

Bo Xilai and Reform: What Will Be the Impact of His Removal?

Joseph Fewsmith

The unexpected flight of Chongqing's Public Security head to the U.S. consulate in Chengdu in February started an unexpected sequence of events that led to the removal of Bo Xilai, the princeling head of the Chongqing party committee, and the subsequent decision to investigate him. Depending on the outcome of that party investigation, Bo could then be subject to civil proceedings (as is almost always the case). These events have disrupted what appeared to be the smooth transition planned for the 18th Party Congress later this fall. There has been much commentary on these events, and different observers look at the significance and impact of the Bo Xilai case on Chinese politics differently. Looking at Bo's unique place in the Chinese political system and at the actions taken and commentary issued by the government in Beijing, this article concludes that Beijing is taking steps to narrow the case against Bo as much as possible, presenting it as a case of violating party discipline and the law. Although this makes sense in the short run, there may be ramifications of the case that will reverberate for a long time.

The run-up to the 18th Party Congress scheduled to be held this fall has proven to be more interesting than anyone imagined. The escape of Wang Lijun, Chongqing's vice mayor and head of public security, to the U.S. consulate in Chengdu and his subsequent arrest, followed by stories that Gu Kailai, wife of the Chongqing party secretary, was suspected of the murder of English entrepreneur Neil Heywood, and finally the removal and investigation of Bo Xilai himself have generated vast quantities of newspaper articles, lurid stories, and speculation. Despite incredible detail being included in journalistic accounts, there is much that still is not known. More important, from the perspective of those concerned with China's political evolution, what does all this mean for our understanding of Chinese politics, for the 18th Party Congress, and for the future of reform in China?

The Bo Xilai case¹ is often called the most important since Tiananmen, and it is often compared to the purges of Chen Xitong 陈希同, the party secretary of Beijing municipality who was purged in 1995, and Chen Liangyu 陈良宇, the party secretary of Shanghai who was purged in 2006.

In speculating about the importance and impact of the Bo Xilai case, many assumptions are made, often implicitly. It seems, therefore, useful to define the ways in which the Bo Xilai case is important. There are, it appears, three ways in which the Bo Xilai case is important, as outlined below:

First, Bo appears to have challenged the rules of elite politics in a significant way. There is reason to believe that the rules governing elites politics will change over time because of the passing of the era of strong leaders. Bo's challenge may be the first of many new challenges in the future, or the reaction to it may reinforce the old, consensus-based rules. Whichever direction elite politics moves will have consequences for the ability to bring in new voices and implement decisions.

Second, Bo had an intellectual program, however opportunistic it may have been. Although Chen Xitong and Chen Liangu presented significant challenges to the authority of Jiang Zemin 江泽民 and Hu Jintao 胡锦涛, respectively, neither had any political program. When they were removed from office, the political system moved on without apparent impact. Bo's removal is certainly a major setback to the New Left, but the New Left is likely to continue to be a force in Chinese society and politics for reasons discussed below.

Third, Bo developed a significant populist base. Observers can disagree about how extensive this base was and what impact it could have had if allowed to develop, but elite politics in China has seen nothing comparable in the reform era.

Rules of the Game

Promotions to the Politburo and the Politburo Standing Committee (PBSC) have always been determined by a small number of officials, sometimes retired, on the basis of their bureaucratic rank, perceived competence, and the need to balance different forces and interests within the party. Overt campaigning has not been part of pre-party congress activities; on the contrary, keeping a low profile and at least appearing to reinforce party unity have become the expected norm. On this basis, one would not have expected the flamboyant Bo Xilai to rise to the top, and, indeed, his political career did not seem to match the requirements to join the PBSC. He had been appointed governor of Liaoning Province in 2001, a position that qualified him to join the Central Committee, which he promptly did in 2002 at the 16th Party Congress. He was then appointed minister of commerce, a significant central appointment that sometimes carries PB rank and sometimes does not. For instance, Bo Xilai's predecessor, as head of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation, which was reorganized as the Ministry of Commerce in 2003, was Shi Guangsheng 石广生, who never made the Politburo. Shi's predecessor, Wu Yi 吴仪, however, was an alternate member of the Politburo from 1997 to 2002, and then a full member of the Politburo from 2002 to 2007.

