Penn History Review

Journal of Undergraduate Historians

Volume 30, Issue 2 Fall 2023

Penn History Review

Journal of Undergraduate Historians
Volume 30, Issue 2 Fall 2023

Cover image:

Malina, J.B. - Orbis Catholicus, 1 (Papst Pius XI), Bilder gläubiger Menschen und geheiligter Formen. Atlantis-Verlag, Berlin 1930, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Malina,_J.B._-_Orbis_Catholicus,_1_(Papst_Pius_XI.)_(cropped).jpg

Penn History Review

Volume 30, Issue 2 Fall 2023

Contents:

Letter from the Editor

On behalf of the entire editorial board, I am honored to present the latest issue of the Penn History Review. Since 1991, the Penn History Review has been dedicated to promoting the study of history amongst undergraduate students. Since its founding, PHR has published exceptional historical scholarship written by students at the University of Pennsylvania as well as schools across the United States and beyond. Our Fall 2023 edition exemplifies the diversity of study within our field. It includes articles that explore dynamic topics such as culture, politics, race, gender, and identity. Together, these pieces manifest the core values of our publication: curiosity, critical thinking, a dedication to research, and most importantly a passion for history. Our entire editorial team deeply enjoyed working with the authors and editing these papers. We hope that you will find them thought-provoking and as much as we did!

Our first article, "Freedom From Sin: Moral Regulation in Philadelphia's Early Free Black Church Communities" is authored by Sophia Weglarz. She focuses upon the interconnections present between race, religion, and crime in Philadelphia during the 19th century. Her scholarship thus analyzes the public dimensions of race-based crime and how Black religious leaders developed new ways to regulate the moral behavior of their congregants while also protecting their communal identity.

In the next article, "Emergent Bureaucracy in Counter Bureaucratism, From the Hundred Flowers to the Anti-Rightist Campaign" Shutong Wang delves into the interactions between Mao Zedong, student activists, and the Party Leaders of Beijing University in the May 19th Student Movement. He thereby analyzes the related emergent bureaucracy in the historical transition from the

Hundred Flowers-Rectification Movement to the Anti-Rightist Campaign in 1957 China in order to interrogate the adequateness of the conventional notion of the "Maoist regime."

In the third paper, "Imagining the Possibilities of the Post-Marxist Moment: Anarchism, Castoriadis, and the Project of Autonomy," Yoora Da explores the political and philosophical significance of anarchism in a post-Marxist world. Specializing their analysis in reference to the ideas of Cornelius Castoriadis, they argue that anarchist theory enabled a radical renewal of leftist politics while simultaneously rejecting and accepting certain tenets of Marxist thought.

Our fourth and final piece, "DIO O IL DUCE? Pope Pius XI and the Rise of European Fascism," comes from Noah Maxwell. In his work, he attempts to understand the emergence of European fascism during the Second World War by analyzing Benito Mussolini's rise to power in Italy in conjunction with the role that Pope Pius XI played in affirming and resisting various aspects of social and political fascism.

The editorial board would also like to thank a number of people without whom this edition of the PHR would not have been possible. Our publication only exists thanks to the generous support of the Penn History Department who continues to support and fund us each year. As of this year (2023), our publication is thirty-two years old, a milestone we would never have been able to reach without the support of the Penn History Department.

In particular, we are extremely grateful to Dr. Ramya Sreenivasan, the Undergraduate Chair of the department, and Dr. Yvonne Fabella, the Associate Director of Undergraduate Studies. They have both offered invaluable guidance and encouragement throughout the editing and publishing processes. The dedication they have for both their students

and field of study is an inspiration. In addition, we would like to thank the faculty members at Penn and other universities who promoted our publication, as well as all of the students who submitted papers for consideration. This edition would not exist without your support. Thank you as well to our contributing authors, who worked patiently and diligently to refine their articles for publication.

Finally, I would like to thank our editors for their exceptionally hard work on this issue of the Penn History Review.Congratulations again to all of the authors and editors who participated in this edition of the Penn History Review!

Olivia McClary
Editor-in-Chief

Olivia McClary

Freedom From Sin: Moral Regulation in Philadelphia's Early Free Black Church Communities

Sophia Weglarz

"People of Colour:

To you, the murder of Mrs. Cross, speaks as with a voice of thunder. Many of you fear the living God, and walk in his commandments;--but, oh, how many are slaves of Sin. See the tendency of dishonesty and lust, of drunkenness and stealing, in the murder, an account of which is subjoined. See the tendency of mid-night dances and frolics. While the lustful dance is delighting thee, forget not, that 'for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."

