

## 2. FOUNDING FATHER LUO ZHENGQI (1983-1989)

To understand why SZU was established as it was is to understand the man who put his personal stamp on the university. In Luo Zhengqi's personal story lay elements that were to influence his creating the school.

Luo was assigned the SZU posts for several reasons: his youth, his Guangdong origins and his Party credentials. In fact, he was one of the very few academics in China who met these criteria. First, the SEdC sought SZU leadership that was young and could oversee the building of the university and the development of its reforms for at least a decade. Luo was just under 50 when he was selected for SZU. Second, his Guangdong heritage was also important. Panyu was Luo's ancestral home, what Chinese refer to as "hometown." Luo had never really lived in Panyu, but Panyu was still considered his hometown. Cantonese—the major dialect of Guangdong province—was spoken in Luo's childhood home, but since he grew up in Beijing, Luo spoke China's official dialect *putonghua* (common Chinese or Mandarin) without the Cantonese accent that marks the language as spoken in Southern China. Third, Luo's credentials as vice-Party secretary of Qinghua were highly regarded. In addition, from 1980-1981 Luo had attended a college for Party cadres. At this time, attending Party School was a requisite for promotion.

Luo's assignment to SZU can be attributed to another reason. In China, as in other countries, education has its own set of political dynamics that relate to personalities, positioning and power-sharing. Qinghua University, politically speaking, is China's most important university.<sup>1</sup> In terms of placing its graduates in positions of political power, Qinghua far surpasses Beijing University or People's University. The network of Qinghua alumni was becoming quite influential, especially in the post-Mao era. The groundwork for Qinghua's influence had been laid in the 1950s by its president, Jiang Nanxiang, who believed that intellectuals should be part of the political system in order to maximize their contributions to China's development. Luo was a rising star on the Beijing scene. As the deputy minister for education had mentioned on visiting SZU, Luo had been slated for transfer to the State Council secretariat. This would have improved his power base in Beijing political circles, something that his political rivals preferred not to happen. Luo's rivals felt threatened by this young, energetic reformer. Luo's most highly placed rival was his contemporary at Qinghua, He Dongchang who, although a few years older than Luo, was Luo's political equal, not

superior. They often disagreed over issues of education and ideology, with He Dongchang advocating CCP dominance over education in the dual-track system. He Dongchang strongly supported Luo's "promotion" to SZU vice-president, which in effect would remove him from Beijing's educational circle. After Luo's departure from Beijing, He Dongchang was subsequently appointed deputy Minister of Education, a promotion that might not have been possible if Luo had remained in Beijing to raise questions concerning He's anti-reformist conservative ideology. Thus, Luo's assignment to SZU was as much "push" as "pull." While he was being pulled in by the university's need for a young, Guangdong-born, well-placed Party official, he was being pushed out by Beijing's educational politics.

### ***From Panyu to Qinghua***

Luo Zhengqi was born in Beijing in 1934, the eldest male among nine children. He was from a solid middle class family, not part of the landlord élite, but probably in the top percentiles in terms of family wealth in China at the time (Most rural China was barely surviving). The Luo family was an intellectual household; both parents held college degrees, something extraordinarily rare at the time, and very rare even today. Luo's three sisters were educated. One elder sister went to Yanjing University, which later merged with Beijing University, where she majored in journalism. The second eldest sister went to Yenjing Musical College which later merged with the Central Music Institute. She worked as a piano accompanist for the Central Ballet Troupe. A younger sister has taught chemistry in a high school near Beijing. Three of Luo's younger brothers died of illnesses: two at pre-school age, one at 28 years old. Two years after the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, another brother was arrested by the Red Guards. He escaped; the Red Guards went to the Luo family and took another brother, whom they then beat to death. The brother who escaped became mentally disturbed and was institutionalized in Beijing.

Luo's parents (his father died in 1984, his mother in 1993) were both of Cantonese stock, but neither lived in Southern China. His mother was brought up in Shanghai and educated at the Shanghai Music College, where she majored in piano. After graduation she worked as a violinist with the Shanghai Philharmonic. Around the turn of the century, Luo's paternal grandfather had moved from Panyu to Hong Kong, where his father attended St. Stephen's College. After graduating from university, his father returned to China to run cinemas in Beijing. While Luo was growing up, his father went back several times to Hong Kong, but travel during the war years was

difficult. His father owned and operated two cinemas in Beijing, where he served as the agent for eight American movie companies. Educated in Hong Kong and good in English, he translated film dialogue into Chinese and arranged the live music. As a child Luo watched many movies, including *Gone with the Wind*; the cinema was conveniently located near to his primary school. After 1977, many old movies that had been banned during the Cultural Revolution reappeared. His father, then quite elderly, went to see *Waterloo Bridge*, which Luo had seen as a child. His father came out of the movie humming and singing the theme. A young passer-by was amazed: "How, old man, do you know how to sing the song?" In fact, the senior Luo had done the translation that was still being used, shown not as subtitles but separately on the wall, just as in Chinese opera. The title in Chinese was *Blue Bridge*, meaning sad bridge. In both of his parents, his father especially, Luo saw a mixture of Chinese and Western culture. Luo's parents gave him access to Western ideas and culture and endowed him with respect for what in the contemporary West has become known as multi-culturalism. His upbringing, however, was very much Chinese. The elder Luo was a good calligrapher and familiar with traditional Chinese thought, and he inculcated upon the children the moral values of a traditional Chinese life style. The children were required to speak Cantonese at home to ensure the continuation of their heritage.

Luo grew up during Japan's occupation of China; he and his peers were taunted by Japanese neighbors as "defeated-country slaves." In French primary school, Luo should have studied three years of French, as had his three elder sisters who were fluent in French (because a neighbor was French). With the Japanese occupation, however, Luo had to be taught Japanese, not French. The teacher as well as students resisted this, and the teacher used to give students the answers to tests beforehand; the students did not study hard. Luo learned English in high school and studied Russian at university. He contends he is fluent only in Chinese; actually, he comprehends to various degrees three western languages. Luo's childhood was filled with a mixture of traditional Chinese and Western culture. Luo's formal education included reciting the great Chinese works of literature and poetry. The family was musical (Luo himself played violin); to this day Luo prefers Western classical music to its Chinese counterpart; in the visual arts, however, he prefers Chinese traditional calligraphy, as well as traditional Chinese philosophy. His architecture is a hybrid of Chinese and Western, perhaps influenced by the fact he had studied at Qinghua under the first generation of Western educated architects.

In 1949, in Luo's first year in high school, the People's Liberation Army took over Beijing. Luo was impressed with the troops' discipline. The government took tight control, cadres were good, currency was stabilized. At first, Luo did not understand communism; its ideology remained vague; with time he developed an understanding and respect for this new system. His father's future was not very bright at that time. After 1949, the senior Luo ran the Great Brightness Cinema in Beijing, on the banks of the river. Then all cinemas were confiscated. He went to Tianjin and met a British-educated Pakistani who owned big hotels. In 1955, the Pakistani was kicked out of China. Luo's father was his only friend and before leaving China, the Pakistani gave Luo's father title to property on two streets in Beijing and two streets in Tianjin. When Luo learned about this he advised his father he could not accept the gift. He handed it over to the government and received a receipt (no money). During the Cultural Revolution, the Luo residence was ransacked, and the Red Guards found the receipt. "How dare you keep this record, if not for the purpose of eventually changing it into money," they accused. Father said it was just a receipt, not a record. During the Cultural Revolution Luo senior was assigned physical labor. Eventually, he was hired to work for the Sri Lankan embassy.

Luo Zhengqi attended kindergarten, primary and secondary school and university all in Beijing. He attended a French-run primary school, an American-run secondary school, both attached to churches. He later went to Peking Academy (Hui Wen) to complete high school. Luo enrolled in Qinghua University in 1951 and graduated in 1955. He taught for a year. Afterwards, he became Youth League Secretary in the Architecture Department, while also teaching. This was a common practice at Qinghua where academics taught even if their primary duty concerned Party matters. Then, he was appointed vice-secretary of the Qinghua Youth League, an organization that serves as a support unit to the CCP. Luo was deputy head of the CCP propaganda department at Qinghua until 1966.

Luo met his future wife, Liang Hongwen, at Qinghua. Liang had lived in Guangdong for the first seventeen years of her life. When she went off to Qinghua, she spoke no *putonghua*. Even today, she still speaks heavily accented *putonghua*. In the Qinghua architecture department, where both Luo and Liang studied, the sketches of the three best students were displayed: those of Luo, Liang and a third student named Han. Only these three out of nearly 500 students won a scholarship. Luo became impressed with Liang's work, which he considered the work of a mature student, not a girl. Liang had known of Luo, two years her senior; among students he was a big man

on campus. After the competition, they began to date, and eventually married. They had a single daughter and, during the Cultural Revolution, chose to have no more children. Their daughter is also a Qinghua-trained architect and works with her husband outside the PRC.

As part of a series of interviews that lasted fifteen hours, Luo Zhengqi described for me the three major influences on his educational thought. First, a Western and Chinese mixture acquired at home that made him respect both Western and Eastern culture. Second, after 1949 a communist education. As an educator, Luo agreed with the basic Marxist principles, especially that practice is fundamental and that students should develop both physically and mentally. He considered physical work to be good and knew the advantages of combining study with practice. Third, his education at Qinghua, China's premier science and technology university. The architecture faculty placed much value on creativity and the development of creative thinking. He remembers the words of a professor who had returned from a stay in the U.S.: "We should make something new, something different." This phrase left a deep impression on Luo. He thought that there should be something new and different every day of his life, a continual process. In other words, innovation for Luo was "not a once-in-an-era phenomenon. If innovation is not continual, then it no longer becomes innovation. It just becomes static." Luo firmly believed that SZU should be a university with special characteristics. "Shenzhen spends so much money to run the university, if SZU turns out without special characteristics, then we should stop. We would be better off paying some inland famous universities to train (*daipei*) students for Shenzhen, which would be cheaper than creating a new university in Shenzhen. It makes no difference to build a SZU if it is the same as other universities."<sup>2</sup> Perhaps, SZU's most visible difference is in the university's architecture.

### ***The architecture of Shenzhen University***

Luo was in charge of creating the university, literally and figuratively. The fact that Luo Zhengqi was a trained architect was, ironically, not one of the criteria that led to his selection as the university's builder. Nevertheless, the factor worked well to the advantage of the university.