Bo was made a member of the Politburo in 2007, but he was then sent to Chongqing. Previous heads of Chongqing—He Guoqiang 贺国强 (1999–2002), Huang Zhendong 黄镇东 (2002–2005), and Wang Yang 王洋 (2005–2007)—had not merited Politburo status while serving there, though both He and Wang were subsequently promoted to the Politburo (He as head of the Organization Department and Wang as provincial party

secretary of Guangdong). So it appeared that Bo's political career had reached its zenith; given his age (he was born in 1949 and so is 63 in 2012), the 18th Party Congress was really his last chance to move up in the political system.

Given the norms surrounding promotion to the highest levels of the party, to campaign openly for a seat in the PBSC, which is what most observers believe Bo was doing, was risky. Nevertheless, the changes in elite politics may have persuaded Bo that it was a risk worth taking. Deng Xiaoping paved the way for two decades of elite stability by naming Jiang Zemin as general secretary and Hu Jintao as his successor. With the end of Hu's term, however, there was no strong hand to "strike the table" and make a firm decision.² The elders could play a role, as events would show, but they did not have the same authority as Deng. Current political leaders could bargain, and some of them may well have supported Bo. The implementation of a degree of "inner-party democracy," however limited, might open up the Central Committee to persuasion. In short, given a degree of fluidity in the situation, Bo's combination of princeling background, support among some of the elite, bold personality, and a political program (the New Left, see below) appear to have tempted him to reach for the brass ring. If this interpretation is correct, Bo was indeed challenging the way elite politics was conducted.

The New Left

The "New Left" (as the movement has come to be known) identified a number of issues—inequality, corruption, erosion of "socialist values," and the alienation of the populace from the political elite—that are real problems in Chinese society and continue to be foci of discontent. The New Left emerged in a very specific moment in history, shortly after the Tiananmen crackdown, when liberal discourse was truncated, when the West and Western values were routinely described as "hostile forces" (they still are), and regime legitimacy was at a low point. Developed initially by American-educated Chinese, the New Left picked up on neo-Marxist trends in academia, including post-modernism, Orientalism, post-colonial discourse, and critiques of the global economic system (à la Wallerstein and Gunter Frank). This neo-Marxist critique was presented as upholding Chinese values against so-called Western values. Perhaps the core of New Left discourse, although rarely discussed directly, was a defense of the Chinese revolution. It was this understanding of modern Chinese history that really distinguished the New Left from their liberal counterparts. Whereas liberals either thought the revolution unnecessary or passé—something to be gotten over as quickly as possible—the New Left upheld the value of the revolution (and, of course, the CCP) and "socialist" (non-capitalist) values. Part of the New Left critique was an embrace of neo-statism against the decentralizing trends of the 1980s, something that was embraced, ironically, by Premier Zhu Rongji in his tax reform of 1994.³

U.S. policy in the early 1990s had the unintended consequence of helping China's new nationalists. The congressional opposition to the Chinese bid to host the Olympics in 2000 (which convinced many Chinese that the United States was not opposed to the government that had crushed the Tiananmen demonstrations but was opposed to China as a whole). This was followed quickly by the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1995–96, which

continues to echo today as Chinese military modernization begets U.S. military responses. And the Yinhe hao 银河号 (Milky Way) incident, in which a Chinese ship believed to be carrying precursor chemicals that could be used in developing chemical weapons, was stopped outside the Strait of Hormuz, but was found to be carrying no contraband, fueled complaints about U.S. interference. Such incidents prepared the ground for the publication of *China Can Say No* (中国可以说不) in 1996, which was followed by numerous imitators. The New Left, which started as a narrow intellectual movement, developed roots in popular nationalism.

