

## 論文の英文要旨

論文題目	<b>A study of the Integration Policies towards the Mongolian Ethnicity of the Chinese Communist Party, 1949-1966 – Economic Integration and the Imposition of Socialist Ideology in Inner Mongolia</b>
氏名	<b>RENQIN</b>

For the multiethnic Chinese state, consisting of the ethnic Han majority and fifty-five ethnic minorities, the period between 1949 and the beginning of the Great Cultural Revolution in 1966 was an important period in regard to the integration of these ethnic minorities into the People's Republic of China (PRC). Not only was the general theoretical framework for the ethnic policies of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), which are based on the concept of regional autonomy for ethnic minorities (*minzu quyì zìzhì*), determined during this period, but this period also saw the concrete implementation of the economic and military as well as cultural integration of these regions. Simultaneous to these developments, there occurred an imposition of socialist ideology on the population, eventually leading into the Great Cultural Revolution. The ethnic policies of the CCP during the period under discussion form to a large part the basis of contemporary ethnic relations in China. Consequently, as the consecutive outbreaks of ethnic strife have gained the world's attention, it is of utmost importance to examine the period between 1949 and 1966, as it was then that the CCP's ethnic policies were first put into practice.

In the analysis of these policies, a consideration of the case of Inner Mongolia, where the various policies of the national integration of an ethnic minority were carried out for the first time, is indispensable due to the following reasons.

Firstly, the government of the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region (founded on May 1, 1947) provided the model for the subsequent establishment of the policy of regional autonomy for ethnic minorities, which forms the backbone of the CCP's ethnic policies. Secondly, Inner Mongolia was frequently treated as a model autonomous region (*mofan zìzhì qū*). Thirdly, the Mongolian people of Inner Mongolia suffered the most extensive harm under the ethnic policies of the CCP. Fourthly, an important point when thinking about the national integration of Inner Mongolia is that the Mongolian people of this region possess the collective memory of having once formed a political and cultural historical community that opposed the Han people.

However, in China there has so far been no detailed and objective treatment based on historical facts of the matters discussed in this thesis. This is because Chinese scholars are still restrained in their work by the highly ideological view of history proposed by the CCP and are unable to conduct research from an independent point of view. Also, even in Japan and the West, where much valuable research has

already been conducted on the issue of ethnic policies (*minzu wenti*) in China, there has so far been no research that deals with the issues covered in this thesis, namely the policies of the CCP towards Inner Mongolia and the implications of the implementation of these policies during the period from the 1950s to the mid-1960s.

The rural Mongolian population was discriminated and their rights were infringed upon particularly in regard to 1.) the distribution of land, the division of pasture land, and the conversion of pasture land into farm land during the land reform; 2.) the problems caused by the forced collectivization of livestock and the setting of unreasonable purchase prices for livestock and livestock farm products during the socialist reconstruction of society; 3.) the problem of the social disdain and neglect shown for the Mongolian language and related to this, the issue of the lack of Mongolian party cadres; 4.) the problem that Mongolian intellectuals and cadres became the main target during the Anti-Rightist Movement (*fan youpai yundong*); 5.) the problem that under the Three Red Flags policy (*sanmian hongqi*) the guideline of “taking agriculture as the foundation” (*yi nongye wei jichu*) was declared and pasture land was turned into farm land under the slogan of “self-sufficiency in food and fodder in livestock farming areas,” as well as the issue of the migration of Han Chinese to Inner Mongolia under the slogan of supporting the border areas (*zhibian*); 6.) the communalization (*renmin gongshe hua*) of livestock farming; 7.) the criticism leveled at the Mongolian people during the Four Cleanups (*siqing*) campaign centering on the issue of the class divisions in livestock farming regions and the idea of the unification of Outer and Inner Mongolia.

This thesis focuses on a discussion of the above issues from an original standpoint based on previously untapped source materials.

