FACTIONS IN A BUREAUCRATIC SETTING: THE ORIGINS OF CULTURAL REVOLUTION CONFLICT IN NANJING
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The mass conflicts in China from 1966 to 1968 have long been understood within a framework of collective solidarity. The conflicts have been portrayed as instances of political mobilization by individuals who shared common interests based on their positions in China’s social and political order—a form of interest-group politics. Factional conflict—presented as a struggle between conservative and radical tendencies—is viewed as a struggle between groups having different stakes in the post-revolution order. The argument is coherent, intuitively appealing and fits well with popular social science perspectives on contentious politics. It has been so persuasive since it first appeared in the late 1970s that it has become enshrined in standard histories of the Cultural Revolution and in lecture courses for generations of students.

Evidence for this view was established in influential early studies. High school students in Beijing and elsewhere carried out a spirited debate about family background—whether the children of revolutionaries and ranking Party members were inherently more loyal politically and more qualified than others to lead the student movement. This argument was pushed early on by many

1 The most important early statements of this interpretation are Hong Yung Lee, The Politics of the Chinese Cultural Revolution (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978) and Stanley Rosen, Red Guard Factionalism and the Cultural Revolution in Guangzhou (Canton) (Boulder: Westview, 1982).

2 In particular, the highly influential tradition of research associated with the work of Charles Tilly and Doug McAdam, who analyze political movements as a problem of mobilization by groups with shared interests and identities. See Charles Tilly, From Mobilization to Revolution (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1978) and Doug McAdam, Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

from “revolutionary” households, and was later roundly criticized by other students and the Maoist leadership. This debate linked individual stakes in the status quo to political affiliation and created a cleavage that could readily be interpreted in interest-group terms. Also important was evidence that temporary workers, demobilized soldiers on state farms and urban youths sent to the countryside all forwarded group-specific demands to improve their lot, and usually joined groups that sought initially to overthrow local authorities. In addition, there emerged in almost all regions a rebel coalition that fought to overthrow local officials and an opposed faction that sought to defend them—a conflict that appeared to pit “radicals” against “conservatives”.

Keith Forster’s early study of province-level factional coalitions in Zhejiang was one of the first to stray from this interpretation. While he continued to use the terms “radical” and “conservative”, he viewed these labels as arbitrary. The leaders of both major Zhejiang factions had rebelled early against workplace authority figures, and the only evident issue dividing the two factions was which provincial leaders they supported. Forster’s sources did not permit him to examine the social background of factional membership, but his portrayal of the leaders’ backgrounds and the factions’ political stances struck implicitly at the core of interest-group interpretations. Richard Baum objected to Forster’s neglect of the presumed socio–economic basis of mass factions, arguing that it is not otherwise possible to understand the politics of the period: “Detached from its socio–economic base, political behavior defies logical systematization”. Forster responded at length, defending the idea that factions which did not map onto


6 Keith Forster, *Rebellion and Factionalism in a Chinese Province: Zhejiang, 1966-1976* (Armonk: M. E. Sharpe, 1990). As Forster explains (p. 3): “… one unavoidable gap in the sources relied on for this study is the absence of Red Guard materials, available in abundance for places like Beijing and Guangzhou … The lack of this material makes a detailed analysis of the social background of members of the major mass organizations in Zhejiang almost impossible.”

existing social categories could emerge out of political conflicts, although he was not able to bring evidence directly to bear on the issue and still conceded that socio–economic interests may have played a role.\(^8\)

Drawing on unprecedented access to archival sources, the penetrating account by Elizabeth Perry and Li Xin of the divided Shanghai workers’ movement during this period introduced remarkable nuance into the delineation of the group and individual characteristics dividing mass activists.\(^9\) They established that levels of Youth League and Party membership among rebel activists did not differ from those among their opponents or the workforce in general. Instead, rebels were distinguished by a previous history of conflict with authority figures, native-place origins outside Shanghai or a political career that had been cut short due to an alleged political infraction. Perry and Li affirm the role of the Party’s networks in mobilizing conservative opposition to the rebel forces, but they emphasize that more fine-grained distinctions channeled factory employees into different forms of political activism.\(^10\) In their account, while pre-existing group characteristics are still paramount in explaining patterns of conflict, individual-level differences, as revealed in detailed personal biographies, consistently blur the group categories defined by so many earlier analysts.

Writing too soon to absorb this more nuanced argument, Xu Youyu emerged as an ardent critic of “Western” interest-group interpretations. He argued that these portrayals slide too easily from high school debates about family heritage and protests by temporary workers into overly general assertions about factional conflict.\(^11\) One of Xu’s most convincing points is that interest-group interpretations confuse the conflicts between factions for and against the overthrow of local authorities in 1966 with conflicts over the restoration of authority in 1967 and 1968. He points out that, in most provinces, the struggles over the restoration of authority actually pitted rival rebel factions—former allies in overthrowing the prior leadership—against one another. If one believes that the late-1966 factions were based on shared group interests, he argues, then it is not logically possible to view those of 1967 and afterwards in the same light. Xu’s evidence is primarily about province-level factions. He does not analyze any region in depth, nor does he offer evidence about conflict at the level of the school or work unit.\(^12\)

---


\(^12\) However, one recent study supports Xu’s arguments about province-level factions. See Dong Guoqiang and Andrew G. Walder, “Nanjing’s Failed ‘January Revolution’ of 1967: The Inner Politics of a Provincial Power Seizure”, *The China Quarterly*, No. 203 (September 2010), pp. 675-92.
Walder’s recent research on university Red Guards in Beijing lends credence to Xu’s criticisms, and offers an alternative explanation for factional divisions. In his portrayal, the factional divide in the capital in the fall of 1966 pitted university students from essentially identical backgrounds against one another over issues that had to do with school-specific events during the first weeks of the Cultural Revolution rather than with features of China’s political order. Moreover, the major citywide factional division after 1966 was clearly between two wings of the rebel movement which did not articulate distinct political viewpoints, despite unalterable opposition to one another. What distinguishes Walder’s explanation from all previous ones is that it places the problem of political choice in rapidly changing contexts at the center of the analysis; this raises questions about whether individual backgrounds and political affiliations were highly relevant to the choices which participants actually faced.

Walder recognized, however, that his arguments could be a product of circumstances in the nation’s capital that were unusual in three ways. First, the municipal leadership of Beijing was thoroughly purged and discredited in May 1966, unlike other regions where local Party leaders remained in power and tried to defend themselves for many months to come. Second, the Central Cultural Revolution Group had intimate ties with the student leaders in Beijing and intervened extensively in their activities, manipulations that created and exacerbated splits in the movement. Third, there was never a mass power seizure in Beijing, and there was never a genuine contest over political power at the city level, in marked contrast to most of the rest of China. In short, outside Beijing there was a regional political establishment that remained in power throughout the last half of 1966 and could well have made the status quo a more central axis of local political contention. Because his analysis of factional politics emphasizes variation across local contexts—in his case, universities, high schools and the local bureaucratic systems in which they were lodged—Walder was unwilling to assert that political conflicts unfolded similarly in localities where contexts remain unexamined.

Piling up new case studies will not resolve the issue. As new evidence is gathered, it is necessary to rethink the logical structure of past explanations and to clarify alternative ways of thinking about the politics of the period, in particular the social and organizational context of the era. Interest-group interpretations are essentially about group solidarity. While these claims are usually left implicit, they are nonetheless clear. They posit that individuals in schools and workplaces

---


who shared similar characteristics or political allegiances at the outset of the Cultural Revolution would share interests in the context of Cultural Revolution politics and would band together to defend them. They assume that groups formed in this manner would be able to recognize like-minded groups from other schools or workplaces and make alliances with them to form homogeneous coalitions, that their opponents would form alliances in a similar manner, and that the two sides would have different memberships and adopt different political orientations reflecting at least indirectly the inherent interests of group members.