#### **The new campus site**

When Luo arrived in late August 1983, the site for the permanent campus had already been chosen. By January 1983 the government had selected a one square kilometer piece of land located near Gui Miao [laurel temple]

village in the Nantou (later Nanshan) District in the western reaches of the SEZ, just west of the Shahe River, about 10 kilometers east of Shekou Port (see Map 1). Like many other Chinese universities, SZU was to be located away from the city center, in this case over 25 kilometers from the Luo Hu train station. Situated on the seacoast, the site was part of a network of small Hakka fishing villages, separated from Hong Kong by several kilometers of open water (Houhai Wan or Back Bay) to the east and southeast. The future SZU site was one with much potential, but little realization in 1983. There were 1,700 dying leeches trees, a muddy beach with a sea stench, a few ducks and water buffalo. Its best and highest use had been as the ancestral grave site for generations of local people (several thousand tombs had to be relocated during the early phases of construction). The site was worth little even as agricultural land. "Even the weeds didn't grow very well," according to Luo Zhengqi.<sup>3</sup>

In March 1983 a team of Shenzhen officials, headed by deputy mayor Zhou Erkan and including the heads of the city departments for construction, survey, design and planning, visited the site.<sup>4</sup> They discussed the ideal location: just east of the major arterial that connected Shekou with Nantou (the district center) and Shenzhen. Within a week after the meeting, the head of the Shenzhen Planning Bureau formally acquired the property and a survey team drew red lines to demarcate the site. Within a month, general plans and designs were produced. Before actual design and planning began, a team would visit Hong Kong and Macau to get ideas from their universities. A major task involved earth moving equipment and the relocation of power cables. During 1983 ¥5 million was allocated for pre-construction work, and to oversee construction, SZU set up a Capital Construction Office in May of that year.

Luo inherited a campus site plan that had been prepared by the city's planning office and had been approved by the municipality. City engineers, not architects, had designed the plan. Luo, however, was not satisfied with the plan which "lacked imagination," and one of his first acts upon arrival was to suggest the city seek alternative plans. He turned to his former colleagues at Qinghua, whose architecture staff and students produced a new plan that the city accepted. A key participant in the design was Professor Liang Hongwen, Luo's wife, and in her own right one of China's premier planners and designers.<sup>5</sup> After finishing the plan, Liang went to the University of Michigan for two years and then returned to Qinghua for six months. She joined her husband on the SZU staff as an architecture professor in 1986.

## The plan

The campus plan, as designed at Qinghua, provided for an open campus with a lot of common space. This fact alone makes it distinct among Chinese universities, which are crowded, cramped institutions because they lacked land for expansion.<sup>6</sup> Space that was originally intended for common use at these schools has been constructed upon. The plan for SZU, in contrast, started with a central campus, occupying only about one-third of the square kilometer. The perimeter included two lakes, a leech forest, a wooded area that had once been used as a cemetery, as well as 30% open space which was left for later expansion as the university matured. The center of the campus was a central square, an open park that includes several pools and connecting paths. On three sides of the square were the university's three major buildings: administration, library, and classroom (see Map 2). On the fourth side was a lecture theater. The vehicular entry to the campus was from behind the administration building, at the ends of which were located an amphitheater and a science laboratory building.

The central pedestrian square of the campus was designed by Liang Hongwen to be a vast void enclosed by four low buildings—the office building (five floors), the library (six floors), the teaching building (four floors) and the lecture theater (two floors).<sup>7</sup> The square measures about 170 meters both in breadth and length, with a six meter differential in height, and it slopes from north to south. This large scale three-dimensional space molds the campus environment in several ways. It conforms to the natural topography which widens and slopes from north to south, higher in the east and lower in the west. Corridors enclose the narrower gaps between the library and the other two buildings. This gives the yard an obvious direction facing it to the Back Sea. With the sea and mountain ranges rising and falling in the distance, people were able to enjoy the scenery from all the buildings and to relax in the plaza.

The space is organized with two main axes, one symmetric and the other asymmetric. The symmetric one at the center from the south to the north has gently sloping steps that lead people to the library building. Another asymmetric area comes from outside the front square and passes the ground floor open space of the office building. It is angled at 45° and intersects the center axis at the center of the yard. A pavement on this axis slopes down to the center accompanied by pools with fountains on one side and a green field with trees, shrubs and flowers on the other.

Two side roads on the east and west of the yard were to be used only during construction, but Liang found them useful and kept them in the final

design and added a crosswise section to the east road leading up to the platform in front of the library. The bicycles can climb to the upper terrace on a 3% slope.

The campus forms a hierarchy of spaces according to the site-terrain and community needs. The open ground areas inside the building create several bowl spaces. The yard seems to extend and insert itself into all the buildings and moves through their ground floors through different levels to the outside. These gray medium spaces provide shade and protection from sunshine and rain as well as establish a spatial interest due to the changes in scale, light and form in the central yard. All buildings entered from the central yard have their own platforms in front, linked by steps or slopes. The entrances are celebrated, according to Liang, by allowing space to flow vertically through three levels, and this is broken down by the use of platforms. These platforms provide communication spaces on different scales. Stone circular benches on platforms, lawn or path sides and wide steps beside the pools are set aside for private use and small group meetings.

Traditional visual esthetics generates an ambiance infused with meaning and space decorated with plant, water, fountain and art elements. A 7.5 meter diameter giant sundial sculpture adorns the front square's circular lawn. It shows the 12 Earthly Branches in the old style of calligraphy on its surface and a motto engraved on the rear reads: "Study perseveringly, study anything, anytime and anywhere!" It is named "Light and Time" to imply its importance to our school life and to give a "time and space" feeling to the campus space.

At the center of the central yard, which is the focus from all directions, there is a fountain sculpture named "Harmony of the Universe" in a 12 meter diameter round pool. Its traditional cultural consciousness corresponds to the "Light and Time" and uses "three" as the basic number in its measurement. Nine pillars arise from the intersection points of a *tian* (天) (means cultivated field in Chinese) foundation with 18 structural beams to support a three-level basic platform covered with 36 pieces of black granite planes. Colors and patterns express the "Yin-Yang" and "Eight-Diagrams" on the middle of each of the eight sides and the four corners of its square top surface. A stainless sphere sculpture is set on top. Eight stone jets in the pool spurt water from eight directions to the sphere which signifies the celestial body dropping down to the square platform which implies the Earth.

Liang also designed a mosaic relief mural for the ground floor library exterior wall at the end of the central axis of the yard. The mural was composed of three up and down wave-shaped patterns with brightly colored lines

that show a forward movement. It was named “Endless.” Another colored steel sculpture titled “Small Rest” with flagpoles aside and behind was set on a winding path on the eastern lawn.

The SZU campus plan has won several national awards and has been the subject of numerous photo spreads in architectural publications. When Jiang Nanxiang, former president of Qinghua, visited SZU in 1986, he remarked to Luo about the elegance of the campus and was surprised to learn that it had been designed by Qinghua architects. The Qinghua campus, Jiang reportedly said, was dull, but SZU was bright. Luo responded that it was not just architects who made design decisions at Qinghua; administrators were responsible for designs. “When I worked at Qinghua my field was architecture, but the university leaders never asked me for architectural advice.”

The design for SZU reflected input from Luo, in his position of client. In reviewing the new plan, some city leaders preferred the original plan in which the student dorm area and lecture buildings were further away than in the new plan. Since Shenzhen was located in monsoonal Southern China, Luo argued, students would get wet if the distance was too far. Even at Qinghua in Beijing (which does not even suffer the tropical torrential downpours of Shenzhen), the dorms were only 100 meters from classes. (Two hundred meters is a more accurate distance, Luo later recalled). The SZU plan had dorms just 40 meters away, Luo said, fudging the actual figure which was 30 meters. At the leaders’ insistence the model was adjusted to push the dorms back to 100 meters, but after the city fathers left, the model was returned to its original shape. When the same leaders visited during construction, they were pleased with the work, especially the location of the dormitories. “It was your correct decision,” Luo told them.

Another instance in which city officials’ advice was disregarded concerned the library. Luo was aware that many university libraries ran out of space 30 or 40 years after being built. The SZU library was sizable by both Chinese and international standards. For further expansion, the plans called for a basement. A vice-mayor objected, so the plans that went to the city for approval labeled the sub-ground level a “framing basis,” although, when completed, the space became a complete basement that could be used for further expansion. The top floor of the library housed the Architecture Department, which could eventually move to its own building on the perimeter of campus, thus freeing up more library space.

## Symbolic architecture

In his dissertation on SZU's early efforts at building a spiritual civilization, Jordan Pollack, who taught at the university from 1986-88 just prior to my arrival, discusses the symbolic nature of the school's architecture.<sup>8</sup> "The campus designers went to great metaphorical lengths to encode meanings within structural elements. The main buildings, when viewed from the air, had been laid out in the form of a giant, abstract footprint: the science building as heel, library and administration buildings as instep, and some student dormitories as toes. According to Pollack's informants, such a careful positioning of structures gave figurative expression to one of SZU's favorite dictums: *jiao ta shi di*. The slogan, carved on a stone wall near the university's main entrance meant "to plant one's feet on solid ground," exhorting all concerned to recognize the importance of education. Furthermore, the step-wise placement of school buildings along SZU's naturally ascending terrain was meant to suggest that SZU was an institution on the rise, destined for success."<sup>9</sup>

"The exteriors of the main buildings on campus (which included the Administration, Laboratory, and Classroom buildings, as well as the Library) communicated two additional themes of importance: (1) the advisability of combining traditional administration and pedagogical methods with modern ones; and (2) the desirability of balancing institutional diversity and uniformity to achieve a harmonious complexity. Facades of vertical and horizontal lines, formed of white and pastel blue tiles laid out in continuous and interrupted fashion, produced historically recognizable patterns. Seen from a distance, the patterns appeared as symbols from ancient (Zhou Dynasty, ca. 1,000 BC) times—specifically, as divinational trigrams—the *Ba Gua*—associated with the remarkable *Yijing*, or *Book of Changes*. Designers intended the allusive effect. An observer was to conclude from the tile configurations that SZU's planners viewed China's intellectual past as an important source of insight and wisdom. History was a repository with lasting potential to inspire and instruct the present efforts to modernize. Rather than simply dismiss the nation's earlier achievements as irrelevant to the present, China's rebuilders were instead prudent to re-examine and selectively borrow from their rich experience, or so the designers tried to suggest by their choice of motif.

