

Chapter 2

1949—1978: Social Integration and Mass Mobilization

CPC had just made a revolutionary victory and was facing with new task of socialist construction after the foundation of P.R. China. At this background, an important issue in front of CPC was how to learn from the successful experience of past revolutions, and to continue to adhere to the mass line, to stimulate vitality of grass-roots public, to promote in a wide range social mobilization and social organization, and to coordinate and deal with their relationship with the masses. How to construct the basic social organization or social structure that can consistently follow and reflect the country's will and power? How to guarantee people's participating vitality as well as their support and recognition of the national will? Facing with the issues, the Chinese Communist Party carried out a tortuous and difficult exploration. Some scholars call this exploration as "to achieve the reconstruction of social integration through the reconstruction of political integration".¹ And they believe "in the case of global failure of mechanisms in political integration and social integration, the reconstruction of political integration is not only a top priority, but also relatively easy considering resources of the state and government at that time". Therefore, the way of "reconstructing social integration through reconstructing political integration" is an inevitable choice in that historical context. Mr. Zou Dang generalized it as the "Totalism" in state-society relations. "Totalism" means that political power can involve into various areas of society and individual life. In principle, it is free from legal, ideological and moral (including religion) restrictions, but in practice (as opposed to in principle) the extent to which the state penetrates into the social sphere and the individual's life is more or less, and the degree of its control is strong or weak".² Even in a given period, the actual control of the state in the social sphere may be weakened, but the principle of totalism of state-society relations is consistent.

The country's strong transformation and penetration of the social sphere is undoubtedly the important feature of the state-society relations during this period.

¹Liping et al. [1].

²Dang [2].

From the specific means, there are three key words of importance: class consciousness, unit organization, mass movement. Class division itself is closely related to ideological transformation. It is not only a kind of judgment and division of the relationship between the real classes, but also an important incentive and impetus mechanism to carry out social transformation and social mobilization. Unit system and the people's commune system is the organizational carrier of social transformation and social mobilization. The process of reconstruction of national system in urban and rural areas is also a process of enhancing state's capacity in social mobilization step by step and the process of social penetration by state power step by step. With the construction of unit system and the people's commune system in the country, state power was able to penetrate into all aspects of social daily life completely. The mass movement is the dominant way in which society and state interact with each other in this situation. The specific practices of the masses at the grassroots level are selectively incorporated into the national policy system as a manifestation of the masses' vitality and enthusiasm, and the masses are strongly transformed and promoted through class struggle and organizational system. On the other hand, the blunders in the concrete practice of state policy can be attributed to the neglect of the masses' voluntariness and the overestimation of the mass consciousness.

2.1 Classes: Class Division and Ideological Reform

After the foundation of People's Republic of China, the theory of class became an important norm of state governance. The first step in state governance was to conceptually re-identify all classes in Chinese society and all levels in the class: The leading class was the working class; the alliance of workers and peasants was the political basis; the national bourgeoisie was both an ally of the revolution and an object of the revolution; the intellectuals were the middle class; the remnants of the Kuomintang, the landlords and counter-revolutionaries were enemies. Secondly, social members were divided into different classes according to their family background and historical performance. Class was no longer a social theory or ideology in abstract concept, but must be implemented to each individual in the society. In the countryside, the "class troop" which constituted from poor peasants according to the class origin concentrated the social basis of regime and at the same time "regulated" a small number of specific group of people. In the city, "democratic reform movement" was carried out through "finding out the real situation" and classified the class of majority of residents carefully. Purification and counter-insurgency campaigns were also carried out within the CPC and the members were categorized by class origin and historical records. In addition, different classes were closely linked with income, social opportunities, and so on. In

the cities, through the establishment of strict personnel examination system in party and governmental organs, cultural and educational units, and state-owned enterprises, the income was closely linked with class origin and political loyalty. In rural areas, in the practice of people's communism, the work credits and distribution of types of work were closely linked with the class origin. By identifying the identity of each social member and by linking with allocation of resources under the planned economy, class classification can quickly form a highly efficient mobilization of organizational capacity.

Communist Party of China is a Marxist political party; it must pay attention to the practical application of class theory. This is the ideological reason for class classification; In addition, to motivate the enthusiasm of the masses through "improving" the class may also be the internal motivation of class classification. It should be noted, however, that there were several important features of class division. Firstly, as some scholars have pointed out, "theoretically the CPC did not have to carry out class struggle in every village. It can simply declare that tenancy and employment was illegal, and decided on redistribution of land". But why the practical way to organize the class struggle was through class division, "from the macro analysis to micro-social action of each village", and through corresponding each individual to a class label?³ Secondly, after the agrarian revolution, the cooperative movement, and the socialist transformation movement, the objective social conditions of class dependence no longer existed, but the labels of class division persisted and played a vital role in the daily social life. In addition to that, the principle of class division was basically carried out in accordance with the possession of land and the amount of means of production, but in practice there has been a situation of magnification. Some scholars have described it as "the gap between expressive reality and objective reality".⁴ The reason for this gap was simple due to deviation of the practice from of specific principles, or has a certain inherent logic? Thirdly, although the emphasis has always been on class division and class struggle, but a more detailed analysis found that in the early period, more emphasis was on the decisive significance of class origin for the behavior, while later on more emphasis was on the decisive significance of behavior for class position and class division. The meaning of class has a subtle change.⁵ Why was there such a subtle change in a consistent class division? The above three features cannot be solely attributed to the class ideology, but must be answered from the state-society relations in the specific historical context: Class division itself not only concerned on the transformation of the old power and social structure, but also concerned on the "class education" and "class consciousness" to educate and transform people, so as to achieve a thorough social transformation.

³Zongzhi [3].

⁴Zongzhi [3].

⁵Letian [4].

2.1.1 *“Class Identity” and Identification of Identity*

Who are people? In China, at present, they are the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. These classes, under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party, unite to form their own country, to elect their own government, and to exercise the dictatorship on the imperialists, the landlord class and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the Kuomintang reactionaries and their accomplices on behalf of these classes. The implementation of dictatorship and oppression of these people aim at making them to behave and not to cause chaos.

—Mao Zedong, On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship, 1949

In the countryside, class division was carried out with the agrarian reform movement. In June 1950, the Central Government of People’s Committee adopted and promulgated the “Land Reform Law of the People’s Republic of China”, which was the basic legal basis for guiding land reform. The land reform adhered to the mass line in its working methods and opposed the “peaceful land reform” that did not mobilize the masses and “gift” the land with administrative orders to the peasants. At the same time, the Party pointed out that the mass movement must not be allowed to indulge in drift. It must mobilize the masses and at the same time use the party’s policies to arm and guide the masses. The Land Reform insisted on the general line of “relying on the poor peasants, farm laborer, uniting the middle peasants, eliminating the feudal exploitation system step by step and developing agricultural production.” It aimed at mobilizing the vast numbers of peasants in the struggle to defeat the landlord class, so that they can improve their consciousness and organization, and truly believed in their own strength, to achieve to become masters. It was therefore a prerequisite for the agrarian reform to classify the rural population, to classify the class to each specific person, and then to redistribute political power and social prestige.

In August 1950, the Central Government of People’s Administrative Council adopted the “Decision on the Division of the Composition of Rural Classes”, which stipulated that the landlord referred to those who occupied land but did not work or only work incidentally, and depended on exploitation for his own livelihood; The rich peasants refer to those who occupied land and better means of production and the capital of activity, participated in work but often relied on exploitation as a part or the majority of their source of livelihood. Land confiscation and collection for the landlords and rich peasants were in accordance with relevant provisions of “Land Reform Law of People’s Republic of China.” By the spring of 1953, except for a few minority areas, the land reform had been completed. More than 300 million landless peasants (including farmers of the old liberated areas) got free access to about 700 million acres of land and a large number of means of production. The land reform not only reconstructed the rural economic structure in China, but also reconstructed the rural social structure through class division and mass movement.

The division of classes in the agrarian reform movement was repeatedly emphasized in successive movements and rural work.

In the cities, class division was carried out through the “urban democratic reform”, “democratic government”, and some other work. From 1949 to 1953, the “urban democratic reform” was carried out in the factories, institutions, schools, shops, streets of the cities. all the urban people were investigated “thoroughly” of their class origin, focusing on carefully investigating the old staff (their family background, their occupation before 1949, and their experience), including the investigation of historical experience, social relations, and life.⁶ In November 1951, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued “Instructions on the Clearing of Counterrevolutionaries in Enterprises, in Factories, and Mining and Transportation Industries and the Perform Democratic Reform in these Enterprises”. In the democratic reform, the basic principle was to give freedom and rely on the masses of workers, to expose and prosecute many systems that oppress workers in the old enterprises and the feudal head system that had been accepted but not yet reformed, to clear counter-revolutionary elements and feudal remnants hidden in the enterprise, to promote a group of prestigious workers and staff in the masses to the leadership positions in administrative and productive management, to establish the factories’ management committee and the workers’ representatives meeting so as to absorb workers to participate in factory management to realize democratization of enterprise management and the workers becoming the true owners of the enterprise.⁷ In January 1952, the CPC Central Committee issued a directive calling on relying on the working class, uniting the law-abiding bourgeoisie and other citizens to carry out a large-scale struggle called “the five evils” against the illegal bourgeoisie. “Fighting against the bourgeoisie’s frenzied attack” became a strong voice of the whole country at that time.⁸

In February 1954, the Fourth Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China adopted a decision, formally approved the general line of the transition period, which proposed to “gradually realize the state’s socialist transformation in agriculture, the handicraft industry and capitalist industry and commerce”. With the socialist transformation, the work of class division in cities was also carried out in depth. In the early and mid-1950s, a survey was carried out on the situation of workers and staff members at all levels in the country. Party organizations at all levels conducted a general “clear survey” of the workers’ historical status, and found out the workers’ political and historical situation by filling out registration forms, investigating out the cities by the enterprise, and so on.⁹ “Searching and Queuing” was not limited to investigating the impure elements of

⁶Hua [5].

⁷Hua [5].