 - Richard Allen, *Confession of John Joyce and Peter Matthias* (1808)

On a cold December night in 1807, "covered by the darkness of night" in Philadelphia's Black Horse Alley, two young, free Black men robbed a white, widowed shopkeeper, Mrs. Sarah Cross.[1] They strangled the woman with a rope and wounded her with a sharp blow to her head.[2] The two perpetrators, John Joyce and Peter Matthias, were captured by local authorities shortly thereafter.[3] The violent nature of the crime transformed the trial into a spectacle, drawing in clamoring crowds "whose curiosity was not to be restrained" in the streets surrounding the courthouse.[4] Joyce and Matthias were both convicted of first-degree murder, or, as Chief Justice

William Tilghman declared in his opinion, "an offence of the blackest dye."[5] His opinion reviled the two young men for their depravity. "You," Tilghman's voice bellowed to the courtroom with a choked tone, "rifled her house of her money, clothing and bed; and proving yourselves utterly destitute of human feelings, you went fresh from this scene, at the bare recital of which the heart recoils, to partake of the amusement of a dance."[6] In what would become his first exercise of the death penalty in his judicial career, Tilghman recognized the execution of Joyce and Matthias as a moral "example" from which Philadelphia's free Black community could potentially "profit."[7]

Though the murder of Sarah Cross cost the two eternity-bound men their lives, the infamy of the crime outlasted them.[8] One newspaper account written about the trial included the following meditation: "The evil that men do, lives after them."[9] And live on it did. Joyce and Matthias' crime not only harmed society but also led to the vilification of people of color as a whole "by rendering them objects of disgust and suspicion."[10] For many white Philadelphians, Joyce and Matthias' crime invigorated their beliefs which equated the city's growing free Black population with a pervasive immorality on the basis of race. The public dimensions of Joyce and Matthias' trial impelled free Black religious leaders in Philadelphia to answer for the men's crimes by developing new ways to regulate the moral behavior of their congregants and protect their communities' newly free and self-determined identity.

Villainy and Violence: Fears of Black Criminality in Early-1800s Philadelphia

"And with respect to the oppressed, it debases the mind and corrupts the moral character very naturally: for what else can be expected of ignorant, unlettered Africans, groaning under the frowns of oppression, seeing nothing but complicated villainy and violence; instructed by the treachery and deception, with which they are subjected, they naturally learn to disregard the rights of others; every moral feeling is blunted, and every social virtue is destroyed. They are of course exported to the North, where we have to provide for, and support them, with all their vices upon them."

- Thomas Branagan, *Serious Remonstrances Addressed to the Citizens of the Northern States and Their Representatives* (1804)

Following the passage of Pennsylvania's Gradual Abolition Act in 1780, Philadelphia became a "city of refuge" for free Black people, with Philadelphia's free Black population reaching 6,381 by the turn of the 19th century.[11]Despite free Black people only making up 9.2 percent of the 69,678 people living in Philadelphia in 1800, white Philadelphians feared that the city's newest residents would soon overwhelm the city with crime due to their reputedly rebellious, immoral, and vengeful tendencies.[12]

Thomas Branagan's 1804 publication of Serious Remonstrances Addressed to the Citizens of the Northern States and Their Representatives spurred Philadelphia whites' pre-existing fears of Black immorality. Branagan warned that while free Black people had escaped their previous condition of enslavement, their lives were indelibly marked by slavery. According to Branagan, the very nature of slavery destroyed formerly enslaved people's capacities to

act morally.[13] White Philadelphians' concerns regarding free Black refugees' perceived inability to assimilate into the strict moral conventions of white society resulted in a deep-seated paranoia about potential social disorder, or worse, outright insurgence.

The dread of a free Black rebellion in Philadelphia, whether real or imagined, loomed in the wake of the slave revolt beginning in 1791 in Saint Domingue. On one stormy night in August, thousands of enslaved persons, Maroons, free Blacks, and mulattoes living in the slave colony Saint Domingue rose up to kill thousands of the island's white slave owners after holding a clandestine Vodou ceremony at Bois Caiman.[14] In Philadelphia in 1804, decades after America declared its independence, hundreds of free Black people armed with bludgeons and swords marched down the streets of the Southwark neighborhood on July 4th, "damning the whites and saying they would shew them St. Domingo."[15]

White Philadelphians escaped from the scourge of Black resistance by retreating from the areas of the city where free Black people resided. As crime rates increased in the Cedar Ward area, white Philadelphians moved inward to the center of the city in Middle Ward, where space, resources, and security were more abundant.[16] Poor Black Philadelphians migrated outward to the city's edge, where crimes like drunkenness, prostitution, and theft ran rampant. By the time Joyce and Matthias set foot in the city, Philadelphia was segregated along racial lines. The crossing of racial lines in the Cross murder struck a chord within the hearts of white Philadelphians, who feared that free Blacks would bedevil their newly-formed safe havens.[17] White notions of Black-incited chaos posed a threat to free Black people's ability to establish themselves within society and exercise their new domain of freedom.