"One could easily read the second theme also in the patterned building exteriors. Common colors brought and held together alternating shapes, implying an acknowledgment of the compatibility—even symbiosis—between

uniformity and diversity. Said in the language of design, the message was simple: Here was a leading institution that tolerated heterogeneity—of methods, norms, programs, and ideas. Evolutionist in its logic, the argument was precisely that cultural variety contributes to social health and thus harmony. To be sure, members of the school community had to keep their entertainment of differences within the bounds of propriety and civic correctness. Laxity with respect to educational heterogeneity, if only because it tempted people into political heterodoxy, was defensible (and likely to survive the censorship of nervous officials) so long as staff and students behaved responsibly; that is, so long as they were willing to limit their intellectual and other experiments in the larger interest of preserving order in the polity. Promoting the uses of diversity was a regular, official SZU practice. Yet so also was reminding people of the need to contain their fascination for alterity, lest the University suffer as a whole from diversity's potential disintegrative effects.”

### The construction

The story is often told of a remark made by Deng Xiaoping as his car passed the SZU construction site on 18 January 1984, just five days after the campus site plan had received formal approval by the Shenzhen government. The paramount leader was on his way back to Shenzhen after a visit to Shekou. One of the municipal leaders accompanying Deng pointed out the car window and said: “Comrade Xiaoping, this is Shenzhen University.” Mr. Deng looked and found nothing. There were some excavating and drilling machines but they were obscured from the road, and construction was not scheduled to begin until 17 February. Mr. Deng asked when the school would be ready. The city leader replied: “We are moving in September and we will have classes then.” After Deng returned to Beijing, he mentioned this story to some colleagues and said: “They have nothing now but will begin the school year in September. This is Shenzhen speed.”<sup>10</sup>

“Shenzhen speed” translated at SZU as finishing the classroom buildings in nine months, although state standards for construction allowed 18 months completion time. The largest women's dorm, *Ziwei* building that housed over 700 students, took six rather than the permitted 12 months to build. The *Haitang* men's dorm took five, not 10 months. The water tower was completed in only 78 days, not five months. Several factors account for a rapid pace of construction. The Shenzhen leadership, especially Mayor Liang Xiang, wanted the university completed and operational for classes in September 1984 to prove to Deng Xiaoping that they were true to their word.

Armed with Deng's comment, the municipal leaders had three site meetings and took an active role in supervising construction. The paramount leader's tour of Shenzhen had commenced a "new era of Special Economic Zone reform."<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, given the history of on-again-off-again support for the zones by the central government, the Shenzhen leaders found it imperative to move fast, for it was not certain how long Beijing's current enthusiasm for Shenzhen would last. In fact, a peak in criticism of the economic zones appeared in early 1985,<sup>12</sup> but by then most major SZU construction was completed, or at least well underway. Construction speed was also aided by a streamlined management system in city hall so that most of SZU's requests were "immediately approved."<sup>13</sup>

### ***Educational and administrative philosophy***

From the start, Luo Zhengqi, who formally became SZU president on 17 March 1987, had a very clear vision of the type of educational institution SZU should develop into, and he had definite ideas on how to achieve this vision. His vision was painted with broad strokes: student and faculty participation and self-management, Party integration, an open management style, and an institutional focus on students. It is these elements, as much as specific reforms—no job allocation, a credit system, student work-study—that characterize his tenure.<sup>14</sup>

Luo's beliefs were reflected in the motto of the university located in a foot-print shaped relief in the lobby of the administration building: *zili, zili, ziqiang*, self-autonomy, self-discipline, self-strengthening. This Three Selves philosophy was the foundation for student management and the basis of learning. Students through their organizations governed and disciplined themselves. They, alone, determined whether they attended classes. Students were permitted to skip classes, study on their own, and take the final exam of a course.

Three years after SZU's founding, the Student Psychological Counseling Center (*xuesheng xinli yu xingwei zhidao*) was set up.<sup>15</sup> Fifteen teachers of various ranks and from a wide spectrum of disciplines worked as part-time counselors; all conversations with students were held confidential. The Center also gave 978 students admitted in 1987 and 1988 international questionnaires that led to compiling personality profiles.<sup>16</sup>

### **The role of the CCP**

Luo intended to fully integrate the CCP into the school administration by replacing the dual-track system with a single monorail. The Party was not to

be a separate entity, but rather would become synonymous with the university. Depending on one's point of view, this change accomplished one of two things. Either it made the CCP of paramount importance or else it made the CCP totally unimportant. Luo subscribed to the first view; his successors supported the latter. A full discussion of the role the CCP played at SZU over various administrations appears in Chapter Six.

### Focus on responsibility

Several aspects of Luo's management relate to responsibility. Following the generally accepted implications of the "presidential responsibility system," Luo considered himself accountable for all aspects of SZU. He did not, however, micro-manage school operations. To the contrary, he delegated administrative authority to the heads of departments. He gave department heads and other leaders (*lingdao*) general directions to follow, and only from a distance did he monitor their progress at following directions. Similarly, students were given autonomy over managing their college life. A student union, with representatives elected by students during an electoral campaign, represented students; a disciplinary committee composed only of students handled discipline problems. Issues of academics, such as those involving pedagogy, course materials, and examinations, were overseen primarily by individual classroom teachers and, to a lesser extent, by department heads, in their capacity to set up majors and coordinate curriculum.

Luo's ability to delegate responsibility took advantage of the fact that SZU's initial staff was extremely young (in their 30s), and he was able to tap youthful energies in order to maximize participation from staff and students. As president, he made himself accessible in his office through an "open-door afternoon" once a week. He welcomed suggestions and did not punish critics in further dealings with them. Luo made it quite clear to the staff that he did not want to deal in personalities and petty bickering, and he did not put himself in the position of routinely countermanding orders issued by subordinates. Often in China, staff who have grievances with their immediate superiors seek out a higher level leader to reverse decisions that affect them. In such a way, a factory manager or the president of the university serves as an ombudsman, settling squabbles between personnel. Such a system relies heavily on *guanxi*, or personal relationships. *Guanxi* often has its foundations in common ties. Individuals who went to the same university or who hail from the same hometown or region hold a certain commonality that is said to give them *guanxi* with one another. Since SZU was a new university, it lacked the relational networks that require time to harden. Instead of

spending his energy on building up such networks through banqueting, gift-giving, or reciprocating favors, Luo decided instead to deal with individuals on the issues involved; he did not favor individuals on the basis of their connections with him. As one faculty member explained: "Everyone has *guanxi* with Luo, but at the same time no one has *guanxi* with Luo." The code of universalism, rather than one of particularism, characterized Luo's administration. In other words, decisions were based on certain standard criteria, rather than based on personal relationships with individuals.

In addition to making unit leaders accountable for the performance of their work-units, Luo attempted to make individual offices take responsibility. He suggested that within an office all positions should have clear-cut duties but that each position should be able to substitute for one another. In other words, if the staff person with responsibility over a certain action (e.g., filling out a certain form) was unavailable due to illness or other reasons, a colleague could accomplish the task. Too often, decisions in Chinese bureaucracies are delayed because of missing signatures or chops (seals). To strive to become a more efficient work place, SZU adopted a salary-reservation system, in which 10% of a staff's salary was automatically withheld. Given the results of an annual evaluation, the staff might have the 10% reservation returned, or could receive more or less than the 10%.

Likewise, students were made responsible for their own performances. SZU was the first university in China to cancel automatic subsidies and replace this form of "iron rice bowl" with a scholarship system. Students received scholarships based on their individual academic performances. Students with a grade point average (GPA) over 85 (out of 100%) and who ranked in the top 3% of their major, by year, received a top scholarship, which translated as ¥100 per month. Lower scholarships provided less money, with about half the students receiving merit-based awards at any one time.

## Reform and efficiency

For Luo reform was the key to SZU's success. Reform was a theme in many of his speeches, one of which was reprinted in a glossy booklet, targeting prospective students from Hong Kong, to commemorate the university's fifth anniversary.<sup>17</sup> Efficiency was also a prime concern of the Luo administration. Nothing symbolized this more than his decision to have short lunches. Traditionally, a long-lunch period (usually 2½ hours) permits employees of Chinese work-units to take naps. Luo, however, preferred working lunches, and the period between morning and afternoon classes was shortened to one

hour. He often used this time for staff meetings, so the hour spent at lunch did not take time away from university business.

Before Luo came to SZU, however, he was quite weary of reforms. He had experienced the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, both intended reforms that led to national disasters. The former had occurred in the mid-1950s and had been intended to industrialize rural areas in an attempt to overtake the U.K. in national production through such measures as converting kitchen utensils into pig iron in backyard furnaces. The Great Leap Forward was indeed a great leap backward in which millions of Chinese perished from famine. Luo had worried that the reforms of the 1980s would also suffer unintended catastrophe. In early 1983, before Luo had accepted the SZU position, he had read about the university's reform in a government report. The report had used a Chinese idiom for determination that refers to a story from the Han Dynasty, in which a leading general named Han Xin crossed a river and then had his army "break the woks, sink the boats; with the river behind you, we fight" (*po hu chen zhou; bei shui yi zhan*). When Luo had read the sentence, he was scared and said:<sup>18</sup>

'This is not good; we should not do this.' The sentence is one of the reasons I was reluctant to go to SZU. But then I visited SZU and witnessed the construction and realized that this was the situation that Chinese people had been longing to see for a long time: '1,000 *li* a day' [*yi ri qian li*, one day—1,000 *li*, meaning quick development].<sup>[19]</sup> I saw dozens of comrades in charge of land preparation working in harsh conditions and circumstances. So I joined them immediately. On reflection, we realize we were a bit afraid. But without this determination, maybe the site of SZU would still be deserted.

Reform permitted Luo to define SZU as a unique institution. He was concerned that initially there was a misunderstanding that SZU was intended to imitate famous institutions like Beijing University (Beida), Qinghua, or People's University. Luo never considered SZU to be in competition with China's renowned universities. There was no way, he said, that a young university like SZU could ever consider itself a competitor. It made no sense to replicate the old systems and then reform them (for Luo was convinced many of these systems did not work properly); rather, SZU could create a new system from the start. SZU was in the fortunate position of being able to create its own characteristics and "try to find a new road with a totally new concept of value and to open up a totally new situation."<sup>20</sup> For Luo Zhengqi, innovation was essential. In mid-1986 he referred to Hu Yaobang, then CCP Party Secretary, who had said: "new ways for new things; special solutions for special problems; guidelines remain unchanged; solutions are

all new.” Luo applied this to SZU: “For everything we do, we should ask: ‘what is the newness of it; what is special about it?’”