⁸Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee. THE SEVENTY-YEAR HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

⁹Hua [5].

workers, but also included classifying workers into three groups by their mental status: advanced, intermediate, and backward levels. Through these efforts, revolutionary classics, revolutionaries, workers, the bourgeoisie, businessmen and landlords, small owners, staff, the urban poor citizens and other urban class division system was basically established. Class division effectively promoted the process of transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, and the situation that “private industry and commerce, including part of the enterprise workers requiring the approval of public-private partnerships every day by beating drums” emerged everywhere. By the end of January 1956, more than 50 large and medium-sized cities where capitalist industry and commerce were relatively concentrated had announced the realization of the city’s industry-wide public-private partnerships. By the end of the year, 99% of the private industrial households and 88.2% of the private commercial households were on the track of public-private partnerships or co-operatives respectively.¹⁰

In 1962, the Eighth Plenary Session of the Tenth Central Committee put forward: “During the entire historical period of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, there existed a class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the entire historical period from capitalism to communism and the struggle between the two paths of socialism and capitalism. Among the people, there are still some people who had not been given socialist transformation. They are small in number, accounting for only a few percent of the population, but as long as they had an opportunity, they would seek to leave the socialist road and take the capitalist road. In this case, class struggle was unavoidable. This is a historical law that Marxism-Leninism has long expounded. We must not forget.” Some scholars have suggested that the meaning of the class division changed subtly in the following “The Four Cleans Movement” and “the Cultural Revolution”: “people’s behavior was elevated to a high position. It was the people’s behavior rather than their position in the social relations of production or difference of relations with the means of production that differentiated different classes.¹¹ In the past, it was the family background that had determined the behavior of people, and now it was human behavior that determined the class position. Behind the subtle changes in the meaning of class, there was a consistent logic: class was not only a tool for the transformation of social structure, but also a tool for human education and transformation to enhance the class consciousness of the people. Class origin can be used as a tool for transformation. With the change of the object to be transformed, the class position can also serve as a tool for transformation. The division of the family background concerns the existence of the old social structure and its thought as an old remnant; while the class position divided according to the act directed at the regeneration of these old social structures and their ideas under

¹⁰Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee. *THE SEVENTY-YEAR HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA*, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

¹¹Letian [6].

the new social structure may. Class components were constantly strengthened, or even re-divided in previous campaigns. After repeated discussions, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China promulgated on September 10, 1964, a number of specific policies in the rural socialist education movement (draft amendments): “In the socialist education movement, it was necessary to carry out seriously the work of cleaning up the class based on full discussion by the masses, the work of examining and assessing the composition of each household, and establishing class files.” On October 28 of 1964, the CPC Central Committee, in “Mobilizing the Masses to Further Carry Out the Socialist Education Movement in the City of Instructions (Draft)” required, “all urban organs, enterprises, schools, streets and all other units, should without exception mobilize the masses to carry out the work of class division.

2.1.2 “Class Consciousness” and People Transformation

The serious issue is the educating farmers.

——Mao Zedong, On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship, 1949

Class division made it possible for everyone to have a corresponding class label, whose primary function was to link national politics and individual life more closely than ever before. The various political operations at the national level are no longer abstract, but in stead specifically related to each individual, and it was closely related to daily life. Socialism and capitalism were no longer distant, unrelated state discourses, but incorporated into each individual’s daily life through class division. “The concept of class formed a new set of dominant discursive systems that affected the speech and action of the rural population and strengthened the social hierarchy in the village.” “With this approach, the image of the country and the authority of the state infiltrated the daily life of rural areas”.¹² Through class division, the old identities, interests, contradictions and conflicts were incorporated into the new framework of class identity, class interests, class contradictions and class conflict for repositioning and reorganization. People’s behaviors and emotions were also elaborated with new class discourse, such as class positions and class feelings.

It is particularly noteworthy that, with the advancement of the rural land revolution, the movement of collectivization, the completion of the urban socialist transformation, and the destruction of the old social structure, the label of class was preserved and permeated into people’s daily life. This is because class division itself concerned not only on the transformation of old power and social structure, but also concerned on the education and transformation of people through “class education” and “class consciousness”. Although the social structure on which the

¹²Shuji [7].

class resided changed, the people who represented the old social structure and its ideas were still in existence. It is only by insisting on the class education that the revolutionary vigilance and the revolutionary achievements can be maintained. This is the basis for the class labels to be preserved. When it comes to defining the people who represented the old social fabric and its ideas, family background was the most convenient and clear standard. In this framework, the family background determines the orientation of human behavior.

It is precisely because class division was mainly to achieve the transformation of people, the basic function of which was to achieve incentive and driving force of the mechanisms for social mobilization and social transformation that there was a “deviation between expressive reality and objectivity reality”.¹³ Class division was basically carried out in accordance with the possession of land and the amount of means of production, but in some places, there was also the case of the expansion. “According to Mao Zedong’s “Rejuvenating the investigation”, 1% of the landlords and 5% of the rich peasants constitute the exploiting class in rural areas. This was later changed to 5%, which has become a basic data index for the Chinese Communist Party leaders to make China social analysis”.¹⁴ In order to finish the task or meet the indicators of dividing landlords and rich peasants, according to the “Land Reform Law”, someone who had originally not been a landlord was designated as a landlord, and who had not been a rich peasant was classified as a rich peasant. So the situation appeared to expand. In addition to being a material category, class composition had more moral and political implications. In addition, under the label of class origin, although the degree of equality in economic resources of social members was greatly improved, the inequality in their political status and social opportunity was on the rise. In the process of emphasizing mass participation, while the sense of equality was being strengthened, the spirit of struggle was emphasized and struggle became an important form of participation.

The “class division” during the land reform period provided an important basis for social mobilization in the “mass movement”. In the course of agricultural cooperation, it was repeatedly stressed to “establish the advantage of the poor peasants”. Whether to achieve cooperation or to oppose cooperation was manifested through the peaceful competition between the poor peasants, middle peasants and rich peasants. According to the different situation of middle peasants after the land reform, they were subdivided into “rich middle peasants” and “lower middle peasants”. The poor peasants and the lower middle peasants became the cornerstones of the cooperation, while the landlords and rich peasants were strictly controlled and criticized. Participation to cooperation or not was not only a behavior of economic production, but also criteria for the consideration of political consciousness and representation of the social sequence. This has made it necessary for the poor and lower-middle peasants to firmly support the cooperative approach in order to protect themselves. In the process of joining in the cooperation, the

¹³Zongzhi [3].

¹⁴Shuji [7].

grass-roots organizations would arrange the order of cooperatives according to class composition, “The first step was to establish a basic framework with poor peasant as the backbone, and then to absorb the middle peasants to participate in the basic framework, the middle peasants and rich middle peasants were in strict control and finally, the landlords and rich peasants were suspended; If the established cooperation can not protect the class advantage of the poor and lower-middle peasants, it must be rearranged and dissolute”.¹⁵ As the succession had become an evaluation of political identity, the way of “sequence of cooperation” formed a “coaching effect” that people were afraid to lag behind. This is an important reason for the success of social mobilization in the cooperative movement. Class division, the division of active and backward participants, the arrangement of the order of joining the community itself became far more important than the economic resources of social resources, and played the most important role in the mobilization of the masses. Through the educational reform of class division and class consciousness, national politics and individual life, national development and individual interests were closely integrated together. If put in the mobilization of state-society relations, “class” really played a key role in solving many problems.

2.1.3 Digestion of Class Division

In the process of Land Reform and Democratic Construction, class was divided by family background. But since the Land Reform, Cooperative Movement and Socialist Transformation Movement had completely changed the basic economic and social conditions, even if the ideology was constantly strengthening the class origin and behavior, the gap between class labels and social reality was difficult to smooth out. As time went by, this gap would continue to deepen, the rationality of class division would be increasingly cut, and the dissatisfaction with the class division would gradually backlog. After the 10th Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee, people’s language and behavior were used to distinguish their class position, which also led to the blurring of class boundaries. “Every movement in relation to class struggle was constantly changing the subject, and every transformation had a new set of class, class enemies, and class struggle. The revolution left a big question mark to the peasantry: What is a class?”.¹⁶ With the development of the movement, the class and the class struggle was more and more mixed with subjective arbitrariness, and the difference between “expressive reality” and “objective reality” was more and more big.¹⁷ Although the logic behind the two views called family background determining the action of a person and the action of a person determining its class position was the same, namely reforming and education

¹⁵Xiaohong [8].

¹⁶Zongzhi [3].

¹⁷Zongzhi [3].

of people, in practice they were still in great tension and contradiction. With the introduction of the latter view, “the tension between the rural grassroots and the Party Central Committee in the class and class struggle was on the rise,” the resulting contradictions and hostility also makes class division rationality in practice increasingly digestion.¹⁸

To understand the digestion of class division, we need to understand people’s acceptance of class division. Class division and class discourse operated on the people from the top-down “class consciousness” education and transformation into the lives of the people, but the people were not completely accepting this education and transformation passively, instead, their acceptance or rejection of class division was related to their own interests and life experience. Zhang Letian distinguished this acceptance as rational acceptance, emotional acceptance and instrumental acceptance. “During the land reform period, class was related to land and other property, when the farmers calculated their own land to confirm the family composition, they rationally accepted the class. After the land reform, many farmers were inspired by the country’s moral image, and they were willing to listen to Chairman Mao, and follow the Communist Party. The early days of the commune catastrophe left lessons to the farmers, their acceptance of class after experiencing a rational acceptance, emotional acceptance, changed into instrumental acceptance. During the period of the Four Cleans Movement and Cultural Revolution, class struggle became the main theme of rural social and political life at that time, and became the most effective tool for gaining superior status, gaining power or protecting itself.” However, “the limitations of instrumental acceptance were the instrumentality of acceptance”, once the central governmental decision transferred to focus the party’s work on economic construction and to abandon the class struggle as the key link approach, the class division among the people would quickly disappeared.

On January 11, 1979, the CPC Central Committee issued the Decision “on Removing the Title of Landlords, Rich Peasants and Identity of The Children of Landlords and Rich Peasants”. In addition to a very small number of people, the decision removed the title of landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, and bad elements, and gave them treatment of members of rural people commune. Members of the rural people’s commune who were from landlords, rich peasant enjoyed the same treatment with other members. In the future, the evaluation on them in admission, enrollment, joining the army, joining the Youth League, joining the Party and assigning jobs should be based on their political performance and should not be discriminated. The children of landlords and rich peasants should be treated as member of people’s commune rather than as landlord or rich peasants. The central government believed that this decision would help to better mobilize all positive factors, and transform negative factors into positive factors.

¹⁸Letian [6].