Free Black people living in Philadelphia gained their

freedom through a variety of means, whether it was through intrepid escapes or inspiring manumissions; however, their freedom was fragile and tenuous. Formerly-enslaved individuals possessed formal legal rights allowing for an abstract exercise of freedom in court, but these rights ultimately lacked any meaningful tenets protecting civil freedom within society. Social mobility for free Blacks was certainly not impossible, but achieving respect within society was no easy task. Complete freedom had to be earned and, in some cases, acquired with moral force. Free Black religious leaders in Philadelphia regulated morality within their religious communities and beyond in order to secure and protect the freedom of liberated Blacks by remaining morally deserving and pious in the eyes of white society.

The Long Walk: Allen's Gallows Pamphlet and Freedom Through Piety

"When the pious are informed of the departure of any from this world, the first enquiry arising in their minds, is, How did they seem prepared? In answer to such we can say…to repent of his sins, and to implore mercy from the hands of that Omniscient Being from whose notice nothing can be hid, and before whose bar he must shortly stand. By means of these admonitions (to all human appearances) he was brought to a discovery of his lost and deplorable condition, not merely under sentence of that law, which can only inflict its penalties on the body, but that more awful one which roars in thunder, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."

- Richard Allen, *Confession of John Joyce and Peter Matthias* (1808)

     Joyce and Matthias were hanged by mid-March 1808 before an audience of 20,000 Philadelphians, composed of white and black people alike. For the free Black onlookers

within the multiracial crowd, the execution carried heavy moral consequences.[18] Among these onlookers was none other than Reverend Richard Allen, founder of Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia's Society Hill neighborhood. Allen penned a fervent response to Joyce and Matthias' crimes in a publication that is widely considered to be the first Black-edited gallows pamphlet.[19] Joyce and Matthias were not members of Allen's free Black congregation, but the public nature of the crime gave Allen the opportunity to publish a spirited, public commentary on the importance of living a God-fearing life. "To you," Allen's voice echoed off the page, "the murder of Mrs. Cross, speaks as with a voice of thunder. Many of you fear the living God, and walk in his commandments;--but, oh, how many are slaves of Sin."[20]

Contending with how Joyce and Matthias' crimes would shape the white public's perception of Black criminality, Allen's Confession of John Joyce and Peter Matthias set out to lambast the two men as sinners — not as black sinners, but just as sinners. Beyond the morally reproachful tone of Allen's Confession, Allen offered the two men comfort in their final moments, along with a final opportunity to seek repentance from a higher authority. The two men were enslaved by their sins but found freedom "through the atoning blood of Christ" in their final moments in the temporal world.[21] After the execution of Joyce and Matthias, Allen implemented a stricter form of moral regulation in Bethel's amended articles of incorporation to challenge the belief that free Black people were incapable of regulating the morality of their communities without white encroachment. Allen's work in moral regulation cemented his status as a prominent, literate, and respectable leader within Philadelphia's free Black community, forging a destiny for himself in a country where free Black people's lives were

overly determined by their previous status of enslavement.

Born into slavery in Delaware to prominent Quaker lawyer Benjamin Chew in 1760, Allen was introduced to Methodism by a nearby religious society while under the ownership of Delaware planter Stokely Sturgis. Methodism provided Allen with his freedom and salvation.[22] "My sins were a heavy burden," Allen wrote in his autobiography, The Life, Experience, and Gospel Labours of the Rt. Rev. Richard Allen, "… I cried to the Lord both night and day…I cried unto Him who delighteth to hear the prayers of a poor sinner; and all of a sudden my dungeon shook, my chains flew off, and glory to God, I cried."[23]Allen learned how to read with encouragement from Sturgis, and he began to preach in his teenage years, freely exhorting sermons to nearby houses at his owner's discretion. Sturgis, under the influence of the leading Methodist preacher Freeborn Garettson, offered Allen and his brother an opportunity to purchase their freedom.[24]