We propose a different line of analysis, one that emphasizes division rather than solidarity. In our view, the Cultural Revolution was as likely to divide individuals from similar backgrounds as it was to promote their solidarity. The political impulses emanating from Beijing were ambiguous, and constantly changing in ways that could not be anticipated. Interest-group explanations view this ambiguity as providing a political opportunity for groups to pursue shared interests under the cover of superficially radical political rhetoric. We emphasize, instead, that this ambiguity made it difficult for people who shared a common position in the status quo to make similar political decisions in rapidly changing, novel and high-stakes situations.15

Nanjing Contexts: Two Schools, One Factory

To develop this line of analysis further we will need to trace the evolution of factions from their origins in schools and factories into the alliances that fought with one another either to defend or to overthrow local civilian authorities. We will reconstruct the development of factional conflict within three important units in Nanjing in the second half of 1966. These units generated prominent leaders of student and workers’ factions who played major roles in the city’s politics well into 1967. This will give us a sense of variation in the origins of factional affiliation across types of units, and will also clarify how cross-unit coalitions were formed.

The first setting is Nanjing Normal University High School (Nanshi fuzhong 南师附中). This was the most important élite high school in Nanjing, and its student body, like those of the similar schools highlighted in previous studies of the Red Guard movement, was dominated by the offspring of political and professional élites. The school spawned two Red Guard groups composed primarily of students from the households of senior civilian and military officials. These organizations dominated the early Red Guard movement in the school, and both argued openly that students from their own political backgrounds were the best qualified to lead the radical assault on China’s revisionists. As was true elsewhere in China, both “élitist” Red Guard groups were supplanted by a new rebel faction that denied their claims about superior family heritage. However, the two “élitist” Red Guard groups

adopted different political stances: one defended school authorities from the outset and defended municipal authorities to the end, while the other attacked school authorities and joined the rebel coalition dedicated to the overthrow of the Nanjing Party leadership.

The second setting is Nanjing University (Nanda 南大), which played a key role as the cradle of the local Cultural Revolution, analogous to the role of Beijing University (Beida 北大) in the nation’s capital. Shortly after the purge of the Beida leadership on 1 June 1966, Nanda’s President and Party Secretary, Kuang Yaming (匡亚明), was stripped of all posts and denounced in similar terms in the People’s Daily. The incident which led to Kuang’s demise ignited the mass movement in Nanjing. Three different Nanda student groups played prominent roles in the citywide alliances in the fall of 1966, and in the continuing factional conflicts of 1967. Student leaders from Nanda were instrumental in founding and leading the two major rebel coalitions targeting the municipal and provincial Party authorities. A third rebel faction was led by students who, ironically, were initially celebrated as the heroes of the struggle against Kuang Yaming, but who defended Nanda’s work team and later joined the coalition defending the Nanjing authorities.

The third setting is the Nanjing Yangzi River Machine Works (Nanjing changjiang jiqi zhizao chang 南京长江机器制造厂). The Yangzi Machine Works was a key state enterprise and the site of the first workers’ rebel organization. Its leaders played key roles in citywide rebel alliances and in Nanjing’s factional politics well into 1967. The group’s origin offers a unique window onto the formation of political forces which dominated Nanjing’s politics for almost two years. The group was created by and supported the factory’s Party leadership, but it led the attack on the Nanjing authorities. Their opponents in the factory, on the other hand, fought to overthrow the factory’s Party leadership, but supported the Nanjing authorities. This complicated scenario developed out of intra-bureaucratic rivalries pitting factory officials against the Nanjing authorities.

Developments at these units were covered extensively in the local Party newspaper, Xinhua ribao (新华日报), and in rebel tabloids and handbills. Alumni from Nanjing Normal High School have created a website that includes photos and memoirs about this period at the school. Dong Guoqiang has conducted a series of recent interviews with many of the key protagonists, and we have access to an unpublished draft chronology of the Cultural Revolution compiled by the Nanjing government in the mid-1980s. These sources permit us to reconstruct the origins and evolution of factional politics at a level of detail still rare in published scholarship.

Our account of these three units in the first months of the Cultural Revolution is focused on several questions. What were the origins of rebellion, and what issues divided the participants? What do we know about the social and political backgrounds of those who led opposed factions, and why did they take opposed sides? How did factions within schools map onto factions within factories as citywide alliances were formed, and what did these factions stand for? The answers will help us to assess to what extent factions developed out of solidarity among people with similar backgrounds and interests, or whether people from similar
backgrounds were divided against one another for reasons unrelated to their position in the status quo.

**Nanjing Normal High School**

This school, founded in the 1920s, was affiliated with the National Central University under the Kuomintang, and in 1952 was placed under Nanjing Normal University. Widely considered Nanjing’s best school, its student body included high percentages of students from the households of educated professionals and senior civilian and military officials. The Party secretary and principal was Sha Yao (沙尧), who joined the Communist Party in 1944 in his hometown, Rugao (如皋), in northern Jiangsu. He had held leadership posts in Rugao County before his transfer to Nanjing in 1954. The school’s vice principal was Li Yeguang (李夜光), a former member of the local Communist underground. Li was in Nanjing in 1949, helped set up the school’s first Party branch and remained in the school.

The publication of Nie Yuanzi’s Beida wall poster on 2 June ignited a flurry of similar wall posters on the school’s campus. On 9 June, Sha Yao held a mass rally of the entire school and called for active participation in the unfolding Cultural Revolution. Soon a wall poster appeared, alleging that vice principal Li Yeguang was a Nationalist spy. Some of the older teachers were criticized as “reactionary academic authorities”. Sha Yao encouraged these developments, but strenuously opposed claims that the entire school leadership was anti-Mao.

The city government sent a work team to the school in mid-June, but the team declared that it would simply “assist” the school’s Party branch in carrying out the Cultural Revolution, and played little independent role. The first Red Guard group, the Red Rebel Army (*Hongse zaofan jun* 红色造反军), was founded on 12 August. Its members were mainly children of military officers, and its leaders were from élite families. Li Tianyan (李天燕), whose father was a major general recently transferred to a post in the Nanjing Military Region, had previously attended Beijing’s élite No. 101 High School. Wang Shiwei (王史维) was the son of a cadre.

---

16 A detailed history of the school is available at the following website: [http://baike.baidu.com/view/218354.htm#2](http://baike.baidu.com/view/218354.htm#2), last accessed 20 August 2010.

17 Xiong Yijun, “Fang Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu ting yuan fu tingzhang Sha Yao” (Interview with Former Vice Head of the Jiangsu Province Education Bureau, Sha Yao), *Tongzhou ribao* (Tongzhou Daily), 27 October 2003, p. C1.

18 Dong’s interview with Wang Hong, 4 December 2009. As described below, Wang Hong was a founder of the rebel alliance that challenged the early Red Guard organizations in the school.


20 Wang Hong, “Nanshi fuzhong wen’ge dashijii”.

21 Dong’s interview with Wang Hong.
in the provincial government, and Zeng Xiaobo (曾小渤) was the son of a military officer. These three were among the first to target the school’s “reactionary academic authorities” and those with politically suspicious personal histories, but they also clashed with the school authorities. The day before they established their Red Guard group, they demanded that the school authorities permit them to put up wall posters without interference. This stance placed them in the vanguard of the national Red Guard movement, and their leaders traveled on 18 August to Beijing for the first Tiananmen mass rally, where they were invited to sit on the rostrum.

Soon a second Red Guard organization formed at the school—the Mao Zedong Thought Red Guards (毛泽东思想红卫兵). This group was dominated by children of civilian officials, and included large numbers of student leaders and political activists. The leaders were Chen Guanghua (陈光华), son of a revolutionary martyr, Zhu Huimin (朱汇民), whose father was a military officer, and Zhou Xiaoang (周晓阳), from a proletarian household, who was a model student praised by Sha Yao and already a Party member. This second Red Guard group, unlike the first, cooperated fully with the school authorities, though they also argued that students with revolutionary heritage should lead the Red Guards. There were now two Red Guard organizations from privileged households: a “radical” one antagonistic to the school’s Party organization and a “conservative” one that sought to cooperate.

