

张学兵：邓小平“关于农村政策问题”谈话的几点研究 Zhang Xuebing: Research Points on Deng Xiaoping's Talks 'On Rural Policy Issues' ”

2019-08-28 21:18

url: <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/117936.html>, accessed October 25, 2023

FN 051 - Zhang Xuebing on Deng's attitudes toward Rural Reform in the early 1980s

进入专题：邓小平 包产到户 农村改革

张学兵

内容提要：1980年5月邓小平“关于农村政策问题”的谈话，是围绕农村改革争议正酣的背景下的产物，也是邓小平关于包产到户思想演变的一个合理结果。对谈话的信息来源、传达和贯彻情况以及谈话中某些具体内容进行考辨、探究，是认知农村改革史的一个重要角度。回顾农村改革初期的争议，可以看到，思想解放和体制变革过程中许多情势并非“两极化”，人物也非“脸谱化”。

关键词：邓小平 包产到户 农村改革

1980年5月31日，围绕农村包产、包干到户的争议正酣之际，邓小平发表谈话，明确支持包产到户和大包干。这次谈话不限于农村问题，但其中涉及的农村问题影响最大，相关内容被冠以“关于农村政策问题”之名，整理成篇收入《邓小平文选》，成为中国改革史上的一份重要文献，其意义在于“标志着包产到户可能成为中国经济改革的一个突破口”^①。

一般来说，各类关于中国改革史的著述均会引述这篇谈话，强调邓小平在关键时刻对农村改革的支持和推动，同时这些著述大多又会提到谈话并没有解决相关争议问题。例如，有著作说：“邓小平的讲话肯定了安徽的大胆试验，对于打破一些人的僵化观念，消除一些人的疑虑，稳定包产到户和推动农村改革，无疑起了重要作用。但是，问题还没有根本解决，争论还在继续。”^②至于为什么没有解决争议，相关著述或者语焉不详，或者不置一词，甚至还存在表述矛盾。例如，有著作指出，“在这关键时刻，按照我们国家的惯例，需要有一位最高的权威来做出决断。这位权威已由毛泽东变为三落三起的邓小平。他在5月31日发表了《关于农村政策问题》的重要讲话”^③。“最高的权威”说话了，却又没有解决争议，这似乎有悖常情。

进行历史类比，或能引人思索。众所周知，1992年初邓小平南方谈话发表，一时间解决了市场经济姓“社”姓“资”的争议，推动了市场经济体制的部署和构建。同样，1980年5月的谈话，也是发表在关于包产、包干到户姓“社”姓“资”之争的关键时刻，虽然产生了积极影响，但是没有能够平息争论。此后，争议依然激烈，分歧并未和缓，包产、包干到户直到1982年中央一号文件出台才无可争议地在中央政策中获得认可，其在全国范围内的推广更是1983年之后的事情了。

鉴于以上情况，本文试从历史背景、思想脉络、信息来源、传达贯彻、内容考辨等方面，对邓小平关于农村政策问题的谈话进行分析，并由此引申，对当时围绕争议的一些人与事略作评述，希望能有助于理解复杂、真实的历史，并且使我们感悟到思想解放和体制变革过程中许多情势并非“两极化”，人物也不是“脸谱化”。

一、邓小平谈话的历史背景

“文化大革命”结束尤其是中共十一届三中全会以后，随着思想解放的推进和农村政策的落实，一些贫困地区的农民又一次悄悄搞起了各种形式的家庭承包经营，最初以安徽、四

川、内蒙古等地最为典型④。在安徽，肥西县的小井庄、凤阳县的小岗村分别以最早搞包产到户、包干到户而著称，并在后来逐步被塑造成为新时期农村改革的两个重要起源地⑤。

包产到户并非新事物，20世纪50年代农业合作化、集体化以来已然几番起落，遭遇过多次政治批判和整顿纠正，但20余年间一直或隐或现，或此或彼，或多或少地存在着。包干到户则几乎首度出现，它不仅以农户经营取代生产队经营，更“把分配也包进去了”⑥，是对人民公社体制下的农村经营模式从内容到形式的彻底变革。

尽管十一届三中全会以后政治环境趋于宽松，经济社会政策趋于务实，但对于包产、包干到户，到底让不让搞，究竟姓“社”姓“资”，从高层到基层，从干部到群众，认识不尽一致，行为时有龃龉⑦。搞包产、包干到户的农民和支持包产、包干到户的干部，从一开始就面对着关于包产到户属于资本主义的疑虑和指责，承受着压力和风险。

最早造成巨大影响的公开质疑，是1979年3月15日《人民日报》头版以《三级所有队为基础应该稳定》为题发表的甘肃读者张浩来信和同时配发的编者按。文中认为包产到组动摇了人民公社“三级所有，队为基础”的基本制度，也就是动摇社会主义，要求已划分作业组的“改正错误”。据当时人民日报社农村部主任李克林回忆，这篇文稿是“奉命搞的”，当时国家农委领导根据上边指示，写信给报社总编，要注意制止农村的分队现象。编者按就是根据指示信改编的。⑧这对当时实行包产到组的农民造成了非常大的震动和担心，对包产到组尚且如此，对包产到户的压力更不言而喻。

尽管被质疑，而且有的地方也在“纠正”包产到组、到户，但有的地方包产到户却逐渐从秘密走向公开，并不断扩大范围。例如安徽，到1979年底，全省近38万个生产队，实行包产到组的占22.9%，实行包干到组的占16.9%，实行包产到户和包干到户的占10%⑨。这样，争议、批判开始直接围绕包产到户进行，进入1980年以后表现得尤其明显和激烈。这可从两个方面的情况窥见一斑。

一个事情是，1980年初，《农村工作通讯》连续发表文章，批判包产到户属于“分田单干”，脱离社会主义方向，要求“必须纠正”^⑩。《农村工作通讯》是国家农委主办的刊物，在这上面发表反对包产到户的文章，人们自然会联想其“来头”和“背景”，窥探某种“风向”，因而所造成的压力和引起的担忧可想而知。

另一个事情发生在实行包产到户比较典型的安徽。1980年初，给安徽农民包产到户上了“户口”的万里，离开安徽赴中央任书记处书记，分管农业工作。出人意料的是，他离开后，安徽的包产到户出现了一些反复。从当年4月起，省委在几个月内连续召开多次会议，省委一位主要领导批判包产到户是“经济主义”“机会主义”“工团主义”。他说，工团主义只顾眼前利益，主张“运动就是一切，主义是微不足道的，为了一个‘戈比’而斗争”。“包产到户虽然增产，但这不是方向，县以上领导干部要保持清醒头脑，不能只顾眼前利益，犯机会主义的错误。”甚至说迟早有那么一天，要算他们的账。在这些会议的影响下，全省农村改革的形势骤然变冷，搞得人心惶惶。(11)

正是在此背景下，1980年5月31日，邓小平在同胡乔木、邓力群谈话时，就农村包产到户问题发表了意见。他说：“农村政策放宽以后，一些适宜搞包产到户的地方搞了包产到户，效果很好，变化很快。安徽肥西县绝大多数生产队搞了包产到户，增产幅度很大。

‘凤阳花鼓’中唱的那个凤阳县，绝大多数生产队搞了大包干，也是一年翻身，改变面貌。有的同志担心，这样搞会不会影响集体经济。我看这种担心是不必要的。”(12)邓小平明确表态支持包产到户和大包干，并直接援引安徽肥西和凤阳的材料作为论据，其影响自然是积极而深刻的。

二、邓小平关于包产到户的思想脉络

邓小平关于包产到户的思想由来已久。60年代初，安徽、四川、广西等地农村又一次兴起包产到户，引起广泛关注，甚至成为阶级斗争调门提高的诱因之一。当时，邓小平也对

包产到户表示了意见。1962年7月，他在一次谈话中提到，有些以生产队为核算单位的地方，现在出现了一些新的情况，如实行“包产到户”“责任到田”等，以各种形式包产到户的恐怕不只是20%。他希望大家出主意，找出办法来解决这个问题。接着，他从宽泛的意义上提出一个初步意见，指出：“生产关系究竟以什么形式为最好，恐怕要采取这样一种态度，就是哪种形式在哪个地方能够比较容易比较快地恢复和发展农业生产，就采取哪种形式；群众愿意采取哪种形式，就采取哪种形式，不合法的使它合法起来。”(13)正如他自己所说，这些初步意见“以后可能不算数”，很快“三自一包”就遭到政治批判。

邓小平这次谈话中的一些含蓄态度和立论方式，有些可以和改革年代作一些大历史的关联。例如，他虽然没有明确支持包产到户，但对此保持着一种相对开放、宽容、可讨论、可试验的态度。他含蓄地表示包产到户也是一种可以采取的生产关系形式，但也强调了条件，如“比较容易比较快地恢复和发展农业生产”等，这或可理解为恢复国民经济的具体背景下的特定方针和权宜之计。至于如包产到户有无制度属性、姓“社”还是姓“资”这样的重大的政治意识形态问题，这次谈话不曾涉及。最具长远意义的，当是谈话中说的“群众愿意采取哪种形式，就采取哪种形式，不合法的使它合法起来”，这在农村早期改革突破中具有决定意义，但能否做到，还需要一定的体制和社会环境保证，甚至还期待务实政治家、改革家关键时刻的支持。

60年代邓小平这篇“怎样恢复农业生产”的谈话，到70年代末之后，随着时空环境的转换，变得“算数”了，而且更丰富了。谈话中的一些含蓄态度和立论方式，在改革年代的相关争议中，也不时能听到历史的回声。

1978年底的中央工作会议上，曾有人提出过包产到户问题。例如，会议讨论中，中央广播事业局局长张香山提出包产到户的问题：究竟什么是包产到户？什么是走资本主义道路？如果生产资料所有制不变，又不剥削他人，包产到组或户，这是不是资本主义？(14)于光远回忆说，在文件没有定稿前，有一天我听说在胡乔木起草的农业文件中不但没有写进可以实行包产到户，相反的把“两个不许”写进去了。(15)

从这一情况看，邓小平等领导人也可能通过会议简报等形式，对讨论中涉及的包产到户有所知悉。不过，提出这一问题的，还是零星现象，整体上还不可能设想突破人民公社体制，实行家庭承包经营。这应该是理解日后关于包产到户、包干到户争议的一个基本的思想、政治和体制背景。

进入 1979 年以后，包产到户不断为人所关注，也不断成为一个从基层到高层的政策甚至政治议题。随着决策角色和位次的转换，邓小平对包产到户的问题，势必更多地涉及，也更多地需要他表态。

1979 年 3 月的全国七省三县农村工作座谈会之后不久，华国锋主持召开一次中央会议，邓小平、李先念等出席。会上，华国锋用他在湖南“三夏”抢收抢种必须互助、合作的事例来说，非集体化不可。邓小平没有就此表态，他说：贫困地区总得放宽政策。(16)

1979 年 6 月，在第五届全国人大二次会议期间，万里向邓小平汇报说，安徽农村一些地方已经搞起包产到户，但有人反对。邓小平说：不要争论，你就这么干下去就行了，就实事求是干下去。(17)会议期间，万里还就这个问题询问陈云。陈云表示：“我举双手赞成。”(18)这两次互动应该说带有非正式的、私下交换意见的性质。由此看来，万里在安徽能够大胆放宽农村政策、支持农民包产到户，除了自身的见识和胆识，邓小平、陈云的态度应该也是一个重要原因。

1980 年 1 月 31 日，在全国农村人民公社经营管理会议期间，中央政治局听取了会议情况的汇报。华国锋强调，已经搞了包产到户的，要认真总结经验，提高群众觉悟，逐步引导他们组织起来。邓小平没有作明确表态。他说：对包产到户这样的大问题，事先没有通气，思想毫无准备，不好回答。他还重点讲了世纪末实现小康的战略问题。(19)

4 月 2 日，邓小平同胡耀邦、万里、姚依林、邓力群谈长期规划问题。姚依林说：工业、农业都要甩掉一些包袱。农委同志建议如甘肃、内蒙古、贵州、云南等省，中央调给他们粮食很多，是国家很大的负担。可不可以考虑，对这些地区，在政策上放得宽一点。地广

人稀、经济落后、生活穷困的地区，索性实行包产到户之类的办法。让他们自己多想办法，减少国家的负担。邓小平说：我赞成依林同志刚才讲的意见。在农村地广人稀、经济落后、生活穷困的地区，像西北、贵州、云南等省，有的地方可以实行包产到户之类的办法。(20)

接下来就是 1980 年 5 月 31 日，邓小平发表著名的关于农村政策问题的讲话。就在此次谈话后不久，邓小平还和杜润生在一次会后谈了话。他说：看来我们农村经济的形式可以多样化一点。像贫困地区过去不是有个包产到户吗，可以试试嘛！将来要改还可以改，先吃饱饭要紧。(21)

回顾邓小平改革年代关于包产到户的思想脉络，可以发现一个值得注意的现象：大体上，他在非正式场合或者由他主导的谈话场合，谈及包产到户似乎都比较直率，明确表示支持；但在比较正式的高层会议场合，似乎比较含蓄，很少直抒己见。这或许是一种委婉的回避争论的态度，当然也不排除他对这个问题其实也还在思考之中。

三、邓小平谈话的信息来源

思考包产到户问题，离不开各种信息和材料，就像一部著作提及的，邓小平不仅多次听取万里等人对农村搞包产到户、包干到户情况的汇报，而且花了很多精力翻阅大量资料(22)。