2.2 Organization: Establish Units and Collect Resources

We should be further organized. We should organize the overwhelming majority of Chinese people in the political, military, economic, cultural and other organizations to overcome the disorganized state of old China.

——Mao Zedong, “Long Live the Great Unity of Chinese People”, 1949

After the founding of People’s Republic of China, the organizational structure of Chinese society under the strong intervention of the state has undergone tremendous restructuring, which led to the formation of a unique urban unit system and the rural people’s commune system, and thus greatly promoted the country’s social mobilization capacity and resource mobilization. Some scholars summarize the following three characteristics of the unit system: “Firstly, the whole society was organized in accordance with the unified plan, centralized management, the overall principle of mobilization. In this pattern, almost all members of society were included in various organizations. These various organizations - mainly organizations in the cities, were called units. Secondly, the units were organized according to the work and function of the masses. The units were generally constructed according to the mode of administrative organization. At the same time, the party and group organization ran through them. In this way, all levels of various organizations were of high homogeneity, and formed a large administrative organization system. Thirdly, the state mobilized and managed the social members through administrative organization system, and political movement. Organization (unit) became an indispensable intermediary between the state and members of society, and was in the center of social life. The performance of the operation of the whole society was represented by the operation of various organizations. This social structure was called the unit system”.¹⁹ If the traditional family, clan, village community formed the old honeycomb-type social structure, the urban unit system and the rural people’s commune system constituted a new honeycomb-type social structure. People’s interpersonal relationships, cultural activities, power relations, interest expression and politics were all basically defined by the boundaries of units or communes.

Some scholars believe that there were two kinds of exchange in resources between the state and individuals: one was the use of national favors to exchange personal gratitude based on the enthusiasm in work; the other was the use of national commitment to exchange personal consent of suppression in consumption at that time.²⁰ The urban unit system and the rural people’s commune system were the main places for the exchange of these two kinds of resources. From the perspective of state, the urban unit system and rural people’s commune system was an important carrier of national mobilization mechanism. It was through these organizational systems which covered almost all social members that the

¹⁹Liping et al. [1].

²⁰Ning [9].

aforementioned class ideology and conventional ideological and political mobilization was able to implement to the grass-roots level; In various competitions and recognition of the organization that distinguished between the good and backward performers, the external intention of national policy was transferred into the internal motivation of individual action; Through welfare systems of organization, the state not only made the members of the society form an institutional dependence on the resources of the unified control of the state, but also achieved coherence between the individual interests and the national interests. The legitimacy of the country was further consolidated, and the people's enthusiasm in socialist construction was mobilized. From the social point of view, although the neighborhood committees in the city at that time involved in a large number of administrative affairs and political mobilization, its function as "mass self-autonomy organizations" had always been unshakable. Due to the impact of family and village organizations, People's commune system led to tensions between farmers and the party and the government. The final establishment people's commune system inherently combines institutional elements of traditional villages; the welfare system of unit system stimulated the pride and collective spirit of the members, and made the individual interest of the members of the society and the national interest consistent to a certain extent.

2.2.1 The Establishment of Unit System

1. Unit Organization

The basic prototype of the unit of organization originated in the revolutionary process of the establishment of the various organizations by the Chinese Communist Party, and these organizations and organizational system was extended to all parts of the country with the victory of the revolution.²¹ In addition to the experience of the base areas, a set of models and experiences for the management of cities and enterprises gradually formed during the liberation of the Communists in the process of taking over the enterprises and managing the cities. Was also an important source of the establishment of unit organizations and unit system.²² However, regardless of its origin, the establishment of the unit system was closely related to the adjustment of state-society relations. It was "a measure to overcome the laxity of traditional Chinese society"²³ and "organizational means and basic procedure of direct administrative management of society by the nation".²⁴

At the beginning of the founding of People's Republic of China, in order to stimulate the working class enthusiasm in work, and reflect the status of the working class as masters, the state has made decision of gradual establishment of

²¹Feng [10].

²²Yipeng [11].

²³Yipeng [11].

²⁴Feng [10].

the general employment system in both public and private enterprises. In 1952, the State Council issued “the Decision on Labor and Employment Issues”, which provided concrete guidance on the employment system of urban public and private enterprises and the resettlement of the unemployed in the city. “Some enterprises even in temporary difficulties, should overcome the difficulties, find ways to protect the interests of workers, and avoid increasing unemployment from the positive development of production and business rather than from the dismissal of workers to.....All public and private enterprises, for implementing the reform of production, and rationally improving efficiency of labor, the excessive workers should not be dismissed but instead provided the original wage by the original enterprise units (included in the cost of business).” The socialist transformation of urban handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce, which began in 1953, greatly promoted the development of the unit system. By the end of 1956, 99% of the private industrial households and 82.2% of the private commercial households were on the track of public-private partnerships or cooperatives respectively. Most of the researchers regarded the First Five-Year Plan of 1957 as the symbol of complete formation of unit system.

The unit system established the “all package down” welfare system, which not only improved the living conditions of workers, but also greatly stimulated the enthusiasm and pride of the masses. The sense of belonging and stability gained in the organization has also “played a role in overcoming the traditional laxity of Chinese people and cultivating the collective spirit of the people”.²⁵ Particularly importantly, the unit was set up with party organization as its core. The network of party organization was deeply rooted in every basic unit organization, which played an important role in educating and mobilizing workers. Wei Angde pointed out that the stability of the workforce and stability of the party organization system in grass-roots units was an important basis for mass mobilization. Within the unit, through the movement of rationalization of the proposals and the new records, workers’ sense of master was cultivated to mobilize the “bottom-up” revolutionary forces. Another feature of unit was the overlap of the community and the workplace, which not only was conducive to the convenience of life, but more importantly, greatly enhanced the unit members’ sense of belonging to enhance their mobilization. Social mobilization was the core function of urban unit system. “Regardless of the nature of their social division of labor and their professional function, every social organization that served as a unit had an administrative lineage and hierarchy and was subordinate to the executive branch of the government according to this relationship... Party and state policies, planning targets and administrative orders were sent in accordance with administrative subordination relations to each unit, and then implemented to the whole society through the specific implementation of the units”.²⁶

²⁵Yipeng [11].

²⁶Feng [10].

However, since all the needs of the unit members must rely on the unit to provide, and outside the unit there did not exist other sources to meet the needs, a serious economic dependence was developed between units and its members. In addition, because the unit was not only an economic organization but also a political organization, a variety of political organizations (such as party organizations) and units overlap, the members of the units must also be attached to the political unit. At the same time, in the specific allocation of resources and work, the unit members gradually developed direct attachment to the supervisors in the units. The result was a “reciprocal” model and a “subculture characterized by pragmatic personal relationships as a channel for workers to pursue their own interests in an individual way.” By the mid-sixties, there had been considerable development in the sub-cultural direction of the stable reciprocal model and pragmatic private relations in Chinese society”.²⁷ This kind of reciprocal relationship model and private relations network, Wei Angde called it “neo-traditionalism” factor embedded in the unit mobilization system, and he believes that the unit type of political mobilization system will inevitably lead to the development of private relations. As long as there is a system of incentives for resource dependency and politicization of units, the unit system may lead its members to meticulous calculation and political indifference.

2. Neighborhood Committee

After taking over the cities, The Communist Party of China first announced the abolition of the Bao-Jia system, the complete destruction of the old community authority, and the establishment of their own grass-roots organizations. In the face of “unorganized residents” such as street vendors, businessmen, freelancers and housewives, how to organize them for effective political mobilization and to solve the basic welfare problems of the residents was an important problem in the urban work. Even in industrial and commercial cities like Shanghai, these “unorganized residents” still accounted for 40% before the Great Leap Forward. In about 1952, on the basis of various temporary groups, many cities established their neighborhood organizations independently. On December 31 of 1954, the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress passed the “Regulations on the Organization of Urban Neighborhood Committees”, which finally stipulated the name, location and work content of the neighborhood committees. After the establishment of the neighborhood committee, in order to further purify and standardize the organization, and to ensure that the leadership of working class in the neighborhood, members of the neighborhood were cleaned up several times in accordance with the class identity. Since it was not realistic for the working class to do the work of the neighborhood committee, “family members of workers” dominated in the members of neighborhood committee.

Since the establishment of the neighborhood committee, it has been labeled as the “mass self-autonomy organizations.” In Shanghai, in the earliest neighborhood

²⁷Walder [12].

committee, “the Interim Measures for the Organization of Shanghai Neighborhood Committee (1953)”, pointed out that “there is a need to establish an organization to organize residents so that they who do not directly participate in the production, have the opportunity to self-education, work together to solve the problem of public welfare, keep close the relationship of government and residents, and assist and support the government to carry out the work to the residents. This organization is the neighborhood committee.” In 1953, Peng Zhen pointed out in “the Report on the Organization and Funding Issues for The Sub-district Office and The Neighborhood Committee” that the neighborhood committees must be established and it was autonomous organizations of the masses, not political organizations, nor the grass-root regime.” In 1960–1962, after the Great Leap Forward, there was a short period of urban communes in which the neighborhood committees became the grass-roots organizations of the urban people’s communes. However, in the afterward adjustment and rectification, its nature of “autonomous organizations” was once again affirmed. In August 1962, the paper of enlarged discussion in Shanghai Municipal Standing Committee pointed out that “the neighborhood committee is still basically a mass autonomous organization, but in practice it plays some role in the administrative organization”, so it was required that the administrative departments should directly handle their own affairs rather than deliver to the neighborhood committee. The nature of “mass autonomous organizations” of the neighborhood committee did not change even during “Cultural Revolution”, though the name of which was changed to “Revolutionary Resident Committee” or “Street Revolutionary Committee”. Based on the political legitimacy of “mass line” and “mass autonomy”, the attribute of “mass autonomous organizations” could not be changed, no matter how the external environment changed.

As “mass autonomous organizations”, to closely contact the masses and mobilize the masses to participate in various mass movements would become the natural responsibility of the neighborhood. According to a survey conducted in 1952 by an ordinary neighborhood committee in Jiu’an, 80% of the work of the neighborhood committee was the mass movement and 20% was the daily work”. The mass movements included air raid warning and winter precaution in 1950, the Donation for Korean War, the Constituting of Patriotic Convention, the May Day March, and the National Day Celebration in 1951, “the Three-anti and Five-anti Campaigns”, the Patriotic Health Campaign, Reforming the old police, Prohibition of Opium and Gambling, Judicial Reform, Registration of Labor Employment, etc. in 1952. The Daily work includes welfare, provision of preferential treatment for families of army-men and martyrs, culture and education, health, mediation, law and order, and so on.²⁸ In the post-1962 economic adjustment, the central government decided to devolve 20 million people to rural areas. After 1968, the central government mobilized a large number of educated youth to go to the countryside. In this way, in the process of “to be on call at any instant” the process, the neighborhood committees took a lot of work on mobilization and organization.