On 20 August the Red Rebel Army held a mass rally to criticize Sha Yao and the leader of the school’s work team. After being denounced on the stage, the two were forced to march around the campus with shoes in their mouths. The Mao Thought Red Guards refused to participate and instead held a struggle session against teachers with alleged historical problems and students who challenged the superiority of students from “revolutionary” families. Within weeks, however, the Red Rebel Army curtailed its attack on Sha Yao and joined with the Mao Thought Red Guards in carrying out struggle sessions, home searches and beatings of victims. They denounced selected teachers and staff as reactionaries, locked them up and beat them severely. Among the victims was Li Yeguang, the school’s vice principal. The Red Guards also held struggle sessions against student rivals and critics—some were the children of Party members in good standing, some were the offspring of university faculty, and several were the children of army officers.

---

22 Dong’s interview with Wang Hong.
23 Ibid., and Wang Hong, “Nanshi fuzhong wen’ge dashiji”. Li Tianyan was able to get his group onto the rostrum due to his ties with his former Beijing classmates, who were active in the capital’s Red Guard movement.
24 Dong’s interview with Wang Hong.
25 Ibid.
Their offense was that they challenged the assumed superiority of students from privileged backgrounds and tried to establish Red Guard groups of their own.27

Rival student leaders emerged by early September, but they came from the same family backgrounds as the élitist Red Guards. They initiated a debate about the assumed political superiority of students from privileged households, and moved to set up rival organizations.28 The most important challenger was the Red Rebel Alliance (Hongse zaofan lianhehui 红色造反联合会), led by Shen Lizhi (沈立智), a student of revolutionary soldier background, and Wang Hong, whose father, an underground Communist operative before 1949, was a mid-level Party official in Nanjing.29 They failed to weaken the hold of the two Red Guard organizations over the school. Delegations from famous Beijing Red Guard groups camped at their school and openly supported the Red Rebel Army and Mao Thought Red Guards, as did the Nanjing authorities, who established a Nanjing Red Guard Headquarters and a Red Guard Picket Corps in imitation of Beijing practices. Facing defeat, the dissenting students left in September to “exchange revolutionary experiences” around the country, returning only in November.30

They returned to a greatly altered political environment. The “class origin theory” of the early Red Guards was roundly criticized by Chen Boda at the October Party Work Conference, and a nationwide campaign against Beijing Red Guard leader Tan Lifu, an alleged proponent of the “bloodline theory”, was in full swing.31

---

27 Wang Hong, “Nanshi fuzhong wen’ge pohai diaocha”, contains biographical details.
28 The first challenges appeared in early wall posters: He Jining, Du Hongyue, Wu Huirong, Li Xiuzhu, Guo Youhua and Qin Zhining, “Women dui hongweibing chuangli xuanyan de kanfa” (Our Views on the Founding Proclamation of the Red Guards), 12 August 1966, reprinted in Guanghui de licheng: jinian Mao Zhuxi jiejian hongweibing liangzhou nian—xian Nanshi fuzhong honglian (Glorious Course: Commemorating the Second Anniversary of Chairman Mao’s Reception of the Red Guards—From Nanjing Normal Red Alliance), 18 August 1968, mimeograph, pp. 31-35; Gao Huimin, “Chushen buhao, ye keyi qu Beijing chuanlian” (Those with Bad Class Background can also go to Beijing to Exchange Revolutionary Experience), October 1966, in Wang Hong, “Nanshi fuzhong wen’ge dashiji”.
29 As early as 8 July, Shen and Wang had signed a wallposter challenging the “mistaken line” followed by the school leadership: “Nanshi fuzhong de jiaogai fangxiang zhende duitou ma?” (Is the Orientation of Nanjing Normal High School’s Educational Reform Really Correct?), in Guanghui de licheng, pp. 24-27. A closer look behind these privileged political labels reveals cracks in the solidarity of these groups. Shen Lizhi’s birth father was a Nationalist general who fled to Taiwan. His mother divorced his father and married a general in the PLA. Shen inherited his stepfather’s political label, but experienced prejudice due to his birth father’s identity. Wang Hong’s father experienced the subtle discrimination sensed by underground Communists at the hands of the PLA forces that occupied Nanjing in 1949, and felt that his career was hampered thereafter. In other words, there were already inherent conflicts within the groups that officially experienced privileges in the regime; Dong’s interview with Wang Hong.
30 Dong’s interview with Wang Hong.
Red Guards who celebrated their privileged backgrounds were now out of favor.\textsuperscript{32} The dissidents seized the opportunity and launched a campaign against the Red Rebel Army and Mao Thought Red Guards as proponents of a mistaken political orientation.\textsuperscript{33} Because they espoused the official position of the Central Cultural Revolution Group, their Red Rebel Alliance soon became the largest in the school.\textsuperscript{34}

While the Mao Thought Red Guards remained silent, the Red Rebel Army outflanked their critics and announced an even more radical campaign to “Bombard the Provincial Party Committee”.\textsuperscript{35} The Red Rebel Alliance denounced this as a trick and refused to accept the Red Rebel Army as rebels. They argued that the real issue was whether the authorities would be overthrown through a “genuine mass line” or by an elitist vanguard such as their opponents.\textsuperscript{36} The Red Rebel Army responded that that the main orientation of the movement was to attack bourgeois elements inside the Party; therefore the Red Rebel Alliance’s insistence on a campaign to criticize “class origin theory” served only to split the movement and protect those in power.\textsuperscript{37} This created a strange inversion of political orientations, with the old “conservative” Red Guards pushing for radical attacks on provincial authorities, while the new “radical” Red Guards were more interested in pursuing intra-school rivalries.

The paths of the two “old Red Guard” organizations therefore diverged. The Mao Thought Red Guards joined the Nanjing Red Guard Headquarters and the Nanjing Red Guard Picket Corps, both dedicated to moderation and founded in early September with the assistance of the municipal authorities. The Red Rebel Army

\textsuperscript{32} Dong’s interview with Wang Hong, and Dong’s interview with Shen Lizhi, 24 February 2008.

\textsuperscript{33} Among the most important wall posters in this campaign were “Wo xiao ‘Mao Zedong sixiang hongweibing’ jiujing yao chenmo dao nei yitian?” (How Long Will Our School’s ‘Mao Thought Red Guards’ Remain Silent?), \textit{Yezhanjun bao} (Field Army News), 8 December 1966, p. 2; “Wo xiao yundong lengleng qingqing de genzi zai nali?” (What Were the Roots of the Chill Cast Over our School’s Movement?), \textit{Yezhanjun bao}, 8 December 1966, p. 3; “‘Tanshi luxian’ yinhun busan—bo miulun zhongzhong” (The Spirit of the “Tan Line” Lingers On—A Refutation of Various Erroneous Ideas), \textit{Yezhanjun bao}, 16 December 1966, pp. 1-3; “Mao Zedong sixiang hongweibing de douzheng da fangxiang jiu shi cuole!” (The Main Orientation of the Mao Zedong Thought Red Guards is Mistaken!), \textit{Yezhanjun bao}, 18 December 1966, p. 3; and “Zaofanjun zhong de yixie tongzhi bu shi zhenzheng de zaofanfanzhe!” (Certain Comrades in the Rebel Army Are Not Genuine Rebels!), Hongse zaofan lianhehui, Jinggangshan geming zaofandui (eds), \textit{Dazibao xuanbian} (Selected Wall Posters), December 1966, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{34} Wang Hong, “Nanshi fuzhong wen’ge dashiji”, and “Nanshi fuzhong hongweibing zaofan lianhehui xiangli xuananyu” (Founding Proclamation of the Nanjing Normal High School Red Guard Rebel Alliance), 16 December 1966, \textit{Dazibao xuanbian}, December 1966, p. 1.


\textsuperscript{36} “Hongse zaofan lianhehui shengming (di yi hao)” (Proclamation of the Red Rebel Alliance [No. 1]), 17 December 1966, in \textit{Dazibao xuanbian}, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{37} “Wo xiao pipan zichan jiejie fandong luxian dashiji”.
did not join these organizations, but did participate in some of their activities. The Mao Thought Red Guards maintained their stance of open support for the municipal authorities until early January 1967, at which point it became no longer tenable. The Red Rebel Army, by contrast, split with their old allies in early December, and joined the rebel movement to bombard the Nanjing authorities.