那么，邓小平是如何得到，以及得到了哪些关于包产到户、包干到户的信息和资料的呢？鉴于 1980 年 5 月 31 日谈话中，邓小平主要列举了安徽的事例作为包产到户、大包干实效的佐证，这里就对他如何知晓安徽农村改革的情况这一问题，尝试作一些探讨。

首先，不得不说一下在 1977 年到 1980 年间主政安徽的万里。万里在历史上与邓小平工作渊源颇深，关系密切(23)，他们之间“有至交，关系非同一般”(24)。远的不说，1975 年邓小平主持整顿期间，万里任铁道部部长，对于恢复铁路系统正常秩序作出了重要贡献。正因此，1976 年“批邓”的时候，就曾要追查邓与万的所谓“黑关系”(25)。可以说，万里是邓小平比较熟悉和信赖的高级领导干部，双方正式或非正式场合接触比较多，汇报、交流工作自然比较方便、畅达。如前所述，1979 年 6 月，万里向邓小平汇报安徽包产到户问题。1980 年 4 月，邓小平在谈长期规划问题时，万里也在座。万里曾说：“亏了小平同志的支持，我从安徽回来多次向他汇报，他表示同意，可以试验。出了成果之后，他公开表示支持。”(26)这表明，万里主政安徽时获得邓小平的支持，邓小平也通过万里多次获悉安徽包产到户的情况。及至 1980 年后，万里回京任中央书记处书记、国务院副总理，分管全国农业工作，自然有更多的机会向邓小平汇报或谈及安徽。

其次，各种会议及情况汇报，是邓小平等领导人知悉安徽改革情况的公开和正式的渠道。十一届三中全会之后，国家农委召开多次农村工作座谈会，并在会议期间向中央领导同志汇报。例如，1979 年 3 月，国家农委召开七省三县农口干部座谈会，与会的七省分别是广东、湖南、江苏、安徽、四川、河北、吉林，三县分别是广东博罗、安徽全椒、四川广汉。会议进程中始终贯穿着关于责任制的争论，主要是两个问题，一是实行应当坚持什么原则，二是对包产到户应当采取什么态度。(27)1980 年初，国家农委召开全国农村人民公社经营管理会议，其间围绕包产到户再次发生激辩。安徽农委副主任周曰礼作了题为《联系产量责任制的强大生命力》的发言，为包产到户辩护，讲了两个多小时。在讲到包产到户在贫困地区的作用更为显著时，他重点列举了 3 个例子，分别是肥西县山南区、凤阳县梨园公社小岗生产队、来安县玉明公社。(28)前已述及，此次会议期间，国家农委向中央政治局作了汇报，邓小平在座。值得指出的是，周曰礼列举的肥西和凤阳，均出现在了一年多以后邓小平的谈话中，这或许不只是一个巧合。

再者，各类供领导参阅的内参文稿，是领导人获悉信息的另一个重要渠道。关于安徽包产到户的情况，通过内参渠道上达的，可以举出几个事例。例如，安徽省政府参事室副主任郭崇毅回忆说，1979 年 7 月，他带着自己撰写的反映肥西县包产到户情况的《关于参观肥西县午季大丰收情况的报告》来到北京，找到社会科学院农业经济研究所所长王耕今。后者及研究所认真地听了他的陈述，收下报告，并答应代转中央。很快一位姓陈的研究员

告诉他：报告已送中央办公厅，很受重视，赶快回省，再送一份给万里同志。7月29日，他将调查报告送到省委。8月1日，农村政策研究室给报告加上赞赏性的按语，以《政策研究》18期印发上报。郭崇毅也比较委婉、含蓄地暗示邓小平谈话中提到的肥西县搞包产到户的情况，或许跟他的材料有一定关联。(29)再如，1980年4月中旬，根据万里的指示，新华社记者张广友和吴象到安徽省的江淮地区农村进行了一个多月的调查，写下8篇共2万多字的《江淮地区农村见闻》系列文章(30)，在新华社的内部刊物上发表。其中，见闻之一写道：“实行‘大包干’产量责任制一年大翻身的凤阳县，在严重不利的自然条件下，大部分地区夏季作物长势也都比去年好……肥西县是实行包产到户比较早比较多(97%)的一个县，去年夏季作物长势之好在全省是数一数二的。”(31)这段话的写作与邓小平谈话在时间上更为接近，在内容上也颇有重合之处。有文章认为，这篇报道对邓小平的讲话产生了直接的影响。据说该系列报道于当年5月27日至30日在专送中央领导参阅的内刊上连续刊发，每天早晨即送在京政治局委员阅读。(32)这个判断有一定的合理性。

上述关于邓小平谈话信息来源的分析，相当粗疏和笼统。这个问题非常复杂，关涉到高层决策的信息搜集、传递、处理以及反馈等一系列正式、非正式机制，既包含正式的信息传递渠道和程序，也离不开难以把握、难以言说的组织人事渊源。

四、邓小平谈话的传达和贯彻情况

邓小平的这篇谈话，当时并没有公开报道，到1983年《邓小平文选(1975-1982)》出版时才公之于世，且最初是以内部征求意见的形式出现的。时任滁县地委书记王郁昭后来回忆说，他在当年6月初见到过省委送来的邓小平《关于农村政策问题》的内部谈话稿，并规定不许抄录(33)。

由此看来，这篇谈话当时在社会上应该知悉面不广，但在党内的知悉面不能算小。当年6月19日，赵紫阳就当前农村政策问题致信万里、胡耀邦。信中说，根据小平同志关于农村政策问题的指示，需要组织农业部门的干部和理论工作者相结合，深入不同类型的地区 and 社队，对包产到户问题作一些比较深入的调查和分析，争取在今年秋后能够形成一个中央文件，有个统一的、明确的说法，有领导地解决好这个问题。他还建议书记处讨论一下这件事。(34)经杜润生向胡耀邦建议，这封信转发全党(35)。信中并没有详述邓小平谈话的内容，但通过这封信，谈话的精神应该广为党内所知了。

(一)邓小平的谈话推动了地方的农村改革实践

在河南，1980年春，“联产到劳”成为农业生产责任制的主要形式，同时兰考、虞城等县包产到户或大包干也大面积推行，因此引起激烈争论。有人指责包产到户是分田单干，“犯了方向性错误”，有的县派工作组到农村“纠偏”。在争论中，省委学习贯彻邓小平关于支持安徽凤阳等地实行包产到户的讲话精神，深入农村调查研究，并且明确提出，只要能促进生产发展，解决群众温饱问题，就符合党的十一届三中全会精神，从而肯定了河南农村出现的各种责任制形式。(36)

在湖北，邓小平的谈话对省委推行家庭联产承包责任制起了重大作用。1980年上半年，省委组织4个调查组对武昌、黄冈、钟祥、利川4个县实行责任制的情况进行调查。省委认为，位于边远山区、居住分散、甚至单家独户的农户，可以从实际出发，在生产队统一领导下实行包产到户。8月，省委扩大会议肯定了生产责任制对推动生产力发展的积极作用。以这次会议为起点，湖北省先是贫困山区、后是平原丘陵地区，先是旱地、后是水田，先是农田、后是山林水面，先是包产到组、后是大包干，在全省广泛地开始推行各种形式的农业生产责任制。(37)

在云南，1980年4月，省委传达了全国编制长期规划会议期间姚依林的讲话。讲话指出：邓小平同意在农村对地广人稀、经济落后、生活穷困的地区，像西北、贵州、云南、甘肃等省份中的这类地区，政策上要更宽一些，索性实行包产到户之类的办法。7月召开的县委书记会议，又决定在内地高寒、分散、贫瘠的山区、边疆那些经济文化基础十分落

后的 1000 万人口的地区搞包产到户。(38)这时，云南传达的还是 1980 年 4 月邓小平的谈话内容，但从支持搞包产到户这一点来讲，邓小平 4 月、5 月两次谈话的精神是一致的。

在安徽，情况更为生动。1980 年 8 月，省委常委扩大会议上对包产到户形成“一边倒”的批评，但滁县地委书记王郁昭等少数人依然为包产到户辩护。主持会议的省委第二书记顾卓新认为意见分歧大，不好进行会议总结，建议念一下邓小平的谈话，作为会议总结。值得注意的是，在会议上，王郁昭说，如果上级领导不同意搞包产到户，那就请公开下命令进行纠正，我作为一个共产党员，作为下级，服从就是了。(39)王郁昭实际是“将”了省委主要领导一“军”，其底气何在？省委后来也没有下命令“纠正”，其顾虑何在？显然，邓小平的谈话是重要因素。

(二)邓小平的谈话推动了中央关于包产、包干到户政策的突破

在前述赵紫阳的信中，他结合邓小平谈话精神，对包产到户问题提出 3 点看法：“第一，在那些困难、落后的地方，可以包产到户；第二，在那些生产比较正常、集体经济搞得比较好的地方，原则上不搞包产到户(至于社队的副业生产和多种经营，可以包给专业组、专业户、专业工)；第三，现在有些集体经济搞得比较好的地方也搞了包产到户的，可先进行试验，经过一段试验看结果如何。”(40)

经过农口干部和理论工作者的调研以及一些领导人的推动，包产到户、包干到户终于在中央政策上获得了合法身份。1980 年 9 月，中央召开省、自治区、直辖市党委第一书记座谈会，后又转发会议纪要《关于进一步加强和完善农业生产责任制的几个问题》。该文件提出了差异化的政策，区分“一般地区”和“边远山区和贫困落后的地区”，强调前一类地区“不要搞包产到户”，而后一类地区则“可以包产到户，也可以包干到户”(41)。

这一重大突破，无疑是农民实践推动的结果，是思想不断解放的结果，是务实领导人不断努力的结果，但从高层决策演变来看，更是贯彻邓小平谈话的结果。

五、邓小平谈话的内容辨析

邓小平谈话标志着农村改革的重要突破，却没有根本解决争议，在此后具有标志意义的第一书记座谈会上，还发生了激烈的争论，并以“阳关道与独木桥”之争闻名于世。其间原因自然复杂。万里曾回顾指出，邓小平讲话后，“情况有了好转，但还是吵吵嚷嚷，全国性的争论并没有停止，有些反对的人手里掌着权，他不同意你就干不成”（42）。对于这个问题的组织、人事和权力背景，此处笔者不作涉及，只想通过对谈话的一些具体内容进行辨析，从而认知这个问题的政策、思想和实践背景。

（一）邓小平在什么意义上支持的包产到户？

说邓小平谈话支持搞包产到户，这没有错，但还不够。准确地说，他并不是在绝对意义上支持包产到户，更不是提倡搞包产到户，而是强调了条件即“适宜搞包产到户的地方”。对于这一点，可以从1978年以来中央关于农村包产到户政策突破的历史脉络中获得进一步理解。

中共十一届三中全会通过的农村人民公社工作条例中明确指出：“不许包产到户，不许分田单干。”（43）1979年9月，中共十一届四中全会通过的《关于加快农业发展若干问题的决定》对此稍有松动，提出“除某些副业生产的特殊需要和边远山区、交通不便的单家独户外，也不要包产到户”（44）。从表面上看，虽然禁止包产到户的方针未有变化，但从“不许”到“不要”，语气变得和缓了，多少有了点商量的余地。

及至前文所说的1980年9月第一书记座谈会，中央政策才有了真正突破，即在贫困地区“可以包产到户，也可以包干到户”。这些地方就是邓小平所说的“适宜搞包产到户的地方”。那么，如何判定这些地方呢？杜润生在第一书记会上作说明时指出，可以搞包产到

户的是人均收入 40 元以下的最穷队。这些生产队 60%左右分布在云、贵、豫、鲁、甘、宁、蒙、闽、皖等 9 省(自治区), 约占农村人口的 20%。(45)

1981 年之后, 这一差异化政策又被进一步量化与细化为三类: 20%左右的最穷的社队搞包产到户; 另有 25%的先进社队搞专业承包、联产计酬; 还有百分之五六十的中间状态的社队推行统一经营、联产到劳责任制。(46)这项政策, 在当时农口部门以及农民中被戏称为“切三刀”。它“基本上具有画地为牢的性质”(47), 因而很快就维持不住, 被农民的实践所突破, 而中央则更进一步认可了农民的实践, 不再因区域位置和经济条件设限, 准许农民自由选择, 甚至于一些地方开始自上而下地推广包产到户、包干到户。随之, 包干到户全面取代包产到户, 覆盖绝大多数农村, 几乎可以说是另一种形式的“一刀切”。

回顾这一政策转变的脉络, 可以发现最主要的两个关节点: 一个是正式承认贫困地区可以搞包产、包干到户; 另一个是尊重农民意愿, 由其选择是否搞包产、包干到户。邓小平的谈话正处在第一个节点上, 或者说是推动了第一个节点的形成, 承认“适宜搞包产到户的地方”可以搞。那么, 哪些地方适宜搞, 在地方执行上就存在着弹性, 也可能因为各自的环境和认识而各取所需, 各执一词。此外, 当时争议的焦点之一即包产到户姓“社”姓“资”的问题, 邓小平的谈话对此也没有正面回答, 因而导致围绕这个问题的意识形态争议也就不可能真正得到解决。

(二)邓小平说的“大包干”是包干到户吗?