The voice of the New Left, which has developed many different strands, has grown over the years. Stirred by concerns that the “color revolutions” of Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan presaged new pressures—both domestic and international—toward “peaceful evolution,” conservatives attacked “neoliberalism,” the Washington Consensus, and the emergence of liberal “public intellectuals.” Larry Lang (Lang Xianping 朗咸平) launched a sharp attack against management buyouts (MBOs) saying that they allowed state-owned assets to be drained away and SOEs to be privatized. Many of his charges were based in fact, but his speeches and writings defended SOEs against the neoliberal ideas that supposedly lay behind the MBOs. In 2005, the text of a draft property rights law was released and it immediately drew harsh criticism from the left. Beijing University law professor Gong Xiantian alleged that the “masses” were saying that the Chinese Communist Party had become the “private property party.” He also said, “Is not privatization the greatest cause of the current social instability in China?” These leftist protests tied up the legislation for a year, at the end of which a watered-down version of the law was passed.⁴

If the social forces that shaped the New Left were already sufficient by the middle of the first decade of this century to influence the overall political and social environment of the country, it was Bo Xilai who gave the movement political force. Qinghua University professor Cui Zhiyuan 催之元, one of the prominent leaders of the New Left, joined the Chongqing government,⁵ and Wang Shaoguang 王绍光, another leader of the New Left, praised the Chongqing model as “socialism 3.0.”⁶ The virulently nationalist website “Utopia” (乌有之乡) was set up to propagandize New Left views, repeatedly warning that China had adopted “neo-liberal” policies. Some of these articles directly criticized Premier Wen Jiabao.⁷

Populism

Bo’s Chongqing experiment was centered on attacking organized crime, encouraging people to sing revolutionary songs, building new housing, and developing land swaps that would encourage villagers to move into the city. Many of these policies were popular among Chongqing’s residents, though how popular is difficult to say without survey research. Certainly after Bo was removed Beijing moved to dampen reaction from leftists throughout the country—police were dispatched to prevent incidents, the singing of “red songs” was banned in Chongqing, and leftist websites, including the famous Utopia, were shut down. Journalists traveling to Chongqing reported that Bo remained popular even after his dismissal.⁸

The Response of the Central Government

The implications of the Bo Xilai case for the 18th Party Congress and for reform in general can be judged, at least preliminarily, by looking at the response of central leaders, the reorganization of the Chongqing Party Committee, and at central media coverage, particularly the authoritative media.

Central Leaders

The only central leader to comment directly, and seemingly indirectly, on the Bo Xilai case is Premier Wen Jiabao in his much-cited press conference on the last day of the NPC meeting. In a surprising and controversial comment Wen talked about the “pernicious influence” (遗毒) of the Cultural Revolution and the continuing influence of “feudalism” that continued to haunt the Chinese political system. Wen said that the only way to solve these problems was through political reform, especially of the party and state leadership system (employing the same terms Deng Xiaoping used in his famous August 1980 speech). Unless political reform were tackled, the fruits of economic reform could be lost and it was even possible that the tragedy of the Cultural Revolution could be repeated. “All responsible party members and leading cadres should have a sense of urgency,” the premier concluded.

It is not completely clear that this was a reference to Bo, but given the prominence of singing red songs in Chongqing it seems likely. In any event, Wen turned directly to the question of Bo Xilai at the end of his press conference, saying that the current leadership of Chongqing (Bo had not yet been removed from office) should reflect on reform and draw lessons from the Wang Lijun incident. As in his comments on the Cultural Revolution, Wen again referred to the “Decision on Some Historical Problems in the Party Since the Founding of the Country” (关于建国以来党的若干历史问题的决议) adopted in June 1981,⁹ suggesting that his comments were prompted by the threats posed by Bo Xilai and the left in general to the whole program of reform and opening.¹⁰ In other words, the Bo Xilai issue involved a major ideological issue or what used to be called a “two line struggle.”