The new Red Rebel Alliance never abandoned its opposition to the two old Red Guard groups, and eventually joined the citywide rebel alliance, “Nanjing 27 August”, when this was established in December. Shen Lizhi, the group’s head, became the leader of the high school division of that rebel coalition.

**Nanjing University**

Nanjing University was one of China’s premier institutions of higher education. Formed out of a merger of the Nationalist Party’s Central University (Guoli zhongyang daxue 国立中央大学) and the American Christian college, Jinling University (Jinling daxue 金陵大学), it had many faculty and administrators from these former institutions who had “complicated” political histories.

Kuang Yaming, Nanda’s Party Secretary and President, was therefore determined to enforce the highest political standards. Kuang responded decisively to early radical initiatives in educational reform. In 1964 and 1965, in widely circulated talks with his niece Wang Hairong and nephew Mao Yuanxin, Mao Zedong made critical comments about university education. In response, Kuang seized the initiative in February 1966 and established a “half-farming, half-study” campus for the humanities faculty in rural Liyang County (溧阳县), 60 miles from Nanjing. Conditions on the farm were horrible for the 500-plus students and faculty from the Chinese Literature, History and Politics Departments, and they resented the fact that the Science and Engineering departments remained in Nanjing.

The simmering dissatisfaction over the exile to Liyang fed directly into Cultural Revolution politics. As soon as the Liyang faculty and students heard about Nie Yuanzi’s Beida rebellion, wall posters appeared in Liyang criticizing the campus as an example of revisionism. Kuang Yaming responded to these criticisms as if they were

---

38 Dong’s interview with Wang Hong.
39 Interviews with Shen Lizhi and Wang Hong, “Nanshi fuzhong wen’ge dashiji”.
40 Kuang was born in 1906 into the family of a Jiangsu village teacher. After graduating from high school he moved to Shanghai to pursue a literary career, and joined the Communist Party. He served for a period as the editor-in-chief of Shandong’s Dazhong ribao (Masses’ Daily) and as vice head of the East China Bureau’s Propaganda Department. In 1955 he became President and Party Secretary of Jilin University, where he distinguished himself as an activist in pursuing the Anti-Rightist Campaign. In 1963 he took over at Nanjing University. See [http://baike.baidu.com/view/111347.htm](http://baike.baidu.com/view/111347.htm), last accessed 20 August 2010.
a reactionary attack on Maoist educational initiatives, and organized a harsh campaign which labeled close to half the students and faculty in Liyang as rightists and reactionaries. As part of this campaign, a dozen prominent student cadres were targeted for masterminding the attack on the principles represented by Liyang. Among them were Hu Caiji (胡才基), Sun Jiazheng (孙家正) and Zhu Yingcai (朱英才). Hu, a 32-year-old student of Chinese literature, was Chairman of the Student Association and a Party member of middle peasant background, who had joined the revolution before 1949 and entered Nanda as a “cadre transfer student”. Sun, the son of a revolutionary martyr, was secretary of the Chinese Department’s Communist Youth League branch. Zhu was a Party member and student cadre in the Politics department.42 All of them, in other words, had strong stakes in the status quo.

Kuang’s harsh counter-attack came to the attention of authorities in Beijing, and Kang Sheng (康生) decided to use it to signal that student rebellion must not be suppressed. He decreed that the Liyang wall posters were “correct” and that Kuang’s reaction opposed Mao Thought.43 The Jiangsu Provincial Party Committee immediately sent a liaison group to Liyang and announced that Kuang was stripped of all his posts. The story was publicized nationwide.44 The hapless Kuang was felled for his active promotion of Mao’s ideas and his militant defense of them against self-interested critics.

The persecuted rebels now became celebrated heroes. Encouraged by this turn of events, they put up even more wall posters to expose Kuang’s “crimes”. On 8 June, the Provincial Party Committee sent a group to prepare the way for a provincial work team, which arrived on 15 June. The initial work team head was Wang Bingshi (汪冰石), director of the Jiangsu Provincial Economic Commission. The deputy heads were Liang Jiqing (梁辑卿), Du Fangping (杜方平) and Wu Dasheng (吴大胜),

42 Dong’s interviews with: Jiang Guangxue, 9 March 2006 (graduated from Nanda’s Politics Department in 1965 and at the time was on the staff of the Liyang campus Political Department); Jing Shenghong, 10 March 2006 (third-year student in the Politics Department at the Liyang campus, where he was a classmate of Sun Jiazheng and Zhu Yingcai); Dong Jian, 8 May 2006 (1965 graduate of Nanda’s Chinese Department where, as a student in the Chinese Department’s Master’s degree program, he served as a teaching assistant and as the political instructor of Hu Caiji’s class); Hu Caiji, 22 April 2007.

43 Interview with Hu Caiji, 22 April 2007. Hu learned this in subsequent conversations with Kang Sheng. See also “Zhongyang shouzhang lun Kuang Yaming” (Central Leaders on Kuang Yaming), Xin Nanda (New Nanjing University), 6 January 1968, p. 1; see also “Zhongyang shouzhang jiejian Jiangsu fu jing daibiaotuan de jianghua” (Central Leaders’ Talks with the Jiangsu Delegation in the Capital), 18 November 1967, in Song Yongyi (ed.), The Chinese Cultural Revolution Database, CD-ROM (Hong Kong: Universities Service Centre for Chinese Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2002).

44 “Nanjing daxue jiuchu fandang fan shehui zhuyi de fangeming fenzi Kuang Yaming” (Nanjing University Drags out Anti-Party, Anti-Socialist, Counter-revolutionary Element Kuang Yaming), Renmin ribao, 16 June 1966, p. 1.
all officers from the Nanjing Military Region.\footnote{Liang was a major general and vice political commissar of the Jiangsu Military District; Du was a colonel and head of the Defense Industry Department of the Nanjing Military Region; Wu was a colonel and vice head of the Nanjing Military Region Logistics Department.} On 4 July, Peng Chong (彭冲), a member of the Jiangsu Province Secretariat, became the new Party Secretary of Nanda and replaced Wang Bingshi as work team head. Most of the work team’s 130 members were officers from the Nanjing Military Region.\footnote{Wang Dezi (ed.), \textit{Nanjing daxue bainian shi} (Hundred Year History of Nanjing University) (Nanjing: Nanjing Daxue Chubanshe, 2002), pp. 377-78, and Jiang Weiqing, \textit{Qishinian zhengcheng—Jiang Weiqing huiyi lu} (Seventy Year Journey—The Memoirs of Jiang Weiqing) (Nanjing: Jiangsu Renmin Chubanshe, 1996), p. 517.}

The Nanda work team celebrated the Liyang rebels and encouraged denunciations of Kuang, but they resisted broader attacks on the school’s leadership. The Nanda Party apparatus was under the direction of the Provincial Party Committee, and an expanding denunciation of the school’s leaders threatened to implicate higher authorities. There ensued a tug-of-war between the work team, which tried to focus attacks on Kuang Yaming and Liyang, and students and faculty who wanted a broader campaign.

The work team’s dilemma was illustrated in their handling of the main campus, where students put up wall posters critical of the school’s Party leadership when the controversy over Liyang broke out. Two of the school’s deputy Party secretaries, who remained in charge of the campus while Kuang went to Liyang to quell the uprising, organized a campaign against these rebellious students. After Kuang’s downfall and the celebration of the Liyang rebels, these students expected also to be celebrated as persecuted rebels, but the work team ignored them and denied their charges that the school’s leadership problems went beyond Liyang.