许多著作以为邓小平谈话中的“大包干”, 说的就是凤阳小岗村搞的那种包干到户。这恐怕不够准确, 大包干和包干到户最初远不是一回事。

大包干的概念史别有意趣, 可以说是农村人民公社化之后, 经营核算主体变革的一个缩影。从名称上讲, 大包干可以追溯至 60 年代初。当时要解决的一大问题, 就是人民公社、生产大队对生产队经营权的限制和对生产队财产的平调。1961 年, 河北省张家口地区第一书记胡开明在万全县郭磊庄村搞了“收益分配大包干”的试点, 内容是“三包一

奖” (即包工、包产、包投资, 超产奖励), 继而进一步把核算单位下放到生产队。此后, 毛泽东采纳了试点经验, 决定将基本核算单位下放到生产队, 实行“三级所有, 队为基础”。(48)这个时候, 大包干指的是包干到队。

70年代末, 大包干的概念再次出现, 不过, 所针对的已非生产队, 而是其下的作业组, 亦即包干到组。首先把包干到组称为大包干的, 是安徽省滁县地委书记王郁昭。1979年2月, 他与凤阳县委书记陈庭元一道, 来到凤阳县城南公社岳北生产队调研那里正在实行的包产到组情况。当时, 社员们计算包产包工和各种上缴的比例, 算来算去, 总算不清楚。有几位老社员说, 最好的办法是, 把产量包到组, 交足国家的, 留够集体的, 剩下多少是组里的, 既简单又省事, 一刀一个血口子, 干部省心, 社员放心。王郁昭、陈庭元觉得这个办法好, 同意他们这样干, 王郁昭还为其命名为“大包干”。(49)很快, “大包干, 大包干, 直来直去不拐弯, 交够国家的, 留够集体的, 剩下都是自己的”这个顺口溜在凤阳全县流行。

进入1980年之后, 随着小岗村的包干到户由秘密走向公开, 受其影响的地方逐步增多, 引起的关注也越来越大, 大包干也逐步从包干到组进一步下移为包干到户, 那句著名的顺口溜, 也逐步被用作包干到户的专门俗称了。随着时间流转以及包干到户覆盖绝大多数农村, 人们逐渐习惯性地 will 大包干等同于包干到户。然而, 这在阅读历史文献的时候, 难免造成干扰, 形成某些误读。

那么邓小平谈话中所说的凤阳大包干, 究竟指的是包干到组, 还是到户呢? 仔细分析来, 他说的应该是包干到组, 可从三方面看:

第一, 资料显示, 1979年凤阳全县共有3710个生产队, 实行大包干到组的有3098个, 占生产队总数的83.5%(50)。事实上, 当年凤阳的包干到组影响非常大。6月, 赴凤阳调研包干到组之后的万里, 派周曰礼等3人, 会同滁县地委办公室主任陆子修等2人, 赴凤阳总结经验, 整理材料。因此, 凤阳县大包干政策逐步走向条理化和理论化。8月8日, 《安徽日报》头版头条发表《凤阳县在农村实行“大包干”》。一时间, 新闻界、文艺界

和理论界的记者和专家、学者，云集凤阳，参观访问。(51)可以说，邓小平所说凤阳“绝大多数生产队搞了大包干”，正是对这一盛况的反映。

第二，邓小平谈话是在1980年5月。揆诸常情，他所知悉的凤阳大包干的材料应该要更早些，大致说的就是1979年初到1980年初的情况，这也正与他所说的“一年翻身”在时间上基本吻合。而在这一年中，小岗村的包干到户尚处于秘密状态，不愿也不敢为人所知。1980年1月，凤阳县委政策研究室在一份调研报告中写道：“小岗生产队包产到户搞了一年，谁也不敢去总结它，更没有人敢去宣传它。在县里整理的一些材料中，偶尔出现小岗的例子，也都谨慎地被删去了。”(52)正是在1980年1月初安徽全省农业工作会议期间，经由王郁昭，这份调研材料送交了万里。万里看后高兴地说：“像看小说一样，连看了两遍。”很快，万里就去了一趟小岗村。(53)此后，小岗村的情况才陆续公开，因此邓小平所说凤阳绝大多数地方搞了大包干，就不可能是说小岗村的这种包干到户。

第三，据笔者看到的材料，最迟到1980年7月，在行文中，“大包干”和“包干到户”这两个词还不相通，而此时已是邓小平谈话两个月之后了。例如，这年7月，安徽省委赴凤阳调查组的一份调研报告中指出，“大包干”是一种过渡性形式，它或者过渡到在生产队统一领导下，实行专业化分工协作的基础上的包产到人，或者发展到“包干到户”。报告强调，在凤阳，由“大包干”到“包干到户”是人心所向，大势所趋。(54)

邓小平所说“大包干”指的是包干到组，而非到户，这或许也是在他谈话后争议依然存在的一个原因。对于反对包产到户、包干到户的领导干部来说，邓小平谈到支持包产到户，那么包产到户就不便反对，但邓小平并没有支持搞包干到户，那么反对包干到户或许未尝不可。例如，前面提到的在1980年6月初安徽省委领导召开的巢湖会议上，此时省委领导已见过邓小平谈话的内部稿，“在讨论的时候，没有人再明目张胆地反对包产到户，但却不大赞成大包干到户。省委领导说，包产到户还可以，因为还坚持五统一，还有统一分配，而大包干到户则是两包一脚蹬(踢)，因此不同意包干到户”(55)。

六、不是“两极化”，不能“脸谱化”

在许多改革史著作和相关人士的回忆中，早期农村改革突破过程中的争议和争论，被描述得似乎针锋相对，是非分明，势不两立。这里面有从特定视角看问题形成的“放大”效应，但研究者、回顾者有意无意地拔高一方，批评一方，也强化了这种印象。其实，在真实的历史中，思想观点有争论，但非“两极化”，相关人物有分歧，但非“脸谱化”。此处结合邓小平后来的回顾，对当时围绕包产、包干到户的争议进行几点评析。

第一，支持农民包产到户、包干到户的领导干部承受着巨大的压力，具有不一般的政治智慧、勇气和担当。这应该是评判当时争论、分歧的基点。万里的一段回顾极其真实、传神、深刻，道尽了其间的艰难与不凡。他说：“有些好心的同志向我反映说，有人批评我们既违背宪法，又违背党的决定。怎么办呢？我说，农民赞成，农民一定要搞，那只好硬着头皮顶着吧，反正已经干了，就这样子干吧。党的决定说不要搞包产到户，我不能公开表示反对，但我对他们说，是我同意你们干的，就这么干算了，出了什么问题我来顶着。安徽那一段就是这种‘违法乱纪’的情况，实质上反映了农民发展生产力的要求和已不适应的旧的上层建筑、旧的规章制度之间的矛盾。”(56)确实，尽管时代背景转换了，也有了实践是检验真理的唯一标准这一思想武器，但历史上包产到户几次遭到政治批判，牵涉到许多领导干部的政治命运和人生境遇，这在改革初期依然令人心有余悸。就像有论著所指出的，凡是农村改革搞得早搞得好的地方，大概都有一批不怕挨批坐牢的农民和一批不怕撤职挨整的干部，有一批“睁一只眼闭一只眼”、暗暗支持或公开支持的领导(57)。因此，面对新一轮包产到户的兴起，这一批默认、容忍、支持包产到户的干部，是值得称颂的。邓小平就曾回顾说：“有两个省带头，一个是四川省，那是我的家乡；一个是安徽省，那时候是万里同志主持。”(58)他还曾指出，中国的改革始于农村，农村的改革始于安徽，万里同志是有功的(59)。这里，万里可以被视作当时从高层到基层一批干部的典型和代表。

第二，对包产到户认识的转变过程是一个连续的谱系。前已述及，关于包产到户的政策和认识转变，有两个关节点，一为是否允许贫困地区搞包产到户，二为是否允许农民自主选择经营方式。从更大的背景看，农村改革最初的一个重大突破，就是结束搞穷过渡的学大寨运动(60)。认识的转变是艰难的。就像万里1981年3月在农业部党组会议上讲的，“‘左’的思想在我们同志的头脑里程度不同地存在着，这里不是有无之分，而是多少之分”(61)。因此，从认识上讲，关于包产到户的转变，可构成一个谱系，很多领导干部处

在这个谱系的不同位置，转变中存在着先与后之分、迟与速之分、多与少之分。一些不太赞成、不大认可大面积搞包产到户的领导，后来大多转变了认识。(62)例如，陆子修回忆说，“1980年万里同志离开安徽，张劲夫同志主持省委工作期间，联产承包责任制出现了波折。劲夫同志属认识问题，后来他自己也作了自我批评”(63)。在张劲夫去世后新华社播发的生平中，则明确指出：“他不断清除‘左’的思想，大力推进农村改革，继续推行家庭联产承包责任制。”(64)这是一种比较典型的情形。邓小平后来曾回顾说：“搞农村家庭联产承包……开始搞并不踊跃呀，好多人在看。我们的政策就是允许看。允许看，比强制好得多”，“有许多人不同意，家庭承包还算社会主义吗？嘴里不说，心里想不通，行动上就拖，有的顶了两年，我们等待”。(65)在农村改革中，中央本着一条原则处理人的问题，即对包产到户的态度，只当作认识问题来对待，而且认为认识是可以变化的。为此而被调离原地的领导人并不影响继续工作，有的还成了国家领导人，在地县一级大致也如此。(66)

第三，一些一度不太赞成大面积搞包产到户者的认识，其实也触及一些深层次的问题。例如，张劲夫到任安徽后，跑遍所有地、市、县，去了一些贫困的地方，特别像临泉这样人口多的大县。后来他向财政部要了一笔钱，作为解决临泉群众生活困难的专款。他在安徽讲过两句话：“农民光靠一亩三分地富不起来”，“安徽光靠一把米富不起来”。第一句强调的是农业要搞多种经营，第二句强调的是要大力发展工业。(67)在黑龙江，杨易辰一开始也不大赞成大面积推广包产到户。他认为，不能搞一刀切，不能搞一个模式。有的地方搞包产到户、包产到组，是适合那里情况的，是对的，而在另外一些地方就不一定适合。你走你的“阳关道”，我走我的“独木桥”。如果不从我们那里的特点出发，去搞划队型、包产到组、包产到户，那我们就将失去我们的优势。他强调的是东北土地面积大、机械化程度特别高这个地域特征。(68)他们所提出的问题，不一定构成反对包产到户的理由，但在包产到户普及后，这些问题依然是需要关注、应对和解决的。从这一角度出发而提出的问题，其实在邓小平的谈话中也有勾画和设想，因本文主题所限，就不再赘述了。

注释：

①杜润生：《杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实》，人民出版社，2005年，第115页。

②中共中央党史研究室第三研究部：《中国改革开放史》，辽宁人民出版社，2002年，第109页。

③吴象：《中国农村改革实录》，浙江人民出版社，2001年，第153页。

④该三省区当时的第一书记分别是万里、赵紫阳、周惠，他们以开明、务实态度，默认、支持当地农民进行各种生产责任制的探索，这在当时比较典型，颇有影响。因此，一度流行着“要吃米，找万里；要吃粮，找紫阳”的民谚。胡耀邦也曾经说：“包产到户，万里第一，赵紫阳第二，周惠是第三。”参见余国耀等：《中国农民命运大转折——农村改革决策纪实》，珠海出版社，1999年，第59页。

⑤小井庄和小岗村已经分别建立了包产到户纪念馆和大包干纪念馆。其实，各种资料表明，搞包产、包干到户的农村，小井庄和小岗村都未必最早。用一句俗语来形容就是“莫道君行早，更有早行人”。在严格的实证意义上，哪个地方最早的问题或许根本说不清楚，因为在20余年的农业合作化、集体化历程中，有的地方一直在秘密搞着各种形式的包产到户、包干到户。参见范晓春：《改革开放前的包产到户》，中共党史出版社，2009年。

⑥《杜润生文集(1980-1998)》(上)，山西经济出版社，1998年，第58页。

⑦对于包产到户、包干到户可以迅速帮助贫困地区增加粮食产量这一点，其实无异议。因此，争论虽然激烈，但其间逻辑却比较简单，即“干部要方向，社员要产量”，“干部怕错，农民怕饿”。转引自陈吉元等主编：《中国农村社会经济变迁(1949-1989)》，山西经济出版社，1993年，第482页。

⑧杜润生主编：《中国农村改革决策纪事》，中央文献出版社，1999年，第122页。

⑨中共安徽省委党史研究室编：《中国新时期农村的变革(安徽卷)》，中共党史出版社，1999年，第7-8页。

⑩印存栋：《分田单干必须纠正》，《农村工作通讯》1980年第2期；刘必坚：《包产到户是否坚持了公有制和按劳分配》，《农村工作通讯》1980年第3期。

(11)吴象：《中国农村改革实录》，第152页。

(12)《邓小平文选》第2卷，人民出版社，1994年，第315页。

(13)《邓小平文选》第1卷，人民出版社，1994年，第323页。

(14)转引自韩钢：《艰难的转型：一九七八年中央工作会议的农业议题》，《中共党史研究》2011年第9期。

(15)于光远：《我亲历的那次历史大转折——十一届三中全会的台前幕后》，中央编译出版社，1998年，第63页。

(16)杜润生：《杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实》，第106-107页。

(17)《邓小平年谱(1975-1997)》(上)，中央文献出版社，2004年，第531页。

(18)《陈云年谱(1905-1995)》(下)，中央文献出版社，2000年，第248页。

(19)杜润生主编：《中国农村改革决策纪事》，第 259-260 页。

(20)《邓小平年谱(1975-1997)》(上)，第 615-616 页；杜润生：《杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实》，第 115 页。