Chapter 1, “A Re-examination of the Land Reforms in the Mongol Banners of Suiyuan Province (1951-1953),” provides an overview of the historical, ethnic and regional situation of Inner Mongolia from the late Qing dynasty to the 1950s focusing on the issues of land, population and industry patterns. It also discusses the historical changes in the administrative divisions of Suiyuan Province. The chapter then proceeds to investigate the state of land possession of Mongols and the relations between Mongols and Han Chinese concerning land in this region. It identifies the characteristics of these relations in the Mongol banners of Suiyuan Province and analyzes the establishment and the process of implementation of a unique approach to land reform based on these relations (this approach is outlined in the policy document “Methods for the Implementation of Land Reform in the Mongol Banners of Suiyuan Province”). Furthermore, the historical, ethnic and regional characteristics of areas of mixed Mongol-Han habitation have so far been ignored. This chapter thus elucidates for the first time the actual conditions of the discrimination and the infringement of Mongolian rights that occurred in regard to land distribution, the division of pasture land and the conversion of pasture land into farm land. The chapter concludes that the cause for the occurrence of the above problems lies in the disregard for the ethnic

particularity of this region, the existence of a conflicting administrative double-structure consisting of banners (*qi*) and counties (*xian*), as well as the existence of a Han chauvinism that showed complete disregard for ethnic minorities. Through this discussion, the chapter re-examines the essence of the so-called “Golden Age” of ethnic policies and offers a counter-perspective to the official view expressed by the CCP.

Chapter 2, “An Investigation of the Socialist Reconstruction of Livestock Farming in Inner Mongolia (1953-1958),” seeks to elucidate the main problems that were caused by socialist reconstruction in livestock farming regions through a discussion of the process of socialist reconstruction in Inner Mongolia. The problems that occurred as part of socialist reconstruction included such serious issues as forced collectivization and unreasonable pricing for livestock and livestock products. Because of these issues, the desires of farmers and herders to further develop livestock farming were thwarted and large numbers of livestock in agricultural and semipastoral areas were slaughtered or sold. As the result, during the phase of cooperativization, the growth rate of livestock shrunk and live stock development even showed substantial negative growth.

In addition to the radicalization of the socialist reconstruction of agriculture in all of China, the background to these problems is also formed by ethnic tensions that were the result of Han chauvinism. The chapter points out that the official evaluation of the socialist reconstruction of livestock farming in Inner Mongolia, which ignores the above issues and paints the reconstruction efforts in a very positive light, is deeply flawed. In this way, the chapter casts doubt on the common understanding of this period as the “Golden Age” of ethnic policies.

Chapter 3, “The Issues of the Use of the Mongolian Language and the Recruitment of Mongolian Ethnic Cadres (1950s),” discusses the issue of the use of the Mongolian spoken and written language among the Mongolian people in Inner Mongolia and the problem of the lack of recruitment of ethnically Mongolian party cadres. The chapter points out that Mongols did not have sufficient opportunity to exercise their legally-granted right to use and promote the spoken and written Mongolian language, and that to the contrary, the Mongolian language was often socially despised and ignored. Also, although the regional ethnic autonomy granted to all ethnic minorities by the constitution and the Program for the Implementation of Regional Ethnic Autonomy of the People's Republic of China (Minzu quyī zīzhī shìshì gāngyāo) required the recruitment of ethnic party cadres who would manage the internal affairs of their ethnic minority according to local customs and using their own language, in reality there occurred many problems in regard to the recruitment of Mongolian ethnic cadres in Inner Mongolia. Important factors causing these problems were the failure of the Inner Mongolia Party Committee (Neimeng dangwei) and the government of the autonomous region to take concrete measures to implement these rights as well as the tendency to downplay the issue of ethnicity. Furthermore, the existence of Han chauvinism, which discriminated against ethnic minorities and infringed upon their freedom and rights,

also contributed to generating these problems.

Chapter 4, “Criticism of Mongol “Ethnic Rightist Elements (*minzu youpai fenzi*)” during the Anti-Rightist Struggle,” discusses the anti-rightist struggle (*fanyoupai douzheng*) in Inner Mongolia by focusing on its effects on Mongols, using heretofore untapped source materials and interviews conducted by the author himself with Mongols who had been attacked as rightist elements during this campaign.

