who stood to lose much. In China, political reform has necessarily meant the democratisation of the Party (although not "true" democracy). In a Leninist state, where everything is politicalised by the Party State, political reform is impossible without initiative from the highest echelons of power.

In the fall of 1995, Jiang made another move to establish himself as the undisputed leader of China. On 27 September 1995, he delivered a speech entitled "Leaders Must Stress Politics" (or "Stressing Politics") (*"Jiang Zhengzhi", Renmin Chubanshe,* Beijing, 1996) at a meeting for the coordinators of the Fifth Plenary Session of the Fourteenth Congress[81]. This speech outlined twelve critical relationships that the Party and government must deal with in the coming years. Overall, it was a speech that called for development and marketisation, as well as for stability and enhancing State capabilities. As Fewsmith (1997) concludes, the speech was obviously intended to present Jiang as a thoughtful leader, cognizant of the difficulties facing China and reasonable in his approach

---

[81] A year before, on 29 September 1994, Jiang presented a speech at the Fourth Plenary Session. In this speech, Jiang spoke of the need to "elevate" Party building, and that all things were built upon the necessity of strengthening the organisational construction, such as perfecting the democratic centralism, strengthening and improving the Party's grass-roots organisations and training capable leaders for the future.

to these problems. It was, in short, an agenda-setting speech, intended to lay the formation for Jiang's leadership and the "Jiang Zemin Era".

Jiang reiterated his viewpoint when he met high-level officials from the Editorial Board of *Jiefangjun Ribao* (*People's Liberation Army Daily*) on 2 January 1996. Jiang presented a revised version of his speech when he participated at a meeting for CCP leaders of the NPC and the CPPCC on 3 March 1996. This speech was published on 1 July 1996 by *Qiu Shi* (*Searching Truth*) magazine, a publication sponsored by the Central Committee.

This speech allowed Jiang, who at this stage was eager to create his own theory, to construct a theory that was, on the one hand, aimed at developing Deng's thought and, on the other hand, still maintained Jiang's legitimacy to rule post-Deng China. Indeed, Hong Zhaohui (1997, p.90) has accurately delineated the key points of the speech and how these were utilised by differing core audiences. First, many people in Beijing believed that "stressing politics" meant stressing the core of Jiang's leadership of the CCP, which was basically designed to maintain Jiang's power and the CCP's authority. Second, some ordinary people read this political message as a signal of an anti-corruption campaign. Third, the speech was seen to be an anti-reform call. Fourth, the local leaders who were losing political control might be able to maintain their political power. Fifth, groups involved with Hong Kong, Taiwan and international affairs believed that Jiang's speech demonstrated a new change of international policy, moving towards a hardline stance against Taiwan's independence , Hong Kong democracy and American hegemonism. Sixth, most Chinese intellectuals and politicians interpreted it as a duplication of

the older ideas, such as CCP authority and anti-corruption, which were not created by Jiang, but by Zhao Ziyang's idea of neo-authoritarianism and Chen Yun's theory of CCP construction.

Before this speech, many China analysts, like Hong, had identified Mao as a conservative of the left, Deng as a moderate in the middle and Jiang as a liberal on the right. In fact, Hong (1997) assumed that "Jiang would promote political democracy to make up for the deficiencies of Deng's reforms which focused on the economic field only". Jiang's speech, however, moved him from the right (Mao-Deng-Jiang) to the middle (Mao-Jiang-Deng). This "middle" position indicated that Jiang's ideas would be designed to balance and equalise Mao's leftist and Deng's rightist excessiveness.

Jiang's speech presented an ideology, and what was significant about this ideology was that it was closely linked with leadership. As Fewsmith (2001, p.88) correctly states: "it is impossible to think of Mao Zedong without Mao Zedong Thought, or Deng Xiaoping without 'reform and opening up' (now known as 'Deng Xiaoping Theory')". Jiang, therefore, inevitably had to put his stamp on the ideology, to define a 'line' that was both personal and organisational. "Stressing Politics" was to be Jiang's neo-conservative "stamp".

Deng had raised the slogan "guard against the right, but primarily against the left", in his 1992 Southern Sojourn, but this creed had been largely ignored in the official media following the Fourteenth Congress. Jiang's "Stressing Politics" revived it and allowed Jiang to be identified with Deng's reforms. Jiang "touted" Deng's reputation and legacy, whereby hinting that he

himself would push that legacy forward. Furthermore, Jiang built links with Mao and Deng in most of his speeches. Indeed, Jiang needed to define a coherent line that was identifiable as the program of his leadership – one that was distinguishable from both his predecessors and his competitors; and a program that would legitimise the new rulers, with himself as the "core".

"Stressing Politics" was not a new idea for Jiang, as he had previously spoken about the need to reinforce the power of the centre, thus maintaining the stability of the CCP in order to promote economic development. In his speech to Party members (June 25 1993), Jiang (1993, June 28) stated that:

> [The Party leadership and Party building represent the fundamental assurance for the success of economic construction, reform and opening up. The deeper the policy of reform and opening and the greater the economy develops, the more we should enhance Party leadership and promote Party building.

Following the Fourteenth Congress, Jiang continually reiterated the neo-conservative tenets of a "strong government" working to develop the market economy, where the "Party's leadership and construction constitute the fundamental guarantee for the success of economic construction, economic reforms and opening up in China" and that "without the strong leadership of the CCP, there would be no liberalisation and development [of the economy]" (Jiang, 1993, p.18).

Reflecting neo-conservatism, "Stressing Politics" did not commit to the ideology of MLM, but it did remain committed to the Leninist notion of State ownership of the core means of production, and the maintenance of centralism. The CCP would remain the "vanguard of the proletariat", and the Party would

continue to "defend" the interests of the working classes. Indeed, previously Jiang had spoken about the "ideological confusion [that had] shaken Party member's faith [as] Deng's theory had been set against the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought" (FBIS, 1993, May 3, p.18), yet neo-conservatism was able to merge attributes of both these theories.

From 1989 until Jiang's enunciation of the creed of "Stressing Politics", the leaders of the CCP did not seriously undertake a redefinition of the role of the Party in a market economy. Indeed, for a leader who was often criticised for being bland, cautious and technocratic[82], Jiang was beginning to reveal a boldness previously visible only in his deft manoeuvres against political enemies. Furthermore, the classification of the "Jiang Era" as being "dull" was due to the fact that it was continually being contrasted to the constant drama associated with both the Mao and Deng eras (Pye, 2001, p.45).

However, even as Jiang was "stressing politics" and his role as the "core" in the Party leadership, Qiao Shi chose to stress political reform and the "rule of law". Qiao stepped up the pace of legislation and incorporated greater expertise in its formulation. Qiao Shi also gave greater weight to provincial initiatives and to the speed of economic reform than either Jiang or Li Peng (Fewsmith, 1997, p.522). On the other hand, leftists, such as Deng Liqun, in a

---

[82] Pye (2001) alludes to Jiang, the private man, as being probably the most sophisticated of all of the Chinese leaders with his ability to speak Russian and workable English, German and Romanian.

series of unofficial ten thousand word letters, attempted to interpret Jiang's "politics" in a leftist-conservative strain (Kelly, 1998, p.65).