²⁸Minzheng and Shengli [13].

However, the tension and sway between “mass autonomous organizations” and “quasi-administrative organizations” was a problem that has been faced since the appearance of neighborhood committees. In practice, the neighborhood committee was not only the mass autonomous organization, since its establishment; to assist government on a variety of administrative affairs has become its main work. Scholars’ research shows that “work of the Committee which was mainly on the political and administrative affairs supplemented by welfare of the residents did not start from the Great Leap Forward, nor began after reform, but began as it was established”.²⁹ The neighborhood committee, as the most basic unit in the urban governance structure, undertook a great deal of informational work, ranging from “surveying residents’ commodities” to “savings, literacy, pregnancy, housing, collective registered residence, temporary residence permit, retired workers, People’s health, children’s schooling, winter clothes, fodder, nutrition, panic purchase, and other wide range of situations. At the same time it also bear a lot of work of proof by providing letters of identification.” According to a statistic in 1961, these certificates came from a total of sixty-three items of four major areas ranging from the finance and trade, culture, education, health, politics and law, to transportation and public utilities.³⁰ From birth to death, from eating to use, from marriage to funerals, from declaring accounts to medical expenses, from the exchange of houses to buying car tickets, from dealing with a dead pig to buying pig medicines, almost the people’s daily life problems have to come up with proof.” Information work was to aggregate individual information into the overall structure of the macro, work of proof was to give the macro social definition to each individual. These two important tasks were undertaken by the residents’ committee. In addition, the establishment of the specific offices in the neighborhood committees had a corresponding association with the government departments. For example, as an important institution in the neighborhood committee, the security office was under dual guidance by the neighborhood committee and the police station; the mediation office was subject to the dual committees and the court guidance.

3. People’s Organizations and Social Organizations

The whole process of dealing with old societies in People’s Republic of China can be summed up in two aspects: first, the establishment of new people’s organizations (such as trade unions, chambers of commerce and industry associations) to replace and take over the old trade unions, old chambers of commerce and trade associations; Second, guidance and clean-up of social groups on welfare affairs as well as the establishment of national welfare system.³¹

For a variety of charitable organizations, associations, clubs and other welfare organizations, the Government’s policy was to allow its existence, at the same time to carry out rectification and transformation. In 1951, according to “the Central

²⁹Shengli and Mingzheng [14].

³⁰Shengli and Mingzheng [15].

³¹Shengli [16].

Committee's Guidelines for the Registration of Social Organizations in Shanghai (draft)", the association was designated as a feudal group, but at the same time it stipulated that "organized activities, property and undertakings should be transformed on the basis of the original to make a new democratic society welfare undertakings". In 1957, the Ministry of the Interior pointed out in "The Registration of Social Groups": "the basic policy to deal with the association and clubs for townsmen is to unite the progressive elements and decent people of them and to rectify and transform it to an organization public service".³² Although the government had not banned the old welfare organizations, these organizations gradually lost their social basis in the new social situation. Changes in the situation discredited members, and the money to donate and the economic sources of these organizations fell sharply. In addition, such organizations were generally considered to have a strong feudal color, the person in charge of the organization was not in line with the new social order of class composition. So the political legitimacy of it was challenged. In this case, these organizations either recognized the situation and took the initiative to end their organization, or were forced to cease activities due to the exhaustion of the economic support.

The first ended Townsmen Association in Shanghai: Pudong Townsmen Association

Pudong Townsmen Association was founded in January in 1932, when the membership of it was up to 2 million people. Pudong Hospital, Chinese and Western medical clinics, Pudong First, Second Child Care Centers were under its administration. In addition, there were funds for cold and disaster relief, street shelter, fund-raising support for the anti-Japanese and refugees and other temporary relief work. In October 1952, Pudong Townsmen Association requested Shanghai Relief Association on "direct management in order to better serve the community". It claimed that members of the committee had already realized that "the association is the product of a feudal society. In the new society, there should be no such institutions, both in ideology and work, which should be completely changed and to bring people's property into the people for the public. Therefore, in the previous year, in accordance with the instructions of Standing Committee member Huang Yanpei, the Deputy Prime Minister and steps of all members, internal and external work was being gradually improved, the requirements were facing the public. But that was not enough. "Now everyone unanimously recognized that" in the new society there should not be the feudal sense and regional concept." "We should also see the great achievements of all the new societies under the leadership of the Communist Party and the People's Government, and we hope to speed up our access to the bright future of socialism, and so we are asking for direct administration by the club." On November 18, 1952, the request was approved.

Source: Guo Shengli: "The dual logic of revolution and state: the evolution of urban social space—Annihilation of Shanghai Social Groups in the early Liberation

³²Ibid. Shengli [16].

Period”, “Journal of East China University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition), Issue 1, 2010.

The Chinese Communist Party has always attached importance to social groups which has nature of the interests of representatives and political participation, and regarded them as a united front and an important part of the formation of democratic coalition government. In October 1947, Mao Zedong put forward in the “Declaration of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army”: “Unite the workers, peasants and soldiers, the oppressed classes, the people’s organizations, the democratic parties, ethnic minorities, overseas Chinese and other patriotic elements to form the national united front, fight against Chiang Kai-shek dictatorship, and establish democratic coalition government. Before the founding of People’s Republic of China, in order for the organizational preparation to convene a new political consultative conference, a number of people’s organizations were established or prepared to establish. In August 1948, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions was restored. From March to July in 1949, the All-China Student Federation, the All-China Democratic Woman’s Federation, the Chinese New Democratic Youth League, the All-China Democratic Youth League and the All-China Federation of Literary and Art were established. National preparatory committees for professionals in natural science, social science, educators, journalists and other organizations were also established. In 1951, the Ministry of the Interior of the Central People’s Government published “the Detailed Rules for the Implementation of Interim Measures for the Registration of Social Organizations”, in which people’s organizations was clearly defined as “social organizations that engage in a great deal of social activities for people’s sake”. In 1953, the All China Federation of Industry and Commerce was established. In 1956, the National Federation of returned overseas Chinese was established. Political nature was the most important attribute of people’s organizations. People’s organizations were an important part of the patriotic united front, an organic part of the socialist political system, and a bridge and link between the Party and the government and the people. The state decided basic functions of the people’s organizations approved their institutions, allocated funds, and they were under the leadership of the party committees under the same level. In 1958, in Chengdu Work Conference of CPC Central Committee adopted the “Views on the Labor Union Organizations”, the labor unions at all levels should be under the leadership of party at the same level as well as higher-level trade union.

Labor Union Reform in the Early Period of People’s Republic of China

On the eve of the founding of People’s Republic of China, the National Federation of Labor Unions, led by the Chinese Communist Party, convened a national labor union work conference from July to August in 1949. In this conference, the Chinese Labor Association and the National Federation of Labor Unions combined to achieve the organizational unity of the Chinese trade labor

movement. The conference called for a nationwide, especially in key cities, development of labor unions and against the appointment system and phenomenon of taking on what ought to be done by others in the work of labor unions. Li Lisan pointed out: "One of the most serious problems now was that the labor unions did not represent all workers. There were three problems, appointments, orders and arrangements; so that the workers thought that the labor unions represented the Communist Party, not everyone. In Beijing, this issue was most serious. The cadres were assigned by higher organization, so that workers did not regard labor unions as their own. Such labor unions were false. Since it was official, people do not dare to go against it. This was what we had been used to in the past."

However, shortly after the founding of People's Republic of China, in the party there was a fierce debate on the role of the labor unions. The debate was ended by criticism of the controversy on Li Lisan "economism" and "syndicalism". On December 22, 1951, the enlarged meeting of party of All China Federation of Trade Union adopted the "Resolution on the work of the National Federation of Trade Unions." While affirming the great achievements made in the work of the national trade unions in the past three years, the resolution stressed that the leadership work of the ACFTU made three major mistakes. The first major mistake related to the fundamental policy of the work of labor unions, which did not street the unanimity of public and private interests, but the contradictions of public and private interests, and lead to narrow economism. The second major mistake related to the relationship between labor unions and the Party. Li Lisan's leadership was leading the labor unions to leave the leadership of the Communist Party, which was a serious syndical mistake. The third mistake is about the working method was subjective which was divorced from reality and the masses. Li Lisan was removed from All China Federation of Trade Unions, and the labor union reform designed and promoted by him was therefore stopped. The criticism of Li Lisan brought far-reaching negative effects to the work of labor unions in the future. "Economism" and "syndicalism" hooped the minds of labor union cadres, which led to the shrinking of function of labor unions. Since then, the main task of the work of labor unions limited to production as the center, and combined production, life, and education together, which can not play a role to protect the material interests and democratic rights of workers. After the completion of the socialist transformation, the theory of "union demise" was even put forward. At the climax of the Great Leap Forward in 1958, the ACFTU even proposed revocation of labor union programs at the county and sub-county levels, which led to suspense or withdrawal of a large number of labor unions.

Material Resource: You Zhenglin: "60 Years of China's Three Major Labor Union Reform", "Sociological Research", No. 4, 2010; Wang Shaoguang: "Political Culture and Social Structure of Political Participation", "Journal of Tsinghua University" (Philosophy and Social Science), No. 4, 2008.

2.2.2 *The Establishment of Cooperatives and People's Communes*

After the land reform was completed, the rural basic social organization was the family and the village, and the local party organization began to enter the countryside. Compared with cities, family organizations and village organizations played a more important role in traditional society, so the reshaping of rural basic social organizations has experienced more ups and downs and turbulence.