Wen’s view that the Bo Xilai problem was one of ideology was not endorsed by the leadership, which chose to view the problem in as narrow of terms as possible, stressing the legal issues and party unity. This decision to cast the problem narrowly, as was done in both the Chen Xitong and Chen Liangyu cases, makes political sense—to open up major ideological issues would have created deep cleavages in the party. Even if the leadership, present or future, comes to accept Wen’s view that the ideological issues need to be tackled, they are likely to do so only gradually as specific problems need to be tackled. And that seems unlikely for the moment. The party’s decision to cast the problem in the narrowest possible terms is evident in the reorganization of the Chongqing Party Committee in March and largely confirmed in the city’s party congress held in late June.

Reorganizing the Chongqing Party Committee

As *People's Daily* and other outlets were breaking the news of Bo's ouster in the central media, Li Yuanchao 李源潮, head of the Central Organization Department, and Zhang Dejiang 张德江, the vice premier who would replace Bo Xilai, traveled to Chongqing to convey Beijing's decision, to make strategic replacements, and to try to maintain stability in the city. Beijing's concern was reflected in the fact that Zhang Jinan 张纪南, deputy head of the Central Organization Department, Cai Mingxi 蔡名熙, deputy head of the central Propaganda Department, and Pan Ligang 潘立刚, also from the Central Organization Department, accompanied Li and Zhang.¹¹

The importance Beijing attached to the situation was conveyed by the decision to appoint Zhang Dejiang, a Politburo member and vice premier, to take over from Bo. The only analogous situation in recent times was when Wei Jianxing 尉健行, then a Politburo member and head of the Central Discipline Inspection Commission (CDIC), replaced Chen Xitong 陈希同 as party secretary of Beijing municipality when the latter was purged in 1995. Li Yuanchao praised Zhang as "fair and upright," noted that he had served as party secretary in Jilin, Zhejiang, and Guangdong provinces, and declared that he was capable of "mastering the overall situation" and "handling complex problems."¹² Similarly, Beijing transferred in He Ting 何挺, a specialist in antiterrorism with the MSS who had been serving in Qinghai as vice governor, to take Wang Lijun's place as vice mayor and head of Public Security.¹³ At the same time, Beijing replaced Chen Cungen 陈存根, head of the municipal Organization Department,¹⁴ with Xu Songnan 徐松南, a cadre who had spent most of his career in Sichuan before rising in Hubei, suggesting a possible link to Yu Zhengsheng, who served as Hubei party secretary 2001–2007), and then to Ningxia where he served as head of the Organization Department.¹⁵

Although a few other close aides were also removed, Beijing moved to stabilize the situation, a message that was conveyed when Mayor Huang Qifan 黄奇帆, who had worked as closely as anyone with Bo Xilai, chaired the meeting and was allowed to retain his position. In the course of his remarks, Huang declared his loyalty, pledging to "maintain a high degree of unity ideologically, politically, and in action" with the Central Committee.¹⁶

The theme of basic continuity was continued at the Chongqing party congress, which was held June 18–22. Zhang Dejiang was confirmed as municipal party head, and Huang Qifan continued his position on the party committee and hence as mayor (the party congress does not openly decide government positions). While most people stayed in place, He Shizhong 何事忠, the head of the municipal Propaganda Department, who had originally been allowed to retain his position in March, was removed. Interestingly Liu Guanglei 刘光磊, who had served as head of the Political and Legal Affairs Committee under Bo, was allowed to retain his position, perhaps because he was not close to Bo.¹⁷ This arrangement meant that He Ting, who had been appointed vice mayor in March, did not have a position on the party Standing Committee.