In any case, the Jiang camp began to engineer a personality cult that was almost as elaborate as that of Mao or Lin Bao. Jiang's public relations operatives began in 1993 to leak or circulate sayings of Deng's that were supportive of Jiang (Lam, 1998, p.35). Indeed, by 1995, the Propaganda Department was completely under Jiang's control. From 1994 onwards, the Jiang image-building exercises almost overshadowed those of Deng. Jiang was portrayed as a "genius who spun words of wisdom on the economy, foreign affairs, Party building and army construction" (Lam, 1998, p.36).

Furthermore, Jiang was interested in increasing the power of the Secretariat, as its loyalty was more important than that of the Politburo. Indeed, Zeng Qinghong, Director of the General Office, oversaw a dramatic increase in the organisation's responsibilities, as it became a key institution in the research and formulation of policies, including important economic policies. Jiang thus gained further control over research by establishing a "central social and political work research team" to provide information of central decisions (Garvey, 1997, p.15).

The appointment in mid-1995 of the Shanghai political scientist Wang Huning[83] to the Central Committee Policy Research Office political group, can

---

[83] Wang Huning was also the "ghost writer", or contributor, of Jiang's future "Three Emphases" and "Three Representative" campaigns that dominated in 2000.

be taken as a return to favour of the neo-conservative trend. Wang belonged to a "policy faction" of neo-conservatives that was said to include Xiao Gongqin, the architect of the political theory of neo-authoritarianism, and the political thought of neo-conservatism. Indeed, the number of think tanks and research institutes had expanded in number under Jiang.

By 1995, Jiang had created all four types of power bases within the Chinese political system: credentialist; personal; institutional; and, regional. Jiang had made considerable efforts to establish himself as a legitimate ruler. He had promoted allies into key positions of power; created institutional power bases in the Secretariat, Propaganda Department, Organisation Department, General Office, the CMC, the LGFE, Electronics Ministry; and devoted resources to Shanghai.

In sum, the incorporation of the political thought of neo-conservatism in the emergence of the Jiang Zemin Era can be clearly seen in his speech, "Stressing Politics". This public discourse of neo-conservatism by Jiang, although hidden within his "Stressing Politics" speech, reveals the CCP's acknowledgement of that political thought. This is because Jiang's speech would have had to have been endorsed by the Politburo Standing Committee before it was announced.

Therefore, the assumption can be made that many other CCP leaders adhered, or aspired, to the political thought of neo-conservatism. Lam (1999) had already identified both Li Peng and Zhu Rongji as neo-conservatives.

Indeed, Jiang has, through his promotions and political manoeuvrings, endorsed the expansion of the influence of the Shanghai Faction. The members of this clique are not only Jiang's allies and protégés, but they also are neo-conservative in nature.

Throughout this period, Jiang consolidated his position successfully contending with perceived "threats" to his position from people such as Qiao Shi and Chen Xitong.

Ultimately, then, Jiang, through his speech, "Stressing Politics", revealed his neo-conservative credentials and had, by the end of 1995, embarked on the emergence and maintenance of a "Jiang Zemin Era".

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The research focus of this study has been to evaluate the leadership of Jiang Zemin as the "core leader" of the "third generational leadership" of the PRC during his "formulative stage", from 1989 to 1995 (that is, before the consolidation of the "Jiang Zemin Era"). Therefore an examination of Jiang's ability to sustain and legitimise his position as the "core" and his usage of key elements of the political thought of "neo-conservatism" in order to develop his own "theory", as a condition that would lend substance to the creation of his own "era", is central to this research.

In the immediate aftermath of the Tiananmen Incident of June 1989, Sinologists embarked on examinations of post-Tiananmen China, however they were initially concerned about the apparent lack of legitimacy of leaders such as Deng Xiaoping and Jiang within the CCP (see for examples Kelly, 1998, Young 1998 and Yang 1996) and/or the demise of Jiang Zemin in his role as General Secretary of the CCP (see Bachmann, 1991)[84]. Although Sinologists, such as Lam (1999) and Fewsmith (1998), have sought to reveal how Jiang successfully legitimised and consolidated his position as the "core" from 1989 to 1995 they have not been able to delineate Jiang's success in orchestrating his own "era". Herein lies the value of this particular study.

---

[84] Even Fewsmith initially hypothesised the "eventual fall of Jiang Zemin" and suggested others would replace him.

This research has shown that Jiang's success in consolidating and legitimising his leadership was due to his ability to incorporate key tenets of the political thought of neo-conservatism into what could be seen as his own "theory". As a contextual background, this research first examined the evolving political thought of neo-conservatism, as well as the process of Jiang's leadership of the CCP since 1989. Jiang's self-legitimiation, and that of the CCP, through the utilisation of key elements of the political thought of neo-conservatism, in order to sustain and consolidate his own "era", is then examined in a historiographical narrative form.

Following his appointment as General Secretary of the CCP in 1989 Jiang Zemin had to, primarily, secure his position as "the core" through the creation of informal and formal positions in the CCP which he held, and then support this with the elevation of allies and protégés to key positions in Party and governmental organisations. Moreover, in order to further reinforce and legitimise his position as "the core", Jiang had to develop his own "theory" for governing the country – not unlike Mao and Deng and done before him.

In order to achieve these objectives, Jiang had to first create a sustainable power base in order to retain, and therefore legitimise, his position as General Secretary. As mentioned in Chapter Four, until 1992 Sinologists vigorously debated the possibilities of Jiang losing his position as General Secretary due to the precariousness of his appointment. This was simply because his appointment by Deng Xiaoping was made during a period of factional struggle leading up to and continuing after the 1989 Tiananmen

Incident. As a result, a somewhat unknown former Mayor of Shanghai, with "dubious credentials", was suddenly elevated to a position that had been coveted by Beijing-based hardliners, led by Li Peng. It would appear, then, that the only support Jiang had was that of Deng Xiaoping, who himself was struggling with challenges from the hardliners within the Party over the dismissal of Zhao Ziyang and the continuation of his own economic reform program.

During the period from 1989 – 1992, Jiang had to manoeuvre between the weakening reformers within the CCP, led by Deng Xiaoping, and the elder/conservative factions, led by Chen Yun and Li Peng, whose influence within the CCP was on the rise. As Bachman (1991, p.252) notes, Jiang, as designated successor, had to maintain the trust of Deng Xiaoping. However, Jiang lacked Deng's resources and therefore had to develop independent power bases[85] of his own. This study has revealed that in order to do this Jiang initially formed an "alliance", or "axis", with Li Peng and the conservatives within the Party. At this time, Jiang focused more on the maintenance of these networks and the continuation of their conservative political stance than on the continuation of Deng's economic reforms.