In the early 1950s, labor unions had developed to some extent in the old liberated areas after the land reform. In December 1951, “CPC Central Committee on agricultural production cooperation and resolution” issued to the local party organizations and officially announced in March 1953 proposed that in the process of agricultural cooperation “two kinds of enthusiasm” should be paid attention to. The resolution pointed out that enthusiasm of production of Chinese peasants mobilized on the basis of land reform manifested in two aspects: one was the enthusiasm in individual economy; the other was the enthusiasm in mutual assistance. “Resolution” clearly determined that the only way was that the party guided the farmers develop collective economy from the individual economy gradually, but in practice, farmers’ private property should not be prematurely unduly denied. But the need for nation-building quickly changed the emphasis on “two enthusiasms”. In December 1953, after the tensions of grain market and the implementation of grain purchase and marketing system, only 9 months after the announcement of the previous resolution, the central government issued “Resolution on the Development of Agricultural Production Cooperatives.” Unlike the previous guidelines which emphasized the “two enthusiasms”, the new “resolution” considered that primary societies had shown superiority and could be the appropriate form of guidance for the peasantry to the transition to high fully socialist society, which was increasingly becoming an important part to move forward the party-led Cooperative Movement. In the aforementioned two “resolutions”, mutual cooperation stressed then was still to serve the agricultural production, “mutual cooperation functioned well or not fundamentally depended on whether it can increase production”.³³

However, in addition to agricultural production itself, the restructuring of rural society itself has also been concerned by leaders of the party. Mao Zedong pointed out in 1955 in “the Issue of Agricultural Co-operation”, “now there exists in the rural area the rich peasant capitalism ownership and a great deal of individual peasants ownership.” It was on the basis of such judgment and concern that the spirit of the cooperative movement shifted from the initial “serve to agriculture” and “two kinds of enthusiasms,” to a “mass movement” of encouraging and inspiring “the peasants’ initiative of socialism”. This was the basic reason for the rapid development of the cooperative movement after 1955. In the summer of 1955,

³³Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee, *The Seventy-Year History of The Communist Party of China*, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

Deng Zigui's central rural work was criticized as "rightist" by Mao Zedong because he proposed it should not develop too fast in the development of cooperative movement. He was criticized to be "from the point of view of bourgeois, rich peasants or rich middle peasants with spontaneous tendencies of capitalism". In such a political atmosphere, the process of agricultural cooperative movement formed a violent wave of ultra-high-speed development. By the end of 1956, the number of farmers who joined the cooperatives reached 96.3% of the total number of rural households in the country, among which 87.8% of the total households were in the high-level society.³⁴

In the context of the "Great Leap Forward" Movement, the scale of cooperation was growing. In August 1958, the Beidaihe Conference of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPC made the "Resolution on the Establishment of People's Communes in the Countryside" cleared that "the people's commune should be the basic policy to speed up the construction of socialism, to realize the socialism in advance and to transit to communism", and proposed that the people's communes achieved the transition to ownership of the whole people in three or four years, or five or six years or in a longer time. After Beidaihe meeting, people's communes were everywhere in the countryside. By the end of 1958, the country's 740,000 agricultural cooperatives had been consolidated into 26,000 people's communes, and more than 99% of the peasant households had joined the communes. People's communes generally included the original dozens or even hundreds of cooperatives, and its characteristics were summarized as "large in size and collective in nature." The people's commune not only collected the means of production of the members, but also merged the cooperatives whose original economic conditions and levels were different. All the properties were turned over to the commune under unified accounting and unified distribution. This means that not only the rural family organizations have been hit, but also the traditional village organizational boundaries have been formally abolished.

The establishment of the people's commune system was a more thorough transformation of rural organizational system, and it was precisely because of this, conflict and problems arose in the process was more prominent than that of cooperation, and was finally shaped after several adjustments. The impact of the people's commune system on family and village organizations has created tensions between the party and government and the peasantry. In the face of the resulting catastrophic consequences of agricultural production, the central government carried out adjustment in guiding ideology. In the "Regulations on the Management System of the People's Commune (Draft)" adopted at the Zhengzhou Conference in February 1959, the production team was the basic accounting unit of the people's commune and the ownership of production team was the main foundation of the commune. This, to a certain extent, recognized the original boundaries of village

³⁴Ibid. Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee, *The Seventy-Year History of The Communist Party of China*, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

organizations. This adjustment was based on the mass line consistently adhered by CPC, “everything should be in accordance with the views of the masses, no matter what way, the need of the masses should be met. Otherwise things won’t work out”.³⁵ However, the anti-rightist struggle of the Lushan Conference in July 1959 set off a new upsurge in the Great Leap Forward, and there was a widespread use of the labor and financial resources of the production teams. Rural public canteens, as a help to “transition from socialism to communism” should be considered as a major event and should be performed in all over the country with no exception.

The commune system which went beyond the natural villages and broke the traditional rural social economic model led to greatly damage in agricultural economy and production. So the central government once again conducted a policy adjustment. In November 1960, the Central Committee issued an “Emergent Instruction Letter on the Current Policy of Rural People’s Commune” and reiterated that “the fundamental system of the people’s commune at this stage was ownership at three levels and the team as the foundation” and required strengthening the basic ownership of productive teams, performed a small portion of the ownership of the production squad and allowed members to operate small amounts of private plots and small-scale family sideline production. “Emergent instructions letter” was welcomed in practice by the grassroots cadres. On September 27 in 1962, the 10th Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China adopted the “Draft Amendments to the Work Regulations of Rural People’s Communes (the “Sixty Articles of Agriculture” for short)”, which affirmed the people’s communes as “grassroots units of China’s socialist society in rural areas, it was an economic as well as a political organization”. At the same time, it stressed that the rural people’s commune was a three-tiered collective ownership system based on a production team. It was a fundamental system implemented over a long period of time, for example, at least 30 years.

“The ‘Sixty Articles of Agriculture’ symbolized that the people’s commune system characterized by “three-tiered team-based collective ownership” was basically shaped. Some scholars pointed out that the people’s commune system was a special institutional model produced in special period which combined the new systemic design and traditional villages, “there existed integration between commune system and village traditions, and the integration can be basis for the development and stability of the commune; There also existed tension between the commune system and the village traditions which can provide justification for the necessity of an ongoing class struggle”.³⁶ First of all, in contrast to the change of organizational system, the living space and scenes were stable. After 1949, the restrictions on population mobility did not disintegrate but reinforce some features of rural society. Some basic elements of the traditional homeland remained intact

³⁵Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee, *The Seventy-Year History of The Communist Party of China*, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

³⁶Letian [4].

(patrilineal, patrilocal residence). “After 1949, the agricultural collectivization movement strengthened the traditional geographical factor, and gave the geographical factor with new significance.....The communes had allowed the former peasantry to continue to live together; they had a closer contact because of restrictions on the peasant’s going out; Since farmers in the team were mainly agricultural, with state controlling the market, they were more self-sufficient than their ancestors; Since farmers still had to deal with their own problems of life, the basic resources that they could mobilize were still their blood relatives, in-laws, neighborhoods”.³⁷ Secondly, although the new regime brought revolution to the old customs and habits, the customs linked to the families were still continuing. “In the life scenes created by the language and behavior of the actors, revolution and tradition were so intertwined that it was impossible to distinguish between them. The share between revolution and tradition, related to a variety of factors, including the depth of the revolution, different effects of revolution for different actors and the theme of the scene.”³⁸ “In addition, even in the heyday of the development of the people’s commune, the influence of families still existed to some extent, such as the role in the election of cadres, the distribution of benefits, factional struggle, and dispute resolution. Although some political movements aimed at using Mao Zedong’s thought to create a sense of trust in the government, the concrete practice tended to deepen the struggle among different families. In some areas, the excessive denial of traditional community identity and social relations led the villagers to look for a more independent identity and relationship, which would stimulate their enthusiasm for the reconstruction of ancestral halls.”³⁹

Although the people’s commune system contained some village traditions, more importantly it restructured rural organizational system. Land reform made the economic foundation of the rural clan—the public fields completely disappear, the mutual aid system built on the clan and the public field, the community joint system and local rituals thus completely declined. In addition, the power base of parents was directly impaired by the negligible amount of family property that parents can pass on to the next generation in the process of separation.⁴⁰ After cooperation and commune movement, the rural family system and village organizations were impacted in a greater degree. Yan Yunxiang in his study on “individualistic” culture of youth after the reform and opening up pointed out that this culture did not emerge overnight in the reform era, but through a gradual and long-term process that began with land reform and developed during the collective period. The state played a decisive role in this: young people became the main body in various political organizations; Collective production broadened the social space for young people; Work points system cultivated individual identical consciousness; Gradual popularization in education brought more opportunities to young people in

³⁷Letian [17].

³⁸Letian [17].

³⁹Mingming [18].

⁴⁰Yunxiang [19].

activities with fellows; And the Marriage Law gave young people independent right to choose their spouse.⁴¹

The establishment and disappearance of peasant association

Before 1949, peasant associations had been established in the vast rural areas of the old and new liberated areas. Before 1950, “only in Eastern and Central South regions in China, farmer associations had 24 million members.” In July 1950, the State Council approved and promulgated the “General Principles of Farmers’ Associations”, which stipulated that the nature of peasant associations was “mass organizations of peasants’ voluntary integration” and called for the establishment of peasant associations at all levels except the central government (township, county, special district, province, and Greater Administrative District). The peasant association at that time was an organization that contained middle peasants and rich peasants, instead of the poor peasant associations and hired labor unions set up in some liberated areas (especially in the northeast liberated areas) during the war of liberation. But the main leaders of the peasant associations were selected among the poor peasants. In order to unite the middle peasants, it was also put forward that it was required that middle peasants made up one-third of the leading members in the peasant associations. As for the function of the peasant association, the General Principles provided that “according to the *Land Reform Law* of the People’s Republic of China, the peasant association was the lawful executing organ of the reform of the land system in the countryside”. After the implementation of the General Principles, peasants’ associations were established in the countryside. The peasants’ association played an important role in the land reform, the organization of rural production, the protection of peasants’ enjoyment of political power, and so on, and set a high prestige. It was also through the peasant associations that poor peasants had mastered rural power and became masters of the countryside. The first two years of the 1950s were probably the most prosperous period for peasant associations since the Great Revolution. However, due to its strong characteristics of grassroots political power, with the land reform review in the spring of 1953 ended, and then rural political institutions gradually formed, the backbones of original grassroots peasant association, mostly became village and township cadres. In spring of 1954, after the general election, the township people’s congress was generally established, and replaced the original peasant association; the peasant association below township level was replaced by the village government. Since then, in the rural political arena, peasants associations disappeared. Until 1963, after the beginning of the rural socialism education movement, the poor and lower-middle peasant associations reappeared, and they existed until the early 1980 s, and disappeared along with the people’s commune.