Authoritative Commentary

There was, as Wen Jiabao suggested, an important ideological component to the challenge presented by Bo Xilai and the New Left in general, but it was too divisive to address these issues openly. So when the CCP announced on April 10 that it would investigate Bo, it made no mention of ideological issues. Instead the announcement said only that Bo was suspected of “serious violations of discipline” and would be investigated in accordance with the relevant articles of the party charter and the Regulations on the Investigative Work of the CCP Discipline Inspection Organs (中国共产党纪律检查机关案件检查工作条例).¹⁸

The brief announcement in *People’s Daily* was accompanied by a Commentator article that depicted the problem with Bo Xilai, as well as those of Wang Lijun and Gu Kailai, strictly in terms of the law. The article declared that the “dignity and prestige of the law must not be violated” and that “[n]o matter who it touches and how high their position, any violation of party discipline or state law will be dealt with seriously.” The political sensitivity of the case was only betrayed at the end when the article called for “unifying thought” around the spirit of the center and “tightly unifying” around the party center led by Hu Jintao.¹⁹

The following day another Commentator article was more palpably interested in unifying the party as it moved toward the 18th Party Congress. The article declared that the “vast majority of cadres and the masses supported the correct decision of the party center.” The important thing was to maintain the good situation by “unifying thought and pulling our strength together.”²⁰ The next day, a final Commentator article returned to the theme of upholding the law, saying that “all people are equal before the law” and that it was “impermissible to allow ‘special party members’ to ride roughshod over party discipline and state law.”²¹

The very fact that *People’s Daily* issued three Commentator articles to expand on the decision to put Bo Xilai under party investigation suggests the sensitivity of the case. Although Commentator articles are generally less authoritative than Editorials, it seems likely that these Commentator articles were approved by the PBSC as a whole. When Chen Xitong was purged in 1995, *People’s Daily* issued only one Commentator article, and that appeared nine weeks after Chen’s purge. Moreover that Commentator article denounced the corruption of Chen’s subordinate, Wang Baosen, who committed suicide. It did not mention Chen’s name. When Shanghai party secretary Chen Liangyu was purged in 2006, *People’s Daily* ran no Commentator articles.²²

Other Commentary

Although the three Commentator articles marked an authoritative response to the decision to investigate Bo Xilai, there has also been other commentary reflecting the party’s response to this case. The most important article was no doubt the piece by heir apparent Xi Jinping that appeared in the May 16th edition of the party’s theoretical journal *Seeking Truth* (求实). This was the day that *People’s Daily* announced the reorganization of the Chongqing party committee, and there was a large announcement of Xi’s article on the front page of the paper, larger than the announcement of Bo’s removal.

Xi's article was a speech he had given to a new class of students at the Central Party School on March 1. There was certainly no time to revise the manuscript extensively, but it is possible that some phrases were reworked to meet the current situation. Xi's speech builds on Hu Jintao's call at the seventh plenum on the 17th Central Discipline Inspection Commission to preserve the "purity" (纯洁性) of the party. Xi noted that it was important to oppose all behavior that "split the party," and to expel party members who had become corrupt, and also that it was necessary to maintain a humble attitude and "not become arrogant or impetuous" (不骄不躁).²³

Shortly thereafter, Wen Jiabao presided over the Fifth Work Meeting on Honest Government (廉政工作会议) and called for "creating the conditions that will allow the people to supervise the government." While saying that progress had been made, Wen also said that there was a rather great gap between anti-corruption and building honest government on the one hand and the people's expectation on the other. "The greatest danger facing the ruling party," Wen said, "is corruption."²⁴

Implications

There are important aspects of the Bo Xilai story that we are unlikely ever to know. For instance, if Bo had not been cashiered, would he have been able to mobilize support from different elements of the party to launch himself into the PBSC, seemingly against the wishes of the senior party leaders who sent him to Chongqing? Are the rules of elite politics changing that quickly? And would Bo, the quintessential "princeling," have maintained his neo-Maoist, populist stance if he had been able to make it into the PBSC, or would he have jettisoned it as quickly and expediently as he seemed to pick it up?