Furthermore, Jiang had to compete with the rise of the princelings' articulation of the direction they believed the CCP should take, which had been published in their 1991 document, *Realistic Responses*. This was set in the context of the perceived upheavals that had occurred in China (for example, the

---

[85] However, in order to further legitimise Jiang's position as General Secretary, Deng had Jiang appointed as the Chair of the CMC also in 1989. As Wu Anchia (1993, pp.35-36) notes, a Party leader's ultimate authority relies to an extent of the strength and breadth of his personal links to the military. Relying upon Deng's influence throughout the military apparatus first, Jiang eventually appointed his own protégés to key positions in the CMC in order to strengthen his position.

Tiananmen Incident and the economic crisis of 1988) as well as those upheavals that had occurred in the rest of the world (the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe and the then USSR, as well as the military strength of the USA that was evidenced during the 1990-1991 Gulf War).

The ties that Jiang established with Li Peng and his associates, as well as Jiang's recruitment of is own protégés to key CCP organisations and governmental departments, did indeed assist in his creation of a viable power base independent to that of Deng. However, a dilemma existed in the fact that it was all but impossible for a successor to both maintain the trust of the top leader while concurrently building an independent power base.

Due to Deng's dissatisfaction with the prolonged policy and ideological debates that had constrained further economic reform, he embarked on his "Southern Sojourn" in the early months of 1992. This sojourn enabled Deng to not only steer attention back to the economic realm but also to signify Jiang as the designated successor whose stance would be to continue the economic reforms. With Deng's elevation of Zhu Rongji to assist in further economic reform in 1992, and the fact that Zhu could be seen as a potential "rival" to Jiang's position as "the core", Jiang had to be seen to be supportive of the renewed emphasis on these economic matters.

Whilst it was advantageous for Jiang to be associated with Li Peng and the conservative elders during this early period of his tenure as General Secretary, Deng's return to the "political centre stage" in early 1992 helped to guarantee his positions, as long as Jiang adhered to the now dominant Dengist agenda. Indeed, without Deng, a careful reading of the sources reveals that

Jiang would not have been able to resist the influence of the princelings and other anti-reformists at the 1992 Fourteenth Party Congress. However, Deng succeeded in not only blocking the princeling's elevation to any real positions of power within the high echelons of the CCP, he also further legitimised Jiang's position as "the core" by seeing that he was elected President. Jiang, in return, successfully led the efforts to have Deng's economic thought entrenched in the Chinese constitution, as exemplified by his affirmation of the theorem of the "primary stages of socialism".

This study has shown that by the end of 1992, Jiang had begun to further establish himself as "the core" of the Party leadership by moving beyond Deng's patronage. Not only did he have sufficient "formalised" power as General Secretary, Chairman of the CMC and as President, Jiang also had established considerable "informalised" power through his creation of the *Shanghaibang* (the Shanghai Faction), with the appointment of protégés from the Shanghai region to key organisational and departmental posts. Sinologists, such as Fewsmith, have suggested that China then entered a period of sustainable and secure governance due to the triumvirate of power concentrated between Jiang Zemin, Li Peng and Zhu Rongji. However, this study shows that with the elevation of Zhu Rongji, also a former Mayor of Shanghai, Jiang began a new alliance, the Jiang-Zhu Rongji axis, which further diminished the influence of Li Peng and his associates within the CCP.

Thus, although all three were instrumental in constructing the new working environment within the CCP, factionalism continued to occur. Indeed, the continual theme of stability and unity that had been relentlessly repeated

after 1992 suggests the extent of the institutional, political and societal problems that China faced (Fewsmith, 1995, p.253). In the political arena, it would appear that Jiang's emphasis on "democratic centralism" might be undermined by the call for further political liberalisation by Qiao Shi, and his protégé Tian Jiyun, in the NPC.

Overall, the research has shown that since 1989 there has been an emergence of an alliance of reformers and conservatives in China, and the emergence of an even broader coalition between that alliance and the moderates, primarily focused on concerns about the development of the economy. The continuation of this alliance has resulted in a general consensus on economic and political reforms amongst the "constructed" political elites; and the leadership has not been deeply divided on any significant issues.   No leadership faction, reformist or conservative, favoured a return to central planning, the elimination of foreign or private ownership, or the revival of class struggle. The remaining disagreement amongst the leadership was largely over the speed of reforms, rather than the reforms to be undertaken (Tong, 1998, p.99).   The neo-conservatives within the CCP took an authoritarian-developmentalist approach to the reforms, focusing on further marketisation on the one hand and the tightening of political control on the other. Development, essentially, had become the sole criterion in evaluating the policies and political leadership in China.

In establishing himself as "the core" and legitimising his position within in the CCP hierarchy, Jiang had to determine his own theory for governing the country. As Zheng (1997, p.43) notes, Jiang did not simply want to defend "Deng's flag", in reference to Deng's commitment to the development of the Chinese economy. In addition, Jiang did not want to, nor could he do so if he wished, continue Mao's emphasis upon class struggle. Jiang had to develop a theory that complimented Deng's economic reforms, especially as he was designated by Deng, yet one that retained a smattering of Mao Zedong's "Thoughts" that could be applied pragmatically during the nineties.

Jiang's support, indeed his reemphasis, of the 1987 "primary stages of socialism" at the 1992 Party Congress assisted in the enunciation of his own "theory". The evidence supports the view that at the time Jiang's support of the "primary stages of socialism" was multi-fold. First, as Deng's heir, his legitimacy was based on Deng's legacy. If Jiang had continued to tolerate the conservative attacks on Deng that persisted after the 1989 Tiananmen Incident, his own position would have certainly destabilised. Second, although Deng's reforms resulted in enormous "negative" consequences, they did provide economic growth. From 1992, with the assistance of Zhu Rongji, Jiang and other leaders without a "revolutionary credential" experience have been increasingly dependent upon economic development for their political legitimacy. Therefore, if economic development was to be chaotic, then the leadership needed to show that it was necessary and only a brief and transitional, or a "primary", stage. Thus, whilst Mao led the first "revolution" and Deng led the second "revolution", the third generational leadership, namely Jiang, Zhu and to a lesser extent

Peng, were the "custodians" of this second revolution. The theory, therefore, provided an explanation of China's chaotic economic circumstances, and went on to propose how the Party would then be able to "discover" new institutions and methods to address and control them in the future. Third, Jiang's support of the "primary stages" principle guaranteed the continuation of the economic reform agenda and allowed Jiang to begin pursuing his own ideological construction. Indeed, the argument here is that whilst it was necessary for Jiang to defend Deng, he also needed to be able to further expand and consolidate his own authority through the creation of his own "theory", thus establishing his own "era".