By 1780, after five years of working extra time, Allen bought his freedom for $2000, escaping the "bitter pill" of enslavement.[25] Shortly after arriving in Philadelphia, Allen became a minister in 1786 at St. George's Methodist Church, a mixed-race congregation. However, he was relegated to preaching only during early morning services.[26] Allen's services attracted crowds of new Black followers, sowing tension between St. George's white Methodist authority and its latest crop of congregants who were viewed as a "nuisance."[27] Racial strife within St. George's congregation came to a head when the white elders constructed a separate seating area for Black parishioners, prompting the Great Walkout in 1791, where the Black congregation members left in a mass exodus.[28] Jones and Allen parted ways, with Jones founding St. Thomas African Episcopal Church in 1792 two years before Allen founded Bethel Church. The two men worked together as allies in uplifting free Black

Philadelphians but competed at every turn, battling over congregation numbers and church incorporation.

By 1808, Allen was a well-known figure within Philadelphia's free Black community with immense influence over his religious community, already adept in the art of public print culture. Allen's status as a prominent leader within Philadelphia's free Black community grew after a devastating yellow fever outbreak swept Philadelphia in 1793.[29] Matthew Carey, an Irish immigrant living in Philadelphia, published A Short Account of the Malignant Fever. "The great demand for nurses," Carey began his attack on Philadelphia's free Black community, "afforded an opportunity for imposition, which was eagerly seized by some of the vilest of the blacks. Some of them were even detected in plundering the houses of the sick."[30] After condemning the very group of people who aided the sick and dying during the epidemic at the expense of their lives, Carey later revised his attack to praise "the elders of the African church" by name.[31]

He wrote, "The services of Jones, Allen, and Gray, and others of their colour, have been very great, and demand public gratitude."[32] In response to Carey's enmity, Allen and Jones published a pamphlet entitled, Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia in the Year 1793. "We wish not to offend," the two men wrote in their acerbic counterattack, "but when an unprovoked attempt is made, to make us blacker than we are, it becomes less necessary to be over cautious on that account; therefore we shall take the liberty to tell of the conduct of some of the whites."[33] Allen's first major foray into print culture allowed him to challenge Carey's claims regarding Black immorality in the yellow fever epidemic, indicting whites for the same behavior that free Blacks were "held up to censure" for Allen and

Jones' pamphlet was emblematic of the same category of protest print literature with which the country declared its independence, rewriting the narrative of the "awful calamity" from the perspective of Black people.

  As a prominent and literate Black leader, the pamphlet fashioned Allen as an important liaison between free Blacks and their deprecatory white counterparts. On a mission to establish his status, Allen desired to pave a path towards acquiring resolute and unchallengeable freedom in a racially divided city and country, since financial security and economic privileges failed to guarantee Black people with true freedom outside of legal formalities. Allen nearly saw his freedom snatched away when a slave catcher accused him of running away from a Southern plantation and threatened to sell him on the slave market. Allen's status as a public figure saved his life when an acquaintance corroborated his status as a free man.[34] However, most of Philadelphia's free Black community did not possess the specialized social status that Allen did. For the rest of his Bethel brethren, Allen believed that initiatives to morally uplift Black Philadelphians were the only legitimate means by which they could safeguard their freedom — by remaining morally deserving through piety in the eyes of white society.

  Allen's Confession of John Joyce and Peter Matthias sought to reinstate free Black people as morally deserving in the eyes of whites, all while castigating the two men who put his Black flock's freedom in peril. Compositionally, Allen's pamphlet contained an address to the public and people of color, notes and details about the trial, Tilghman's "an offense of the blackest dye" opinion, and Joyce and Matthias' confessions, which were transcribed by Allen and certified with the two men's marks. Execution confessions and gallows pamphlets were especially popular in nineteenth-century America, as they doubled as sensational

entertainment and moral instruction.[35] Thus, Allen's didactic tone in Confession was modeled after popular contemporary pamphlets and a familiar sight to the public. However, Confession was remarkable for being the first gallows pamphlet edited and published by a Black person, demonstrating the increasingly important role of free Blacks in shaping morality within their communities and beyond.

While the question of who wrote Confession is no mystery, determining who the pamphlet was written for is more complex. The pamphlet was printed "for the benefit of Bethel Church."[36] Allen's religious flock comprised all economic classes, from artisans to day laborers, many of whom were not literate.[37] In Bethel's original articles of association in 1792, six trustees signed with their names, while the remaining three signed with "their mark," indicating that these men were not literate. Early gallows literature was often dictated in the form of sermons by preachers eager to extract moral lessons for the benefit of their congregations, meaning that parts of Confession, like Allen's "Address to the Public, and the People of Colour," were likely read aloud as a sermon to Bethel congregants.[38] However, with a large number of Allen's congregants unable to read Confession, Allen's printing of Confession's moral messaging suggests the pamphlet was geared toward a wider audience. This makes Allen's meditations on sin and guidance on moral actions even more poignant, as they were intended to address all Philadelphians, not just his small circle of Black parishioners.