Even without knowing the answer to these and other questions, however, we can say a few things about this case. First, it was of a different order than the cases of Chen Xitong and Chen Liangyu, with which it is most frequently compared. Those cases presented challenges to the leadership, especially to the persons of Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao, respectively. But they did not present challenges to the "rules of the game." Although both challenges had to be handled carefully (the two Chens were, after all, Politburo members), their removal presented no danger of splitting the party. The Bo Xilai case may not be as serious as the removal of Zhao Ziyang in the midst of the Tiananmen demonstrations, when there were deep divisions in the party, but then the CCP of today lacks any figure remotely comparable to Deng Xiaoping. Deng could, and did, remove Zhao without hesitation and then wait over two years to relaunch his reforms in his "Southern Journey" to Wuhan, Shenzhen, and Shanghai in early 1992. It is difficult to say how divided the party is today—certainly Bo had more than a few supporters at different levels of the party—but it is also clear that there is no dominant personality to strike the table. The likely outcome of the Bo Xilai affair will be to patch together different elements of the party on the basis of the lowest common denominator, much as the April Commentator articles suggested.

The Bo Xilai incident also sheds much light on the way elite politics works. It is clear from the outcome that the presumed conflict between "princelings" and those who

came up through the Communist Youth League (CYL) or “tuanpai” is not the only axis of conflict and perhaps not the primary one. Bo Xilai was a full-fledged member of the group of princelings, but, contrary to their elitist reputation, Bo developed a populist and ideological persona that was largely directed against the elite. And Jiang Zemin’s group of followers, the so-called Shanghai Gang, seems to have divided as He Guoqiang, despite his early support for Bo, appears to have split from Bo as Bo’s actions in Chongqing sullied He’s reputation and affected his associates. Finally, Xi Jinping, who rose to his position as heir apparent particularly with Zeng Hongqing’s support, seems to have worked closely with Hu Jintao to support the ouster of Bo. Individual and small group interests as well as policy inclinations appear to have been more important than overarching “princeling” and “tuanpai” affiliations.

If divisions between princelings and CYL affiliates do not capture the complexity of personal affiliations and the decisions actors will take when faced with crisis, neither do explanations based on an understanding of institutionalized rules. At least to a certain extent, the whole incident appears to have come about because one person—Bo Xilai—believed that the time was right to challenge the rules of the game. Rather than lobbying quietly and behind the scenes, where his career path suggests he would not have been successful, Bo decided to campaign openly, apparently hoping to pressure party leaders by a combination of popular support, elite networking, and whatever remained of his father’s old associates (perhaps including Jiang Zemin, who owed much to Bo Yibo). It could be argued that the ouster of Bo marked a coalescing of political elites in defense of the rules, and, in part, that seems to be true. However, that argument does not seem to take sufficiently into account the very personal nature of power—which the unfolding of events displays—and the formation of coalitions which are, at heart, the opposite of institutions. It seems better, when all is said and done, to think in terms of “xietiao” (协调), or “coordination,” that vague but important Chinese term for balancing different interests.

Finally, the Bo Xilai affair makes it clear once again that leaders may retire but they continue to have influence, especially on personnel matters. Qiao Shi, who was forced to retire from the PBSC by Jiang Zemin in 1997 (with Bo Yibo playing a critical role), seems to have played an active role, and Bo Yibo’s role in ousting Hu Yaobang in 1987 seems to have been one motive among several for Wen Jiabao—and perhaps Hu Jintao—to oppose Bo Xilai. Incidents thought buried in the past and individuals thought inactive can continue to have a bearing on the resolution of elite conflict and the rebalancing of the elite.

The impact of the Bo Xilai case—and of ongoing bargaining about which we know nothing—seems likely to result in compromise at the 18th Party Congress. The most likely way to compromise will be to promote eligible (by age) members of the Politburo to the PBSC, though whether to promote five or seven still seems to be in some dispute. Still, the possibility of a “helicopter” promotion directly to the PBSC cannot be ruled out—both Hu Jintao and Xi Jinping were promoted in such fashion. But most of the bargaining is likely to focus on the members of the Politburo rather than its standing committee. Of the 15 remaining members, 7 are expected to retire for reasons of age. If

only 5 are promoted to the PBSC, that leaves 12–13 openings for new faces on the Politburo, and more if 7 are promoted. These are the people who will have an impact on Chinese politics in five years, when some of them will be promoted to the PBSC, and in 10 years, when others will be promoted. So the full impact of the Bo Xilai case may not be understood for many years.