The princelings' ideological power had been reduced at the Fourteenth Party Congress, and their own political theorem of neo-conservatism ("hard" neo-conservatism) outlined in *Realistic Responses* was sidelined, allowing Jiang to effectively utilise and pursue select tenets of this thought in the establishment of his own theory ("soft" neo-conservatism). Indeed, some of the neo-conservative strains within *Realistic Responses* are similar to those neo-conservative elements incorporated into Jiang's theory. As raised in Chapter Two, the central tenets of neo-conservatism (centralism and strong government as well as the establishment of a market economy) are intertwined in both "hard" and "soft" variants of neo-conservatism. As previously argued in Chapter Two, several China scholars have stated that the reduced influence of the princelings also resulted in the "collapse" of the political thought of neo-conservatism as an ideological alternative to MLM. Yet these scholars have failed to realise that

Jiang had simply modified key elements and produced a more considered and balanced interpretation of neo-conservatism that would be more conducive to China's development in the 1990s and beyond. This "managed" evolution of neo-conservatism revealed that it incorporated two schools of thought: "hard" neo-conservatism (espoused by the princelings); and "soft" neo-conservatism (as argued in Chapter Two), yet this has been neglected in studies by other Sinologists.

A further area of neglect, yet pivotal to the central hypothesis of this research, is that there is ample evidence showing that Jiang did utilise neo-conservatism in order to create the "Jiang Zemin Era", a subject similarly that has not been recognised or closely examined by other China experts. Before the Tiananmen Incident, China specialists usually opted for the one of three models when analysing the Deng Xiaoping era: factional struggle; modernisation; or East-West confrontation (Bachman, 1991, p.252). After the Tiananmen Incident, scholars continued to examine the Deng Xiaoping era, whereby any study undertaken of Jiang Zemin was reduced to the anticipated problems of succession in China. Indeed, any valuable study focusing on the Jiang Zemin era began only after 1995. However, even then there was still only limited discussion of Jiang's performance as General Secretary, and rather significantly less on Jiang's attempt to re-legitimise the CCP so that the CCP could be a purposeful and meaningful institution in the nineties and beyond. Therefore, with the rare exception of scholars such as Fewsmith, the argument that Jiang Zemin had incorporated the political thought of neo-conservatism

within his "ideological theorem" to establish and maintain a "Jiang Zemin Era" has been neglected in previous studies.

Whilst Jiang did indeed incorporate neo-conservatism into his ideological platform, as revealed in his 1995 speech "Stressing Politics", it nonetheless is anticipated that further research is indeed required to examine the full extent of Jiang's incorporation of neo-conservatism as a means to increase his own legitimacy, and that of the CCP. Until 1995, Jiang was securing his tenure as General Secretary, Chair of the CMC and President. It was only towards the end of 1995 that Jiang had sufficient confidence in his position to proceed in a theoretical direction so as to create his own "era".

Indeed, events that occurred after 1995, such as the death of Deng Xiaoping, the Hong Kong handover and the 1997 Fifteenth Party Congress have further revealed Jiang's strengthened grasp over the ideological and political apparatus in China, including his ideological preference for the political thought of "neo-conservatism" as an ideological guide. Furthermore, the 2002 Sixteenth Party Congress, which encompassed the handing of the guard to a new "fourth generational leadership" who possessed ideological directions similar to that of Jiang's, would further support the hypothesis that Jiang Zemin utilised neo-conservatism to create his own era. Indeed, Jiang's adoption of "neo-conservatism" set a precedent for the decisions made beyond the Sixteenth Party Congress, by those who are members of the "fourth generational leadership".

ABBREVIATIONS

CAC	Central Advisory Commission
CASS	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
CC	Central Committee
CCP	Chinese Communist Party
CDIC	Central Discipline Inspection Committee
CMC	Central Military Commission
CPPCC	Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference
CPS	Central Party School
KMT	Guomindang
LGFA	Leading Group on Foreign Affairs
LGFE	Leading Group on Finance and Economics
MLM	Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought
MMBE	Ministry of Machine Building and Electronics
NPC	National People's Congress
PAP	(Singapore's) People's Action Party
PRC	People's Republic of China
ROC	Republic of China, Taiwan
SEZ	Special Economic Zone
SOE	State Owned Enterprise
TVE	Town-Village Enterprise

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, Lincoln, 1994, "On the Gap between Theories of Democracy and Theories of Democratisation", *Democratisation*, vol. 1, no. 1, Spring, pp. 8-26

An Chen, 1999, *Restructuring Political Power in China*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.

Bachman, David, 2001, "The Paradox of Analysing Elite Politics under Jiang Zemin", *The China Journal*, no. 45, January, pp. 95-100.
----- 2000,"Emerging Patterns of Political Conflict", *China under Jiang Zemin*, Lynne Reinner Publishers, Boulder, pp. 55-70.
----- 1991, "Preparing for the Succession", *Current History*, vol. 90, no. 557, September, pp. 251-254
----- 1990, "Retrogression in Chinese Politics", *Current History*, vol. 89, no. 548, September, pp. 249-252.

Barker, Rodney, 1990, *Political Legitimacy and the State*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Barmé, Geremie, 1998, "Spring Clamor and Autumnal Silence: Cultural Control in China", *Current History*, vol. 97, no. 620, September, pp. 257-262.
----- 1994, "Soft Porn, Packaged Dissent, and Nationalism: Notes on Chinese Culture in the 1990s", *Current History*, vol. 93, no. 584, September, pp. 270-275.

Baum, Richard, 2000, "Jiang Takes Command: The 'Fifteenth National Party Congress and Beyond", *China under Jiang Zemin*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, pp. 15-31.
----- 1998, "The Fifteenth National Party Congress: Jiang Takes Command?", *The China Quarterly*, March, no. 153, pp. 141-156.
----- 1996, "China After Deng: Ten Scenarios in Search of Reality", *The China Quarterly*, March, no. 145, pp. 153-175.

Beetham, David, 1993, *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 55-73.

Benewick, Robert, 1995, "Tiananmen Crackdown and it Legacy", Chinese Democracy and the Crisis of 1989, University of New York Press, Albany.

Biffl, Gudrun, 1998, "Unemployment, Under-employment and Internal Migration: A Challenge for Labour Market Policy in China", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Economics and Business*, vol. 2, no. 2, December, pp. 33-50.

Brahm, Laurence, J., 1995, *China Inc. A Concise Overview of China's Power Structure and Profiles of China's Leaders Today*, NAGA, Singapore.

Brosseau, Maurice, 1995, "Political Transitions: A Test of Deng Xiaoping's Reforms", *China News Analysis*, vol. 1526, January 1.

Brugger, Bill, 1990, "Do We Need to Reassess the Chinese regime after the events of mid 1989?", *Asian Studies Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, July, pp. 36-40.

Cabestan, Jean-Pierre, 1994, "CNRS", *China News Analysis*, vol. 1507, April 1.