In creating new systems from the beginning, SZU faced several options. One approach would be to begin with managerial reform; another could start with specific teaching reforms; or one might begin with theoretical study, unify opinions and then implement. The third option was dismissed by Luo as impractical for a new university that wanted to become immediately operational. Instead, SZU chose managerial reform, according to Luo, because as a new university SZU lacked strength to reform teaching. Teachers would just say: ‘you have your curriculum change, I have mine.’ With the more generalized system reform, however, reform could provoke mass interest. Reform targets had to be vague; they could not be achieved immediately. All this required long-term commitment and reforms that were evolutionary in nature. An example often cited by Luo was the part-time job system. When it was initiated, it involved students cleaning the toilets. This evolved into a system that became one of SZU’s defining characteristics, the concept of the Three Classrooms: lessons, job practice and extra-curricular activities. Luo did not accept ideologically based reforms. For him “Reform is great practice; practice is above theory...Ideology should be realized in practice; otherwise, it is just empty words.”<sup>21</sup>

Reform at SZU in 1987 included Three Measures and Five Systems.<sup>22</sup> From its early days, SZU adhered to the practice of “policy numbering” which is quite prevalent in China. Policy is often identified by items that share a common theme, and the policy is sloganized as a numbered phenomenon. The most obvious example in post-Mao China is perhaps the Four Modernizations. SZU’s Three Measures and Five Systems was but one of the earliest of many enumerated policies at the university. Such a convenient catch phrase is useful, but it tends not to be all-inclusive. In other words, Luo’s policies included more than these eight items. They were merely the emphatic points of the speech which contained them. Luo’s three measures involved simplification, control of staffing and economic management. Simplified management meant as few levels of administration as possible. Departments would not be sub-divided into sections and there would be no teaching-research offices. Working through lunch added another hour per day, during the 5½ day work week. Attempts were made to reduce the number of meetings and avoid “waste-of-time” meetings. Staff size was strictly controlled with emphasis on personnel quality. The university was not able to hire permanent staff without upper level approval; additional fixed staff positions required quotas from the municipal government. Part-time students

reduced the need for some fixed staff. The university was managed according to the economic principles of payment according to performance. Policies tended to encourage departments to generate income and to discourage them from unnecessary expenditures, *kai yuan jie liu*. This Chinese idiom, commonly used to describe economic behavior, refers to making the source of a river bigger while trying to stop it from flowing away too quickly. Thus, departments had individualized budgets, and it was understood that some departments would “get rich first.” This was in accordance to Deng Xiaoping’s often quoted idea about the nation that long-term equality would have to be preceded by short-term inequities.

Luo’s five systems included the ability-qualification system, which related to the promotion process and allowed for evaluation of staff within SZU. This process was separate from the formal ranking system, in which assessment resided at the municipal and provincial levels (although with input from the SZU administration). The other systems were the employment contract system, the salary reservation system, the efficiency responsibility system based on individual job responsibilities, and the goal responsibility system. These produced a sort of management by objectives in which both leaders and cadres set objectives for their service terms. Their performances were judged against their meeting their objectives.

Luo was aware that reform entailed risk and was accompanied by failures:

Since reform is risky, we cannot require perfection from the beginning and only allow success. We must allow failures; we must not allow all things to remain unchanged. We should prefer new things with defects to seemingly perfect things that are actually backward and conservative. Since reform is risky, we must destroy old power and entrenched thinking.

## Participating in society

Part of Luo Zhengqi’s educational philosophy concerned the university’s full participation in society. Grounded in the discipline of architecture, Luo saw education as practical and shared the general view in China that schooling should benefit the collective; benefits to individuals are secondary. The attempt to have the school serve society took several forms. The setting of majors and curriculum served the needs of the SEZ. While studying at the university, students took part-time jobs that exposed them to the real world. The university itself ran factories and enterprises that produced goods and services for both export and domestic use. And the university’s major output—its graduates—were to serve society when they entered the workforce.

One of the well-publicized, defining features of pre-1989 SZU was its work-study program.<sup>23</sup> Work-study allowed full-time *benke* (bachelors track) students to take part-time campus jobs in their spare time. Night school students in the part-time *zhuanke* (specialized certificate) program were able to take day-time jobs on campus. University officials were pleased with work-study because it yielded a “double harvest” for students. They learned skills and acquired experience on-the-job, and they put what they had learned in the classroom to practical use on the job. The work-study program served as a bridge between academia and society. Students could leave the “ivory pagoda” and learn about the real world. Luo Zhengqi, himself, considered the work-study program to be one of the university’s most important reforms.<sup>24</sup>

The part-time work program served Luo’s main thesis that a university should be about students, that all staff should support the training of students, who serve society’s needs. Administrative and support staff would be in constant contact with students who worked part-time in their offices and work-units. In contrast, in most Chinese universities non-teaching staff rarely interacted with students. Most staff were less educated than students; the two groups had little in common, and they were not exposed to each other in the work place. Given their very different educational levels, they often could not work together on tasks to pursue common objectives. Having SZU students interact with less-educated staff would give them useful experience in the real world.

### Flexibility in education

Luo adopted and expanded upon the liberal educational policies of his predecessor, Zhang Wei.<sup>25</sup> The university used the credit system, and students were allowed to graduate early as soon as they earned enough credits to meet graduation requirements.<sup>26</sup> Students who did not earn sufficient credits to graduate within four years were permitted to remain another year as fee-paying students; or they could choose to take a completion certificate (*jie ye zheng*), but not a diploma. Then, while employed, they could then study by themselves, pass the exams, and get a diploma.

Students, as in other universities in China, were admitted to SZU by major. After completing their first year, however, SZU students could apply to change majors, with the approval of both departments if departments were also to be changed. SZU was probably the first university in China to permit this type of alteration, as Chinese institutions of higher education generally adhered to the European system which was less flexible in these regards than

their North American counterparts (or more disciplined depending on one's point of view).

Starting with the class that entered in 1987, students were permitted to take double degrees if they met certain requirements by their third year—an accumulated Grade Point Average (GPA) of at least 80, credits within the first major that exceeded the requirement, and two recommendation letters from teachers ranked lecturer or above. Student who strove to take a second degree but failed to acquire sufficient credits could convert the intended second degree into a minor, or could take an extra year to obtain the second degree.

Attendance was required for courses with much practice, such as laboratories, military training, physical education, computing, design and foreign language basics. Students who were absent from these courses more than one-third of the time were to fail the course. Other courses did not have mandatory attendance. The Luo administration also encouraged departments to offer self-study courses, based on reading lists and periodic group discussions.

The academic system included a set of rewards and punishments.<sup>27</sup> Merit-based scholarships accompanied individual ¥100 (US \$25) awards given for particular subjects or achievements. The top graduates in every department received a ¥200 gift, and anyone who graduated early also received ¥200. Punishments included academic probation, the result of a failing GPA (below 60), too few accumulated credits, or failing three or more courses. Students faced expulsion if their GPA for the semester was below 44. Under some conditions, students who failed courses were permitted to take make-up exams. Only one make-up was given for required courses. No make-ups were allowed for students who failed over three courses in a semester, had a GPA below 40 for the semester, failed to attend the exam without a proper excuse, or were caught cheating.

### Democracy in administration

Luo operated with a very open managerial style, unencumbered by what is often referred to as “one-speech meetings,” in which the leadership exposes subordinates to a lengthy monologue. He also created a system of checks and balances that was usually described with the phrases: president running school, professors running academics, Party Committee running the Party.<sup>28</sup> As implemented, the presidential responsibility system (*xiaozhang fuze zhi*) gave the president final approval on virtually any matter in the university. Managing such power required tremendous delegation of responsibility. The

president himself had autonomy over teaching administration, personnel, finance and resources, with occasional review by the upper levels, which came in the form of inspection visits. The details of Party running fell to the vice-chair of the Party; the academic scheme fell to department heads, with administrative details handled by the Academic Affairs Office. Committees on school affairs, finance, teaching reform and student affairs assisted the president in school administration. A committee of professors concerned itself with academic matters, a category considered totally separate from school administration. This committee contained all professors at the rank of associate professor or above; it did not initiate academic policy, but rather reviewed policies that were generated by the administration. It provided a sounding board for policy discussion.

The SZU administrative structure permitted a strong-president system and a strong department head system. The Chinese term *lingdao* refers to work-unit leaders and includes the heads and deputy heads of academic and administrative offices. China employs a ranking system for cadres, or administrative staff: *sheng, ting, chu, ke*. The president and Party secretary of the university were at *ting* level, department heads at *chu* level. In the university setting, *lingdao* refers to the leaders at *chu* level and above. The president nominated vice-presidents (vice *ting*-level) for municipal approval and appointed department heads. As president, Luo Zhengqi gave department leaders almost total autonomy. How they ran their departments was left totally up to them. There were no structural requirements, such as for committees, that could ensure participation. Administrative offices such as Academic Affairs, Finance and Student Affairs oversaw certain areas of departmental activity, but department heads were given loose reins.

### An expansive view of education

Formal education in China is often described as a three-part system that addresses the intellectual, moral and physical needs of students. (Students who excel in each area are known as Three Good students). Luo subscribed to and indeed enlarged this expansive view of education which he believed should include the Three Classrooms as opposed to the Five Ones.<sup>29</sup> In many ways, the second classroom (*di er ketang*) of part-time jobs was considered more useful and more important than the first classroom, the latter which was still plagued by ineffective pedagogy—where much time was wasted in useless meetings and ideological studies. For students, work ethic had replaced Marxism.

SZU itself included more than just teaching and research. There were various school-run enterprises on campus that earned money for the school. Some students worked in these units, which provided them real life work experiences. The enterprises provided a major source of revenue; without it the university would have had an annual deficit since it always overspent its city allocation of funds.

Consistent with SZU's opposition to an iron ricebowl mode of operation was the policy that departments should learn to take care of themselves. Teachers and staff were encouraged to run side-businesses so they would become less dependent on hand-outs from the university, which itself depended on subsidies from the city government.

### ***Administrative reshuffle: Luo Zhengqi fully in charge***

It might be argued that Luo Zhengqi took command of SZU the moment he stepped foot into the special economic zone. Indeed, within a week he had commissioned a new site plan for the proposed campus. But Luo did not push aside the other leaders. Zhang Wei, the nominal president, and Feng Shen, the scholar, both had definite ideas on reforming traditional educational methods and their input was largely responsible for ensuring a flexible structure that permitted the credit system, double degrees, changing majors, and early and late graduation. Not a scholar himself, Luo deferred to these experts, and he enthusiastically accepted their policies. In matters of Party, Luo as Party secretary, had the loudest voice and although opposition was tolerated, it was ineffective. The Party was integrated into university operations; the dual-track became a monorail.