Material Source: Wang Shaoguang: “the Impact of Political Culture and Social Structure on Political Participation”, in *Journal of Tsinghua University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, No. 4, 2008.

⁴¹Yunxiang [19].

2.2.3 *Concentration of Resources and Unity of Interests*

In the process of organizational remodeling, an important issue was how to maintain the cohesion of the organization to ensure incentives of members of the organization. One of the main sources of cohesion in the unit system and people's commune system was its centralized control over resources. Central control of resources was the basic prerequisite for the operation of unit system and people's commune system. "As organizations and units did not have their own resources, they could only allocate resources to their members in lieu of the country's established standards, and lacked the capacity to self-develop and meet the needs of its members. In order to achieve the purpose of development, the only means was to complete the tasks assigned by higher authorities excellently to improve their status in the social administrative hierarchy and be rewarded".⁴² The state's control over "scarce resources" was a prerequisite for "mass mobilization". "The mobilization capacity of the country's resources... in turn promoted the social mobilization capacity of the state, which, when the right to control almost all the basic consuming livelihood materials was in the hands of the state, the social mobilization capacity characterized by administrative means was also greatly improved invisibly".⁴³

As early as spring of 1950, Gao Gang announced in the Northeast Bureau that the payment and purchase of agricultural loans, new farm tools, seed and model workers' reward should be preferential to those who took part in the cooperation; In some areas of Northeast Songjiang Province it was even simply provided that single-household was not given loans, tools, and the cooperatives did not sell things.⁴⁴ A survey of rural areas in Northern Zhejiang showed that most of the loans granted by the government were lent to cooperatives; farmers with proof of mutual cooperation organizations were given special care whether they went to supply and marketing with cooperatives or bought agricultural products.⁴⁵ In 1953, in order to meet the demand for grain for industrialization, the central government made a decision on implementing the planned purchase and planned supply of grain (referred to as unified purchase and marketing) in rural areas and rationing in cities and strictly controlled private business. It was necessary to implement the unified purchase and marketing of grain, to approve surplus household grain, to mobilize all households for sale and to deal with hundreds of millions of peasants directly. This was very complicated and need to mobilize collectivized society. In 1953, after the introduction of the grain purchase and marketing policy, the middle peasants and rich peasants who did not participate in the cooperatives had higher grain purchase amount than the cooperative members. In rural Zhejiang, cadres in order to encourage farmers to join the club, openly declared: "taking part in the

⁴²Liping [1].

⁴³Ning [9].

⁴⁴Yibo [20].

⁴⁵Shuji [7].

community can be attributed to less food procurement tasks, otherwise will be attributed more”.⁴⁶ This control of “scarce resources” was both a prerequisite for successful social mobilization and a consequence of the constant accumulation of social mobilization.

After the establishment of the State Planning Commission in 1953, a unified allocation system of important materials was performed nationwide. Various materials were divided into: (1) the unified distribution of materials (referred to as the central allocation of materials); (2) the materials allocated by the central industrial authority (referred to as the industrial materials by central authority); (3) materials under local management (referred to as three types of materials) and other three categories of local management. From 1953 to 1957, the number of industrial products directly allocated by the State Planning Commission increased from 110 to 300, accounting for 60% of the total industrial output value, the materials allocated by the central industrial authority increased from 227 to 532, which symbolized the realization of country’s direct allocation of necessary materials for economic construction.⁴⁷ A unified distribution system for resources directly led to the formation of the unit system. In unit system, the state had full ownership and control of a variety of social resources, and instead of directly distributing these resources to the unit members, the state distributed the resources through the unit to achieve this distribution process. With the concentration of resources, there were also strict controls on population movements. In 1951, the Ministry of Public Security promulgated the “Temporary Regulations on the Management of Urban Houses”. A management system for urban Registered Permanent Residence was unified nationwide. In 1955, the State Council promulgated the “Directive on the Establishment of a System for Registered Permanent Residence, which stipulated that all cities, towns and villages in the country should establish a household registration system and unify the registration of urban and rural households; In 1958, the “Regulations Registered Permanent Residence for People’s Republic of China” was promulgated which set legal restrictions on rural population into the city. The implementation of the household registration system strictly controlled free movement of people between urban and rural areas.

Another source of organizational cohesion was the emphasis on the unity of national interests and individual interests. Organizational remodeling made the concept of individual interests and national interests docked. “It was an unusual policy by CPC regime to inform the peasantry of the country’s plans and prospects for development through the means of the meeting, which no previous government had ever had such an act”.⁴⁸ Through conveying documents in different levels, members of society believed that everyone’s happy life was closely linked with the prosperity of the country; Everyone’s daily life was closely related to the national economic construction; each person’s specific work was “in line with the national

⁴⁶Yibo [20].

⁴⁷Yifu [21].

⁴⁸Shuji [7].

economic construction”, which aimed at more ambitious goals and making contributions. To achieve their own interests (whether real or long-term interests), one must obey the interests of the whole, keep up with the development of the situation, and change the status quo. In this process, national development and personal life were closely linked from interests and values point of view. With the development of the first five-year plan and the publicity in the countryside, “the distance between the state and the peasants was so close, direct and vivid.” Farmers saw their own interests in the country’s future, or the state’s prospects included the interests of farmers. The new national image was thus shaped: the state was the representative of the interests of farmers, the countryside was designers for a better future; farmers were the masters of the country, and constructors of socialist country and modern agricultural”.⁴⁹ The national interest represented the real and future interests of the people, and it was far more visionary and wise for the realization of such interests; The reason why a few people conflicted with the interests of the whole was because they were “hostile class”, or even though not belong to “hostile class”, they were lack of “class consciousness” and had a backward “small farmer consciousness. Although in the actual work, balance and coordination of “individual interests and collective interests”, “collective interests and national interests”, and “current and long-term interests” continued to be emphasized, based on the fundamental identity of these interests, the collective interests, national interests, long-term interests were the most in need of consideration. Not only national interests and personal interests were highly uniform and integrated, interests of different social groups and different parts should also be highly unified and integrated. Such a national commitment to the future well-being of life and a better blueprint, together with the elimination of exploitation system in reality, the implementation of various welfare systems, and the protection of life-long employment, constituted a “sacred incentive mechanism”.⁵⁰ It was in such an incentive mechanism, members of the community due to sense of thanksgiving were developed into “dedication culture” of working hard and resisting consumption.

Of course, in fact the identity of interests could not be fully realized. A case study of the process of cooperation showed that grassroots cadres and farmers would adopt various approaches to protect their basic interests in planning. For example, when rural cadres formulated their planning output of crops, “the more important the crops were, the more carefully they planed their output in accordance with the importance of crop production”.⁵¹ The study of the people’s commune showed that “peasants lived in the communes, but instead of considering communes, they always considered the interests of their family, honor and disgrace of their family, reproduction of their family, and development of their family. The competition between families of the farmers in the countryside at all times stimulated farmers to work hard for their family. When collective system was almost

⁴⁹Ibid. Shuji [7].

⁵⁰Ning [9].

⁵¹Shuji [7].

recognized as the socialist system, farmers in the production team also regulated their own behavior”.⁵² In addition, the important mobilization of farmers in the production team to protect the collective interests was motivated by traditional values. “In the production team, behavior of damaging or supporting their team was a coin with double sides, which was the traditional expression of the dual values of farmers. Production team was made up of relatives, neighbors, friends, and acquaintances. After the implementation of collective accounting with the production team as an unit, the farmers found their interests of the family in such a collective team”.⁵³ In both the countryside and the cities, there were a variety of spontaneous self-interest protections for the policy.

The premise of “sacred incentive mechanism” was national commitment to achieve the sanctity and the maintenance of holiness of goals. However, with the completely abolishment of bonus system in 1965 and the long-term freezing of wages (1963–1977), the living standards of majority of workers tended to decline, the housing problem also tended to deteriorate, and the phenomenon of “getting in by the backdoor” began to spread. What’s more, frequent political movement led to growing loss of charm of the original sacred ideals and goals, the aforementioned “sacred incentive mechanism” began to fail, and the search for new incentive mechanism has become the starting point of reform and opening up.⁵⁴

2.3 Movement: Promoting Work and Resolving Contradictions

After the founding of People’s Republic of China, the Mass Line was still adhered to by the Chinese Communist Party as the working line consistently. In his report on “Revising the Constitution of the Party”, Deng Xiaoping put forward: “in contrast to the political parties of the bourgeoisie, the party of working-class does not regard the masses as its own tools, but consciously determines that it is a tool for people to complete a specific historical task in specific historical period.” Mass movement was an important way for the Communist Party of China to carry out social transformation during the revolutionary period. The approach of mass movement was closely linked to the goal of social transformation, which was one of the party’s most important work experiences. But after the founding of People’s Republic of China, the Mass Movement was not only a way to carry out social transformation, but also gradually became a normal way to solve various social problems.

After the founding of People’s Republic of China, the Mass Movement during the period of socialist construction and that in the revolutionary period was both

⁵²Letian [17].

⁵³Ibib. Letian [17].

⁵⁴Ning [9].

related in essence and different in its approach. In the socialist construction, through the Mass Movement, the specific practices of the masses at grassroots level were selectively incorporated into the national policy system, as the embodiment of the masses' vitality and enthusiasm, and then pushed work at basic level with class struggle and organizational system. In such a process of promoting work, to enhance the class consciousness and way of thinking of the cadres and the masses was considered an important way to solve the relationship between the state and the public. And the organizational system with party organizational system as the core, unit system and the people's commune system as the main body enabled the Mass Movement to spread rapidly. However, the Mass Movement not only had the function of promoting work, it also had functions of resolving conflicts that may occur in practice between the state and the people. Whenever there was a mistake in concrete practice of state policy, such mistakes could usually be attributed to the neglect of voluntary of the masses and the overestimation of the mass consciousness. By respecting voluntary of the masses, the contradictions and conflicts existed in practice could be partially resolved, and the work of errors to a certain extent, could be corrected. In the dialectical relationship between these two functions, the Mass Movement became the only way to speed up socialist construction and give full play to the enthusiasm of the people in socialism.

2.3.1 "To Play the Enthusiasm of the Masses"

After the founding of People's Republic of China, in order to consolidate the regime and perform in-depth social change, the Chinese Communist Party launched a series of mass movements, such as "Three Anti and Five Anti Movement", "ideological transformation movement of intellectuals" and so on. However, the basic way of carrying out socialist construction in the way of Mass Movement was highlighted for the first time in the process of rural cooperatives.