(21)杜润生：《杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实》，第 116 页。

(22)当代中国研究所：《中华人民共和国史稿》第 4 卷，人民出版社、当代中国出版社，2012 年，第 132 页。

(23)参与《万里文选》编辑工作的赵树凯先生回忆说，在文选编辑工作临近结束时，万里宴请编辑组成员。在交谈中，万里特别讲到，关于谈邓小平同志的那篇文稿，他决定还是不收到文选里去了。这篇文稿在内容中系统地介绍了他与邓小平长达半个世纪的交往。参见赵树凯：《农民的政治》，商务印书馆，2011 年，第 66-67 页。

(24)田纪云：《改革开放的伟大实践——纪念改革开放三十周年》，新华出版社，2009 年，第 486 页。

(25)张广友：《风云万里》，新华出版社，2007 年，第 98 页。

(26)转引自赵树凯：《农民的政治》，第 94 页。

(27)杜润生主编：《中国农村改革决策纪事》，第 84 页。

(28)杜润生主编：《中国农村改革决策纪事》，第 256-259 页；中共安徽省委农村工作部编：《安徽省农业生产责任制——资料选编》，内部资料，1983 年，第 52-53 页。

(29)郭崇毅：《我是怎样参与农村经济体制改革的》，全国政协等编：《农村改革风云实录》，中国文史出版社，1998年，第195-197页。

(30)这8篇系列见闻分别是：《生产形势很好群众生活稳定》《联产责任制威力大》《包产到户对改变穷队面貌有明显作用》《富队包产到户增产效果也比较显著》《群众为什么喜欢包产到户》《关键在于加强领导》《有关包产到户的几个认识问题》《包产到户是不是权宜之计》。

(31)张广友：《阳关道上》，安徽人民出版社，1985年，第78页。

(32)中共肥西县委党史研究室编印：《中国农村改革发端——安徽肥西山南小井庄》，内部资料，第71页。

(33)王郁昭：《往事回眸与思考》，中国文艺出版社，2012年，第216页。

(34)当代中国农业合作化编辑室编：《建国以来农业合作化史料汇编》，中共党史出版社，1992年，第934页。

(35)杜润生：《杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实》，第116页。

(36)中共河南省委党史研究室编：《中国新时期农村的变革(河南卷)》，中共党史出版社，1998年，第4-5页。

(37)中共湖北省委党史研究室编：《中国新时期农村的变革(湖北卷)》，中共党史出版社，1998年，第3页。

(38)中共云南省委党史研究室编：《中国新时期农村的变革(云南卷)》，中共党史出版社，1999年，第3页。

(39)王郁昭：《往事回眸与思考》，第219-220页。

(40)《建国以来农业合作化史料汇编》，第934页。

(41)中共中央文献研究室等编：《新时期农业和农业工作重要文献选编》，中央文献出版社，1992年，第60页。

(42)张广友、韩钢整理：《万里谈农村改革是怎么搞起来的》，《百年潮》1998年第3期。

(43)国家体改委办公厅编：《十一届三中全会以来经济体制改革重要文献汇编》上册，改革出版社，1990年，第81页。

(44)《新时期农业和农业工作重要文献选编》，第33页。

(45)《建国以来农业合作化史料汇编》，第929页。

(46)《杜润生文集(1980-1998)》(上)，第22页。

(47)凌志军：《历史不再徘徊——人民公社在中国的兴起和失败》，人民出版社，1997年，第292-293页。

(48)欧远方：《开明的胡开明》，全国政协等编：《农村改革风云实录》，中国文史出版社，1998年，第163-164页；张万德：《胡开明在郭磊庄搞分配“大包干”始末》，中国人民政治协商会议万全县委员会文史资料征集委员会编：《万全文史资料》，第6辑，2002年，第10-14页。

(49)陆子修：《新世纪“三农”沉思录》，安徽人民出版社，2008年，第77页；王郁昭：《往事回眸与思考》，第184-185页。

(50)陈吉元等主编：《中国农村社会经济变迁(1949-1989)》，第481页。

(51)张广友：《风云万里》，新华出版社，2007年，第176页。

(52)凤阳县委政研室：《政策放宽穷队翻身——小岗生产队实行大包干到户的变化》，中共安徽省委农村工作部编：《安徽省农业生产责任制——资料选编》，第210页。按，这篇调研报告在不同的地方，似乎还有其他不同的名称，如在王郁昭等人的回忆中都称为《一剂不可少的补药——凤阳县梨园公社小岗生产队包干到户的调查》，而在中国农村发展问题研究组于1981年编的《包产到户资料》第2辑中则称为《令人深思的小岗生产队——穷队实行大包干到户的变化》。

(53)王郁昭：《往事回眸与思考》，第195、206页。

(54)安徽省委赴凤阳调查组：《“大包干”的成效、做法和问题——凤阳县农业实行生产责任制的调查报告》，中共安徽省委农村工作部编：《安徽省农业生产责任制——资料选编》，第198页。

(55)王郁昭：《往事回眸与思考》，第216页。

(56)张广友、韩钢整理：《万里谈农村改革是怎么搞起来的》，《百年潮》，1998年第3期。

(57)余国耀等：《中国农民命运大转折——农村改革决策纪实》，第35页。

(58)《邓小平文选》第3卷，人民出版社，1993年，第238页。

(59)张广友、丁龙嘉：《万里》，中共党史出版社，2006年，第227页。

(60)万里在回顾农村早期改革突破时指出，这期间同“左”的错误作斗争，大致有三个回合，分别是“突破大寨的框框，坚持以生产为中心”，“突破‘三级所有，队为基础’，实行联产计酬，包产到组”，“突破‘不许包产到户’，实行家庭联产承包责任制，给农民充分的自主权”。参见张广友、韩钢整理：《万里谈农村改革是怎么搞起来的》，《百年潮》1998年第3期。这一分析也是有见地、有启发的。

(61)全国人大常委会办公厅万里论著编辑组：《万里论农村改革与发展》，中国民主法制出版社，1996年，第114页。

(62)当然有个别的情况，也颇有异趣。例如，农业部有一位反对包产到户的副部长，曾被万里批评说，“实践的东西，理论的东西，实践和理论结合的东西，都说服不了他”，直到晚年都没有改变。他反对包产到户，被认为是“一种政治信仰的力量”。参见赵树凯：《懂农业与懂农民》，《中国发展观察》2018年第12期。

(63)陆子修口述：《安徽农村改革的兴起》，中共安徽省委党史研究室编：《安徽农村改革口述史》，中共党史出版社，2006年，第147页。

(64)新华社：《张劲夫同志生平》，《人民日报》2015年8月7日。

(65) 《邓小平文选》第3卷，第374、367页。

(66) 杜润生：《杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实》，第131页。

(67) 张劲夫编：《婴鸣·友声》，中国财政经济出版社，2004年，第134、141页。

(68) 《杨易辰回忆录》，中央文献出版社，1996年，第316页。

DeepL translation

Zhang Xuebing: A Study of Deng Xiaoping's Talks on Rural Policy Issues

2019-08-28 21:18

Topics: Deng Xiaoping, Baochuang to Households, Rural Reforms

● Zhang Xuebing

Abstract: Deng Xiaoping's talk on "Rural Policy Issues" in May 1980 was a product of the controversy surrounding rural reform and a logical outcome of the evolution of Deng Xiaoping's thinking on the issue of production to households. An important perspective on the history of rural reform is to examine and explore the sources of information, the communication and implementation of the talk, and certain specific elements of the talk. Looking back at the controversies in the early period of rural reform, we can see that many situations in the process of ideological emancipation and institutional change were not "polarized", nor were the characters "profiled".

Key Words: Deng Xiaoping, Baochuang to Households, Rural Reforms

On May 31, 1980, as the controversy surrounding the contracting of production to the household and the contracting of production to the household was in full swing, Deng Xiaoping made a statement explicitly supporting the contracting of production to the household and the contracting of production to the household. This talk was not limited to rural issues, but the rural issues covered in it had the greatest impact, and the relevant content was labeled as "Issues on Rural Policy", which was compiled and included in Deng Xiaoping's Selected Writings, and became an important document in the history of China's reforms, which was significant in that it "marked the possibility of the contracting of production to the household as a breakthrough in China's economic reforms". The significance of this document is that it "signaled that the contracting of production to households might become a breakthrough in China's economic reform" (1).

Generally speaking, all kinds of writings on the history of China's reform will cite this talk to emphasize Deng Xiaoping's support and promotion of rural reform at the critical moment, while most of these writings will mention that the talk did not resolve the controversial issues. For example, some writers say: "Deng Xiaoping's speech affirmed the bold experiments in Anhui, which undoubtedly played an important role in breaking the rigidity of some people's concepts, dispelling some people's misgivings, stabilizing the practice of contracting production to the household, and pushing forward the rural reforms. However, the problem has not yet been fundamentally resolved, and the controversy continues." ② As to why the controversy has not been resolved, the relevant writings are either incoherent or silent, and there are even contradictory expressions. For example, one work states, "At this critical moment, according to our national practice, a supreme authority was needed to make a decision. This authority has changed from Mao Zedong to Deng Xiaoping, who has fallen three times and risen three times. On May 31st, he delivered an important speech on "Issues of Rural Policy" (关于农村政策问题). It seems counterintuitive that the "highest authority" spoke but failed to resolve the controversy.

A historical analogy may be thought-provoking. As we all know, in early 1992, Deng Xiaoping's Southern Dialogue was published, which solved the controversy over whether the market economy should be called "social" or "capital", and promoted the deployment and construction of the market economy system. Similarly, the talk in May 1980 was also published at a critical moment in the dispute over whether the contracted production and the contracting of production to households should be labeled as "social" or "capital", and although it had a positive impact, it failed to quell the controversy. Since then, the controversy is still intense, the differences have not slowed down, package production, package to the household until the 1982 Central Document No. 1 issued in the central policy is undisputedly recognized, and its nationwide promotion is even more in 1983 after the thing.

In view of the above, this paper tries to analyze Deng Xiaoping's talk on rural policy from the aspects of historical background, ideological lineage, source of information, conveyance and implementation, and content examination, and by extension, to comment on some people and events surrounding the controversy at that time, in the hope that it can help to understand the complex and real history, and make us realize that many situations in the process of ideological emancipation and institutional change are not "I. The history of Deng Xiaoping's talk

I. Historical Background of Deng Xiaoping's Talk

"At the end of the Cultural Revolution, especially after the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC), with the advancement of ideological emancipation and the implementation of rural policies, peasants in some impoverished areas once again quietly engaged in various forms of family contracting, initially in Anhui, Sichuan and Inner Mongolia, the most typical.⁴ In Anhui, a small village in Feixi County, which was the largest in China, had to be contracted out to a large number of peasants. In Anhui, Xiaojingzhuang in Feixi County and Xiaogang Village in Fengyang County are famous for being the first to engage in

contract farming and contract farming, respectively, and have since been molded into two important origins of rural reform in the new era.⁵ The contract farming is not new.

The practice of "production to household" is not a new thing; it has had several ups and downs since the cooperative and collectivization of agriculture in the 1950s, and has been subjected to many political criticisms and rectifications, but it has existed, either hidden or visible, one way or the other, and to a greater or lesser extent, for more than 20 years. The Baojian to the household, on the other hand, was almost the first of its kind, not only replacing the production team with the peasant household, but also "including distribution in it,"⁶ a radical change from content to form in the rural business model under the people's commune system.

Although the political environment after the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee tended to be more relaxed and economic and social policies tended to be more pragmatic, there was no consensus from the top to the grassroots level, from cadres to the masses, on whether or not to allow or not to engage in the contracting of production and household management, and whether to give it the name of "society" or "capital," and there were occasional disagreements over the behavior of the people. There were sometimes disagreements in behavior (7). From the very beginning, the peasants and the cadres who supported the contracting of production to households were faced with doubts and accusations that the contracting of production to households belonged to capitalism, and they were subjected to pressures and risks.

The earliest public skepticism that had a huge impact was a letter from Gansu reader Zhang Hao and an accompanying editor's note published on the front page of the People's Daily on March 15, 1979, under the title "Three-Tier Ownership of Teams as a Basis Should Be Stabilized. The article argued that the production contract to the group had shaken the basic system of the people's commune of "three levels of ownership, with the team as the basis", that is, socialism, and demanded that those who had already been divided into work groups "correct their mistakes". According to the then director of the rural department of the People's Daily, Li Kelin, recalled that this article was "ordered to engage in", when the leadership of the State Agricultural Committee, according to the instructions from above, wrote to the editor-in-chief of the newspaper to pay

attention to stopping the phenomenon of the division of teams in the countryside. The editor's note was adapted from the letter of instruction. (8) This was a very big shock and worry to the farmers who practiced the package production to the group at that time, to the package production to the group is still so, the pressure on the package production to the household is even more self-evident.

Although questioned, and some places are also "correcting" the package production to the group, to the household, but some places to the household has gradually from the secret to the public, and constantly expanding the scope of the package production to the household. In Anhui, for example, by the end of 1979, of the province's nearly 380,000 production teams, 22.9 percent were practicing the practice of transferring production to groups, 16.9 percent were practicing the practice of transferring production to groups, and 10 percent were practicing the practice of transferring production to families and households.⁹ In this way, controversy and criticism began to be directed at the province's production teams and households. In this way, the controversy and criticism began to center directly on the practice of "chartering production to the household", which became particularly obvious and intense after 1980. This can be seen from two aspects of the situation.