"Reader," Allen's printed words call out with fervor, "hast thou conceived murder in thy heart? tremble! tremble! The eye of God is upon thee! his providence will supply a clue for thy detection. 'Be sure your sin will find you out.'"[39] With Confession, Allen took the white-dictated account of Black immorality in the Cross murder and revised

the narrative to implicate all people failing to live a pious Christian life with criminality. For Allen, sin — not blackness — was the true basis for crime and piety represented morality. His argument severed the relationship between blackness and immorality woven into the Cross murder judgment. Achieving piety could shelter free Black people from white claims that they were unworthy of their freedom due to their supposed criminal nature.

Allen introduced the concept of piety in his pamphlet with a discussion of the condemned man's relationship with God. Allen devoted much of Confession to publishing Joyce and Matthias' final confessions of their crimes, which was not uncommon for gallows pamphlets, dating back to the Medieval period which followed the same structure. However, the inclusion of details surrounding the men's lives leading up to their crime served a purpose beyond satiating the readers' mere curiosity. Allen spent a significant amount of time with the two men in the final days of their lives, providing them with the chance to tell their stories beyond the context of their crimes. Instead of painting the two men as unabashedly evil, as the trial accounts and newspapers did, the biography of the two men offered insight into where their lives deviated from moral goodness . While the two men were not born with immorality in their hearts, their lack of piety failed to equip them with the moral sensibilities needed to survive in early-nineteenth-century Philadelphia, marked by bleakness and struggle for free Black communities.

Born into slavery in Maryland, Joyce escaped his owner around the age of fifteen to serve in the United States Navy. Upon his arrival to Philadelphia on a stolen horse, Joyce struggled financially, taking on various odd jobs around the city and committing petty crime to remain afloat. Joyce also remarked that his parents were "piously inclined," with his uncle holding religious meetings at his home.[40] However,

Joyce was not pious in the slightest. He described himself as "depraved in my morals, having "never belonged to any religious society."[41] When Joyce fled enslavement, his mother warned that he "'would be hanged one day or another,'" fearing that Joyce's loose sense of morality would land him in dire circumstances.[42] Joyce's mother's parting words were prophetic, as he would be hanged for his final crime in one of Philadelphia's public squares. By including a discussion of Joyce's piety, Confession suggests that Joyce's lack of piety was the reason for his crimes, rather than his Blackness. Perhaps, the reader might have surmised, if Joyce had joined Allen's flock upon his arrival in Philadelphia, he might have found himself in an entirely different set of circumstances.

In the second portion of the pamphlet, Confession extends its evaluation of piety to the life of Matthias. Matthias was also born into slavery in Maryland, purchasing his liberty from his owner's wife in the years after his death. The pamphlet describes Matthias' relationship with religion:he states in his confession that his mother and uncle were pious and "often gave [him] good advice, to which [he] paid but little attention."[43] Upon arriving in Philadelphia, Matthias found work playing the violin at local dances, which is where he met Joyce. Joyce offered Matthias a lucrative opportunity that was far too good to pass up: Joyce asked Matthias to accompany him in collecting twenty-four dollars in wages from his employer's residence in Black Horse Alley. After Matthias initially refused, Joyce offered to share his wages with Matthias, which amounted to more than he could receive for playing the fiddle. Although Matthias was entirely unaware of Joyce's premeditated plot to rob and kill Cross, his unintended involvement in the crime cost him his life.

In Allen's eyes, Matthias, who had no prior criminal history, was haunted by previous "bad luck," trapped in an economy whose doors had been closed to new free Black

migrants years before he ever stepped foot in Philadelphia.[44] Allen perhaps possessed a greater sympathy for Matthias because he had achieved his freedom in the same respectable manner that Allen did — by paying for his freedom through hard work, as opposed to acquiring freedom by escaping one's owner. Enslavement determined enslaved people's destinies by trapping them in an inherited institution where they had to lead their lives according to their owners' demands. No matter the means, the methods by which free Black people attained their freedom demonstrated their initial steps towards forging their own destiny. However, once the full range of freedom was obtained, free Black people like Joyce and Matthias faced a wide range of institutional obstacles that existed outside of their control.