Notes

¹ For the purpose of this article, I will focus on Bo Xilai rather than Wang Lijun and Gu Kailai. Their cases are closely related to that of Bo Xilai, but the exact relationship remains one of speculation and, more important, they are not, in and of themselves, important politically.

² Joseph Fewsmith, “Now for the Hard Part: Into the Next Decade,” in *Global Asia*, Vol. 5, no. 2 (Summer 2010), pp. 16–21.

³ On the emergence of the New Left, see Joseph Fewsmith, *China Since Tiananmen*, 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 83–162.

⁴ Fewsmith, *China Since Tiananmen*, pp. 258–267.

⁵ See <http://xinweiyuekan.com/news/2011-01-23/新左派崔之元当官-助薄熙来总重庆模式> (Leftist Cui Zhiyuan becomes an official, helps Bo Xilai summarize Chongqing model).

⁶ A copy of Wang’s essay can be found at <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/38896.html>.

⁷ 李必胜, “对30年改革‘十大失误’原因和责任的追问.” A copy can be found at

<http://my.backchina.com/chineseblog/201007/user-241119-message-78754-page-1.html>.

⁸ Keith B. Richburg, “In Chongqing, Bo Xilai’s Legacy Endures,” *Washington Post*, May 22, 2012; Ho Ai Li, “Many in Chongqing Shocked and Saddened by Sacking,” *Straits Times Online*, May 17, 2012.

⁹ The text of the resolution can be found at <http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/71380/71387/71588/4854598.html>.

¹⁰ “温家宝总理答中外记者问,” 人民日报, March 15, 2012.

¹¹ “中央决定调整市委主要领导” (The center decides to readjust the primary leaders of the city party committee), 重庆日报, March 16, 2012. P. 1.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ On He Ting’s career, see <http://baike.baidu.com/view/766445.htm>.

¹⁴ On Chen’s career, see <http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/123659/123804/7330697.html>.

¹⁵ On Xu’s background, see <http://cpc.people.com.cn/GB/64162/123659/123779/7320297.html>.

¹⁶ “中央决定调整市委主要领导” (The center decides to readjust the primary leaders of the city party committee), 重庆日报, March 16, 2012. P. 1.

¹⁷ Liu had served all of his career, until he moved to Chongqing in 2006, in Guizhou, where Hu Jintao had served as party secretary from 1985 to 1988. The *South China Morning Post* claims that Liu and Bo did not get along. See Choi Chi-Yuk, “Bo’s Top Aide Left Out of Leadership,” *South China Morning Post*, June 23, 2012. On Liu’s career, see http://www.cq.xinhuanet.com/2007-02/06/content_9239386.htm.

¹⁸ 人民日报, April 11, 2012, p. 1.

¹⁹ 本报评论员, “坚决拥护党中央的正确决定” (Resolutely support the correct decision of the party center), 人民日报, April 11, 2012.

²⁰ 本报评论员, “自觉维护改革发展稳定的良好局面” (Consciously uphold the good situation of the stable development of reform), 人民日报, April 12, 2012.

²¹ 本报评论员, “自觉遵守党纪国法” (Consciously adhere to party discipline and state law), 人民日报, April 13, 2012, p. 1.

²² I am grateful to Cliff Edmunds for this information.

²³ 习近平, “扎实做好保持党的纯洁性各项工作” (Do a good job in every aspect of work in maintaining the party’s purity in a down-to-earth manner), *Seeking truth 求实*, March 16, 2012, downloaded from www.qstheory.cn/qsgcyl/201203/t2012315_145649.htm.

²⁴ 温家宝强调创造条件让人敏群众监督政府， 人民日报， March 26, 2012, p. 1. A full text of his speech, titled “让权利在阳光下运行” (Let power operate in the sunlight) can be found in 求实， April 16, 2012, available at www.qstheory.cn/qsqz/qsgcyl/201204/t20120412_150801.htm.