A second illustration of the work team’s dilemma was its response to violence by student rebels. On 18 June, 22 students of French in the Foreign Languages Department put up a wall poster denouncing the work team and calling for its expulsion.\footnote{Nanjing shi dang’an guan, \textit{Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, chugao} (A Chronology of the “Great Cultural Revolution” in Nanjing, draft) (Nanjing: Mimeographed, 1985), p. 5.} On 20 June, they dragged Kuang Yaming and several subordinates to a mass rally, during which they were humiliated, beaten and paraded around campus with tall paper hats. The work team broke up the event and organized a criticism campaign against undisciplined violence.\footnote{A similar incident on the Beida campus on 18 June led the central authorities to issue a denunciation of violence, in a Central Committee document issued nationwide on 20 June. See Andrew G. Walder, \textit{Fractured Rebellion}, pp. 60-63.}

The work team continued with their own campaign against alleged revisionists among the school’s faculty and lower-ranking officials. Most members of Nanda’s Party Committee and most of the department Party branch secretaries were shielded
Many faculty and students opposed this focus on people with little authority. Wen Fenglai (文风来) was one of the faculty members who first stood up to criticize the work team. A Party member and young instructor in the Marxism-Leninism Teaching Section, he had transferred into the school after military service. The authors of the wall poster from the Foreign Languages Department French section who criticized the work team were his students, and Wen opposed attacks against ordinary teachers and students. In late July he put up a wall poster denouncing the policy, and it received a great deal of attention.50

The work team mobilized Party members and Youth League leaders to head off the rebellion. Hu Caiji, Sun Jiazheng, Zhu Yingcai and other students who had been vindicated after the Liyang affair and warmly embraced by the work team actively spearheaded the counter-attack. They put up wall posters and held rallies to target Wen Fenglai and other critics of the work team, splitting the faculty and students.51

In early August, Wen Fenglai and several supporters went to Beijing to protest about their treatment. Kang Sheng granted them an interview and recognized that the case would prove politically useful in the unfolding national campaign. He selected Wen Fenglai as a “revolutionary teacher” to sit on the rostrum during Mao’s 18 August Red Guard rally on Tiananmen Square, and a People’s Daily article on the event mentioned Wen by name.52 After returning from Beijing, Wen and his followers formed Nanda’s first Red Guard organization, the Nanda Red Rebels (Nanda hongse zaofan dui 南大红色造反队), on 23 August. Like the early Red Guard groups at Nanjing Normal High School, Wen insisted on a politically pure membership, admitting only those with impeccable political and family backgrounds. This exclusivist stance prevented the organization from growing, although it remained an important vanguard group.53

49 “‘Daji yi dapian, baohu yi xiaocuo’ heqi duye!” (“Attacking Many to Protect a Few”: How Despicable!), Nongnu ji (Serfs’ Halberd), 21 April 1967, pp. 1-2.
50 Interview with Wang Jizhi, 27 February 2007. Wang Jizhi was a 1965 graduate of Nanda’s Chinese Department who remained on the campus as a language instructor for the Vietnamese students studying at the school. He founded and led one of the rebel groups that joined the 27 August alliance described below.
51 Interview with Cui Zhiqing, 1 March 2006. Cui was a student in the History Department at the time.
52 Interview with Geng Changxian, 1 February 2007. Geng Changxian was a close ally of Wen Fenglai (d. 1976). Geng was one of the students who signed the famous wall poster from the Foreign Languages Department in opposition to the work team, and was one of the earliest members of the Red Rebel Brigade. Also see “Zhongyang shouzhang jiejian Jiangsu sheng fu jing daibiaotuan jianghua de jiyao” (Minutes of the Talks of Central Leaders with the Jiangsu Delegation to the Capital), 5 March 1967, in Song Yongyi (ed.), Chinese Cultural Revolution Database, where Kang Sheng is quoted as saying, “I say support Wen Fenglai, and I said this even before you did”; see also “Mao Zhuxi he women xinlianxin” (Chairman Mao Cares Deeply for Us), Renmin ribao, 19 August 1966, p. 7.
Zhang Jianshan (张建山), a fifth-year student in the Mathematics Department, found Wen’s insistence on political purity to be self-defeating. Zhang was vice secretary of the Youth League General Branch of his department, chairman of his department’s student association and one of the first members of the Nanda Red Rebels. On 27 August he set up a separate Red Guard organization, the Nanda 27 August Revolutionary Alliance (Nanda ba er qi geming chuanlianhuì 南大八二七革命串联会). He persuaded Zeng Bangyuan (曾邦元), a young Party member and political instructor in his department, to serve as its primary leader. Zeng was a 1964 graduate of Nanda’s Mathematics Department who stayed on as a political counselor after graduation, also serving as the General Branch Secretary of his department’s Communist Youth League. Nanda 27 August’s political stance was the same as the Red Rebels, but with less restrictive recruitment standards it soon became much larger.54

The imminent departure of the work team set off factional conflict. The two rebel organizations besieged work team members, detained them on campus and demanded that they confess to committing political errors and reverse the verdicts on the students and teachers whom they had attacked. To fend off these demands, the work team met with their student supporters and encouraged them to set up a separate Red Guard group. On 29 August, Nanda Red Flag (Nanda hongqi zhandou dui 南大红旗战斗队) was founded, with the famous Liyang rebels Hu Caiji, Zhu Yingcai and Sun Jiazheng in the lead. They declared that the work team’s political orientation was basically correct and that the rebels were obstructing central policy, which was to withdraw all work teams.55 The stalemate was resolved on 17 September during a citywide mass rally at Nanjing’s Wutaishan Stadium organized by the Red Rebels and Nanda 27 August to denounce the Nanda work team. While this event took place, Nanda Red Flag held a warm farewell rally on the school’s sports field, after which the work team made a dignified withdrawal.56

To protest against the work team’s escape, the Red Rebels and Nanda 27 August sent a delegation of 1,300 to Beijing. 57 They participated in the huge rally at the Beijing Worker’s Stadium on 6 October to denounce the “bourgeois reactionary line”, a meeting that affirmed the ascendancy of the capital’s new rebel faction.58 They found support for their demands in Zhou Enlai’s speech, when he said that

54 Wang Dezi (ed.), Nanjing daxue bainian shi, p. 378; “Nanda hongqi zhandoudui de da houtai shi shenme ren?” (Who is the Big Backstage Boss of the Nanda Red Flag Battle Group?), Ba erqi zhanbao (27 August Battle News), 11 January 1967, p. 3; and Dong’s interview with Ge Zhonglong (fifth-year student in the Mathematics Department and an early member of both the Red Rebel Brigade and Nanda 27 August), 14 April 2007.
57 Ibid., p. 17.
58 See Andrew G. Walder, Fractured Rebellion, pp. 162-63.
“... any work teams that committed errors in schools should go there whenever requested. If the leaders above them were responsible for their errors, they should also go to the schools to conduct a self-criticism.”

Buoyed by Beijing’s support, the delegation returned to Nanjing and brought the Nanda work team back to the campus for struggle sessions. Liang Jiqing, Du Fangping and Wu Dasheng, the deputy heads from the Nanjing Military Region, quickly admitted that the work team manipulated students to oppose one another and collaborated with public security forces to compile dossiers on the critics of the work team. They laid the blame on the Jiangsu Provincial Party Committee who, they said, had directed all these activities behind the scenes. This turned the struggle over the work team into an attack on the Provincial Party Committee.

Nanda Red Flag sought to dull the attacks on the work team and by extension on the municipal and provincial authorities. They helped to found and lead the citywide organization Nanjing Higher Education Scarlet Guards (Nanjing dazhuan yuanxiao chiweidui 南京大专院校赤卫队). They put up wall posters attacking Wen Fenglai and other rebel leaders for defying Party leadership and attacking work team head “comrade Peng Chong”, a member of the provincial Party secretariat. After central policy shifted, with even Zhou Enlai calling for criticisms of the work teams as representatives of the “bourgeois reactionary line”, Red Flag changed its tune. On 6 October, the group launched a strident criticism campaign against the work team as well, but their main targets were, not the provincial authorities, but the three deputy heads from the Nanjing Military Region who confessed to the conspiracy. In late November, after provincial officials publicly confessed their errors, Nanda Red Flag held rallies to criticize the “bourgeois reactionary line of the Jiangsu Party Committee”, but they only demanded that they “correct their mistakes” and “return to Mao’s revolutionary line as soon as possible”.