Matthias was restricted to a destiny determined by the hazards of economic instability and civil enslavement for free Black people in early-19th century Philadelphia, which were the very same problems that Allen and other Black leaders set out to combat through their work to morally uplift the free Black community. Allen's moral guidance conferred to Joyce and Matthias stemmed from his desire to protect fellow free Black people in Philadelphia, whose success and social adjustment in society reflected back onto him as a prominent, free Black leader. The two men's deaths represented Allen's failure to protect a new generation of free Blacks who struggled to survive in Philadelphia, a city that had shut its doors to men like Joyce and Matthias years earlier by social and economic alienation. In Allen's eyes, religious leaders needed to enhance their methods in regulating their flock and specifically its moral and religious conduct, not as a means of control, but as a means of protecting Black freedom and self-determination from opponents of racial integration. This moral regulation led free Black religious leaders to seek help from an unlikely ally — the law.

Powers, Privileges, and Immunities: Moral Constitutionalism in the African Supplement

"Trustees and members of Bethel Church, aforesaid, and their successors duly qualified, elected and appointed in such manner as here, and after is provided and decided, who shall be trustees (for the purposes, and with the powers, and privileges here in after granted and specified) of the church, called Bethel Church, and of all, and any such other church and churches do now or hereafter shall become the property of the corporation."

- Articles of Association of Bethel Church, *Letters of Attorney* (September 17, 1796)

Over a decade before the publication of Confession of John Joyce and Peter Matthias, Black religious leaders set out to incorporate themselves into "corporations and bodies politic," demonstrating a desire to regulate the affairs of their communities through the powers, privileges, and immunities conferred upon corporate bodies at the time.[45] For Allen, these powers, privileges, and immunities could protect free Black people from external white control and influence on moral regulation and religious matters.[46] "Our only design," Allen wrote on behalf of Bethel's Board of Trustees to Saint George's pastor Francis Asbury in 1807 while Bethel was in the process of amending its original articles of association written in 1796, "is to secure to ourselves our rights and privileges, to regulate our affairs, temporal and spiritual, the same as if we were white people, and to guard against any opposition which might possibly arise from the improper prejudice or administration of any individual having the exercise of discipline over us."[47]

Bethel's acts of incorporation are bound in the pages of the massive Letters of Attorney volumes housed in Harrisburg's Pennsylvania State Archives. The words written

in black ink do not fully encapsulate the consequential meaning of what the acts represented. Between the lines of scribe-written penmanship are these free Black men's struggle to forge destinies for themselves and their "successors," and protect their communities from the encroachment of white corruption.[48] Mother Bethel was the first Black corporation in America, with Jones' St. Thomas and its comparatively economically elite congregation, incorporating just forty days after Allen's church.

The acts of incorporation were legally certified by Attorney General Jared Ingersoll and Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices Thomas McKean, Edward Shippen, Jasper Yates, and Thomas Smith. The act, titled "Act or Instrument for the Incorporation of the African Episcopal Methodist Church of the City of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," also required then Governor Thomas Mifflin to approve the act and that Master of Scrolls Matthew Irvin "to enroll the same at the expense of the applicants to the interest that, according to the objects articles conditions there and set forth, contain the parties maybe come and be a corporation and body politic in law."[49] On the surface, the articles of incorporation contain banal details about vestry elections, the appointment of ministers, the expulsion of disorderly members, the passage of bylaws and ordinances, and other provisions of religious governance, but a closer inspection reveals the inner workings of the nascent politics of self-determination operating within Bethel at the time. The articles of incorporation add greater complexity to historians' modern-day understandings of free Black peoples' relationship with law, which could be used to confer rights and protections in some contexts while legalizing their enslavement and disenfranchisement in others.

While corporations possess a largely business-minded connotation in the modern-day, religious organizations were

among the first to be granted the rights of incorporation in North America. The law allowed for any "religious society" to incorporate, subject to state approval.[50] Corporations possessed unique benefits that allowed for property and other estates to be passed down for generations, a feature that Allen and his forward-thinking trustees might have found especially appealing, while the democratically-elected trustees, who were tasked with regulating the temporal affairs of the church, instituted a form of self-governance that paralleled the new republic's ongoing mission to achieve constitutionalism.[51] Corporate culture was not reserved for the exclusively wealthy and privileged, as even free Black people from middling means could vote on corporate affairs related to religious worship. Black religious societies took advantage of the corporate culture to advocate for civil rights in the frame of religious piety. Bethel's original articles of incorporation put in place social hierarchies, with elections sometimes requiring a majority of "two thirds of the regular male members of the said church of at least 21 years of age one years standing"[52] and other times requiring a majority of "two thirds of the trustees for the time being." The articles also centered around the consent of the church's "elder," whose power remained paramount to everyone else's, even the nine trustees. At face value, the language of "trustees" and "elders" seems benign, and if anything, unclear, but additional context enriches the Letters of Attorney Book pages.