Fang Shen was never much interested in running the university. His scholarly pursuits took priority. He was the founding director of the university's Institute of Special Zone Economics, which he used as a base for publishing several monographs, including *Surveys of Economics in the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone* and *Studies on Economic Problems Arising in the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone*. As vice-president, he was member of the SZU Party Committee and served on various committees. In March 1987, Fang stepped down as vice-president, assuming the role of vice-director of the Academic Affairs Committee. He returned to People's University that September.

While Luo was still vice-president, an additional vice-president was appointed by the upper levels. The city and provincial governments approved Li Tianqing, who had good relationships with local authorities, to serve as the vice-president in charge of foreign affairs. Li had once been a doctoral

candidate at London University, where his studies were cut short by the Chinese civil war. In public, Li supported the general direction of educational reform.<sup>30</sup> In private, however, he opposed many innovations that the other vice-presidents accepted; he came up with virtually no creative ideas and his managerial style was one based mostly on relationships, something not favored by many staff who had become accustomed to Luo's open style. Although Li aspired to succeed Zhang Wei as president, the city dismissed him as vice-president in March 1987 and demoted him to director of the Academic Affairs Committee. This was one of five standing committees, and of less importance than the Teaching Reform Committee that Luo himself chaired. In 1988 Li secured himself another assignment, as president of the University of Macau. The Portuguese administration that ran the Macau enclave needed a Mainland Chinese to head the university; Li was given the assignment but little power, as most decisions rested with government officials. By Mainland standards, the University of Macau was considered an extremely mediocre university. The best graduates of Macau's high schools went to universities in Hong Kong, Portugal or China. Macau University had to settle for low achievers; according to several SZU staff who taught there on exchange, SZU was academically superior. It was widely believed among SZU staff that Li's transfer to Macau was a face-saving move that permitted him a place to stay until he retired. It was a move seen as good for both institutions.

Before the March 1987 administrative reshuffle, Luo held an election in which teachers and staff voted for vice-presidents. By that time it was clear that Fang Shen wanted to return to Beijing; Li Tianqing lacked sufficient support to be in the running. The elections produced three candidates for Luo to choose from. The top vote-getter was Ying Qirui, who had worked in the computer section of the Hong Kong branch of the Bank of China from 1977-1984. One of the first computer graduates in China from the 1960s, Ying was fluent in English and well-liked by his colleagues. He was in charge of SZU's computer center. Luo assigned Ying to be vice-president in charge of finance, foreign affairs, and the science departments and institutes. The runner-up in votes was Yang Jinbiao, the first professor hired at SZU and, like Ying, a computer scientist. Luo decided against having two vice-presidents from the same discipline, so Yang was assigned to head the Academic Affairs Office. Within a few months, the city government appointed Yang to head the Shenzhen Teachers College. The third highest number of votes went to Zheng Tianlun, an economist. Luo assigned Zheng to be the vice-president in charge of academics in general and the arts departments in

particular, as well as staff management, and school-run enterprises. Zheng also remained head of the International Trade and Finance Department, which would be founded in 1987, taking its initial teachers from the Economics Department. He was given nominal charge over the library and other units as well.

### ***Luo and student protests***

As just discussed, Luo's educational philosophy put the SZU student at the center of his attention. It is, therefore, somewhat ironic that student protests at SZU contributed to Luo's removal from office. Luo Zhengqi was fired as school president and Party secretary by provincial and municipal authorities in decisions probably finalized around the beginning of July 1989. His "serious mistakes" were the only reasons given. Just prior to Luo's dismissal, SZU students were protesting against the central government, and this so-called demonstration for democracy has often been cited by members of the university community as one of the factors contributing to Luo's firing. This section examines the 1989 student protest and its precedents.

### **Student protests in China**

The spring of 1989 was the climax of a time of intellectual ferment in China. In terms of individual liberties, the period of 1987 and 1988 is today recognized as one of the freest epochs in Chinese history. At that time intellectuals experienced a freedom of expression and government authorities tolerated a degree of dissent. This kind of tolerance had not occurred for many years, if indeed it had ever occurred. China's history has seen much dissent; dissent can lead to armed conflict and revolution. With this sense of history, Chinese governments tend to be wary of dissent. In the early part of the century, Chinese intellectuals had often spoken their minds, but at that time the new republican government was weak—a weakness that begot tolerance. In contrast, the post-Mao government was not weak. The newest "new China" was a country facing a bright economic future. Deng Xiaoping and his economic reform policies were firmly in control. There was no turning back from such innovations as the Special Economic Zones. Of course, there was much debate and disagreement between liberal and conservative reformers over the reform and opening-up policies; continuing dialogues surfaced in the press; the acknowledgment of their existence enhanced the openness of the period.

China of the mid- to late 1980s was a time of experimentation as policy-makers searched for models that could be employed in future development. Many educational institutions were allowed to carry out experiments;

Shenzhen University was the boldest of all these experiments. It had replaced automatic stipends with merit-based scholarships; the curriculum was made more flexible; the iron rice bowl was cracking; teachers and staff deemed incompetent could be fired (at least theoretically); student job allocation was abandoned in favor of market mechanisms; the CCP was integrated into university management.

These reforms had received the attention of China's leaders. On 21 May 1986 Li Peng, then vice-premier of the State Council and minister of the SEDC, inspected SZU. In his visit, which was widely reported in the Chinese press, the vice-premier liked what he saw. He is quoted as saying: "You are providing experience for conducting reforms in institutions of high learning and are constantly summing up your experience in order to perfect it."<sup>31</sup> *Guangming Ribao*, one of China's major periodicals for intellectuals, described the visit for its national readership:

During his 1½-hour inspection, Li Peng asked in detail about ways of reforming the traditional ideological and political work among students—the work-study program; students running banks, lawyers' offices, accountants' offices, postal and telecommunications offices, guesthouses, and washing machine factories; the replacement of grants with scholarships, the credit system, and so on. Luo Zhengqi explained that these practices have enlivened the students' ideology and deepened their love for the socialist system. The number of students wishing to become Party or CYL [Communist Youth League] members has increased with each passing day. Large numbers of students, who are more capable of standing on their own feet, who are strict on themselves, who have attained good results in their studies, and who have gained substantial experience in social practice have been trained. Li Peng said happily that these students will be able to better meet the needs of society after they graduate.

The reforms at SZU had not always proceeded without incident. Problems surfaced just half a year after Li Peng's visit. In December 1986 students protested for democracy in cities across China; these demonstrations became a little violent in several places, including Beijing, Wuhan, Hefei (Anhui Province), and Shenzhen.

Student protests are not uncommon in China. A most famous one occurred on 4 May 1919 when Beijing students demonstrated against concessions made to foreign powers by China's weak government. The protest was sparked by the Versailles Peace Conference accord that had granted Germany's interests in China to Japan. This movement involved "both a patriotic, nationalistic reaction against foreign domination, and a 'cultural revolution' advocating abolition of Confucian institutions — footbinding,

subordination of youth to age, women to men—and complete westernization under the banners of ‘science and democracy.’”<sup>32</sup> From one angle, the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) can be seen as a giant student protest, with the nation’s youth mobilized to fight traditional values that were alleged to be destroying China. Near the end of the Cultural Revolution, students held a large demonstration in Tiananmen Square on 6 April 1976, as they mourned the death of Zhou Enlai, China’s beloved premier. Despite protests’ apparent inevitability, analysts of China do not have a good track record of predicting them. Writing in 1979, noted China historian Wang Gungwu speculated that “...a whole new generation has grown up in the People’s Republic for whom May Fourth nostalgia and the old-fashioned anti-traditionalism of the May Fourth generation are both meaningless. This generation could be a new kind of Chinese, skeptical of cant and humbug, but also rootless and disillusioned. For them, cultural revolutions of any kind, whether May First or [Cultural Revolution], could well be an anathema.”<sup>33</sup> The next year proved Wang wrong as students demonstrated for democracy around the time of the Democracy Wall Movement.<sup>34</sup> And the national protests of 1989, referred to in this book as simply Tiananmen or 4 June events, again proved the historian wrong. In this case, the lesson from history appears to be that student protests in China is part of the national process; the next protest is just a matter of time.

### 1986 SZU protests

The SZU student protest of mid-December 1986 was linked to the nationwide protests only in time, not character. On 5 December over 3,000 students from universities in Anhui Province had marched on government headquarters to protest against the lack of democracy in the selection of representatives to the National People’s Congress, China’s legislature. The democracy protests swept across Chinese campuses, including Zhongshan University, Guangzhou’s premier institution, where 300 marching students called for swifter progress in political reform.<sup>35</sup> Protests at SZU were quite different in nature, as reported in the Hong Kong press. “Last week in Shenzhen saw more than 1,500 university students take to the streets over large increases in school fees—something of a contrast with the lofty ideals such as democracy, liberty and human rights which promoted the spate of student protests sweeping China since December 5, and which paralyzed part of Shanghai at the weekend.”<sup>36</sup>

The Luo administration had announced “20 Regulations” (*ershi tiao*) aimed at improving the *xue feng*, or learning atmosphere. Among these was an increase in tuition that would require all students (including those already

enrolled) to pay a total fee of ¥750 (US \$200) per semester, compared with ¥20 (¥15 for tuition, ¥5 for accommodation) at the time. The 20-point program, which came in the form of “regulations on students’ schooling at SZU,” had been promulgated on 15 September. According to a report in *Da Gong Bao*, a Hong Kong-based, PRC-friendly newspaper, the controversy focused on the third and tenth clauses.<sup>37</sup>

According to the third clause, the present rates of students’ tuition fees and dormitory rents are merely nominal, and a reasonable readjustment will be made in the first semester of the 1987-1988 school year. A multi-layered system for charging fees will be implemented on a trial basis. According to the system students will be divided into different groups in light of their marks and credits in the previous semester. Those who achieve the highest marks will pay ¥40 tuition fees and ¥10 dormitory fees per semester; and students whose marks are low will have to pay ¥600 tuition fees and ¥150 dormitory fees. The tenth clause stipulates that students who fail in any examination will not have a make-up examination. If a student fails in the examination of an obligatory course, he must retake this course and pay a fee of ¥50 for this retaking. But if the course is mainly completed through self-study, the student will not need to pay the retaking fee.

Whether the SZU demonstrations were spontaneous or organized is subject to debate.<sup>38</sup> The report in *Da Gong Bao* stated:

It is understood that the incident was a spontaneous action by the students, and that the official student union was not involved in the action. The students who took the most radical action come from northern provinces. They said that the present living expenses and tuition fees are already too heavy a burden for them to bear. After the reform, the fees may even rise sharply, and it would be absolutely impossible for them to bear the burden.