59 “Zhongyang shouzhang zai xiang zichan jieji fandong luxian menglie kaihuo shishi dahui shang de jianghua” (Speeches by Central Leaders at the Mass Rally to Swear to Open Fire Without Mercy on the Bourgeois Reactionary Line), 6 October 1966, in Song Yongyi (ed.), Chinese Cultural Revolution Database.

60 Chen Qifen, “Wuyun zhebuzhu taiyang, zhenli yongyuan fangguang” (Black Clouds Cannot Block out the Sun, Truth Will Always Shine), Hongweibing bao (Red Guard News), 30 November 1966, pp. 2-3, and “Cong Nanda de dongxiang kan shengwei de xin yinmou” (Nanda Trends Reflect New Provincial Party Committee Conspiracies), Hongweibing bao, 18 December 1966, p. 2.

61 “Xingzuo shiyou de jizhong da baolu—ping 11 yue 28 ri hongqi zhandoudui de dahui” (A Concentrated Outburst of Left in Form but Right in Essence—Assessing the 28 November Mass Rally of Red Flag Battle Group and Other Organizations), Ba erqi zhanbao, 3 December 1966, p. 3; “Hongqi zhandoudui de maotou you zhicuole” (Red Flag Battle Group’s Spearhead is Once Again Aimed Incorrectly), Ba erqi zhanbao, 3 December 1966, p. 2; and “Cong Nanda de dongxiang kan shengwei de xin yinmou”.

62 “Jiekai ‘Nanjing hongweibing zhishu jiuchan siyangbu’ de heimu” (Thoroughly Uncover the Inside Story of the “Nanjing Red Guard Picket Corps Headquarters”), Geming zaofan bao (Revolutionary Rebel News), 17 January 1967, p. 2; Sun Xiaoping, “Chedi jiefa Jiangsu...
In order to break the deadlock, the Nanda rebels forced Xu Jiatun, a member of the provincial secretariat, to accompany them to Beijing. On 5 December they met with Tao Zhu, who announced that they had reached an “Eight-Point Agreement” in which the provincial leaders admitted severe errors in conducting the Cultural Revolution. When this was announced, thousands of members from Nanda Red Flag and the Nanjing Workers Scarlet Guards demonstrated at the provincial Party headquarters, demanding that the authorities repudiate the agreement. Rebuffed, Nanda Red Flag sent a delegation to escort Xu Jiatun back to Beijing and sign a new agreement. Nanjing rebel forces confronted them in Beijing and forcibly took custody of Xu. The confrontation between Nanda Red Flag and its rivals lasted until early January 1967, when the alliance in defense of the local authorities collapsed.

The two Nanda rebel groups, the Red Rebels and Nanda 27 August, fought together in the movement against local authorities, but they also competed for leadership of Nanjing’s rebel movement. Zhang Jianshan and Ge Zhonglong, the founders of Nanda 27 August, were originally members of the Red Rebels and they organized their group as an offshoot with less strict membership requirements. They soon grew much larger than the Red Rebels and declared their complete independence. Zeng Bangyuan took over leadership, and the group surged to the head of the city’s rebel movement. Now a minority on campus, in November the Red Rebels sought to strengthen their hand by organizing the first cross-occupation rebel alliances in Nanjing, the Jiangsu Red Rebel Headquarters (Jiangsu sheng hongzong 江苏省红总) and a large coalition of workers’ organizations, the Jiangsu Workers’ General Headquarters (Jiangsu sheng gongzong 江苏省工总). In December, Nanda 27 August followed suit by organizing its own citywide alliance, Nanjing 27 August. The two alliances worked together to defeat the students and workers who defended shengwei zichan jieji fandong luxian” (Expose the Bourgeois Reactionary Line of the Jiangsu Province Party Committee), Geming zaofan bao, 17 January 1967, p. 3. Sun Xiaoping was a Nanda Red Flag leader. Her father, Sun Haiyun, was the head of the Organization Department of the Jiangsu Party Committee. See also Nanjing shi dang’an guan, Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, p. 27.

63 “Jiangsu shengwei zaofanpai yu shengwei dacheng de baxiang xieyi” (Eight-Point Agreement Reached Between the Jiangsu Revolutionary Rebels and the Provincial Party Committee), Hongweibing bao, 27 December 1966, p. 2. The primary contents of the agreement were: that the provincial and municipal Party committees must immediately stop inciting the masses to struggle against one another; that they immediately remove and destroy all negative materials put into the files of individuals because of their rebellion; that the provincial and municipal authorities make public self-criticisms and accept the criticisms of the masses; and that the authorities must keep their offices open to the rebel forces for negotiations.

64 Nanjing shi dang’an guan, Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, p. 33.

65 Dong’s interview with Ge Zhonglong, 17 July 2008.

66 Interview with Geng Changxian. Ge Zhonglong disputes this account and argues that 27 August was an independent organization from the outset.
the local authorities, but their latent competition for leadership of the citywide movement was rekindled after their enemies were defeated, and they split over the January power seizure.67

Yangzi River Machine Works

This large state enterprise was under the dual leadership of Beijing’s Fourth Ministry of Machine Building and the Nanjing Municipal Party Committee. The ministry was in charge of its business operations, while its Party organization was under the Nanjing Municipal Party Committee. The enterprise was founded in 1945 by the Nationalist government, and had many workers, technicians and administrators from that era. These “old personnel” (jiu renyuan 旧人员) had a distinct identity from the younger workers, technicians and demobilized Red Army soldiers who came later. The factory’s place in China’s bureaucratic hierarchy, its historical legacy and political events in the enterprise shortly before the Cultural Revolution generated the factionalism of 1966.

On the eve of the Socialist Education Movement, the factory’s Party Secretary was Gao Xiangzhi (高祥芝), who was appointed to his post by the Nanjing Municipal Party Committee. In September 1964, the Fourth Ministry of Machine Building sent a work team staffed by more than 600 cadres to the factory. Tan Youming (谭佑铭), the Ministry’s Party vice secretary and Director of its Political Department, headed the work team. Tan had a military background, and had previously headed the Political Department of the People’s Liberation Army Academy of Politics. He considered the factory’s Party leadership thoroughly corrupted by revisionism, and proceeded with a militant campaign. Gao Xiangzhi was purged, close to half the cadres at middle level and above were labeled members of “the Gao Xiangzhi Clique”, and 80 per cent of them were subjected to struggle sessions, along with a number of ordinary workers and technicians who were criticized as their loyal followers.68 The campaign was an implicit rebuke to the Nanjing Party authorities, who were responsible for the factory’s Party organization.

In January 1965, policy shifts in Beijing forced the work team to moderate its radical purge, and it was ordered to conduct a self-criticism.69 The campaign was moderated, and many of the factory leaders who had been targeted in the earlier

67 This is detailed in Dong Guoqiang and Andrew G. Walder, “Nanjing’s Failed ‘January Revolution’ of 1967”.
68 “Shenjing gongren jieji duiwuli de heishou bixu zhanduan” (The Black Hand Extended into the Ranks of the Proletariat Must Be Chopped Off), Dongfang hong zhanbao (East Is Red Battle News), 13 October 1966, p. 2.
phase were permitted to remain in their posts. When the work team withdrew in July 1965, it appointed Sun Shuzhen (孙树桢), a demobilized soldier who had served under Tan Youming during his years at the PLA Academy of Politics, as the factory’s Party vice secretary and director of its political department. A few months later the Fourth Ministry of Machine Building sent another demobilized soldier, Liu Jinming (柳金铭), to serve as the new Party Secretary. Liu and Sun cultivated young workers, recent university graduates and demobilized soldiers, favoring them over the “old personnel” who had suffered badly in the purges. Factory director Duan Jun (段俊) and a few other top leaders survived the purge. This was a compromise between the Ministry and the Nanjing Party authorities: the purge was halted in mid-course, but the work team remained in charge and appointed new leaders.