Chang, Parris H., 2001, "Changing of the Guard", *The China Journal*, no., 45, January, pp. 1-34.

Chen Kuide, 1996, "A Doomed Dynasty's 'New Deal'", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no. 2, March/April, pp.38-41, (originally published in *China Spring*, January 1992).

Chen Weixing, 1994, "Ideology, Policy, and Change – A Framework for Understanding Change and Continuity in Mainland China", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 30, no. 5, May, pp. 45-62.
----- 1993, "The CCP's Socialist Ideology Education Campaign of 1990-92: A Funeral for Ideology", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 29, no. 5, May, pp. 70-88.

Chen Li, 2001, *China's Leaders, The New Generation*, Rowan and Littlefield Publishers Inc, Lanham.

Cheng Tun-jen and Haggard, Stephen, 1992, "Regime Transformation in Taiwan: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives", *Political Change in Taiwan*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.

China Youth Daily Ideological and Theory Department, 1996, "Realistic Responses and Strategic   Options for China After the Soviet Upheaval", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no.2, March/April, pp.13-31.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia), 1999, *Country Economic Brief: China*, February 1999, DFAT, Barton.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, East Asia Analytical Unit, Australia, 1997, *China Embraces the Market: Achievements*, Constraints and Opportunities, DFAT, Barton.

Deng Xiaoping, 1987, *Deng Xiaoping, Speeches and Writings*, Second Expanded Edition, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Ding, Arthur S., 1994, "The Reform of the People's Congresses in Mainland China", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 30, no. 4, April, pp. 14-35.

Ding Yijiang, 2001, *Chinese Democracy after Tiananmen*, UBC Press, Vancouver.

Ding Xueliang (X. L.), 1994, The *Decline of Communism in China: Legitimacy Crisis 1977-1989*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Dirlik, Arif, 1989, "Postsocialism? Reflections on 'Socialism with Chinese Characteristics'", *Marxism and the Chinese Experience*, ME Sharpe Inc, Armonk, pp. 362-384.

Dittmer, Lowell, 2001, "The Changing Nature of Elite Politics", *The China Journal*, no. 45, January, pp. 53-68.
-----   1996, "Approaches to the Study of Chinese", *Issues and Studies*, vol, 32, no. 9, September, pp. 1-9.

Dong Lisheng, 1994, "The Establishment of the Chinese Civil Service: A Delayed Political Reform Programme", *Administrative Reform in the People's Republic of China since 1978*, International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden, pp. 43-61.

Dutt, Amitaua Krishna, Kim, Kwan S. and Singh, Ajit, 1994, "The State, Markets and Development", *The State, Markets and Development, Beyond the Neoclassical Dichotomy*, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.

Fan Gang, Perkins, Dwight H. and Sabin, Lora, 1997, "People's Republic of China: Economic Performance and Prospects, *Asian Development Review*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 43-85.

FBIS,   1995, "Editorial on Jiang Zemin's Twelve Relationships", FBIS, October 12, pp.12-13.
-----   1995, "Jiang Zemin's Plenum Speech Examined", *FBIS*, October 11, pp.12.
-----   1995, "Chen Xitong Dismissed", *FBIS*, September 28, pp.18-19.
-----   1993, "Paper Details Li Peng Health, Responsibilities", *FBIS*, July 1, p. 9.
-----   1993, "Report Says Li Peng Has Second Heart Attack", *FBIS*, June 23, p. 19.
-----   1993, "Jiang Zemin Gives Address", FBIS, June 28, pp.18
-----   1993, "Deng of Posthumous Political Situation", *FBIS*, June 7, pp.22-24.
-----   1993, "Li Peng 'Under Attack' by 'Party Elders'", *FBIS*, May 25, p.10.
-----   1993, "Deng 'Suffering' From Parkinson's Disease", *FBIS*, May 24, pp.31-32.
-----   1993, "Li Peng Enters 3d Week Out of Public View", *FBIS*, May 10, p.23.
-----   1993, "Li Peng Reportedly Recovering From Heart Attack", *FBIS*, May 6, p.13.
-----   1993, "Jiang Zemin's 'Leftist' Views Criticized", *FBIS*, May 3, pp.17-20.
-----   1993, "'Power Struggle' Before NPC Session Reported", *FBIS*, March 1, pp. 22-25.
-----   1992, "Daily Reports Propaganda Meeting Backs Reform", *FBIS*, April 8, p.21.
-----   1992, "Article Analyzes Deng-Chen Yun Rupture", *FBIS*, March 5, p. 15.
-----   1989, "Article Views CPC 'Core' Leadership, Deng", *FBIS*, October 23, pp. 27-30).
-----   1989, "Jiang, Li Peng Deliver National Day Addresses", *FBIS*, October 2, pp.17-21.
-----   1989, "Jiang Zemin Stresses Ideological Education", *FBIS*, September 22, pp.7.

-----   1989, "Article Details Relations between Deng, Jiang", *FBIS*, August 2, pp.12-13 (originally written by He Shaoming).

-----   1989, "Jiang Zemin Writes Article on Party Building", *FBIS*, July 24, pp.28-29.

-----   1989, "The Four Reasons Why Deng Xiaoping choose Jiang Zemin", *FBIS*, July 3, p23.

-----   1989, "Jiang Zemin Speaks at Forum", *FBIS*, July 3, pp. 10-12 (originally written by Li Shangshi in *Local Broadcast News Service*).

Feng Chen, 1995, *Economic Transition and Political Legitimacy in Post-Mao China: Ideology and Reform*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Fewsmith, Joseph, 2001, "The New Shape of Elite Politics", *The China Journal*, no. 45, January, pp. 83-94.

-----   2001, *Elite Politic in Contemporary China,* ME Sharpe, Armonk.

-----   1998, "Jiang Zemin Takes Control", *Current History*, vol. 97, no. 620, September, pp. 250-256 .

-----   1997, "Reaction, resurgence, and, succession: Chinese politics since Tiananmen", *The Politics of China, Second Edition, The Eras of Mao and Deng*, Cambridge University   Press, Cambridge, pp. 472-531.

-----   1996, "Institutions, Informal Politics, and Political Transitions in the Deng-Jiang Era: A Changing Relationship with the Party-State", *The China Quarterly*, vol. 145, March.

-----   1995, "Neoconservatism and the End of the Dengist Era", *Asian Survey*, vol. xxxv, no. 7, July, pp. 635-651.

-----   1995, "Jockeying for Position in the Post-Deng Era", *Current History*, vol. 94, no. 593, September, pp. 252-258.

-----   1994, "Reform, Resistance, and the Politics of Succession", *China Briefing 1994*, Westview Press, Boulder, pp. 7-34.

Garvey, Paul, 1997, "Building a Power Base: Jiang Zemin and the Post-Deng Succession", *Issues and Strategies*, no. 33, no. 11, November, pp. 1-34.