For one thing, in early 1980, the Rural Work Newsletter published a series of articles criticizing the contracting of production to households as a form of "splitting up the land and doing it alone," divorcing it from the direction of socialism and demanding that it "must be corrected."¹⁰ The Rural Work Newsletter was a publication sponsored by the State Agricultural Committee, and when articles were published in it against the practice of contracting production to households, people would naturally associate them with their "origins" and "backgrounds," and spy on a certain "direction of the wind," thus causing a great deal of controversy. "The pressure and concern caused by the publication of an article against the contractualization of production to households can be imagined.

Another thing happened in the implementation of the package production to the household more typical Anhui Province. 1980 early, to the Anhui farmers package production to the household on the "account" of Wan Li, left Anhui Province to the Central Committee to serve as Secretary of the Secretariat, in charge of agricultural work. Surprisingly, after he left, Anhui's package production to

the household appeared some repetition. From April of that year, the provincial party committee held a number of meetings in a few months, a major leader of the provincial party committee criticized the package production to the household is "economicism" "opportunism" "labor unionism". He said that labor-corpsism only cared about immediate interests, advocating that "the movement is everything, and that ism is insignificant, fighting for a 'kopeck'." "Although the contracting of production to households has increased production, this is not the direction, and leading cadres above the county level should keep a clear head and not focus on immediate interests and make opportunistic mistakes." It was even said that sooner or later there would come a day when they would be counted. Under the influence of these meetings, the situation of rural reform in the province suddenly turned cold and made people panic. (11)

It was against this background that Deng Xiaoping, in a conversation with Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun on May 31, 1980, expressed his views on the issue of rural production to households. He said, "After the relaxation of rural policy, some places suitable for contracting production to households have done so, with very good results and rapid changes. The vast majority of production teams in Feixi County, Anhui Province, have engaged in production to households, increasing production by a large margin. In Fengyang County, where the 'Fengyang Flower Drums' are sung, most of the production teams have been organized into large-scale lump-sum operations, and have also turned around in one year, changing their appearance. Some comrades worry that this will affect the collective economy. I think this worry is unnecessary." (12) Deng Xiaoping's clear statement in favor of the contracting of production to households and the *dabaogan*, and his direct citation of the material from Feixi and Fengyang in Anhui as an argument, naturally had a positive and profound impact.

Second, Deng Xiaoping's Thought Process on Household Ownership of Production

Deng Xiaoping's ideas on the transfer of production to households had a long history. In the early 1960s, the transfer of production to households was once again on the rise in the rural areas of Anhui, Sichuan, and Guangxi, which attracted widespread attention and even became one of the triggers of the heightened tone of the class struggle. At that time, Deng Xiaoping also expressed his opinion on the practice of transferring production to households, and in July 1962, he mentioned in a talk that in some places where the production team was the unit of accounting, some new situations had emerged, such as the practice of "transferring production to the household" and "taking responsibility for the fields", and that it was feared that the practice of transferring production to households in various forms would lead to a decline in the number of households that had been allocated production. I am afraid that more than 20% of the households are covered by various forms of production. He hoped that we could come up with ideas and find ways to solve this problem. Then, in a broad sense, he put forward a preliminary opinion, pointing out: "I am afraid that we must adopt the attitude that whichever form is easier and quicker to restore and develop agricultural production in a particular place should be adopted; whichever form the masses are willing to adopt should be adopted; and what is not legal should be made legal. up." (13) As he himself said, these preliminary views "may not count later", and soon the "Three-Self, One-Packet" was subjected to political criticism.

Some of Deng's implicit attitudes and arguments in this talk can be related to the Reform era in broad historical terms. For example, although he did not explicitly support the contracting of production to households, he maintained a relatively open, tolerant, open to discussion, and open to experimentation attitude. He implicitly stated that contract farming was also a form of production relations that could be adopted, but he also emphasized the conditions, such as "it is easier and quicker to restore and develop agricultural production", which could be interpreted as a specific approach and expedient measure in the specific context of the restoration of the national economy. As for such major political and ideological issues as whether or not there are institutional attributes to the contracted production to households, and whether or not the surname is "social" or "capital", this talk did not touch on them. The most long-term significance of the talk is that "the masses are willing to take whichever form they want to take, and those that are not legal should be made legal", which is decisive in the early breakthroughs of rural reforms, but whether it can be done or not requires a certain guarantee of the institutional and social environment, and even expects the

support of the pragmatic politicians and reformers in the critical moment. But whether this can be done requires certain institutional and social guarantees, and even the support of pragmatic politicians and reformers at the critical moment.

Deng Xiaoping's talk on "how to restore agricultural production" in the 1960s became "relevant" and richer with the change of time and space after the end of the 1970s. Some of the implicit attitudes and arguments in the talk can be heard from time to time as historical echoes in the controversies of the reform era.

At the Central Work Conference at the end of 1978, the issue of contracting production to households was raised. For example, during the discussion at the meeting, Zhang Xiangshan, director of the Central Broadcasting Bureau, raised the question of contracting production to households: what exactly is contracting production to households? What does it mean to follow the capitalist road? If the ownership of the means of production remains unchanged and there is no exploitation of others, and production is contracted to groups or households, is this capitalism? (14) Yu Guangyuan recalled that one day, before the document was finalized, I heard that in the agricultural document drafted by Hu Qiaomu, not only was it not written that production could be distributed to households, but on the contrary, the "two prohibitions" had been written into it. (15)

This suggests that Deng Xiaoping and other leaders may have been aware of the discussion on the issue of contract production to the household through conference briefings and the like. However, the raising of this issue was still a sporadic phenomenon, and as a whole it was not possible to envision a breakthrough from the system of people's commune and the implementation of family contracting. This should be a basic ideological, political and institutional background for understanding the later controversy over the contracting of production to households and the contracting of work to households.

After 1979, the contracting of production to households continued to attract attention and became a policy and even political issue from the grassroots to the top. As his decision-making role and

position shifted, Deng Xiaoping was bound to be more involved in the issue of household production and more often needed to take a stand.

Shortly after the March 1979 national forum on rural work in seven provinces and three counties, Hua Guofeng presided over a central government meeting attended by Deng Xiaoping and Li Xiannian. At the meeting, Hua Guofeng used the example of his "three summers" in Hunan, where harvesting and planting had to be done in mutual aid and cooperation, to say that collectivization was not an option. Deng Xiaoping did not take a position on this, he said: poor areas must always relax their policies. (16)

In June 1979, during the Second Session of the Fifth National People's Congress, Wan Li reported to Deng Xiaoping that some places in the Anhui countryside had already begun to collectivize production to households, but some people were against it. Deng Xiaoping said, "Don't argue, just do it, just do it in a practical way". (17) During the meeting, Wan Li also asked Chen Yun about this issue. Chen Yun said, "I raise my hands in favor of it." (18) These two interactions should be characterized as informal, private exchanges of views. From this point of view, Wan Li's ability to boldly liberalize rural policies and support the farmers' contracting of production to households in Anhui should also be an important reason for Deng Xiaoping's and Chen Yun's attitudes, in addition to his own insights and boldness.

On January 31, 1980, during the National Conference on the Operation and Management of Rural People's Communes, the Politburo of the Central Committee heard a report on the conference. Hua Guofeng emphasized that those who had already engaged in contracting production to households should seriously sum up their experience, raise the consciousness of the masses, and gradually guide them to organize themselves. Deng Xiaoping did not make a clear statement. He said that it was not good to answer such a big question as "from production to household" without prior airing and unprepared thinking. He also focused on the strategic issue of realizing Xiaokang at the end of the century. (19)

On April 2, Deng Xiaoping talked with Hu Yaobang, Wan Li, Yao Yilin and Deng Liqun about long-term planning. Yao Yilin says: Industry and agriculture should get rid of some of their baggage. Comrades in the Agriculture Committee suggested that provinces such as Gansu, Inner Mongolia, Guizhou and Yunnan, to whom the central government transfers a lot of grain, are a great burden to the country. Can you consider, for these areas, in the policy to relax a little. The sparsely populated, economically backward, poor areas, simply the implementation of the package of production to the household and so on. Let them think for themselves and reduce the burden on the state. Deng Xiaoping said: I agree with what Comrade Yilin has just said. In rural areas that are sparsely populated, economically backward and poor, such as the provinces of Northwest China, Guizhou and Yunnan, there are places where such methods as transferring production to households can be implemented. (20)

Next came Deng Xiaoping's famous speech on May 31, 1980, on the issue of rural policy. Shortly after this speech, Deng also talked with Du Runsheng after a meeting. He said: It seems that the form of our rural economy can be diversified a bit. Like the poor areas in the past is not a package production to the household, can try it! If we want to change it in the future, we can change it, but it's important to have enough to eat first. (21)

Looking back at Deng Xiaoping's thought process on household production during the reform era, we can find a noteworthy phenomenon: by and large, he seemed to be more outspoken and explicitly supportive of household production in informal occasions or conversations dominated by him; however, he seemed to be more subtle and seldom expressed his views directly in the more formal high-level meetings. This may be a euphemism for avoiding controversy, of course, does not rule out the fact that he is still thinking about this issue.

Sources of Deng Xiaoping's Talks

Thinking about the issue of household production is inseparable from a variety of information and materials, as mentioned in a work, Deng Xiaoping not only listened to Wan Li and others to report on the situation of rural production to household and household work, but also spent a lot of energy to read through a large amount of information (22).

So how did Deng Xiaoping get, and what information and materials did he get about the contracting of production to households and the contracting of work to households? In view of the fact that in the talk of May 31, 1980, Deng Xiaoping mainly cited the example of Anhui as a supporting evidence of the effectiveness of the production-to-household and lump-sum schemes, here is an attempt to make some discussion on the question of how he came to know about the situation of rural reforms in Anhui.

First of all, we have to talk about Wan Li, who was in charge of Anhui between 1977 and 1980. Wan Li in the history of Deng Xiaoping's work with deep, close relationship (23), between them "have a close friend, the relationship is extraordinary" (24). Not to mention, during Deng Xiaoping's reorganization in 1975, Wan Li served as the Minister of Railways and made an important contribution to the restoration of normal order in the railroad system. It is for this reason that when Deng was criticized in 1976, the so-called "black relationship" between Deng and Wan was pursued (25). It can be said that Wan Li was a senior leading cadre that Deng Xiaoping was more familiar with and trusted, and the two sides had more contact on formal or informal occasions, so it was naturally more convenient and smooth to report and exchange work. As mentioned earlier, in June 1979, Wan Li reported to Deng Xiaoping on the issue of the transfer of production to households in Anhui Province, and in April 1980, when Deng Xiaoping was talking about long-term planning, Wan Li was also present. Wan Li once said: "Thanks to the support of Comrade Xiaoping, I came back from Anhui to report to him many times, and he said he agreed that it could be tested. After the results came out, he publicly expressed his support." (26) This suggests that Wan Li was supported by Deng Xiaoping when he was in charge of Anhui, and that Deng Xiaoping was informed of the situation in Anhui through Wan Li on several occasions. After 1980, Wan Li returned to Beijing to serve as Secretary of the Secretariat of the Central Committee and Vice

Premier of the State Council, in charge of the national agricultural work, and naturally had more opportunities to report to Deng Xiaoping or talk about Anhui.

Second, various meetings and debriefings were the public and formal channels through which Deng Xiaoping and other leaders learned about Anhui's reforms. After the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee, the State Agricultural Committee convened a number of symposiums on rural work and reported to the leading comrades of the central government during the meetings. For example, in March 1979, the State Agricultural Committee convened a symposium of agricultural cadres from seven provinces and three counties; the seven provinces in attendance were Guangdong, Hunan, Jiangsu, Anhui, Sichuan, Hebei, and Jilin, and the three counties were Boro in Guangdong, Quanjiao in Anhui, and Guanghan in Sichuan. The conference process has always been throughout the debate on the responsibility system, mainly two issues, one is the implementation of the principle of what should be adhered to, and the second is the packet production to the household what attitude should be taken. (27) In early 1980, the State Agricultural Committee held a national conference on the management of rural people's communes, during which a heated debate once again arose around the contracted production to the household. Zhou Yili, deputy director of the Anhui Agricultural Committee, made a speech entitled "the strong vitality of the linkage production responsibility system," in defense of the package production to the household, spoke for more than two hours. In speaking of the more significant role of the package production to household in poor areas, he focused on three examples, namely, the Shannan district of Feixi County, the Xiaogang production team of Liyuan Commune in Fengyang County, and the Yuming Commune in Lai'an County. (28) As mentioned earlier, during this meeting, the State Agricultural Committee made a report to the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, with Deng Xiaoping in attendance. It is worth pointing out that Zhou Yili's lists of Feixi and Fengyang, both of which appeared in Deng Xiaoping's talk more than a year later, may be more than just a coincidence.