The student demonstrations took place over several days and were the major topic of discussion on campus. The fullest account appeared in the English Club’s daily bulletin, *Shenda Tattler*:<sup>39</sup>

Over 500 students demonstrated last night between 7:30 to around 12:30 p.m. Students first put up *dazibao* [big character posters] at the student cafeteria Friday complaining about the 20 Regulations, which were formally announced one month ago by the Office of Academic Affairs. On Saturday afternoon, student representatives met with Vice-president Ying, Yu Zhongwen, Tang Cairu and Luo Yuanxiang.<sup>40</sup> Because there was not a satisfactory solution found, President Luo met with the student representatives on Saturday evening and stated that he still supported the 20 Regulations. Thus, on Sunday afternoon at 4 p.m., students met at the Office Building Cafeteria and decided to demonstrate on Sunday night. They started from the student dorms around

7:30 p.m. and marched to the quarters of the teachers and staff where they sang 'The Internationale' and chanted slogans. At about 10 p.m., the student group separated into two. One group went to the Office Building Cafeteria and held a discussion with President Luo and Vice-mayor Zhou Erkan. Another group of about 100 students went to the Caltex gas station and stopped traffic along the Guangzhou-Shenzhen Highway for two and a half hours.

The university's official position was contained in a daily news broadside, *News in Brief (jian xun)*:<sup>41</sup>

Leaders pointed out that the direction of school reform cannot change. Students are allowed to voice opinions against the 20 Regulations and regulations on teaching. Blocking traffic is wrong. The standing committee of Shenzhen's CCP summoned a special meeting and gave three instructions: the general target of reform should not change; we should continue routine school work and guarantee teaching; all activities should follow the law. This morning there was a joint meeting with the School Affairs Committee, President's Office, Examination Committee, Professors' Committee, Academic Affairs Office, and the Students' Work Guidance Committee. Teaching this morning was good.

The morning's "good" teaching belied student concern and anger. According to the Hong Kong press report, that evening—15 December—the SZU leadership said it was willing to postpone implementation of the third and tenth clauses of the 20 Regulations, yet "the students held that the university authorities were not sincere, but were only trying to play a dilatory trick. Some students stuck up a poster, calling on schoolmates to gather again at 8 p.m. and continue the demonstration." Students who participated in the events recalled in interviews ten years later that fewer than several hundred students were demonstrating on campus that evening. The rest of the students were in their dormitory rooms. Then, suddenly without notice, the electricity in the dorm area stopped. Students who had been in their rooms became agitated and joined the protest, which snaked around the campus for a while and then headed off campus to the town of Nantou. Several students unfurled banners that read "Down with the 20 Regulations" and "Down with the principal."<sup>42</sup> This is how a Hong Kong newspaper described the events:<sup>43</sup>

That evening, more than 1,000 students held a demonstration on the school campus, then divided themselves into two contingents, one marching toward Shenzhen and the other toward Nantou. While marching along the highroads, some students held up vehicles and asked the drivers whether they supported the students. A luxury car was forced by the students onto a side road,

and the car's antenna was broken off and the hood struck. But the students did not commit other excesses.

The evening had culminated weeks of activity. Soon after the regulations had been promulgated in September, the students complained that "this system would place a great financial burden on their shoulders and would create an unbearable psychological pressure on their studies. Then, they aired their opinions to the university leadership many times, but received no reply from the school leadership." The press report continues:

On 10 December, some students began to put up big-character posters in the school canteen to protest against the 20 Regulations of the school leadership. On the evening of 14 December, as the students' protests become more and more furious, the school leadership held a forum attended by some student representatives. However, the university leaders indicated at the meeting that the university would continue to implement the 20 Regulations. The students found that the university authorities completely rejected their opinions, so they held a demonstration. Nearly 1,000 students first marched in the campus and gathered in front of the houses of the university leaders. After failing to see the school leaders, they left the campus and continued the demonstrations along the Shenzhen-Guangzhou highroad. The students dispersed at 22:00, and on the same evening, leaders of Shenzhen City went to the university to talk to the students, but did not achieve any results.

The following day SZU formally abandoned the controversial two clauses that it had agreed to scrap the previous afternoon, before the protests and violence. In a signed statement reproduced in the *News Brief*, Luo Zhengqi expressed his annoyance with the students:<sup>44</sup>

Most students on 15 December followed the resolution of the School Affairs Committee, and returned to night study. However, at around 8 p.m. a group of students started to gather and protest again. They shouted and made noise. Some even went to night school classrooms and disturbed classes so that many had to be canceled. After that they went to the Guangzhou-Shenzhen highway. Some gathered around Maqueling intersection; some gathered by the Nantou customs and blocked traffic for several hours, during the course of which someone smashed restaurants and car windows with iron tools. This behavior seriously violates the security management rules and criminal law. They came back to school at 2 a.m. Public Security is examining these events. At the president's work meeting this morning, it was reconfirmed that: (1) all teaching of SZU should be carried out normally as scheduled; (2) after talking with the Student Union, the Standing Committee of the Students Representative Conference, and the Students Self-Disciplinary Committee, the School Affairs Committee has resolved not to execute clauses #3 and #10 of the 20

Regulations, and are working on measures of improvement; (3) last night a small group of students disturbed the study of the majority of students on campus and severely violated school regulations and went to block traffic and smash cars. This violated security management rules and criminal law. Teachers and students should fight against this to maintain the normal order of the school.

During the same day, the students and staff self-discipline committees and Work Union issued a joint statement imploring the campus community to fully support reform; in effect students were told to behave:<sup>45</sup>

In the three years since SZU was established, we have made great progress on the broad road of reform and innovation. We have achieved a lot, and our direction is correct. It is inevitable to have some mistakes and short-comings in the course of reform. We should fully support the reform of the school and do our bit to build SZU into a new style socialist university and train *rencai* [talent] for the SEZ. Recently students raised suggestions about the reform measures of the school. Some suggestions are reasonable, but others are radical and even go against security regulations. This troubles us. As parents and teachers, we should have learned lessons from the destructive behavior that occurred in the Cultural Revolution and educate our students and our children accordingly. We should instruct them to cherish the stability of the recent past and try to solve problems arising in reform with an attitude of negotiation and unity. Comrades, China is at an initial stage of political reform and our university is also at an initial reform stage. There is a lot of work to be done to find out the ways of democracy and the ways of educational system reform. We are calling for the whole body of teachers and staff to get fully involved and be fully unified to develop SZU further and push it ahead with revolutionary solution.

With that the matters were put in to rest. There were no recriminations. The disturbances of December 1986 might well have been avoided if the Shenzhen city government had not been intent on extracting tuition from students, a mandate which resulted in SZU's promulgating the infamous 20 Regulations. The SZU leadership took a dig-in-the-heels, draw-the-wagons-in-a-circle kind of attitude, something quite inconsistent with Luo Zhengqi's otherwise open policy of dealing with students. At that time, however, Luo was not formally in charge. As Party secretary and first vice-president, he did not have total control over the situation. His rival vice-presidents were probably not terribly saddened to see him in trouble; to what extent sabotage by high administrative officials figured into the university's intransigent position and the resultant student protests is unclear.

The Shenzhen government was annoyed with the student protests because they reflected badly on the special economic zone as a whole. Since the zone's inception, support from Beijing had waxed and waned.<sup>46</sup> This undulation reflected skirmishes at the central level between fast-speed reformers and slow-speed reformers. Early 1986 had seen a low peak of criticism on SEZ policy, but by the end of the year, criticism was reaching a crescendo. Liang Xiang, the Shenzhen mayor most responsible for the zone's expansion, was replaced in May 1986 by Li Hao, who had helped administer zone policy from Beijing. Liang had been a great supporter of Luo Zhengqi, giving him much autonomy in running the university. Gu Mu, the staunchest supporter of the SEZ among high-level central officials, retired at the end of 1986. Gu Mu had been Liang Xiang's major supporter in the corridors of power. In addition, Guangdong's Party Secretary Lin Ruo, who had assumed his position in July 1985, had publicly expressed his reservations about the SEZ's open international economic policy, which included "decadent capitalist thought."<sup>47</sup> On a positive note for the SEZ, Zhao Ziyang visited Zhuhai and Shenzhen in October and November and rebutted the critiques of zone policy.<sup>48</sup> Thus, by the time the student protests occurred in mid-December 1986, zone political support was still being defined, as political actors started to restate their positions. George Crane, a leading authority on the political economy of the special zones, has assessed the situation as follows:<sup>49</sup>

Although SEZ student protest was rather tame, it provided a pretext for renewed criticism of Shenzhen and, by implication, zone policy in general. By late December central Party authorities were starting to issue circulars censuring the national student movement and calling for action against 'bourgeois liberalization.' Consequently, Lin Ruo went to Shenzhen on January 8, 1987, and led a work conference of the municipal Party committee. At the meeting, Lin held that the student disturbances had been instigated by 'some bad people.'

The university also viewed the disturbances as the result of the actions of a few misguided students. Liang Shuping, the deputy director of the President's Office, told Agence France-Presse that press accounts had exaggerated the number of participating students and that the "small number" of students who had "disrupted social order" would have to undergo re-education.<sup>50</sup> Months later, Luo, after ascending to the presidency, expressed his displeasure, also. Speaking at the ceremony to open the 1987-1988 school year, Luo said:<sup>51</sup>

Freshmen had different opinions about the school's work, so they went out to the street, blocked traffic, and broke the glass of one vehicle and broke two windows of the hotel. Our mayor was very angry. I was very angry, too. The seniors were even angrier. They said: 'We are looking for jobs and you are causing trouble and we won't be able to get jobs.' When employers come to SZU, they ask: 'Did you take part in the riot?' I asked some students, 'Why did you go out to the street? Why not come to me? You can shout at me.' The students said: 'We have such beautiful surroundings in school, we don't want to harm even a single blade of grass in the school.'

Then, in a tone described by one student as that of a loving granny rather than that of a scolding parent, Luo said: "My students, it is not good to do that. That's not sensible of you to do this."

The 1986 protests left Luo Zhengqi rather unscathed. He had outwitted his opponents who wanted to remove him from office. In order to better run the university, Luo instituted a number of vehicles to encourage student participation. Even before the December disturbances, students had succeeded in changing the appointed Students Union into a democratically elected body—one student, one vote. According to a Hong Kong press report, "In June last year [1985] the first 'big character poster,' followed by many others, appeared on campus boards calling for the disbandment of the appointed students' union."<sup>52</sup> Students began to manage their own affairs through a student union and a self-disciplinary committee. At the time of the protests, the head of the student union noted that during the December demonstration, "There had been no big character posters calling for democracy." To further increase student participation, Luo created a special group, *zhi nang tuan*, or intelligence group, to monitor student opinion and relay it to the administration.<sup>53</sup> Six students reviewed correspondence from the students to the president, undertook surveys, and wrote up the results. The group was referred to as "the ears and eyes of the president and the mouth and tongue of the students."