Goldman Merle, 2000, "The Potential for Instability Among Alienated Intellectuals and Students in Post-Mao China", *Is China Unstable?,* ME Sharpe, Armonk, pp. 112-124.

-----   1996, "Politically-Engaged Intellectuals in the Deng-Jiang Era: A Changing Relationship with the Party State", *The China Quarterly*, March, no. 145, pp. 35-53.

-----   1995, "Is Democracy Possible", *Current History*, vol. 94, no. 593, September, pp. 259-263.

Gu Xin and Kelly, David, 1994, "New Conservatism: Intermediate ideology of a 'new elite'", *China's Quiet Revolution, New Interactions Between State and Society*, Longman Cheshire, New York, pp. 219-233.

Guo Jian-Jong, Huang Shih-Hsin and Chiang Min-Hsiu, 1998, "Taiwan", *Political Party Systems and Democratic Developments in East and Southeast Asia, Volume II: East Asia*, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 179-219.

Guo Sujian, 2000, *Post-Mao China*, Praeger, Wesport.

Haggard, Stephen and Kaufman, Robert, R., 1997, "The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions", Comparative Politics, vol. 29, no. 3, April, pp. 263-283.

Hamrin, Carol Lee, 2001, "Inching Towards Open Politics", *The China Journal*, no. 45, January, pp. 123-130.

Harnett, Richard A and Wang Guilan, 1992, "The Problems of Culture: The Clash Between Gerontocrats and Paedocrats in the 1989 Spring Uprising in China", *Asian Profile*, vol. 20, no. 2, April, pp. 97-107.

He Baogang, 1996, *The Democratization of China*, Routledge, London.

Hewison, Kevin, Robinson, Richard and Rodan, Garry (editors), 1993, *Southeast Asia in the 1990s, Authoritarianism, Democracy and Capitalism*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards.

Hood, Steven J., 1997, *The Kuomintang and the Democratization of Taiwan*, Westview Press, Boulder.

Hong Zhaoshui, 1997, "Jiang Zemin's Stressing Politics and Reconstruction of Social Order in China", *Asian Profile*, vol. 25, no. 2, April, pp. 89-99.

Hsin-yi Ou-yang, 1995, "The Impact of the Tiananmen Incident on Mainland China's Provincial Leadership Appointment – A Brief Explanation of Second-Generation Elite Studies", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 31, no. 7, July, pp. 100-117.

Hu Fu and Chu Yun-han, 1996, "Neo-Authoritarianism, Polarised Conflict and Populism in a Newly Democratising Regime: Taiwan's emerging mass Politics", *Journal of Contemporary China*, vol. 5, no. 11, March, pp. 23-41.

Hu Ping, 1996, "Notes on the Program of the CCP Heir's Apparent: How To Treat 'Realistic Responses'", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no. 2, March/April, pp.33-37,   (originally published in *China Spring*, January 1992).

Huang Yuping and Yang Yongzheng, 1998, "China's Financial Fragility and Policy Responses", *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature*, vol. 12, no. 2, November, pp. 1-9.

Hughes, Neil C., 1998, "Smashing the Iron Rice Bowl", *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 77, no. 4, July/August, pp. 67-77.

Huntington, Samuel P., 1991, "Democracy's Third Wave", *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 12, no. 2, Spring, pp. 12-34.
----- 1968, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Hyug Baeg Im, 1996, "Globalisation and Democratisation: Boom Companions or Strange Bedfellows?", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 278-291.

Jackson, Steven, F., 2000, "Introduction: A Typology for Stability and Instability in China", *Is China Unstable?*, ME Sharpe, Armonk, pp. 3-14.

Jennings, Bruce, 1988, "Political Theory and Policy Analysis: Bridging the Gap", *Handbook of Political Theory and Political Science*, Greenwood Press, New York.

Jiang Zemin, 1995, "Jiang Discusses Reform, Development and Stability", *FBIS*, October 10, pp.29-36.
----- 1993, "Jiang Zemin Speech", *FBIS*, November 3, pp. 16-18.
----- 1993, "Jiang Gives 'Important Speech' On Corruption, *FBIS*, August 23, pp.18-20.
----- 1993, "On Improving Organizational Work", *FBIS*, August 13, pp. 6-8.
----- 1993, "Further on Jiang's Speech", *FBIS*, June 28, p.18.
----- 1993, "Jiang Zemin Gives Address", *FBIS*, June 28, pp.16-18.
----- 1989, "Report by Comrade Jiang Zemin, General Secretary of the CCP Central Committee, on Behalf of the CCP Central Committee and State Council", Beijing Television Service, 29 September (1995, *China Since Tiananmen*, ME Sharpe, Armonk, pp. 21-39)

Kane, Daniel, 1993, "Prospects for Democracy in China, 1993", *Asian Studies Review*, vol. 17, no. 1, July, pp. 32-37.

Keane, Micheal, 1998, "Television and Moral Development in China", *Asian Studies Review*, vol. 2, no. 4, December, pp. 475-501.

Kelliher, Daniel, 1993, "Keeping Democracy Safe from the Masses, Intellectuals and Elitism in the Chinese Protest Movement", *Comparative Politics*, vol. 25, no. 4, July, pp. 379-396.

Kelly, David, 1998, "China: Major Ideological Trends of 1995", *China in the Post-Deng Era*, The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong, pp. 55-79.
----- 1996, "Guest Editor's Introduction, Realistic Responses and Strategic Options: An Alternative CCP Ideology and Its Critics", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no. 2, March/April, pp. 3-12.
---- 1995, "Freedom and Civilisation", *China News Analysis*, vol. 1528, February 1.
---- 1991, "Chinese Marxism since Tiananmen Between Evaporation and Dismemberment", *China in the Nineties, Crisis Management and Beyond*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 19-34

Kluver, Alan R., 1996, *Legitimating the Chinese Economic Reforms: A Rhetoric of Myth and Orthodoxy*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Lam, Jermain and Mok Ka-Ho, 1997, "Economic Prosperity or Democracy: Dilemma of Development in Hong Kong and China", *Journal of Contemporary China*, vol. 6, no. 16, November, pp. 461-485.

Lam, Willy Wo-lap, 1999, *The Era of Jiang Zemin*, Prentice Hall, Singapore.
-----   1998, "Leadership Changes in China", *China in the Post-Deng Era*, The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong, pp. 21-54.
-----   1995, *China After Deng Xiaoping: The Power Struggle in Beijing since Tiananmen*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
-----   1994, "Locking Up the Floodgates: Striking a Balance Between Reform and Repression", *China Review 1994*, The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong, pp. 2.1-2.52.
-----   1993, "Zhu Rongji Takes 'Control' of State Council", *FBIS*, July 1, p. 9.
-----   1992, "Deng Xiaoping Bars Leftists From Top Posts", *FBIS*, January 6, p. 25.
-----   1990, "Jiang Zemin Seen Consolidating His Power", *FBIS*, January 5, p.1.