The 1796 articles were written by white Methodist elder Ezekial Cooper, an acquaintance of Allen's, who drafted the articles of incorporation to which the trustees[53] "being ignorant of corporations, cheerfully agreed."[54] Allen would later consider the 1796 articles one of his greatest regrets. Allen despised the amount of power the articles granted to the white Methodists, who, in Allen's eyes, would never

accept free Black self-determination and freedom. However, leading historian on Allen's life Richard S. Newman suggests in his book Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers that Allen's claim of the trustees' ignorance was likely disingenuous. As Newman writes, Allen was a "focused, confident, meticulous man," hardly ignorant or naïve of anything. He knew the immense force that corporations possessed, as the Pennsylvania Abolition Society — a prominent Philadelphia antislavery institution that Allen had come into contact with several times before — had incorporated seven years earlier, furnishing PAS with a sense of legitimacy in their work as an abolitionist enterprise. Incorporation was no flippant feat, and, Black-written or not, it would still result in the legal recognition of Bethel as an established religious institution within Philadelphia. Attorney General Jared Ingersoll, and Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices Thomas McKean, Edward Shippen, Jasper Yates, and Thomas Smith, Governor Thomas Mifflin, and Master of Scrolls Matthew Irvin would read the name of "Bethel Church," along with the names of Richard Allen and his body of trustees. They would have to acknowledge that Allen's church, an African Episcopal Church composed of free Black people from all walks of life, was now a corporation.

The original act of association was more likely a compromise between Allen and the white Methodist elders, and one built with protections at that. While the white "elders" had the power to expel "disorderly members," "preach once on every Sunday," and influence "the direction and management of the spiritual concerns," the elder's power was not without its limitations. If the elder wished to expel a "disorderly member," he was required to seek "the advice" of the Black trustees. While the elder was "at liberty to act according to his own judgment," the trustees were at liberty

to create their own appeal process. "But," the articles stated with insoluble determination, "if at any time it shall happen that a majority of the trustees, so concerned for the purposes aforesaid shall differ in opinion with the elder, the persons or persons concerned shall be allowed an appeal from the judgment of the elder." The race of the "trustees," as well as "local preachers, exhorters, and class leaders," was further clarified in the articles, with positions only available to "Africans and descendants of the African race."

Still, America's first Black corporation was not legally constructed by Black people, leaving enough of an entryway for the white Methodist influence to dictate how Bethel's temporal and spiritual affairs would operate. This entryway, no matter how narrow it might have been, was mutually exclusive with Allen's quest for free Black self-determination. Allen was willing to set fire to his compromise with the white Methodists in his journey to secure absolute and unchallengeable freedom. The articles provided the grounds for the Black trustees to gather the votes and create a new, Black-dictated covenant, which is precisely what occurred in 1807, when Bethel's delegation voted to construct what is now known as the African Supplement. Allen and his trustees reestablished Bethel as a church owned by and operated for free Black people — not the white Methodist committee that sought to keep them under their thumb. In creating the African Supplement, Allen could now regulate and protect his religious flock without white obstruction, creating a moral constitution that used the law to forge a destiny that could finally be directed by Black people.

The African Supplement was more formally known as the "Articles Improving, Amending, and Altering the Articles of Association of the African Methodist Episcopal Church" and was certified on March 28, 1807, nearly fifteen years after their original articles of association were certified. This

time around, the articles were certified by Attorney General Joseph Bell and Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices William Tilghman, Jasper Yeats, Thomas Smith, and Hugh Henry Breckenridge.[55] Certification by Governor Thomas McKean was also required in order to approve the document and a request was made that Master of Rolls Timothy Matlack "enroll the same at the expense of the applicants to the intent, that, according to the objects, articles, and conditions therein set forth and contained the parties may become and be a corporation and body politic in law."[56] In swift and resolute terms, the Supplement took aim at the original incorporation's Article 1. The trustees repealed and altered the first article, which required Blacks to seek white approval to sell church property. Next, Article 2 was taken down, thus placing the power to expel an insubordinate member in the hands of the Black trustees. The African Supplement was a daring act of self-determination, but more importantly, it was an act of freedom from the control of the white Methodist elders, procured by means of exercising their rights through the legal process.