In Inner Mongolia, statements and documents discussing the issue of ethnicity were criticized as expressions of an “ethnic rightist discourse” during the anti-rightist campaign. Those ethnically Mongolian intellectuals and party cadres who engaged in this kind of discourse were branded as “ethnic rightist elements” and became the main target of the campaign. However, contrary to these charges, there is no evidence that these individuals indeed plotted attacks on the party or socialism and sought to foment ethnic separatism or the destruction of the unity of the Chinese state. Also, not only those individuals regarded as “ethnic rightist elements” and their families experienced persecution during the anti-rightist campaign, but all Mongols of Inner Mongolia suffered heavily during this period. Following the anti-rightist campaign, the ethnic issue became the focus of political campaigns in Inner Mongolia, and Mongols and other ethnic minorities became the main target of criticisms and attacks. As they have failed to pay attention to the importance of this ethnic dimension, previous considerations of the anti-rightist campaign in Inner Mongolia have been extremely insufficient. They merely discussed the Inner Mongolian case as part of the general national experience of the anti-rightist campaign in which “some intellectuals, non-party individuals, and party cadres were harmed.”

Chapter 5, “The Conversion of Pasture Land into Farm Land and the Population Issue in Inner Mongolia during the Great Leap Forward (1958-1960),” focuses on the issues of the conversion of pasture land into farm land and the migration of Han Chinese farmers to Inner Mongolia during the period of the Great Leap Forward. During this period, the most extensive conversion of pasture land into farm land since the founding of the People’s Republic of China occurred under the guideline of “taking agriculture as the foundation” (*yi nongye wei jichu*) which called for self-sufficiency in food and fodder in livestock farming regions. Under this guideline, no attention was paid to the question of whether the land in question was located in an agricultural area or a livestock farming area. However, rather than achieving self-sufficiency, the result was actually a decrease in grain production. Furthermore, because the grassland area that could be used as pasture land shrunk as a result of the destructive effects the cultivation effort had on the grassland ecosystem, the population engaged in livestock farming lost its means of production and suffered great hardship because of this policy. At the same time, there was a sudden population increase in Inner Mongolia during the Great Leap Forward, and this period marks the peak of population growth in Inner Mongolia’s modern history. There are various internal and external factors that caused this development, but among the various reasons the most decisive one was the tolerance shown by administrative and party organs towards the phenomenon of uncontrolled migration

into Inner Mongolia.

Chapter 6, “An Analysis of the Process of Communalization in the Livestock Farming Regions of Inner Mongolia (1958-1960),” examines the kind of situational awareness and aims on which the communalization of livestock farming in Inner Mongolia was decided as well as its specific background. The chapter also discusses what kinds of problems arose in the process of putting this policy into practice and what factors were responsible for the occurrence of these problems.

Chapter 7, “Inner Mongolia during the Four Cleanups Movement (1963-1966),” examines the Four Cleanups (*sijing*) campaign in Inner Mongolia based on banner-level (the name of a type of low administrative unit in Inner Mongolia) official documents and interviews with victims of the campaign. During the Four Cleanups campaign in Inner Mongolia, class struggle was made one of the focal points of the campaign. Thus, the ethnic aspects of the Mongolian population were perceived through the lens of class and class struggle and the ethnic dimension of Mongolian identity was ignored and even attacked. It is possible to presume that in Inner Mongolia, where the vast majority of the population consists of Han Chinese, the Mongolian population, which had been turned into an ethnic minority, was helpless in the face of these criticisms and attacks. Also, one of the reasons that the Four Cleanups campaign in the livestock farming regions of Inner Mongolia started in the border areas was the existence of security concerns in regard to the areas bordering the Soviet Union in the north of Inner Mongolia. Another reason was the existence of tensions between the North China Bureau (Huabei) and the Inner Mongolia Party Committee. The historical issue of the merging of Inner and Outer Mongolia was also frequently brought up as an important ethnic issue in political campaigns. This is due to the changes in the international environment bordering Inner Mongolia and a persistent fear of ethnic separatism among the Chinese political centre and the Inner Mongolian leadership.

Contrary to the common perception that sees Inner Mongolia as a “model autonomous region” in the “Golden Age” of ethnic policies of the CCP (1949-1957), the reality was that the rights of Mongols in all areas including politics, economics and culture were infringed upon and that many serious problems occurred. These infringements and problems are a result of the fact that while formally the equality and protection of the ethnicities was prescribed in policies, guidelines and laws, on the level of practice, the integration policies and their implementation carried out in Inner Mongolia showed a strong tendency towards Han chauvinism. These problems and issues existing in the integration policies in Inner Mongolia became even graver during the period of radical leftist politics after 1957. The ultimate conclusion of this thesis is that it was in the way outlined above that the distinctive identity of the Mongolian people was ideologically and economically ignored and even suppressed.