The first Cultural Revolution wall poster appeared on 9 June, co-authored by Jiang Zhenhong (蒋震虹) and Lu Xuezhi (鲁学智). Jiang was a Party member and deputy director of the factory political department, and had recently been transferred from a Shanghai factory at the request of Sun Shuzhen. Her husband headed the political department of the Nanjing Military Region’s engineering corps. Lu Xuezhi was a Party member and Sun Shuzhen’s assistant. He was a demobilized soldier who had worked in the same military department as Jiang Zhenhong’s husband, and was close to the couple. Both individuals, closely associated with the new Party leadership installed by the Ministry, accused factory director Duan Jun of being a counter-revolutionary and “a protector of bourgeois technical authorities”. On 12 July, a wall poster written by a group of young technicians in the design department denounced Duan Jun for trying to “restore capitalism”. These were obvious attempts by the recently installed Party leaders to neutralize the survivors of the recent purge and put forward a façade of Cultural Revolution activism. The attacks on the survivors of the aborted Socialist Education Movement continued; on 16 August, the factory Party Committee, still clearly in charge, framed a survivor, Chen Qichang (陈其昌), a workshop Party branch secretary, for “suppressing the mass movement”, and stripped him of his posts.

Several hundred of Chen’s supporters protested by marching to the Nanjing Party Committee offices to submit a petition calling for his reinstatement. More than two thousand supporters of the new factory Party leaders also marched to the

---

70 “Tan Youming shou shenji” (Tan Youming Audited), Dongfang hong zhanbao, 30 December 1967, p. 3; “Chutou niao Sun Shuzhen” (Outstanding Figure Sun Shuzhen), Jiangsu gongren (Jiangsu Worker), 25 November 1967, pp. 1-2, and Dong’s interview with Lu Xuezhi, 28 February 2008.

71 Nanjing shi dang’an guan, Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, p. 3.

72 Transcript of Wang Hong’s interview with Sun Shuzhen, 10 December 2009, and Dong’s interview with Lu Zuezhi, 5 May 2010.

73 Dong’s interview with Lu Xuezhi, 28 February 2008.

74 Nanjing shi dang’an guan, Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, p. 7.

75 Ibid., p. 9, and Wang Hong’s interview with Sun Shuzhen.
Nanjing Party offices to express their support for Chen’s purge.  

On 20 August the municipal Party committee held a joint conference with the Party leaders of the machine works. Wang Chubing (王楚滨), a member of the municipal Party secretariat, announced that the municipal Party committee would not ratify the decision to purge Chen Qichang.  

This decision reflected the bureaucratic politics around the legacy of the factory’s Socialist Education Movement. The radical purge conducted by the Ministry’s work team had decimated a factory Party leadership responsible to the municipal Party committee, replacing its leaders with individuals transferred in by the Ministry. The changes resulting from the resumption of the purge by the factory’s new Party leaders risked causing damage to the municipal Party committee itself. The Nanjing authorities’ action created a split with the factory Party leadership, and a tug-of-war ensued between factions backed by the national Ministry and the Nanjing Party committee.  

When news of the municipal Party committee’s decision leaked out, the supporters of the factory Party Committee staged a rally, accusing the Nanjing Party of betraying Mao’s theory of class struggle and suppressing the mass movement in order to protect themselves. When Wang Chubing went to the factory on 21 August to enforce the city authorities’ instructions, Liu Jinming refused to meet him. Liu’s assistant, Sun Shuzhen, met Wang but refused to announce the reversal of Chen Chubing’s purge. Wang was forced to convene five meetings that day to relay the decision himself. He told those in attendance that violation of these instructions was a failure to carry out the duty of Party membership and was an anti-Party act. The conflict between rival Party elements within the factory therefore led to an open confrontation between the factory Party Committee and the Nanjing Municipal Party Committee. On 22 August, more than 2,000 supporters of the factory leaders marched downtown, carrying banners denouncing the municipal Party committee, and they submitted a petition to the provincial Party offices.  

On 26 August, the factory’s first workers’ organization, the Yangzi Machine Works Red Flag (Changjiang hongqi 长江红旗), was established with the open support of the factory Party leadership. Zha Yaowen (查尧文) and Lu Xuezhi were its leaders. Zha worked as a dispatcher in a workshop and had recently been set up  

76 Nanjing shi dang’an guan, Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, p. 9.
77 Ibid., p. 10.
78 “Geming zaofan pai de yimian hongqi” (Red Banner of the Revolutionary Rebel Faction), Xinhua ribao, 8 February 1967, p. 2.
79 Ibid.
80 Nanjing shi dang’an guan, Nanjing “wenhua da geming” dashiji, p. 11, and “Geming zaofan pai de yimian hongqi”.
81 Ibid., p. 13.
by the Party committee as a model Mao Thought study activist. Lu was the Party secretary’s loyal assistant. Three days later a rival mass organization, the Red Workers (Hongse zhigong zhandou weiyuanhui 红色职工战斗委员会), was founded. This rebel group opposed the factory Party leadership and supported the Nanjing Municipal Party Committee, which in turn openly supported them. The two cadres whose purge had opened up this rift, Duan Jun and Chen Qichang, aligned themselves with this new rebel group, which had taken up their cause.

On 30 August, 12 members of the factory’s Red Flag faction, led by Zha Yaowen, went to the municipal Party headquarters to demand a debate with Wang Chubing. The municipal leaders refused and ordered surveillance of the group by plainclothes public security agents. Wang finally met with them on 1 September, but only after several hundred members of the Red Workers faction arrived to show their support. Wang debated the Red Flag delegation for 14 hours, insisting on the correctness of the municipal Party’s stance.

The next day, Red Flag sent a delegation of more than 1,000 to lodge a protest in Beijing. When it arrived at the train station in Chuxian (滁县) in northern Anhui (安徽), Tan Youming and a deputy minister from the Fourth Ministry of Machine Building intercepted them, and Sun Shuzhen was ordered by the Nanjing authorities to do the same. The officials convinced the group to return to Nanjing. After their return, the Red Workers circulated flyers denouncing the march to Beijing as a “counter-revolutionary act” that undermined production. Red Flag retorted with wall posters and circulars of their own, accusing provincial and municipal Party leaders of suppressing the mass movement and charging that the Red Workers were a tool of “power holders taking the capitalist road”.

During September and October, the Nanjing city authorities negotiated with the Fourth Ministry of Machine Building and agreed that the leaders of the Yangzi Machine Works had acted improperly and would be replaced. On 2 November, officials from the ministry arrived at the Machine Works to announce that a new Party leading group would be sent to replace the current leaders. The Red Flag faction, which supported the factory leaders, claimed that this was yet another act in an ongoing conspiracy of municipal Party leaders to “suppress revolution”. The Red Workers, of course, strongly supported the decision, and accused Red Flag of violating the principle of Party leadership. By this point, however, attacks on the municipal leaders in Nanjing and the ministry officials in Beijing had advanced to the point that they were unable to enforce their decision, and the insubordinate leaders of the Yangzi Machine Works stayed in their posts. After a violent factional clash

82 “Shenjing gongren jieji duiwuli de heishou bixu zhanduan”, p. 2; interview with Lu Xuezhi, 5 May 2010.
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84 “Geming zaofan pai de yimian hongqi”.
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on 16 November, more than 1,000 members of the defeated Red Workers quit the factory in protest.\textsuperscript{87} This placed the Yangzi Machine Works completely under the control of the factory’s Party leaders and the Red Flag “rebels”.\textsuperscript{88}

The Red Workers, a suppressed minority organization opposed to the factory Party committee, sought support among potential allies elsewhere in Nanjing. Because the Nanjing authorities supported them in their rebellion against an oppressive factory leadership, they joined the Nanjing Workers’ Scarlet Guards, the citywide alliance that defended the Nanjing authorities.\textsuperscript{89} They remained loyal to that organization until the end of the year, when the local Party organization collapsed. After returning to the factory, many of them were imprisoned and tortured.\textsuperscript{90} The dominant Red Flag faction, by contrast, played a leading role in the large citywide workers’ rebel organization, the Jiangsu Workers General Headquarters, which organized provincial and municipal power seizures in late January 1967.\textsuperscript{91}

In January 1967, the Red Flag faction “seized power” at the machine works. Liu Jinming and Sun Shuzhen were celebrated as “revolutionary cadres” and joined the core leadership of the new power structure.\textsuperscript{92} Zha Yaowen, Jiang Zhenhong and Lu Xuezhi also joined in the leading group.\textsuperscript{93} The rebels who seized power were a creation of the incumbent Party leadership, had defended them throughout 1966, and fashioned a “power seizure” that left the leadership in charge.