Furthermore, the various internal references for leaders are another important channel through which they are informed. A few examples can be cited of how information about the situation in Anhui province reached the leaders through the channels of internal references. For example, Guo Chongyi, deputy director of the Counselor's Office of the Anhui Provincial Government, recalled

that in July 1979, he came to Beijing with his own "Report on the Visit to the Afternoon Harvest Situation in Feixi County" reflecting the situation in Feixi County where production was distributed to the households, and found Wang Kengjin, director of the Institute of Agricultural Economics of the Academy of Social Sciences. The latter and the Institute listened carefully to his statement, accepted the report and promised to forward it to the central government on his behalf. Soon a researcher surnamed Chen told him: the report has been sent to the General Office of the Central Committee, very much attention, hurry back to the province, and then send a copy to Comrade Wanli. July 29, he sent the investigation report to the provincial party committee. August 1, the Rural Policy Research Office of the report with an appreciative note to the policy research 18 issue issued by the newspaper. Guo Chongyi also hinted, rather politely and implicitly, that Deng Xiaoping's reference in his talk to the situation in Feixi County, where production was organized to households, might have some relevance to his material. (29) As another example, in mid-April 1980, according to Wan Li's instructions, Xinhua reporters Zhang Guangyou and Wu Xiang went to the rural areas of the Jianghuai region of Anhui Province to conduct an investigation for more than a month, and wrote a series of eight articles totaling more than 20,000 words called "Insights from the Rural Areas of the Jianghuai Region." (30) They were published in the internal journal of Xinhua News Agency. Among them, one of the anecdotes reads: "In Fengyang County, where the 'big baggage' production responsibility system has been implemented for a year, under seriously unfavorable natural conditions, the growth of summer crops in most of the districts is also better than that of last year. Feixi County is a county where the implementation of the "big baggage" production responsibility system is earlier and more numerous than that of the "big baggage" production responsibility system. Packet Production to Households earlier and more (97%) of a county, last year's summer crop growth of good in the province is one of the best." (31) The writing of this passage is much closer in time to Deng Xiaoping's talk, and there is considerable overlap in content. Some articles have suggested that this report had a direct influence on Deng's speech. The series of reports was said to have been published from May 27 to 30 of that year in an internal journal sent exclusively to the central leadership, and sent to members of the Politburo in Beijing to read every morning. (32) There is a certain rationality in this judgment.

The above analysis of the sources of information about Deng Xiaoping's talks is rather sketchy and generalized. The issue is very complex, involving a series of formal and informal mechanisms for

collecting, transmitting, processing, and feeding back information for high-level decision-making, including both formal channels and procedures for transmitting information, as well as organizational and personnel origins that are difficult to grasp and to describe.

Conveyance and implementation of Deng Xiaoping's talk

Deng Xiaoping's talk, there was no public report, to the 1983 "Deng Xiaoping Selected Writings (1975-1982)" published in the world, and initially appeared in the form of internal consultation. Wang Yuzhao, then secretary of the Chu County Party Committee, later recalled that in early June of that year, he had seen the draft of Deng Xiaoping's internal talk on "Issues of Rural Policy" sent to him by the provincial party committee, which was not allowed to be copied (33).

It seems that this talk was not widely known in society at that time, but it could not be considered small in the Party. On June 19 of that year, Zhao Ziyang sent a letter to Wanli and Hu Yaobang on the issue of current rural policy. The letter said that, according to Comrade Xiao Ping's instructions on rural policy, it is necessary to organize a combination of cadres and theoretical workers in the agricultural sector to go into different types of areas and communities to make some in-depth investigations and analyses of the issue of household production, and to strive for the formation of a central government document after the autumn of this year to have a unified and clear statement and to solve this problem in a leading way. He also suggested that the Secretariat discuss the matter. (34) Upon Du Runsheng's suggestion to Hu Yaobang, the letter was forwarded to the whole party (35). The letter did not detail the contents of Deng's talk, but through this letter, the spirit of the talk should be widely known to the Party.

(I) Deng Xiaoping's Talks Promoted Local Rural Reform Practices

In Henan, in the spring of 1980, the "joint production to labor" system became the main form of the agricultural production responsibility system, and at the same time, the "production to household" or "big lump-sum" system was also implemented on a large scale in Lankao, Yucheng and other counties, which aroused heated debates. Some people accused the household production is divided into fields, "made a directional error", some counties sent a working group to the countryside to "correct". In the midst of the controversy, the provincial party committee studied and carried out the spirit of Deng Xiaoping's speech on supporting the implementation of the system of production to household in Fengyang and other places in Anhui, conducted in-depth investigations in the countryside, and made it clear that as long as it could promote the development of production and solve the problem of people's food and clothing, it was in line with the spirit of the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the CPC, thus recognizing the various forms of the system of responsibility that had appeared in the countryside of Henan. (36)

In Hubei, Deng Xiaoping's talk played a major role in the provincial party committee's implementation of the household contract responsibility system. in the first half of 1980, the provincial party committee organized four investigation groups to investigate the implementation of the responsibility system in four counties, namely, Wuchang, Huanggang, Zhongxiang, and Lichuan. The Provincial Party Committee believed that farmers located in remote mountainous areas, living in dispersed, or even single-family households, could, from a practical point of view, implement the system of production to the household under the unified leadership of the production team. in August, the Provincial Party Committee enlarged the meeting affirmed the positive role of the production responsibility system in promoting the development of productive forces. Taking this meeting as a starting point, Hubei Province started to implement various forms of agricultural production responsibility system widely in the province, first in the poor mountainous areas and then in the plains and hills, first in the drylands and then in the paddy fields, first in the farmlands and then in the mountains and forests and water surfaces, and first in the production contracting to the group and then in the big contracting. (37)

In Yunnan, in April 1980, the provincial party committee conveyed Yao Yilin's speech during the national conference on the preparation of long-term planning. The speech pointed out that Deng

Xiaoping agreed that in the rural areas where people were sparsely populated, economically backward, and poor, such as those in the provinces of Northwest China, Guizhou, Yunnan, and Gansu, the policy should be more lenient, and that it would be easier to implement the system of "production to household" or the like, and that at a meeting of the county party secretaries in July, it was decided to implement the system of "production to household" in the high-cold, dispersed, and barren mountainous areas in the interior of the country, and in those areas of the frontier where the economic and cultural basis of the population of 10 million people was very backward. areas where the economic and cultural base of 10 million people is very backward. (38) At this time, Yunnan was still conveying the content of Deng Xiaoping's talk in April 1980, but in terms of supporting the introduction of production to households, the spirit of Deng Xiaoping's two talks in April and May was the same.

In Anhui, the situation was even more vivid: in August 1980, at an enlarged meeting of the Standing Committee of the Provincial Party Committee, there was a "lopsided" criticism of household production, but a few people, such as Wang Yuzhao, secretary of the Chuxian Local Party Committee, still defended household production. Gu Zhuoxin, the second secretary of the provincial party committee who presided over the meeting, thought that the divergence of opinions was so big that it was not good to summarize the meeting, and suggested that Deng Xiaoping's talk be read out as a summary of the meeting. It is worth noting that at the meeting, Wang Yuzhao said that if the higher-ups did not agree to the practice of contracting production to households, then please correct it by public order, and that I, as a Communist Party member and as a subordinate, would just obey. (39) Wang Yuzhao actually "will" the main leaders of the provincial party committee a "military", its bottom line? The provincial party committee later did not give an order to "correct", its concerns? Obviously, Deng Xiaoping's conversation is an important factor.

(B) Deng Xiaoping's talk to promote the central government on the policy of contracted production, contracted to the household policy breakthroughs

In the aforementioned letter of Zhao Ziyang, he combined with the spirit of Deng Xiaoping's talk, put forward three points of view on the issue of production to household: "First, in those difficult

and backward places, production can be contracted to the household; second, in those places where the production is more normal and the collective economy is doing better, in principle, do not engage in the contracting of production to the household (as for the community's sideline production and diversified business, it can be contracted to the professional group, specialized households, specialized workers); thirdly, in some places where the collective economy is doing relatively well and where production has been transferred to households, experiments may be carried out first, and after a period of experimentation to see what the results will be." (40)

After research by cadres and theoreticians in the agricultural sector and the promotion of some leaders, the contracting of production to households and the contracting of production to households finally gained legal status in terms of centralized policy. In September 1980, the central government convened a symposium of the first secretaries of the party committees of provinces, autonomous regions, and municipalities directly under the central government, and then forwarded a summary of the proceedings, "A Few Problems Concerning the Further Strengthening and Improvement of the System of Responsibility for Agricultural Production. The document proposed a differentiated policy, distinguishing between "general areas" and "remote mountainous areas and poor and backward areas," and emphasizing that the former type of areas "should not engage in the practice of contracting production to the household" while the latter type of areas "can contract production to the household" and the latter type of areas "can contract production to the household. It was emphasized that in the former type of areas "production should not be contracted to the household", while in the latter type of areas "production can be contracted to the household, or contracted to the household" (41).

This major breakthrough was undoubtedly the result of the peasants' practice, of the continuous emancipation of their minds, and of the efforts of pragmatic leaders, but in terms of the evolution of high-level decision-making, it was also the result of the implementation of Deng Xiaoping's talk.

V. Analyzing the Content of Deng Xiaoping's Talks

Deng Xiaoping's talk marked an important breakthrough in rural reform, but did not fundamentally resolve the controversy, in the subsequent landmark first secretary of the symposium, but also a heated debate, and the "Yangguan Road and Dokugiao" controversy known to the world. The reasons for this are naturally complex. Wan Li once recalled that after Deng Xiaoping's speech, "the situation has improved, but it is still noisy, and the national debate has not stopped, and some opponents have power in their hands, so you can't do anything if he doesn't agree" (42). For the organizational, personnel and power background of this issue, the author will not deal with it here, but only wants to discern some specific contents of the conversation, so as to cognize the policy, ideological and practical background of this issue.

(I) In what sense did Deng Xiaoping support the idea of production to households?

It is not wrong to say that Deng Xiaoping's talk was in favor of the practice of contracting production to households, but it is not enough. To be precise, he did not support in an absolute sense, not to mention advocating the introduction of production to households, but emphasized the conditions that "suitable for the introduction of production to households". This point can be further understood from the history of the central government's policy breakthrough on rural production to household since 1978.

The regulations on the work of rural people's communes adopted at the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China explicitly stated, "It is not permitted to transfer production to households or to divide the land into separate plots." (43) In September 1979, the Decision on Several Issues Concerning the Acceleration of Agricultural Development, adopted at the Fourth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC), loosened this slightly, proposing that, "except for the special needs of certain sideline production, and for single households in remote mountainous areas with inconvenient transportation, it is not necessary to transfer production to the household" (44). On

the surface, although the policy of forbidding the contracting of production to households remained unchanged, the tone of the words from "forbid" to "don't" became softer, and there was more or less room for negotiation.

It was not until the First Secretary's Symposium in September 1980 that the central government made a real breakthrough in its policy, i.e., in impoverished areas, "production can be contracted out to the household, and it can also be contracted out to the household". These are the places that Deng Xiaoping said were "suitable for contracting production to the household". So, how to determine these places? Du Runsheng pointed out in his explanation at the meeting of the first secretaries that the poorest teams with a per capita income of less than 40 yuan were the ones where production could be distributed to households. About 60 percent of these teams are located in nine provinces (autonomous regions), including Yunnan, Guizhou, Henan, Lu, Gansu, Ningxia, Mongolia, Fujian, and Anhui, accounting for about 20 percent of the rural population. (45)

After 1981, this differentiated policy was further quantified and refined into three categories: about 20 percent of the poorest teams were engaged in contracting production to households; another 25 percent of the advanced teams were engaged in professional contracting and joint production and remuneration; and another 50 to 60 percent of the middle-range teams were engaged in unified management and joint production and labor responsibility systems. (46) This policy was jokingly called "cutting three knives" in the agricultural sector and among the peasants at that time. It was "basically of the nature of drawing a firm line on the ground" (47), and thus soon became untenable and was broken through by the practice of the peasants, while the central government further recognized the practice of the peasants, and no longer set limitations based on the location and economic conditions of the region, and permitted the peasants to make free choices, even to the extent that some localities began to promote the contracting of production to the household and the contracting of production to the household in a top-down manner. The practice was further recognized. Subsequently, the "contracting of production to the household" was completely replaced by the "contracting of production to the household", covering the vast majority of the countryside, which can almost be said to be another form of "one size fits all".

Looking back on this policy shift, we can see that there were two main points of convergence: one was the formal recognition that poor areas could engage in the practice of contracting production to households, and the other was the respect for the will of the peasants, who chose whether or not to engage in the practice of contracting production to households. Deng Xiaoping's talk was at the first junction, or rather promoted the formation of the first junction, recognizing that "where it is appropriate to carry out the contracting of production to the household", it can be done. Then, there was flexibility in local implementation as to which places were suitable for it, and each could take what it wanted, depending on its own circumstances and understanding. In addition, Deng Xiaoping's talk did not give a positive answer to one of the controversial issues at that time, i.e., the question of whether the contracted production to household was "social" or "capital", thus making it impossible for the ideological controversy surrounding the issue to be really resolved.

(2) Did Deng Xiaoping say "Dabaojian" means "parceling out to households"?

Many writers have assumed that Deng Xiaoping's talk of the "Dabao Gan" refers to the kind of "Baogang" (包干) households in Xiaogang Village in Fengyang. I am afraid that this is not accurate enough, and that the Dagan and the Baojian to the household were initially far from being the same thing.