## 1989 events

Various events at SZU in the spring and early summer of 1989 gave Luo's opponents sufficient fodder to mount a successful attack that resulted in his dismissal as head of SZU. During his five years at SZU, Luo had survived without openly having to rely on a patron. (Just having a patron is usually sufficient). The type of patronage politics that so characterizes China was not Luo's style. According to Andrew Nathan, one of several political scientists who view patron-client relationships as a driving force behind Chinese poli-

tics, patronage co-exists with the development of political factions.<sup>54</sup> Factions allow participants to mobilize resources. Individuals without factions face immense difficulties. If Luo could be associated with a faction, he related to Liang Xiang and Gu Mu, neither of whom still exercised power in the Shenzhen arena in 1989.

Even in December 1986, he had survived despite the fact that Liang Xiang and Gu Mu were both without formal power (but probably exercised much informal power). At that time, however, Luo's chief advocates were Lt. Governor Wang Pingshan, at the provincial level, and in Beijing Luo's former Qinghua colleague, Hu Qili, a member of the Politburo and secretary of the CCP Secretariat. Hu, five years Luo's senior, had served as a vice-president of Qinghua in 1977 and as secretary of the Secretariat of the central Youth League office. In these capacities he had worked with Luo. Hu was removed from office in 1989. Lt. Governor Wang retired in 1988. Thus, in mid-1989, Luo had few supporters in his corner. During the intervening years, he had run the university despite some opposition to his reforms from the central and local government. The main resistance from Beijing came from Luo's former colleague and conservative educator He Dongchang. The support Luo received from other individuals in Beijing was sufficient to counteract He's influence.

At the local level, Luo had developed a working relationship with Mayor Li Hao (Liang's successor) and his staff, but one senior official took an extreme dislike to Luo and his policies. In the late 1980s, Lin Zuji was in charge of education, health and welfare for the Shenzhen CCP, and as such directly oversaw the running of SZU. Luo, of course, did not appreciate any attempts by Party officials at the upper level to micro-manage the university; basically, most of Lin's suggestions were ignored. Lin had once been a secondary school teacher and had little familiarity with university operations. At one meeting with Luo, according to an informant, Lin had lost face when Luo questioned Lin's credentials for giving advice on university management. "Just being a Party official and once a secondary school teacher doesn't mean you know anything about running a university," Luo is reported to have said. Lin felt insulted by Luo, and this slight was apparent to observers whenever the two met. Lin, unfortunately for Luo, was a powerful force in the Shenzhen government, especially after 4 June; he later became vice-secretary of the Shenzhen CCP. Whether He Dongchang and Lin Zuji conspired to sack Luo is unknown. Yet, Chinese politics is often characterized by the exercise of personal vendettas, and it is extremely unlikely that these two men did not communicate with one another and indeed pool their

resources to ensure that Luo lost his job. In the years after Luo's ouster, both Lin and He returned to SZU and commented on Luo's "mistakes." An observer who attended these sessions told me that the SZU staff did not generally respect either man; both appeared to relish "kicking a dead horse" in order to justify their own actions.<sup>55</sup>

Two events gave Luo's opponents fodder for attacking him. The first was a telegram sent by SZU faculty to the CCP Central Committee demanding that Deng Xiaoping step down from the political stage. The second was the SZU students' demonstration in support of the Beijing student protest.

### Telegram

On 18 May 1989 over 600 Party members at SZU launched a campaign to retire Deng Xiaoping. As reported in the Hong Kong press, 20,000 Shenzhen residents signed a petition in support of the telegram that SZU Party members had sent to the CCP Central Committee. University teachers and students set up 10 petition activity stations in downtown Shenzhen, and teachers and students from the Shenzhen Experimental School, a key high school, and the Shenzhen Teachers College held demonstrations and sent telegrams.<sup>56</sup> Shenzhen's leading newspaper, *Shenzhen Tequ Bao*, reported the demonstrations, overnight vigil and petition, noting that 50,000 Shenzhen people signed the petition in under three hours.<sup>57</sup> Demonstrators were reported carrying signs and banners that read: "China's future requires democracy; China will die without democracy; Beijing students are starving; long live press freedom; I love rice, but I love freedom more." The local paper, like other members of the Mainland press, failed to mention the petition's call for Deng's resignation and reported only a single sentence from the telegram: "At this crucial moment that affects the future of the Party and nation, we strongly call for the Politburo and the Secretariat to execute their power according to the Party constitution." The rest of the content, however, received wide attention in the Hong Kong media.<sup>58</sup> Their reports circulated in Shenzhen through the electronic media and by word-of-mouth.

Luo, who had signed the telegram along with most Party members at the university, was upset by a remark by CCP General Secretary Zhao Ziyang who had told visiting Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev that Deng was still guiding major policy decisions, despite his purported retirement. The telegram said:<sup>59</sup>

We are alarmed to learn of the actual existence of a helmsman who rides over the Party's legitimate supreme decision-making organ. This is an insult to

and deception of the whole Party, and it is a serious violation of the principles of the Party constitution.

The petition that the public was asked to sign read:<sup>60</sup>

The CPC should reflect, respect, accord with, and represent the will of the people. There should not be a behind-the-scenes ruler in the Party. Neither should there be a so-called helmsman again. For this reason, the residents of Shenzhen City earnestly request Deng Xiaoping to retire, so as to smoothly solve the issue of the Beijing students' patriotic act of staging the hunger strike.

The SZU Party members were also upset with the government's handling of the student protests in Beijing. Just five days previously, some of the protesters had gone on a hunger strike.<sup>61</sup> This event galvanized the SZU community. In the corridors of the university, the hunger strike was the major topic of conversation. It was considered "a most grave turn of events" by one Party member, who seemed to be speaking for her colleagues. It was this concern that drove the Party members to include the following paragraph in their telegram:<sup>62</sup>

The serious mistakes made by the CPC Central Committee in handling the student movement have really put the state on the verge of turmoil. At this crucial moment concerning the destiny of the Party and the state, we strongly demand that the Political Bureau and the Secretariat exercise their power in accordance with the Party constitution. If they fail to do so, we request that a plenary meeting of the CPC Central Committee and a national congress of the Party be held to decide the destiny of the Party.

The facts that the telegram was not kept secret, that it was part of a larger petition drive, and that Hong Kong reporting of such an event would be inevitable, suggest that at least some SZU CCP members saw the general public as their intended audience; the university CCP, with the approval of Party Secretary Luo, was attempting to become a player in national level political events.

### **Student protest**

The second event that precipitated Luo's removal was a demonstration held by SZU students. About 2,000 students and teachers marched in protest on 18 May, and 500 of them staged an overnight vigil in front of the Shenzhen City government (and Party headquarters) building.<sup>63</sup> Until this event the SZU students had remained quiet and unpoliticized. One analysis reported that Shenzhen students had participated in seven days of demonstrations,

compared with 22 days in Guangzhou.<sup>64</sup> Again, the change in attitude is attributable to the hunger strike by the students in Beijing. Many SZU students feared that a hunger strike could lead to fatalities. At that time SZU students, like their northern counterparts, were lean in physique and had little body fat to tide them over a hunger fast of any duration. Students said that a hunger strike in Chinese tradition was a last-ditch effort; death is recognized as a very possible outcome. Money was collected on campus to help subsidize about 25 students to go to Beijing to show SZU's students' support for the protest.

The SZU student's sudden politicization is also due to other factors. The student union had, up until that point, played down the university's support of the Beijing protesters. With the events of December 1986 still remembered, Luo Zhengqi was well known to prefer that the SZU students take a low key approach and eschew protest. While Luo was in Guangzhou for a meeting, young faculty members (mostly from Northern China) encouraged the student union to take a more active role. At that time, an informant told me of a meeting in which young teachers from the North shamed student cadres into action. "How can you sit by idly while your Beijing brothers and sisters are putting their very lives at risk," he was reported to tell the student representatives. The teachers arranged for busses from the university fleet to carry students, at no charge, to City Hall. The demonstration apparently had the approval of the Shenzhen Public Security Bureau, although it is unclear exactly what type of demonstration had been approved.<sup>65</sup> Teachers, who feared violence and police intervention against the students, accompanied them. The protest was peaceful, and students who remained for the all-night vigil reported a "festive, picnic-like atmosphere."

It is possible that Luo might have survived repercussions from either the telegram or the student protest. Both together, however, made a strong case for his dismissal. It is indeed ironic that students—the group Luo Zhengqi believed to be the most important element of a university—were the very persons who helped do him in.

Before 4 June, university officials had asked SZU students who had gone to Beijing to return, and most were back in Shenzhen before the People's Liberation Army was called in to clear the square. According to a Hong Kong press report, Luo said: "We know the situation in Beijing would be hard to control, so we decided to ask all students to come back. Students who failed to come back are staying in other provinces, but we have already contacted them."<sup>66</sup> SZU officially canceled classes for three days after Tiananmen; black wreathes and flowers appeared in front of the library. The

national flag was flown at half staff. By the following Monday, classes resumed, with 73% of the students returning by 15 June.<sup>67</sup>

The school continued classes for a week, exams were given and the term ended. On 9 June some of the next term's entering freshmen arrived. About two dozen test-exempt freshmen had been admitted on the basis of recommendations by principals of key middle schools in Guangdong. For several years, one or two students per major were enrolled on the basis of high school performance and were exempt from the national college entrance exam. They came to the campus several months early in order to receive special instruction in English and computers. Luo Zhengqi, as well as the head of the student union, addressed the group. On 21 July, just the day before Luo was fired, a team of investigators from the Public Security Bureau (PSB) arrived on campus. A notice posted by the education section of the Shenzhen government, which was overseen by Lin Zuji, Luo's nemesis, ordered leaders of two student organizations to register with the PSB. The groups, both declared illegal by the PSB, were the Coordinating Committee in Support of the Emergencies in Beijing and the Autonomous Association of Non-Beijing Students. About 15 students as well as some teachers registered their names, answered questions and were released. An unnamed school official, as reported in a Hong Kong paper, said that no students had been expelled or arrested.<sup>68</sup> This has been confirmed by various observers, although Chinese-language Hong Kong newspapers reported that two students had actually been arrested. (Hong Kong reporting of events in China often contains inaccuracies.)