\textbf{Conclusion}

It should be clear that the origins of factions in Nanjing bear little resemblance to the type of interest-group politics long thought to have bred group conflict during the Cultural Revolution. Only at Nanjing Normal High School do we find the familiar story of Red Guards who hailed from families of senior officials and

\textsuperscript{87} “Geming zaofan pai de yimian hongqi”.

\textsuperscript{88} Under pressure from rebel forces, on 18 December 1966 the Nanjing Municipal Party Committee finally agreed to the purge of Chen Qichang from his posts. See the handbill “Haowai—Heibang fenzi, bao ‘Duan’ zhujiang Chen Qichang bei baguan” (Special Issue: Black Gang Element and Protect “Duan” Commander Chen Qichang is Removed from Office), 18 December 1966.
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\textsuperscript{92} “Changjiang hongqi zhandoudui guanche Mao Zhuxi zhiding de ganbu zhengce, he geming lingdao ganbu bingjian zhandou lianhe duoquan zhangquan” (Yangzi Red Flag Battle Brigade Carries Out the Cadre Policy Established by Chairman Mao, Struggles Side by Side with Revolutionary Cadres to Seize and Hold Power), \textit{Xinhua ribao}, 19 February 1967, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{93} “Geming zaofan pai de yimian hongqi”.
dominated the early Red Guard movement. This does appear to reflect, as past studies have emphasized, a form of self-promotion by a clearly defined interest group. The actions by the Mao Thought Red Guards to defend the school’s officials and the Nanjing Party authorities also fits well with this interpretation. If we had left the story there, and simply described the rhetoric of these Red Guards and their relatively conservative political stance, it would appear that family heritage defined factional conflicts in the school.

A closer and more sustained look, however, reveals several inconsistencies. The first is that the founders of the rebel group that supplanted the two early Red Guard groups were themselves from politically favored households of veteran revolutionaries and Party officials. It is true that they eventually developed a broader membership—a direct result of their more open stance on the question of family heritage. There were aspects of these student leaders’ privileged backgrounds that were different: the father of one suffered suspicion because he was a local Communist who had worked underground in “white” areas, while the other had a PLA general as a stepfather but a Kuomintang general as a birth father. This indicates latent divisions among the privileged, making them less unified than one might imagine.

The second inconsistency is more interesting: the two élite Red Guard factions adopted different political stances. The Red Rebel Army, dominated by the offspring of military officers, was much more antagonistic toward the schools’ Party officials, subjecting the Party Secretary, an old revolutionary, to a humiliating struggle session. The Mao Thought Red Guards, dominated by the offspring of civilian officials, were founded with the encouragement of the school’s leaders precisely in order to blunt the more radical stance of the Red Rebel Army. This strategy was effective for a period but, when it became clear that claims of privilege on the basis of family heritage had been repudiated in Beijing, the Red Rebel Army called for attacks on Nanjing’s Party authorities, temporarily outflanking even the school’s new rebel faction. The Mao Thought Red Guards stuck to their defense of the Nanjing authorities to the end, but the Red Rebel Army’s radicalism contains an important hint about more subtle divisions within China’s élite. If, as it is often claimed, the early Red Guards tended to defend the authorities in order to protect their own families, it appears that students from military households felt little restraint in attacking civilian authorities. Those who had privileged positions in the status quo did not necessarily have the same interests in these unfolding conflicts, and cleavages between individuals who otherwise appeared identical became evident.

While the inconsistencies at Nanjing Normal High School are subtle, at Nanjing University they are glaring. All the leaders who founded and led the school’s three major factions were from identical backgrounds. All had close ties to the school Party organization: they were from revolutionary households, were Party members

94 In a parallel fashion, the officers from the Nanjing Military Region who served as vice heads of Nanda’s work team readily admitted that the provincial Party authorities were responsible for the work team’s oppressive stance, thereby shifting the blame entirely onto the civilian Party leadership.
and held posts as political instructors, student cadres and Youth League branch secretaries. Yet they adopted different stances toward the school authorities, the work team and the Nanjing Party leadership. Those who protested on the Liyang campus and who were crushed by Kuang Yaming’s suppression campaign were celebrated as model rebels in the mass media and embraced by both the work team and the Nanjing authorities, and they reciprocated this support by later forming a Red Guard faction to defend the authorities. By contrast, students from identical backgrounds who made similar protests on the downtown Nanjing campus were snubbed by the work team, leading to a confrontation and counter-attack that made heroes out of this new group of rebels once the work teams were withdrawn on orders from Beijing. This group’s attempt to reverse the verdicts on themselves led to a confrontation with the Nanjing Party authorities. Thus two cohorts of rebels, from identical backgrounds, were led into opposed stances by events that created new sets of winners and losers at different points in time.

Also instructive is the relationship between the university’s two rebel organizations: the Nanda Red Rebels and Nanda 27 August. The founders of the latter were early members of the former, who broke away because of the Red Rebels’ elitist insistence on pure political background for potential members. The Red Rebels had a membership policy similar to that of the two elitist Red Guard groups at Normal High School, yet that did not prevent them from opposing the school’s Party leadership, the work team and, later, the Nanjing authorities. Nanda 27 August differed only in its more relaxed stance about the political qualifications of recruits, and as a result it grew much faster. The two factions were united in the struggle against the Nanjing authorities, but their subtle rivalry had explosive consequences in January 1967 when the rebel coalitions that each of them led split over the provincial power seizure. Nanda 27 August pulled its forces out of the power seizure and moved into open opposition, while the Red Rebels defended their power seizure as legitimate. This bred a fierce struggle between rival rebel coalitions that went through several twists and turns and turns well into 1968, and which could not be meaningfully characterized as a contest between conservatives and radicals.95

Finally, the Yangzi Machine Works appears to be a pure case of bureaucratic factionalism, into which workers were drawn. Cadres and workers were already divided against one another by the intra-bureaucratic politics of the 1964–65 Socialist Education Movement. The Fourth Ministry of Machine Building’s work team struck hard against factory leaders appointed by the Nanjing authorities. When the Cultural Revolution began, the new Beijing-installed leaders simply continued the harsh persecution of the survivors of the interrupted purge. When opponents mobilized in defense and were supported by the Nanjing Party authorities,

the factory Party leaders organized a loyal “rebel” group to defend them and challenge the Nanjing authorities. Thus the factional struggle unfolded as a cleavage within a Party apparatus split apart by the complex interplay of bureaucratic politics between the Beijing Ministry, the Nanjing Party Committee and the factory’s Party leaders. Here we find a scenario in which rebel groups opposed to oppressive factory leaders found support in the Nanjing Party Committee, and joined the conservative Scarlet Guards who defended them to the end. On the other side were the loyal supporters of the factory Party Committee, who fought with the rebel coalitions that eventually overthrew the municipal and provincial Party apparatus. The victorious “rebel power seizure” in the Yangzi Machine Works was utterly fraudulent: it changed virtually nothing about the power arrangements in the factory and only intensified the persecution of those who dared to rebel against the factory’s leaders.

These are narratives of division, not solidarity; of factions in a bureaucratic setting, not of interest groups. Those who had earlier benefited from the status quo did not unite to defend it against outsiders who sought to undermine it. Instead, Party committees, cadres, Party members and the leaders of classrooms and workshops took opposed sides and adopted different political stances under highly variable and often ambiguous circumstances that made these choices understandable. The divisions evolved, as each stage in the conflict created a new set of winners and losers and led to shifts in political allegiances. The Cultural Revolution unfolded in Nanjing, as it did in Beijing and, we suspect, in many other locations, as a process of bureaucratic politics in which the regime’s apparatus of power was shattered from within, and those loyal to it turned upon one another.