In the spring of 1955, the rural cooperative system was stabilized. Under the leadership of Deng Zihui, the Central Rural Work Department put forward plans to increase the number of agricultural cooperatives from 650,000 to 1 million by the spring of 1956. The development of cooperatives should not be too fast. Current cooperatives should be consolidated, which could lie the foundation for the next development. However, according to the experience of southern inspection, Mao Zedong believed that the process of cooperation should be promoted rapidly, requiring the number of cooperatives to develop to 1.3 million within one year. Mao further argued that some leaders and cadres had lagged behind the masses, and used Mass Line to exert pressure on comrades with different opinions in the Party. At the Meeting of the Party Secretary of the CPC Central Committee in July 1955, Mao Zedong made a report on the issue of "Agricultural Cooperativization" and pointed out: "In the rural areas, the new socialist Mass Movement climaxes is coming. The rapid advancement of certain grassroots organizations in the process of cooperation is the proof of great enthusiasm among the masses, and it is only

through such affirmation that the cooperation could be promoted in a more comprehensive and rapid manner.

In the course of socialist construction, the important characteristic of the Mass Movement was that the importance attached to the positivity of the masses was at the same time associated with class position and class-consciousness. Turning a blind eye to this enthusiasm was not only a manifestation of divorce from the masses, but also a question of the class position and the divergence of the two lines. At the time of the new climax of Mass Movement, people who turn a blind eye to the movement were insisting on the wrong approach. In such a situation of class-consciousness and mass position, the newly established grassroots organizations had to redeploy the cooperative movement, and agricultural cooperatives developed rapidly. The propaganda and other aspects of strong work was an important technical means for Mass Movement. Grassroots work constantly invented the “setting an example”, “holding the meeting”, “visiting the advanced”, “attacking the bunker” and other means, which made the abstract movement intention to reality, and then implemented to each specific person. The working team model, which was often seen in the Mass Movement, even thought that the grassroots organizations were still not deep enough to enter the grassroots units in the form of working team, which realized replacement and interference with grassroots power so as to mobilize the masses in greater depth. In such a situation, the masses even though took their rational weighing on the cost-benefit basis, often actively involved and supported the campaign.⁵⁵ For example, poor and middle peasants had the “free-rider” mentality of achieving equalitarianism in the process of co-operation due to the shortage of their means of production, while rich middle peasants and rich peasants had “self-protection” mentality in the face of various policy and political pressures. It was under the influence of these factors, after the Mass Movement started, the ultra-high-speed development had always be formed. In 1955, in “On the Issue of Agricultural Cooperation”, Mao Zedong still affirmed “the Plan to Basically Complete the Agricultural Cooperation in Eighteen Years”, still affirmed to take a progressive, low-to-high approach and still affirmed to control the number of development cooperatives in accordance with the actual situation. But the wave of Mass Movement, made cooperation suddenly completed within a few months. The rapid advancement of the cooperative movement had far exceeded Mao’s own estimates.

This rapid development of the situation itself became the best proof of “socialist initiative” of the masses. In 1955, Mao Zedong personally presided over the selection of the “socialist climax of China’s rural areas,” which he collected 176 articles that could reflect the regional agricultural co-operatives. These grassroots experiences and grassroots typical collections, although selective, may be the best proof of the existence of “mass initiative”. Mao Zedong wrote in the preface: “Now the climax of socialist transformation has emerged in rural areas, and the crowd rejoiced. This gave a profound lesson to all Communists: Why did the masses hold

⁵⁵Xiaohong [8].

such a great enthusiasm for socialism and why did they not feel or feel as few as many leaders did in a few months ago? What do the leaders want to do with what the masses think, and why are they so inconsistent? As a lesson, then, in the future for similar incidents and problems, how should we deal with it? Answer is only one sentence, that is, not from the masses, to be good at finding the essence of enthusiasm of the masses.” Therefore, the development of Mass Movement in the process of socialist construction showed the repeatedly loop hardening logic of “rapid promotion was the proof of the existence of enthusiasm and the existence of enthusiasm was the proof rapid promotion”.

In the Mass Movement of socialist construction, “people’s enthusiasm” was not only an objective reality, but also a subjective existence that needed to be “discovered” in certain class-consciousness and class position. This initiative itself could not be understood only as the expression and voice of interests of the masses, because the masses also had backwardness, it was necessary to give effective identification between the backwardness and enthusiasm of the masses.⁵⁶ Mass movement therefore had a deeper enlightenment and the significance of ideological education. The Mass Movement was not only a process of mobilizing the masses to carry out socialist construction, but also a process of educating both the masses and the cadres at the ideological level. Both the masses and the cadres were educated. Only in such a dynamic ideological background could we understand the real operational mechanism of mass mobilization. Only then would the mutual transformation of “productive movement” and “disciplinary movement” take place.⁵⁷

The class system of ideology and the integrated social organization system were the important prerequisites for the Mass Movement in the process of socialism construction. These elements made it possible to produce results quickly. But it was precisely because the Mass Movement was closely linked with the ideology of the class classification system, its operation was heavily dependent on the social organization system, so there was a Repeatedly loop hardening logic, namely “rapid promotion was the proof of the existence of enthusiasm and the existence of enthusiasm was the proof rapid promotion “. In such a case, even though there was little deviation in judgment of the senior leaders on “enthusiasm” and “backwardness” existed in the masses, it may cause a huge impact in practice. Such a logic embodied in the Mass Movement was not only reflected in the process of cooperation, but also gradually developed to the extreme in the course of the “Great Leap Forward” and the people’s commune movement, which eventually lead to the disastrous result to state and society.

⁵⁶In 1962, when Tian Jiaying reported to Ma Zedong on the situation that “the fixed output to households” was popular with the masses, Mao Zedong said that we need the Mass Line but sometimes, we should not listen to the masses all the time, for example, we should not do the fixed output to households as the masses requested. (Bo Yibo, *A Review of Several Major Decisions and Events(II)*, The Central Party School Publishing House, 1991, p. 1084).

⁵⁷Shizheng [22].

2.3.2 *“Rely on Consciousness and Voluntary of Masses”*

The practice of socialist construction in the form of Mass Movement, such as the “Great Leap Forward” and the people’s commune movement, not only undermined the normal operation of the national economy, but also caused tension in grassroots social life among the people and the state’s grassroots cadres. But this error was proof of the importance of Mass Line. When socialist construction in the form of Mass Movement caused real harm, the theory and discourse of the experience of the conclusion was precisely the request to return to the more rigorous Mass Line, the result of which was the socialist construction practice was corrected to a certain degree. At the same time, the Mass Movement could be sustained under certain conditions, and the basic foundation would not be lost.

When the People’s Commune Movement reflected the problem of longing for transitioning to communism in the practice and the situation of “equal division in the people’s commune, transferring personal belongings for free, and recalling loans” caused panic in farmers, Mao Zedong in March 1959 in the “Party Communication” immediately stressed: “in any case, we must act in accordance with the opinions of the masses, and no matter what measures are taken, it will not work until the demands of the masses are met.” “We should always be concerned about the interests of the masses every day, and their own policies and measures must be suitable for the current level of awareness of the masses and the current urgent needs of the masses. Any violation of these two, will not work, we must fail.” The policy action of deviation from the masses, and beyond the level of public awareness must be corrected, and the most important way of correction was still similar to the Mass Movement, such as the nationwide struggle to “anti-Communist wind, blind command, pompous wind”.

After the “Great Leap Forward” had caused disastrous economic difficulty, in Expanded Central Work Conference of Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) (also called “Seven Thousands People Conference”) in the beginning of 1962, Liu Shaoqi pointed out: “if we had been fully in accordance with the views of the masses, fully carried forward the views of the masses in the past few years, and fully implemented democracy, and completely taken the Mass Line, there were many mistakes that would not commit, even if committed, could also be found early. In his “Report on the Expanded Central Work Conference”, Liu Shaoqi made a special discussion on the “Mass Line” and pointed out that “the Mass Movement must proceed from reality and must be based on the voluntary actions of the masses”, “All matters concerning the vital interests of the broad masses of the people must rely on the consciousness and voluntariness of the masses. We must neither overestimate the level of the masses’ consciousness nor estimate them too low”.⁵⁸ Liu Shaoqi also pointed out in particular that the Mass Movement was not the same as the Mass Line. The Mass Movement was not the only way to carry out the Mass Line. Without a mass basis, the so-called “Mass

⁵⁸Shaoqi [23].

Movement “based on coercive orders violated the Mass Line, which not only damaged the enthusiasm of the masses, but also undermined the party’s prestige. Only by respecting the voluntary actions of the masses could we unify the Mass Line and accomplish the tasks of the party and the state. Therefore, for the difficulties in practice, Liu Shaoqi demanded “Party organizations at all levels must seriously discuss what is the mass line.” All party members and cadres, who have not really understood the Mass Line of the Party, should learn from the beginning”.⁵⁹

The concept of the masses included both the need of enthusiasm in promoting and guiding, but also need to respect and rely on the voluntary. Emphasis on respecting the level of people’s consciousness and objective requirements, starting from the reality of the masses, would naturally be helpful to correct the aggressive movement at that time. However, under the urgent desire of the country to carry out social reform and socialist construction, under the condition that the Mass Movement was closely linked with the class ideology and the social organization system was integrated, this emphasis on the objective demands of the masses could not completely solve the existing problems in the process of Mass Movement in practice. The Mass Movement did not disappear in social life. On the contrary, in order to rekindle the enthusiasm of the masses and to allow the cadres to return to the Mass Line and respect the masses, the state resorted to the motive mechanism and movement mechanism of raising class consciousness. This developed into another form of mass movement, which was mobilizing the masses to correct the bureaucratic tendencies in the functioning of the state apparatus. Such a mass movement to raise cadres’ consciousness was directed at the cadres who could neither see the “enthusiasm” of the masses nor respect the “objective demands” of the masses.