The history of the concept of "big package dry" is interesting, and it can be said that it is a microcosm of the change of the main body of business accounting after the rural people's commune. In terms of its name, the Dapaogans can be traced back to the early 1960s. At that time, one of the major problems to be solved was the restriction of the production team's right to operate by the people's commune and production brigade and the equalization of the production team's property. 1961, Hu Kaiming, the first secretary of Zhangjiakou District in Hebei Province, conducted a pilot project of "big lump-sum distribution of proceeds" in the village of Guo Leizhuang, Wanquan County, which consisted of the "three packages and one prize" (three packages and one prize). One Prize" (i.e., work, production, and investment, with rewards for overproduction), and then further decentralized the accounting unit to the production team. After that, Mao adopted the pilot experience and decided to decentralize the basic accounting unit to the

production team and to implement "three levels of ownership, with the team as the base".(48) At this time, Mao Zedong's decision to decentralize the accounting unit to the production team was not a success. (48) At this time, the term "lump-sum" referred to the practice of transferring the work to the production team.

At the end of the 1970s, the concept of "big lump sum" reappeared, but it was no longer aimed at the production teams, but at the operational groups under them, i.e., the "lump sum" to the groups. The first to refer to the "lump-sum" concept was Wang Yuzhao, secretary of the Chu County Party Committee in Anhui Province, who, together with Chen Tingyuan, secretary of the Fengyang County Party Committee, came to the Yuebei Production Unit of the Chengnan Commune in Fengyang County in February 1979 to study the situation of the lump-sum to the group that was being practiced there. At that time, the members were calculating the proportion of production and labor and various contributions, but the calculation was not clear. A few old members said, the best way is to package the production to the group, pay enough for the country, stay enough for the collective, how much is left is the group, both simple and trouble-free, a cut a bloody mouth, cadres worry, members of the community to rest assured. Wang Yuzhao and Chen Tingyuan thought this was a good idea and agreed to do it, and Wang Yuzhao named it "Dabaojian". (49) Soon, the jingle "Da Pao Gan, Da Pao Gan, straight forward, no detours, pay enough for the state, keep enough for the collective, and the rest is theirs" became popular in Fengyang County.

Into the 1980's, with the Xiaogang village of the package to the household from the secret to the public, affected by the gradual increase in the place, causing more and more attention, the big package also gradually from the package to the group further down to the package to the household, the famous jingle, but also gradually used as a package to the household of the special common name. With the passage of time and the coverage of the majority of rural areas by the Baogao to the household, people gradually and habitually equate the Dabao Gan with the Baogao to the household. However, when reading historical documents, this inevitably causes interference and some misinterpretation.

So when Deng Xiaoping talked about the Fengyang Dabaogan, did he really mean the "package to the group" or the "package to the household"? Carefully analyzed, what he said should be the package dry to the group, can be viewed from three aspects:

First, the data show that in 1979, Fengyang County, a total of 3710 production teams, the implementation of the large parcels to the group of 3098, accounting for 83.5% of the total number of production teams (50). In fact, the impact of Fengyang's "Baogan to group" was very great, and in June, Wan Li, who went to Fengyang to study the "Baogan to group", sent Zhou Yili and three other people, together with Lu Zixiu, director of the office of the Chu County Commission, and two other people, to Fengyang to summarize the experience and collate the materials. Therefore, fengyang county big bag dry policy gradually towards the rationalization and theorization. 8, "anhui daily" front page headline published "fengyang county in the rural areas of the implementation of the "big bag dry ""。 For a while, journalists, experts and scholars from the press, literary and theoretical circles gathered in Fengyang to visit. (51) It can be said that Deng Xiaoping's statement that "the vast majority of the production teams in Fengyang have practiced the "big lump sum" is a reflection of this situation.

Second, Deng Xiaoping's talk took place in May 1980. Considering the common sense, the material he knew about the Dapaojian in Fengyang should be earlier, roughly speaking the situation from the beginning of 1979 to the beginning of 1980, which also coincided with the time of the "one-year turnaround" he said. And in this year, Xiaogang Village, the package to the household is still in a state of secrecy, do not want to and dare not be known. 1980 January, Fengyang County Party Committee Policy Research Office in a research report wrote: "Xiaogang production team package to the household engaged in a year, no one dares to summarize it, and no one dares to publicize it. In some materials organized by the county, occasional examples of Xiaogang appeared, but they were all discreetly deleted." (52) It was during the Anhui provincial agricultural work conference in early January 1980, through Wang Yuzhao, this research material was sent to Wanli. Wan Li looked at it and said happily, "Like reading a novel, I even read it twice." Soon after, Wan Li made a trip to Xiaogang Village. (53) It was only thereafter that the situation in Xiaogang Village became public, so

Deng Xiaoping's statement that the vast majority of places in Fengyang had engaged in dabaojian could not have been referring to this kind of dabaojian to the household in Xiaogang Village.

Thirdly, according to the materials I have seen, at the latest in July 1980, in the line, "big package dry" and "package dry to the household" this two words are not yet common, and at this time is already Deng Xiaoping talk two months later. For example, in July of this year, the Anhui Provincial Party Committee went to Fengyang investigation group of a research report pointed out that the "big dry" is a transitional form, it or transition to the unified leadership of the production team, the implementation of specialized division of labor on the basis of the production to the people, or the development of the "dry" to the households. The report emphasizes that, in Fengyang, the "production" system is based on the "production team". The report emphasizes that, in Fengyang, the transition from "big package dry" to "package dry to the household" is the direction of the people's hearts and the general trend. (54)

The fact that Deng Xiaoping's term "Dabao Gan" refers to the practice of parcelling to the group, not to the household, may be one reason why the controversy still exists after his talk. For those leading cadres who opposed the idea of "production to the household" or "chartering of production to the household," Deng Xiaoping spoke in favor of "chartering production to the household," so it would be inconvenient to oppose "chartering production to the household," but Deng Xiaoping didn't support "chartering production to the household," so it might be a good idea to oppose "chartering production to the household. For example, mentioned earlier in early June 1980, Anhui provincial party committee leaders held a meeting in Chaohu, at this time the provincial party committee leaders have seen Deng Xiaoping's internal draft of the conversation, "in the discussion, no one again blatantly opposed to the package of production to the household, but is not quite in favor of the big package to the household. The leaders of the provincial party committee said that it was all right to go from package production to household, because they still insisted on the five unities and the unified distribution, while the big package to household was two packages and one footstool, so they did not agree to go from package production to household" (55).

Sixth, not "polarization", not "face painting"

In many writings on the history of reform and in the recollections of those involved, the controversies and debates during the early breakthroughs in rural reform are described as if they were tit-for-tat, right and wrong, and incompatible. There is a "magnifying" effect of looking at the issue from a particular perspective, but this impression is also reinforced by researchers and reviewers who consciously or unconsciously elevate one side and criticize the other. In fact, in the real history, there are debates on ideological views, but they are not "polarized", and there are disagreements on relevant figures, but they are not "profiled". Here, in the light of Deng Xiaoping's later retrospectives, I will make a few comments on the controversy surrounding the contracting of production to households.

Firstly, the leading cadres who supported the contracting of production to households and the contracting of households to farmers were under tremendous pressure and had extraordinary political wisdom, courage and commitment. This should be the base point for judging the arguments and differences at that time. A paragraph of Wan Li's review is extremely real, evocative and profound, which tells the story of the difficulties and extraordinary in the meantime. He said: "Some well-meaning comrades reflected to me that some people criticized us for violating both the Constitution and the Party's decision. What to do? I said, the peasants are in favor of it, and the peasants must engage in it, so we have to tough it out, and anyway, we've already done it, so let's do it this way. The Party's decision said not to engage in contract farming to the household, I can not openly oppose, but I said to them, I agree with you to do it, just do it, I will take the blame for any problems. That section of Anhui was a case of such 'lawlessness', essentially reflecting the contradiction between the peasants' demand for the development of the productive forces and the old superstructures, the old rules and regulations, which were no longer adapted to them." (56) Indeed, despite the change in the context of the times and the ideological weapon that practice is the only standard for testing the truth, the historical practice of contracting production to the household has been politically criticized several times, involving the political fate and life situation of many leading cadres, which is still a cause for concern at the early stage of reform. As some writers have pointed out, wherever rural reform was carried out early and well, there was probably a group of peasants who would not be criticized and jailed, a group of cadres who were not afraid of being dismissed and reorganized, and a group of leaders who "turned a blind eye" and supported the

reform either secretly or openly (57). Therefore, in the face of the rise of a new round of household production, this group of cadres who acquiesced in, tolerated, and supported the practice of household production is worthy of praise. Deng Xiaoping then recalled, "Two provinces took the lead, one was Sichuan Province, which was my hometown, and the other was Anhui Province, which was then presided over by Comrade Wan Li." (58) He had also pointed out that China's reforms began in the countryside, and the reforms in the countryside began in Anhui, for which Comrade Wanli was credited (59). Here, Wanli can be regarded as a typical and representative of a group of cadres from the top to the grassroots at that time.

Second, the process of change in the understanding of package production to household is a continuous genealogy. As mentioned earlier, there were two points of convergence in the policy and understanding of the contracting of production to households: first, whether or not to allow contracting of production to households in impoverished areas, and second, whether or not to allow peasants to independently choose their own mode of operation. In the broader context, one of the first major breakthroughs in rural reform was the ending of the Dazhai movement, which was a transition to poverty (60). The shift in understanding was difficult. As Wan Li told a meeting of the Party Group of the Ministry of Agriculture in March 1981, "'left' thinking exists to varying degrees in the minds of our comrades; it is not a matter of whether there is something or not here, but rather a matter of how much" (61). Therefore, cognitively speaking, about the transformation of the package of production to the household, can constitute a spectrum, many leading cadres in different positions in this spectrum, the transformation of the existence of the first and the latter, late and fast, more and less. Some of the leaders who were not quite in favor of, or did not approve of, the widespread introduction of production to households, later on, most of them changed their understanding. (62) For example, Lu Zixiu recalled, "In 1980, when Comrade Wanli left Anhui and Comrade Zhang Jinfu presided over the provincial party committee, there were twists and turns in the contract responsibility system. Comrade Jinfu belonged to the problem of recognizing it, and later he himself made a self-criticism" (63). In Zhang Jinfu's biography, broadcast by Xinhua after his death, it is clearly stated that "he continued to purge 'left' thinking, vigorously pushed forward rural reform, and continued to promote the household contract responsibility system." (64) This is a rather typical situation. Deng Xiaoping later recalled, "The introduction of rural household contracting was not enthusiastic at first, and many people were looking at it. Our policy is to

allow people to look. Allowed to see, than forced much better", "there are many people do not agree, family contracting is still socialism? They don't say it with their mouths, but they can't figure it out in their hearts, so they drag their feet in their actions, and some of them have been on top of it for two years, while we wait". (65) In the rural reform, the central government dealt with the issue of people on the basis of one principle, namely, that the attitude toward the contracting of production to the household should be treated only as a matter of understanding, and that understanding could be changed. Leaders who were transferred out of their places of origin for this reason did not affect the continuation of their work, and some became national leaders, and this was largely true at the prefecture and county levels as well. (66)

Third, the perceptions of some of those who were once less in favor of large-scale household farming actually touched on some deeper issues. For example, when Zhang Jinfu arrived in Anhui, he traveled to all the prefectures, cities, and counties, and went to some of the poorer places, especially big counties with large populations like Linquan. Later, he asked the Ministry of Finance for a sum of money, which was earmarked as a solution to the difficulties of the people living in Linquan. In Anhui, he said two sentences: "Farmers can't get rich just by relying on one acre of land" and "Anhui can't get rich just by relying on a handful of rice". The first sentence emphasized the need to diversify agriculture and the second sentence stressed the need to vigorously develop industry. (67) In Heilongjiang, Yang Yichen was not quite in favor of the large-scale extension of production to households at first. In his opinion, one size does not fit all, one model does not fit all. In some places, the practice of transferring production to households and groups was appropriate and right, while in other places it was not necessarily appropriate. You take your "sunny road", and I take my "wooden bridge". If we do not start from the characteristics of our place, to engage in the team type, package production to the group, package production to the household, then we will lose our advantages. He emphasized the geographical feature of the Northeast in terms of its large land area and particularly high degree of mechanization. (68) The problems they raise do not necessarily constitute reasons for opposing package production to households, but after the popularization of package production to households, they are still problems that need to be paid attention to, responded to, and solved. The issues raised from this perspective are in fact outlined and envisioned in Deng Xiaoping's talk, and will not be repeated due to the limitations of the topic of this paper.

Notes:

① Du Runsheng: "Du Runsheng autobiography: a chronicle of major decisions on China's rural institutional change", People's Publishing House, 2005, p. 115.

② The Third Research Department of the Party History Research Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China: The History of China's Reform and Opening Up, Liaoning People's Publishing House, 2002, p. 109.

③ Wu Xiang: China's Rural Reform Factbook, Zhejiang People's Publishing House, 2001, p. 153.

The first secretaries of the three provinces and regions at that time were Wan Li, Zhao Ziyang, and Zhou Hui, who, with an enlightened and pragmatic attitude, acquiesced in and supported the local peasants' exploration of various production responsibility systems, which was relatively typical and influential at that time. As a result, there was a popular proverb that "if you want to eat rice, look for Wanli; if you want to eat grain, look for Ziyang". Hu Yaobang once said, "Wanli is the first, Zhao Ziyang is the second, and Zhou Hui is the third." See Yu Guoyao and others, "The Great Turnaround in the Fate of Chinese Peasants: A Chronicle of Rural Reform Decisions," Zhuhai Publishing House, 1999, p. 59.