Lawson, Stephanie, 1993, "Conceptual Issues in the Comparative Study of Regime Change and Democratisation", *Comparative Politics*, vol. 26, January, pp. 183-205.

Lee Boon Hiok, 1986, "Political Institutionalisation in Singapore", *Asian Political Institutionalization*, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of Berkeley, pp. 202-220.

Lemon, M. C., 1995, *The Discipline of History and the History of Thought*, Routledge, London.

Lieberthal, Kenneth, 1995, *Governing China, From Revolution Through Reform*, WW Norton and Company Inc, New York.

Liu Binyan, 1994, "Tiananmen and the Future of China", *Current History*, vol. 93, no. 584, September, pp. 341-346.
 ----   1993, "The Long March from Mao: China's De-Communization", *Current History*, vol. 92, no. 575, September, pp. 241-244.

Liu, X. Drew, 1999, *Gadflying China: A Democratic Perspective*, The China Strategic Institute, Washington DC.

Lu Wei, 1996, "How the Princelings Launched their 'Political' Platform", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no. 2, March/April, pp.32-34 (originally published in *Xin Bao*, 16 January 1992).

Lucey, William Les, 1984, *History Methods and Interpretation*, Garland Publishing Inc, New York.

Ma Shu-Yun, 1993, "Continued Clientism in Chinese Intellectual Politics", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 465-483.
----- 1991, "The Rise and Fall of Neo-Authoritarianism in China", *China Information*, vol. v, no. 3, winter, pp. 1-18.

Meisner, Maurice, 1989, "The Deradicalisation of Chinese Socialism", *Marxism and the Chinese Experience*, ME Sharpe Inc, Armonk, pp. 341-361.

Mengin, Francoise, 1999, "State and Identity", *Democratization in Taiwan*, Implications for China, Macmillen Press Ltd, London.

Miles, James, A. R., 1996, *The Legacy of Tiananmen, China in Disarray*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Milner, Anthony (Editor), 1994, *Perceiving "Democracy"*, Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia and the Asia-Australia Institute of NSW, August.

Min Chen, 1993, "Socialism and Confucianism: Problems of Chinee Management", *Asian Profile*, vol. 21, no. 1, February, pp. 1-11.

Misra, Kalpana, 1998, *From Post-Maoism to Post-Marxism*, Routledge, New York.

O'Brien, Kevin J., "Chinese People's Congresses and Legislative Embeddedness Understanding Early Organisational Development", *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 27, no. 1, April, pp. 80-109.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, 1993, "On the State, Democratization and Some Conceptual Problems: A Latin American view with Glances at Some Post Communist Countries", *World Development*, vol. 21, August, pp. 1355-1369.

O'Grady, Tony, 1995,"China's post-Deng Leadership", *Current Affairs Bulletin*, vol. 71, no. 6, April/May, pp. 14-19.

Oksenberg, Micheal, 2001, "China's Political System: Challengers of the Twenty-first Century", *The China Journal*, no. 45, January, pp. 21-27.
----- 1998, "Confronting a Classic Dilemma", *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 9, no.1, January, pp. 27-34.

Paltiel, Jeremy, 2001, "Jiang Talks Politics – Who Listens? Institutionalization and Its Limits in Market Leninism", *The China Journal*, no. 45, January, pp. 113-122.

Pearson, Margaret M., 1997, *China's New Business Elite*, University of California Press, Berkely.

Pei Minxin, 1995, "Creeping Democratization in China", *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 6, no. 4, October, pp.65-79.

----- 1994, "The Puzzle of East Asian Exceptionalism", *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 5, no. 4, October, pp. 90-103.

----- 1991, "A Discussion of Authoritarianism with Samuel Huntington, the Pioneer of the Theory of Authoritarianism", *Chinese Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 23, no. 4, Summer, pp. 67-75.

Petri, Peter A., 1997, "Common Foundations of East Asian Success", *Lessons from East Asia*, The University of Michigan Press, pp. 541-567.

Petracca, Mark P. and Mong Xiong, 1990, "The Concepts of Chinese Neo-Authoritarianism: An exploration and democratic critique", *Asian Survey*, vol. xxx, no. 11, November.

Potter, David, 1997, "Explaining Democratization", *Democratization*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 1-45.

Riskin, Carl, 1995, "Democracy, Authoritarianism and Development in China", *Democracy and Development*, St Martin's Press, New York, pp. 215-233.

Robinson, Richard, 1996, The Politics of 'Asian Values'", *The Pacific Review*, vol. 9, no.3, pp. 309-327.

Rolls, David, 1998, *An Examination of the Promotion and Development of the Political Theory of Neo-Authoritarianism in the People's Republic of China from 1986 – 1989*, Master Thesis.

Roumasset, James A., 1992, "Introduction: The Role of Government in Economic Development", *The Economics of Cooperation: East Asian Development and the case for Pro-market Intervention*, Westview Press, Boulder, pp. 1-4.

Roy, Denny, 1993, "China's post-Deng Foreign Relations", *International Journal*, vol. Liii, no. 1, Winter, pp. 133-146

Rustow, Dankwart A, 1970, "Transitions to Democracy: Towards a Dynamic Model", *Comparative Politics*, vol. 3, pp. 337-363.

Ruan Ming, 1996, "From New Authoritarianism to New Conservatism", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no. 2, March/April, pp. 58-70 (originally published in *Kaifang Zazhi*, February 1992, Hong Kong).

----- 1992, "Article of 'Totalitarian', Anti-Deng Faction, *FBIS*, April 20, pp. 29-32.

Sachsenroder, Wolfgang, 1998, "Introduction", *Political Party Systems and Democratic Developments in East and Southeast Asia*, Volume II: East Asia, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 1-35.

Saich, Tony, 1994, "The Search for Civil Society and Democracy in China", *Current History*, vol. 93, no. 584, September, pp. 260-264.

----- 1994, "The Fourteenth Party Congress: A Programme for Authoritarian Rule", *The China Quarterly*, Burgess, London, December.

Sahlin, Micheal, 1977, *Neo-Authoritarianism and the Problems of Legitimacy: A General Study and a Nigerian example*, Political Science Association in Uppsala, 77, Stockholm.

Scalapino, Robert A., 1998, "Current Trends and Future Prospects", *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 9, no. 1, January, pp. 35-40.

----- 1986, "Legitimacy and Institutionalization in Asian Socialist Societies", *Asian Political Institutionalization*, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of Berkeley, pp. 59-94.

Schmitter, Phillippe C., 1985, "Speculations About the Prospective Demise of Authoritarian Regimes and its Possible Consequences (I)", *Revista De Ciencia Politica*, vol. 10, pp. 83-102.

Shambaugh, David, 2001, "The Dynamics of Elite Politics During the Jiang Era", *The China Journal*, no. 5, January, pp. 35-40.