2.3.3 “Accept Criticism of the Masses”

The cadre was an important node connecting the relationship between the state and the society. The role of the cadres was crucial in the process of the nation’s energizing society for social transformation. In the logic of the Mass Movement, whether to recognize the enthusiasm of the masses, or respect the voluntary nature of the masses, the ideological consciousness and work of cadres was closely related. Cadres were not only public servants who provided administrative services, but also leaders with political consciousness and the masses’ views. Therefore, to ensure that the state transformed the society smoothly and insisted on the sticking and carrying out of the Mass Line, it was necessary not only to raise the class consciousness of the masses, but also to raise the ranks of cadres without divorcing the masses and listening to the masses’ practical opinions. Especially in the prominent

⁵⁹Shaoqi [23].

social contradictions, the problem became increasingly apparent and prominent, the relationship between cadres and the masses of coordination was referred to an important position, and an important way to achieve this goal was still the Mass Movement. The Mass Movement was used as the basic form of correcting bureaucratic tendencies of cadres and relieving contradictions among the people.

In the autumn of 1956, faced with the complex contradictions and changes in the process of socialist transformation, there were some tensions in the domestic economic and political life. According to incomplete statistics, during half a year from September 1956 to March 1957, the country had a total of about more than ten thousand workers strikes, and more than ten thousand students strike petitions in rural areas. In the countryside, there was a wave of farmers retreat and food shortage in many areas.⁶⁰ Although the underlying causes of the contradictions could be complex, they were necessarily concentrated in the antagonism and conflict between the masses and the cadres. In April 1957, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) issued “the Directive on the Rectification Movement”, which required cadres to earnestly listen to the masses’ criticism and work hard to overcome the work style of detaching from the reality and the masses, to conduct a general and thorough opposition to bureaucracy, sectarianism and subjectivism. But as the rectification movement unfolded, the masses (especially intellectuals) appeared in all kinds of criticism were beyond the party’s original expectations. Mao Zedong judged contradictions had been beyond the “people’s internal contradictions” and became enemies contradictions. So in June, the movement quickly turned to the “anti-rightist” struggle. The consequences and effects of the expansion of anti-rightism were serious, and the enthusiasm of the intellectuals was badly hit.

Mass Movement was considered to be an effective way to resolve contradictions among the people (especially the contradictions between cadres and the masses), but in the end it made the contradictions among the people more intensified. On the one hand, the Mass Movement was still based on the class consciousness and class position, so any contradictions needed to be resolved within the framework of this interpretation, and many different types of contradictions were often reduced to ideological issues of class position and class consciousness, which led to intensification of the contradictions. On the other hand, the concept of the masses itself contained the dual implication of positivism and backwardness. The same event could often be interpreted as a manifestation of the masses’ enthusiasm or as a manifestation of the backwardness of the masses. Therefore, the interpretation of the mass criticism movement often became the key to the struggle, where the uncertainty associated with the ups and downs of the participants even intensified the contradictions. Under the premise of the social organization system, the Mass Movement could not make the contradictions in society digest and dissolve

⁶⁰Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee, *The Seventy-Year History of The Communist Party of China*, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

effectively in the social part and the basic level. On the contrary, it made the contradiction easily connected and globalized, and then influenced or even threatened the normal operation of organization system. At this time the country would strongly control and guide the movement to its opposite direction.

After the 10th Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in 1962, Mao Zedong put forward the “class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie exists throughout the historical period from capitalism to socialism.” The contradiction between the masses and the cadres in the masses’ criticism movement was replaced by the struggle between the proletariat and the “bourgeoisie”. In the subsequent “Four Clean-ups Movement” grassroots organizations and grassroots cadres were put aside. Instead, a large number of work teams were deployed to take root in series work methods. The work team approach was not only impossible to solve grassroots contradictions, but also exacerbated the problem of grassroots governance. At the beginning of 1965, Mao Zedong presided over the formulation of “Some Issues Raised at Present on Rural Socialism Education Movement”, the focus of “Four Clean-ups Movement” was to clean “those in power who took the capitalist road.” In the internal instructions, it was pointed out that “bureaucratic class and the working class and the poor and middle peasants are two sharp opposition classes.” Under the guidance of this kind of thought, the depth and breadth of the mass criticism movement were greatly improved, and the problems caused by it were exacerbated. In the words of the class line, the Mass Movement itself was inevitably intertwined with the struggle within the party, it was not only a way to deal with state-society relations, but also a strategy to deal with the internal struggle of the political system.

In the subsequent “Cultural Revolution”, the Mass Movement became the subject of repeated social life, and the paradox of Mass Movement logic was also fully apparent. Once the Mass Movement was launched, it led to overall and connected contradictions. The basic order of the socioeconomic was affected, and the personal freedom of the citizens was violated. At this point serious chaos can not but try to be bound, which led to the need for the restoration of the daily order, the movement itself was suppressed. When the Mass Movement was to be launched to produce certain effects, it must rely on a certain power operation, but once the Mass Movement was combined with the operation of power itself, there would be danger of bureaucratization. In the face of such problems, Mao Zedong proposed “Revolutionary Committee” as the power institution, which was composed of “leaders of revolutionary masses”, the local people’s Liberation Army garrison representatives, and revolutionary cadres”, but in fact “mostly military cadres presided over the work”.⁶¹

Mass Movement was considered to be an effective way to guide and inspire the enthusiasm of the masses to carry out socialist construction, but in the end it caused

⁶¹Director of the Party History Research Center of the CPC Central Committee, *The Seventy-Year History of The Communist Party of China*, Chinese Communist Party History Publishing House, 1991.

great damage to production and life of great damage; Mass Movement was considered to be an effective way to resolve contradictions among the people, especially the contradictions between cadres and the masses, but in the end it made the contradictions among the people more intensified; The Mass Movement was considered a panacea for overcoming bureaucracy, but in the end it was often associated with a power struggle between factions. In the frequent mass movements, the masses themselves were increasingly tired of the movement, even thought that “Mass Movement was the troubles of the masses”, so mass movement as a way of governance was no longer valid.

2.4 Conclusion

The logic of this period that dominated state-society relations was to achieve social integration through political integration through strong transformation and penetration of the social field. Looking back, this process both had a profound historical inevitability, but also full of hardships and twists and turns. Through class division, people involved in national politics in unprecedented ways, and the national politics and individual life, national development and individual interests in reality were highly and closely related. Through organizational reconstruction, people sincerely believed that their work and the country's prosperity were closely related in the sense of interest and value. Through various campaigns, the country's ability to mobilize social resources and people's identity and ownership of the country were greatly enhanced. At the same time, however, the expansion of state power to the social sphere with almost no restrictions had also played a counter-productive effect. The disjunction between the class discourse and the reality made the people confined the class discourse to the instrumental acceptance, but the acceptance on the rational and emotional level was gradually dissipated. The strict control and deep penetration of unit organizations and people's communes had hindered the initiative and creative development of individuals and social groups in many respects. They could not create effective incentives for public participation and could not eliminate in fact all kinds of widespread behaviors of self-interest seeking. Frequent mass movements caused great damage to the people's production and livelihood, intensified the contradictions among the people, and lost their prestige by joining forces with the factional power struggle. On the basis of social identity, organizational basis and operational mode, the “totalism” mode of the country's strong penetration and control of society was facing severe challenges, which was the basis for the adjustment of state-society relations after the reform and opening up.

References

1. Liping, S., Hansheng, W., Sibin, W., Bin, L., & Shanhua, Y. (1994). Changes in China's social structure since reform. *Social Sciences in China*, 2.
2. Dang, Z. (1994). *Chinese politics in the 20th century: From the perspective of macro history and micro action*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
3. Zongzhi, H. (2003). Rural class struggle in the Chinese revolution—from the land reform to the realistic and objective realities of the cultural revolution, Rural China (Vol. 2). The Commercial Press.
4. Letian, Z. (1998). *Farewell to the ideal: Research on the people's commune system*. Orient Publishing Center.
5. Hua, G. (2007). How to integrate the society in New China in the early 50s—A memoir of fifteen Men. *Leader*, 17.
6. Letian, Z. (2001). The incept and disintegration of state discourses: Class and class struggle in commune. *Sociological Study*, 6.
7. Shuji, C. (2008). The creation of the new national image—Based on the national discourse in the 1950s. *Journal of SJTU (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 16(3).
8. Xiaohong, Z. (2005). 1951–1958: The motive force of China's agricultural collectivization—social mobilization in the view of the relationship between state and society. In: Z. Xiaohong & X. Shuguang, (Eds.), *China studies (Spring 2005)*. Social Science Academic Press.
9. Ning, W. (2007). Consumption institutions, incentives to labor, and legitimacy resources: The change of institutional arrangements regarding consumer lives and laborer motivations in urban China. *Sociological Study*, 3.
10. Feng, L. (1989). Unit: A special form of social organization. *Social Sciences in China*, 1.
11. Yipeng, T. (2007). The origin and form of 'typical danwei system'. *Jilin University Journal Social Sciences Edition*, 47(4).
12. Walder, A. G. (1988). *Communist neo-traditionalism: Work and authority in chinese industry*. University of California Press.
13. Minzheng, G., & Shengli, G. (2003). Habitant self-governance and city governance. *Cass Journal of Political Science*, 1.
14. Shengli, G., & Mingzheng, G. (2002). 1958–1966: Variation and renewing of the function of the residents' committee. *Quarterly Journal of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences*, 3.
15. Shengli, G., & Mingzheng, G. (2002). 1952–1957: A historical investigation on the adjustment and improvement of shanghai residents. *The Journal of Shanghai Administration Institute*, 2.
16. Shengli, G. (2010). The twofold logic of the revolution and the state: The disappearance of the social. *Journal of East China University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition)*, 1.
17. Letian, Z. (2005). Morality, rituals and farmers' behavior—a cultural interpretation of a village in Northern Zhejiang in the early 1950s. In Z. Xiaohong and X. Shuguang (Eds.), *Chinese studies (Spring 2005)*. China: Social Sciences Academic Press.
18. Mingming, W. (1997). *The development of the community—A case study of the han family in village*. SDX Joint Publishing Company.
19. Yunxiang, Y. (2012). *The individualization of Chinese society*. Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
20. Yibo, B. (1991). *A review of several major secisions and events*. The Central Party School Publishing House.
21. Yifu, L., Fang, C., & Zhou, L. (1999). China's miracle: Development strategy and economic reform (Revised Edn.). People's Publishing House.
22. Shizheng, F. (2011). The formation and variation of state campaigns in post-1949 China: An regime model. *Open Times*, 1.
23. Shaoqi, L. (1985). On the party, selected works of Liu Shaoqi. People's Publishing House.

The State and Society of China
A Century Long Ensemble of "Great Power" and "New
Citizens"

Gao, Y.; Wu, Y.

2018, VII, 187 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-6661-0