⑤ Xiaojingzhuang and Xiaogang villages have already set up the Memorial Hall for Packet Production to Households and the Memorial Hall for the Great Packet Drying, respectively. In fact, various sources indicate that neither Xiaojingzhuang nor Xiaogang Village may be the earliest in terms of rural areas where production was packaged and household work was carried out. As a common saying goes, "There is no such thing as a gentleman who walks early, but there are even earlier walkers". In a strictly empirical sense, the question of which place was the earliest may not be clear at all, because in the course of more than 20 years of agricultural cooperation and collectivization, some places have been secretly engaging in various forms of contracting production

to households and contracting work to households. See Fan Xiaochun, "Packet Production to Households before Reform and Opening Up," CCP History Press, 2009.

(6) Du Runsheng Anthology (1980-1998) (above), Shanxi Economic Press, 1998, p. 58.

(7) There is in fact no disagreement about the fact that contracting production to the household and contracting to the household can quickly help increase food production in poor areas. Therefore, although the debate was heated, the logic was relatively simple: "Cadres want direction, members want production", and "cadres are afraid of being wrong, peasants are afraid of starvation". Cited in Chen Jiyuan, edited by Chen Jiyuan, "Social and Economic Changes in Rural China (1949-1989)," Shanxi Economic Press, 1993, p. 482.

(8) Du Runsheng, edited by Du Runsheng, Chronicle of China's Rural Reform Decision-making, Central Literature Publishing House, 1999, p. 122.

⑨ CPC Anhui Provincial Committee, Party History Research Office, ed: China's New Period of Rural Transformation (Anhui Volume), CPC Party History Press, 1999, pp. 7-8.

(10) Yin Cundong, "Dividing the Fields and Doing It Alone Must Be Corrected," Rural Work Newsletter, 1980, no. 2; Liu Bijian, "Whether Packet Production to Households Adheres to Public Ownership and Distribution According to Labor," Rural Work Newsletter, 1980, no. 3.

(11) Wu Xiang, China's Rural Reform Factbook, p. 152.

(12) Deng Xiaoping's Selected Writings, vol. 2, People's Publishing House, 1994, p. 315.

(13) Selected Writings of Deng Xiaoping, vol. 1, People's Publishing House, 1994, p. 323.

- (14) Cited in Han Gang, "A Difficult Transition: The Agricultural Issue of the 1978 Central Working Conference," *Studies in CCP History*, No. 9, 2011.
- (15) Yu Guangyuan, "That Great Historical Turnaround I Personally Experienced - Before and After the Stage of the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee", Central Compilation and Translation Publishing House, 1998, p. 63.
- (16) Du Runsheng, "Du Runsheng's Autobiography: A Chronicle of Major Decisions on China's Rural Institutional Changes," pp. 106-107.
- (17) Deng Xiaoping's Chronicle (1975-1997) (上), Central Literature Publishing House, 2004, p. 531.
- (18) Chen Yun's Annals (1905-1995) (下), Central Literature Publishing House, 2000, p. 248.
- (19) Du Runsheng, ed. *Chronicle of China's Rural Reform Decision-making*, pp. 259-260.
- (20) Deng Xiaoping's Chronicle (1975-1997) (邓小平年谱(1975-1997)),(上), pp. 615-616; Du Runsheng, *Du Runsheng's Autobiography: A Chronicle of the Major Decisions on China's Rural Institutional Changes* (杜润生自述：中国农村体制变革重大决策纪实),(第 115 页)。
- (21) Du Runsheng, "Du Runsheng's Autobiography: A Chronicle of Major Decisions on China's Rural Institutional Changes," p. 116.
- (22) Institute of Contemporary China Studies: *Historical Manuscripts of the People's Republic of China*, Volume 4, People's Publishing House and Contemporary China Press, 2012, p. 132.

(23) Mr. Zhao Shukai, who participated in the editing of Selected Writings of Wan Li, recalled that near the end of the editing of the Selected Writings, Wan Li hosted a banquet for the members of the editing team. During the conversation, Wan Li particularly mentioned that he decided not to include the article on Comrade Deng Xiaoping in the anthology. In its content, this manuscript systematically introduced his half-century-long interaction with Deng Xiaoping. See Zhao Shukai, *The Politics of Peasants*, The Commercial Press, 2011, pp. 66-67.

(24) Tian Jiyun, *The Great Practice of Reform and Opening Up - Commemorating the 30th Anniversary of Reform and Opening Up*, Xinhua Press, 2009, p. 486.

(25) Zhang Guangyou, *Ten Thousand Miles of Wind and Cloud*, Xinhua Publishing House, 2007, p. 98.

(26) Cited in Zhao Shukai, *The Politics of Peasants*, p. 94.

(27) Du Runsheng, edited by Du Runsheng, *Chronicle of China's Rural Reform Decisions*, p. 84.

(28) Du Runsheng, ed. *Chronicle of Decision-Making in China's Rural Reforms*, pp. 256-259; Rural Work Department of the Anhui Provincial Committee of the Communist Party of China, ed. *The Responsibility System for Agricultural Production in Anhui Province-Selected Materials*, Internal Materials, 1983, pp. 52-53.

(29) Guo Chongyi, *How I Participated in the Reform of the Rural Economic System*, edited by the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC) and others, *Rural Reform Wind and Cloud Facts*, China Literature and History Press, 1998, pp. 195-197.

(30) The eight articles in this series are: "The Production Situation is Very Good and the Life of the Masses is Stable," "The Joint Production Responsibility System is Powerful," "Ownership of Production to Households has a Significant Role in Changing the Outlook of the Poor Teams," "Ownership of Production to Households by the Wealthy Teams Has Increased Yield, and the Effect of Increasing Production is Also Remarkable," "Why the Masses Like Ownership of Production to Households," "The Key Lies in Strengthening the Leadership," "A few Questions of Knowledge about the Ownership of Production to Households," and "Whether or not Ownership of Production to Households Is an Expedient Measure.

(31) Zhang Guangyou, *On the Yangguan Road*, Anhui People's Publishing House, 1985, p. 78.

(32) CCP Feixi County Committee, Party History Research Office, editor and publisher: *The Beginning of China's Rural Reform--Shannan Xiaojingzhuang in Feixi, Anhui Province*, internal materials, p. 71.

(33) Wang Yuzhao, *Looking Back and Reflecting on the Past*, China Literature and Art Publishing House, 2012, p. 216.

(34) Contemporary Chinese Agricultural Cooperativization Editorial Office, *Compilation of Historical Materials on Agricultural Cooperativization since the Founding of the PRC*, CPC History Press, 1992, p. 934.

(35) Du Runsheng, *Du Runsheng's Autobiography: A Chronicle of Major Decisions on China's Rural Institutional Changes*, p. 116.

(36) Party History Research Office of the Henan Provincial Committee of the Communist Party of China, ed. *Changes in the Rural Areas in the New Period of China (Henan Volume)*, Communist Party History Press, 1998, pp. 4-5.

- (37) CPC Hubei Provincial Committee, Party History Research Office, ed: The Transformation of Rural Areas in China's New Period (Hubei Volume), CPC Party History Press, 1998, p. 3.
- (38) CPC Yunnan Provincial Committee, Party History Research Office, ed: Changes in Rural Areas in China's New Period (Yunnan Volume), CPC Party History Press, 1999, p. 3.
- (39) Wang Yuzhao, Retrospect and Reflection on the Past, pp. 219-220.
- (40) Compilation of Historical Materials on Agricultural Cooperativization since the Founding of the PRC, p. 934.
- (41) Literature Research Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Other Editors, Selected Important Literature on Agriculture and Agricultural Work in the New Period, Central Literature Publishing House, 1992, p. 60.
- (42) Zhang Guangyou and Han Gang, "Wan Li Talks About How Rural Reforms Were Started," Hundred Years of Tide, No. 3, 1998.
- (43) Compiled by the Office of the National Reform Commission: Compilation of Important Literature on Economic System Reform since the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee (11 三中全会以来经济体制改革重要文献汇编), Reform Publishing House, 1990, p. 81.
- (44) Selected Important Literature on Agriculture and Agricultural Work in the New Period, p. 33.

(45) Compilation of Historical Materials on Agricultural Cooperativization since the Founding of the People's Republic of China, p. 929.

(46) Collected Writings of Du Runsheng (1980-1998) (上), p. 22.

(47) Ling Zhijun, History No Longer Lingers - The Rise and Failure of the People's Commune in China, People's Publishing House, 1997, pp. 292-293.

(48) Ou Yuanfang, "The Enlightened Hu Kaiming," National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC) and others, Rural Reforms: A Record of Rural Reforms, China Literature and History Publishing House (China Literature and History Publishing House), 1998, pp. 163-164; Zhang Wandu, "The Beginning and End of the Distribution of the "Big Packet Drying" by Hu Kaiming in Guoleizhuang" (Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC), Wancun County Committee of the CPPCC) Committee: Wanquan Literary and Historical Materials, 6th series, 2002, pp. 10-14.

(49) Lu Zixiu, Meditations on the Three Rural Areas in the New Century, Anhui People's Publishing House, 2008, p. 77; Wang Yuzhao, Looking Back and Reflecting on the Past, pp. 184-185.

(50) Chen Jiyuan and others, eds., Social and Economic Changes in Rural China (1949-1989), p. 481.

(51) Zhang Guangyou, Ten Thousand Miles of Wind and Cloud, Xinhua Publishing House, 2007, p. 176.

(52) Fengyang County Party Committee Political Research Office: "Policies Relaxed and Poor Teams Turned Over - Changes in Xiaogang Production Teams' Implementation of the Big Package to Households", Rural Work Department of the CPC Anhui Provincial Party Committee, Anhui

Province, Anhui Province, Responsibility for Agricultural Production - Selected Materials, p. 210. By the way, this research report seems to have other different names in different places, for example, in the recollections of Wang Yuzhao and others, it is called A Dose of Indispensable Tonic - A Survey of Baogan to Households in Xiaogang Production Team of Liyuan Commune, Fengyang County, whereas in the 2nd series of Baogan to Households Materials compiled by the Research Group of China's Rural Development Problems in 1981 It is called "The Thought-provoking Xiaogang Production Team - Changes in the Poor Team's Implementation of the Large Package Production to Households".

(53) Wang Yuzhao, "Looking Back and Reflecting on the Past," pp. 195, 206.

(54) Anhui Provincial Party Committee Survey Group to Fengyang: "The Effectiveness, Practices, and Problems of the "Great Baogans"--A Survey Report on the Implementation of the Production Responsibility System in Agriculture in Fengyang County," edited by Rural Work Department of Anhui Provincial Party Committee of the Communist Party of China, Anhui Province, Anhui Province, The Responsibility System for Agricultural Production--Selected Materials, p. 193, 206. -- Selected Materials, p. 198.

(55) Wang Yuzhao, Retrospect and Reflection on the Past, p. 216.

(56) Zhang Guangyou and Han Gang, "Wan Li Talks about How Rural Reforms Were Started", Hundred Years of Tide, No. 3, 1998.

(57) Yu Guoyao and others, "The Great Turnaround in the Fate of Chinese Peasants - A Chronicle of Rural Reform Decisions," p. 35.

(58) Deng Xiaoping's Selected Writings, vol. 3, People's Publishing House, 1993, p. 238.

(59) Zhang Guangyou and Ding Longjia, *Wan Li*, CCP History Press, 2006, p. 227.

(60) In reviewing the early breakthroughs in rural reforms, Wan Li pointed out that there were roughly three rounds in the fight against the "left" errors during this period, namely, "breaking through the framework of Dazhai and insisting on production as the center," "breaking through the 'three-tier ownership, team-oriented' system" and "breaking through the 'three-tier ownership, team-oriented' system." "break through the framework of Dazhai, insisting on production as the center", "break through the 'three-tier ownership, team-based', implement joint production and remuneration, and package production to the group", and "break through the 'forbidden package production to the household', implement the household contract responsibility system, and give the peasants full autonomy!". See Zhang Guangyou and Han Gang, "Wan Li Talks About How Rural Reforms Were Started," *Hundred Years of Tide*, No. 3, 1998. This analysis is also insightful and enlightening.

(61) Editorial Group of Wan Li's Treatise, General Office of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress: *Wan Li on Rural Reform and Development*, China Democracy and Law Press, 1996, p. 114.

(62) There are, of course, individual cases that are quite dissimilar. For example, a vice-minister of the Ministry of Agriculture who opposed the practice of contracting production to households was once criticized by Wan Li for "failing to convince him of practical things, theoretical things, and the combination of practice and theory", and remained unchanged until his later years. His opposition to household production was considered "a force of political belief". See Zhao Shukai, "Understanding Agriculture and Understanding Farmers," *China Development Monitor*, No. 12, 2018.

(63) Lu Zixiu, "The Rise of Rural Reform in Anhui" (安徽农村改革的兴起), *Oral History of Rural Reform in Anhui*, edited by the Party History Research Office of the CPC Anhui Provincial Committee, CPC Party History Press, 2006, p. 147.

(64) Xinhua News Agency, "Biography of Comrade Zhang Jinfu", People's Daily, August 7, 2015

(65) Deng Xiaoping's Selected Writings, vol. 3, pp. 374, 367.

(66) Du Runsheng, "Du Runsheng's Autobiography: a Chronicle of Major Decisions on China's Rural Institutional Changes," p. 131.

(67) Zhang Jinfu, edited by Zhang Jinfu, Boing Ming - You Sheng (嚶鳴-友聲), China Finance and Economy Publishing House, 2004, pp. 134, 141.

(68) Memoirs of Yang Yichen, Central Literature Press, 1996, p. 316.