----- 2000, "The Chinese Leadership: Cracks in the Façade?", *Is China Unstable?*, ME Sharpe, Armonk, pp. 26-39.

----- 1998, "The CCP's Fifteenth Congress: Technocrats in Command", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 1-37

----- 1993, "Losing Control: The Erosion of State Authority in China", *Current History*, vol. 92, no. 575, September, pp. 253-259.

----- 1993, "Deng Xiaoping: The Politician", *The China Quarterly*, September, vol. 135, pp. 475-490.

----- 1992, "Regaining Political Momentum: Deng Strikes Back", *Current History*, vol. 91, no. 566, September, pp. 257-261.

Shirk, Susan L., 1994, *How China Opened its Door*, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

Shils, Edward, 1991, "The Virtues of Civil Society", *Government and Opposition*, vol. 26, Winter, pp. 3-20.

Su Shaozhi, 1994, "Problems of Democratic Reform in China", *The Politics of Democratization: Generalising the East Asian Experience*, Westview Press, Boulder.

Sun Yan, 1995, *The Chinese Reassessment of Socialism*, 1976-1982, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Teiwes, Frederick C., 2001, "Normal Politics with Chinese Characteristics", The China Journal, no.45, January, pp. 83-94.

----- 2000, "The Problematic Quest for Stability: Reflections on Succession, Institutionalization, Governability, and Legitimacy in Post-Deng Era", *China under Jiang Zemin*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, pp. 71-95.

Tien Hung-Mao and Cheng Tun-jen, 1999, "Crafting Democratic Institutions", *Democratization in Taiwan, Implications for China*, Macmillen Press Ltd, London.

Tong Yan, 1998, "Political Development in Reforming China", *China in the Post-Deng Era*, The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong, pp. 81-109.

Tsai Wen-hui, 1992, "New Authoritarianism, Neo-Conservatism and Anti-Peaceful Evolution: Mainland China's Resistance to Political Modernization", *Issues and Studies*, December, pp.1-22.

Tsang, Steven, 1999, "Transforming a Party State into a Democracy", *Democratisation in Taiwan, Implications for China*, Macmillan Press Ltd, Houndsmills.

Wade, Robert, 1990, *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Wang Fei-Ling, 1998, *Institutions and Institutional Change in China, Premodernity and Modernization*, Macmillen Press Ltd, London.

Wang, James C.F., 1994, *Comparative Asian Politics Power, Policy, and Change*, Prentice-Hall International, Englewood Cliffs.

Wang Hui and Chan, Sylvia, 1996, *Contemporary Chinese Thought and the Question of Modernity and Democracy*, paper presented at the Economic Change, Political Pluralism and Democratic Reform in the Asian Region Symposium, Centre for Asian Studies, University of Adelaide, 20-21 April.

Watson, Andrew, 1996, *Political Change Without Democracy? The Impact of Economic Reform on Political Development in China*, paper presented at Economic Change, Political Pluralism and Democratic Reform in the Asian Region Symposium, Centre for Asian Studies, University of Adelaide, April 20-21.

White, Gordon, 1995, "The Decline of Ideocracy", *China in the 1990s*, Macmillan, Houndsmills, pp. 21-33.

----- 1994, "Democratization and Economic Reform in China", *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, no. 31, January, pp. 73-92.

White, Lynn T. III, 1998, *Unstately Power*, Volume II: Local Causes of China's Intellectual, Legal and Governmental Reforms, ME Sharpe, Armonk.

Whitehead, Lawrence, 1999, "The Democratisation of Taiwan, A Comparative Perspective", *Democratization in Taiwan, Implications for China*, Macmillen Press Ltd, London.

Whiting, Allen S., 1995, "Chinese Nationalism and Foreign Policy After Deng", *The China Quarterly*, no., 142, pp. 295-316.

Woo-Cumings, 1994, "The 'New-Authoritarianism in East Asia", *Current History*, vol. 93, no. 587, December, pp. 413-416.

Wu An-chia, 1994, "Leadership Changes at the Fourth Plenum", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 30, no. 10, October, pp. 132-134.
----- 1994, "The Political Implications of the CCP's 'Socialist Market Economy Proposals'", *Issues and Studies*, vol, 30, no.8, August, pp. 31-51.
----- 1994, "Possible Political Developments in Mainland China Following the Third Plenum of the CCP's Fourteenth Central Committee", *Issues and Studies,* vol. 30, no. 2, February, pp. 1-14.
----- 1993, "Mainland China's Political Situation in the Post-Teng Era: A Forecast", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 29, no. 6, June, pp. 1-16.
----- 1993, "Power and Policy Orientation in Mainland China Since the CCP's Fourteenth Congress", *Issues and Studies*, vol. 29, no.1,January, pp. 59-74.

Wu Yanrui, 1998, Redundancy and Firm Characteristics in Chinese State-Owned Enterprises", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Economics and Business*, vol. 2, no. 1, June, pp. 33-44

Yang Zhong, 1996, "Legitimacy Crisis and Legitimation in China", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 201-220.

Yin Huimin, 1996, "New Conservatism and China's Outlook", *Chinese Law and Government*, vol. 29, no. 2, March/April, pp. 77-81 (originally published in *Jiushi niandai*, April 1993).

Young, Graham, 1998, "The Chinese Communist Party Under Deng Xiaoping: Ideology and Organisational Decay", *China in the Post-Deng Era*, The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong, pp. 111-135.

Zhang Baohui, 1994, "Corporation, Totalitarianism and Transitions to Democracy", *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 27, no. 1, April, pp. 108-136.

Zhang Shuqiang, 1994, "Marxism, Confucianism and Cultural Nationalism", *The Chinese and Their Future*, the AEI Press, Washington DC, pp. 82-109.

Zhang Weiguo, 1992, "Development and Democracy in China", Economic *Development and Democratization in the Asia-Pacific Region*, CIS, Washington DC, pp. 89-98.

Zhang Wei-wei, 1996, *Ideology and Economic Reform under Deng Xiaoping 1978-1993*, Kegan Paul International, London.

Zang Xiaowei, 1993, "The Fourteenth Central Committee of the CCP, Technocracy or Political Technocracy", *Asian Survey*, vol. xxxiii, no. 8, August, pp. 787-803.

Zhang Yumei, 1995, "China: democratisation or recentralisation", *The Pacific Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 249-265.

Zhao Suisheng, 1993, "Deng Xiaoping's Southern Tour: Elite Politics in Post-Tiananmen China", *Asian Survey*, vol. xxxiii, no. 8, August, pp. 739-756

Zheng Yongnian, 2000, "Institutionalizing de Facto Federalism in Post-Deng China", China under Jiang Zemin, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, pp. 215-231.
-----   1998, "Will China Become More Democratic?", *A Realistic View of China's Democratisation*, Singapore University Press, Singapore, pp. 167-190.
         1994, "Development and Democracy: Are they Compatible in China?", *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 109, no.2, pp. 235-259.