Luo Zhengqi's sacking received little attention at home or abroad. *The Los Angeles Times*, for example, carried a two-paragraph Associated Press report about one week after the fact. It read in full:<sup>69</sup>

Beijing—Authorities in one of China's most reform-minded cities, Shenzhen, said Thursday that they have fired the local university's president for making serious mistakes during the pro-democracy movement, suggesting that he was judged too sympathetic to the student protesters.

The local government office, reached by telephone, said Shenzhen University President Luo Zhengqi, who is also the local Communist Party chief, was fired from both posts Saturday [22 July].

The belated official mention by the Chinese government appears to have come through the government press agency, Xinhua, on 21 September. It mentioned simply that Luo had been removed from his posts.<sup>70</sup>

Luo was the first but not only president to lose his job as a result of 4 June events. Most notable among the dismissed leaders in the wake of Tiananmen was Beijing University's well respected Ding Shisun, who was removed in August 1989.<sup>71</sup>

At the time of his firing, in a phone interview reported in the Hong Kong press, Luo said he was not surprised by the dismissal. "I have prepared for it," he was quoted as saying.<sup>72</sup> In addition to losing his positions of leadership at the university, Luo, who was then in his mid-50s, was not permitted to teach or contribute in any way to the university. His salary was withheld. He was told not to travel. For several weeks, he was sent to a retreat for re-education, during which time he was asked to write a self-criticism, which he failed to do.

Luo was told to vacate his Shenzhen apartment, which he refused to do, because he had not been formally fired as a staff member. While his wife continued to work as an architecture professor, Luo spent his forced retirement reading, exercising, listening to music, and speaking with friends on the phone. (Many considered personal visits too risky). SZU's president in the mid-1990s ended the harsh treatment of Luo by his immediate successors, had Luo's salary reinstated, and occasionally consulted him on university matters.<sup>73</sup> Luo eventually took on some management consulting, and by 1997 was helping his wife, who had just retired, to run the Qinghua Architecture Department's Shenzhen branch design office. The fact that Luo was married to a SZU staff member—one held in high esteem by the entire community, including Luo's successors—protected him against further harassment. His continued existence at SZU was justified by his position as staff spouse. In 1997, Luo and Liang Hongwen moved into a flat built for sale to SZU faculty in a new on-campus staff compound. It is in this new apartment, on the campus he built, that Luo expects to spend the remainder of his life.

The real explanation for Luo's ouster was not made public; the politics that went into the decision were never formally reported; the influence of Luo's "enemies" in the decision has not publicly surfaced. In sum, the CCP decision was not transparent. Despite the lack of transparency, a fairly clear picture emerges concerning the informal dealings that went into the decision to replace Luo with individuals who had little leadership experience, virtually no administrative tract-record, and no familiarization with SZU or the Shenzhen SEZ.

1. See Li, *The Rise of Technocracy*, 1992.
2. Luo Zhengqi, "Implementation and contemplation of reform: looking forward to SZU's fifth anniversary, April 1987," *1987 Yearbook*, p. 93.
3. Luo Zhengqi, "People, environment, efficiency, style: design and building SZU from the point of view of both president and an architect," *1988 Yearbook*, p. 16.
4. "Meeting minutes for selecting a site for SZU and capital construction, 27 March 1983," *1988 Yearbook*, p. 156.
5. Liang's architectural rendering and sketches have been published in her *Drawings by an Architect*, 1991.
6. A discussion of floor-area ratio appears on page 139, below.
7. The description of the campus plan is from Liang Hongwen, "The architecture of Shenzhen university," 1991.
8. Pollack, *Civilizing Chinese*, 1997, pp. 198-201.
9. *Ibid.* For consistency, "SZU" in the quotation has replaced "Shen Da" in the original. "Shen Da" is the commonly accepted abbreviation for SZU, standing for "Shenzhen daxue."
10. The Deng Xiaoping story was reported in: "A visit to SZU's new school site," *China News [zhongguo xinwen]* (25 August 1984), noted in *1986 Yearbook*, p. 209; Luo Zhengqi, "Welcoming speech at 1987 opening ceremony," *1987 Yearbook*, p. 14; Tang, *Searching for Shenzhen University's Reform Path*, 1988, p. 1.
11. Crane, *The Political Economy of China's Special Economic Zones*, 1990, p. 85.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 148.
13. "Reasons for high speed school construction," *1986 Yearbook*, p. 23.
14. SZU's educational policies are discussed in depth in Agelasto, *Educational Disengagement*, 1998.
15. Zhong Jialing, "Psychological Counseling Center," *1987 Yearbook*, p. 119, *1988 Yearbook*, 121-24; Chen Hao, *New Thoughts, New Explorations, New Patterns*, 1989, pp. 77-80.
16. Tang, *Searching for Shenzhen University's Reform Path*, 1988, p. 278.
17. *Shenzhen University 1983-1988*, pp. 5-8. The booklet, priced at ¥15, was printed in orthodox characters, the type used in Hong Kong and Taiwan.
18. Luo Zhengqi, "Look at reform from the point of view of SZU's reform," *1986 Yearbook*, p. 78.
19. Li is a measure of distance, approximating 500 meters.
20. Luo Zhengqi, "Look at reform from the point of view of SZU's reform, *1986 Yearbook*," p. 78.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Luo Zhengqi, "Implementation and contemplation of reform: looking forward to SZU's fifth anniversary, April 1987," *1987 Yearbook*, p. 93. See also Chen

- 
- Hao, *New Thoughts, New Explorations, New Patterns*, 1989, pp. 20-3.
23. Chen Hao, *New Thoughts, New Explorations, New Patterns*, pp. 33-44; Luo Zhengqi, "Profound change caused by the work-study program in SZU," *Shenzhen University Journal* (1986, no. 3), pp. 1-11; *Guangming Ribao*, 17/21 October 1987; Tang, *Searching for Shenzhen University's Reform Path*, 1988, pp. 289-90.
  24. Luo Zhengqi, "Part-time jobs bring big changes to SZU, 16 July 1986," *1986 Yearbook*, pp. 83-93.
  25. "Regulations on students' study, 3 August 1987," *1987 Yearbook*, pp. 123-9.
  26. The credit system is discussed in detail in Agelasto, "Educational transfer of sorts," 1996.
  27. "Regulations on students' study, 3 August 1987," *1987 Yearbook*, pp. 123-29.
  28. Chen Xiaobo, "Footprints of the past three years," *1986 Yearbook*, p. 182; Chen Hao, *New Thoughts, New Explorations, New Patterns*, 1989, pp. 12-9; Tang, *Searching for Shenzhen University's Reform Path*, 1988, pp. 3-144.
  29. One classroom, one teacher, one teaching material, one piece of chalk, and one notebook.
  30. Albert Chan, "Robot plant in high-tech special zone," 1985.
  31. Wu & Cao, "Li Peng inspects Shenzhen university," 1986.
  32. Dockser, *John Dewey and the May Fourth Movement in China*, 1983, p. 20.
  33. Wang, *The Chineseness of China*, 1991, p. 244.
  34. Andrew Nathan, *Chinese Democracy*, 1985.
  35. Chan, "Guangdong's Zhongshan University students," 1986.
  36. "Yeung, Student protest takes a new turn in the south," 1986.
  37. \_\_\_\_\_, "Shenzhen University student strike subsidies, 1986." [Edited for style and typos; the *FBIS* transcription reports ¥750 dorm fees, rather than ¥150].
  38. Information in this section comes from university *News Briefs*, published reports in the Hong Kong press, as well as interviews with members of the SZU community. The SZU yearbook for 1986 does not mention the disturbances and fails to list them among the university's major events, a chronology which includes 84 items.
  39. *Shenda Tattler #59*, 15 December 1986.
  40. The vice president, Party vice-secretary, head of Party office, presidential consultant, respectively.
  41. *News Brief # 478* (15 December 1986), which was mimeographed on the same sheet as the *Tattler*.
  42. Yeung & Yu, "Shenzhen student violence overturns higher fees plan," 1986.
  43. \_\_\_\_\_, "Shenzhen University student strike subsidies," 1986.
  44. *News Brief # 479* (16 December 1986).
  45. "Students/staff Self-discipline Committee and Work Union, Announcement to staff, 16 December 1986," mimeographed.
  46. Crane, *The Political Economy of China's Special Economic Zones*, 1990.

47. Crane, *ibid.*, p. 124.
48. Crane, *ibid.*, p. 149.
49. Crane, *ibid.*, pp. 132-33, references omitted.
50. AFP reports further, *FBIS-CHI-86-242* (17 December 1986), p. P4.
51. Luo Zhengqi, "Speech at 1987 opening ceremony, *1987 Yearbook*," p. 17.
52. Yeung, "Student protest takes a new turn in the south," 1986.
53. Wu, "Student 'Intelligence group' for president," 1987.
54. Nathan, *China's Crisis*, 1990, pp. 23-37.
55. Interview, 1994. Lin visited SZU 17 December 1993; He Dongchang visited SZU 25 April 1991.
56. Ho, "Shenzhen's CPC members send message to the central committee," 1989.
57. Fu & Wu, "SZU teachers and students continue to demonstrate," 1989, p. 1.
58. See Ho, "Shenzhen's CPC members send message to the central committee," 1989. The next day, 20 May, a report appeared in an English-language Hong Kong daily: Fan, "Shenzhen Party members call on Deng to resign," 1989.
59. Ho, "Shenzhen's CPC members send message to the central committee," 1989.
60. *Ibid.*
61. These events are chronicled and discussed in Teresa Wright, "Campus Life in the Spring of 1989," in Agelasto and Adamson, *Higher Education in Post-Mao China*, 1998, pp. 375-98.
62. Ho, "Shenzhen's CPC members send message to the central committee," 1989.
63. Fu & Wu, "SZU teachers and students continue to demonstrate, 1989," p. 1.
64. Tong, *The 1989 democracy movement in China*, 1991, p. 34. This document states that the first date of protest in Shenzhen occurred 25 April, compared to 22 April in Guangzhou. Protests at other universities in Guangdong started 18 May.
65. \_\_\_\_, "Shenzhen students return with 'apprehension,'" 1989.
66. *Ibid.*
67. *Ibid.*
68. Cheung, "Security squad seeks Shenzhen student bosses," 1989.
69. *Los Angeles Times*, 28 July 1989, p. 10.
70. Agence France Presse, "Students enlisted in corruption crusade," 1989.
71. \_\_\_\_, "Beijing University's president ousted," 1989.
72. Cheung, "Security squad seeks Shenzhen student bosses," 1989.
73. This policy reversal was commented on in a Hong Kong magazine that reports on Mainland political affairs. See \_\_\_\_, "Partial revisionism of 4 June," 1994.