Naturally, such a dauntless declaration of self-determination and freedom did not go unnoticed. Allen reported that the Supplement caused a "considerable rumpus" among white Methodist leaders who were displeased by Bethel's bold showing of Black autonomy.[57] The Supplement severed the union between Bethel and St. George's completely. Counsel for St. George's claimed that the Supplement was grounds for "prosecution at law" and "utterly void." In fundamentally changing the 1792 articles without authorization and notice, lawyer John Hopkinson claimed that Bethel's African Supplement was "conducted with circumstances of misrepresentation, concealment and a want of good faith that seem to indicate a consciousness of wrong."[58] If true freedom from the white Methodists would not be granted benevolently, Bethel was required to take it with force. Without the encroachment of the white Methodist committee, Bethel could forge its own free destiny as a Black-run institution, one whose

first major test of moral regulation would come only a year after the Supplement's passage when Allen would use the moral lessons learned from Joyce and Matthias' trial to rouse a new generation of Black people within Bethel.

Allen was, above all else, a man committed to order and propriety, which can be seen in he and fellow Bethel preacher Jacob Tapisco's publication of The Doctrines and Discipline of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1817. The Doctrines and Disciplines set forth a strict form of governance within the African Methodist religion and included stringent provisions on member discipline, complete with a three strikes system for expelling members "in cases of neglect of duties of any kind, imprudent conduct, indulging sinful tempers or words, or disobedience to the order and discipline of the church."[59] In Bethel's disciplinary trials, charges of misconduct included serious offenses, such as theft and murder, which were investigated and tried within the church. Lesser infractions, such as the use of profane language or unfriendly behavior towards other parishioners also warranted trial proceedings. The smaller offenses were of equal concern, as they could be precursory to deeper expressions of immorality. Allen wrote of abiding by moral "resolutions" in Confession, professing that, "'In God's name and strength, I will never more attend a frolic. Drunkards and swearers, Whoremongers and Sabbath breakers, I have done with you for ever.'" Discipline became central to Bethel in the years following the Supplement's acceptance as law, in part large due to the public moral failings attributed to the free Black community in the Joyce and Matthias trial. If misconduct could be handled by the church privately and with grace, then the free Black community could be reined in with little to no white interference.

For Allen and other religious leaders, temporal punishments like imprisonment and execution paled in

comparison to the eternal spiritual punishment that awaited sinners in the afterlife, emphasizing the need to live piously while existing on the temporal plane. "'Whoremongers and adulterers,'" Allen exclaimed in his address in Confession, "'God will judge.' Go not to the tavern; the song of the drunkard will soon be changed to weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. Drunkenness hurls reason from the throne, and when she has fallen, Vice always stands ready to ascend. Break off, O young man your impious companions. If you still grasp their hands they will drag you down to everlasting fire."[60] In 1809, a little over a year after Joyce and Matthias were executed, Allen and Jones, along with wealthy Black ship maker James Forten, founded the Society for the Suppression of Vice and Immorality to "visit the more dissipated parts of Philadelphia and offer advice, instruction and persuasive measures" to expand moral regulation beyond their religious communities.[61] Free Black leaders saw the moral failings of Joyce and Matthias as a path for moral revitalization in their communities. However, perhaps with more shrewd intentions in mind, Black religious leaders might have also acknowledged the trial as an opportunity to enlist more members for their free Black religious flocks, offering the promise of protection from the same fates the publicly condemned men suffered.

As the political and economic milieu for free Black people living in Philadelphia changed throughout the early 19th century, the mission of Black freedom and self-determination remained particularly important, as these two things became increasingly fragile. Allen would later die in 1831, the same year that slavery and abolition would explode as national issues in the face of a calamitous nullification crisis and a consequential slave rebellion in Virginia. "If," Allen cried out in his 1794 address to his fellow people of color, "we are lazy and idle, the enemies of freedom plead it as a cause why we ought not to be free, and say we are better in a state of servitude,

and that giving us our liberty would be an injury to us and by such conduct we strengthen the bands of oppression and kept many who are more worthy than ourselves. I entreat you to consider the obligations we lie under to help forward the cause of freedom."[62] The "pious preacher" — who had dreamt for so much for himself and the community he built with his two hands — left behind a legacy of moral regulation that marked the early emergence of "respectability politics" in Black religious communities. In the great battle towards guaranteeing freedom for his fellow free Blacks, Allen left no man behind, walking with them to the gallows of freedom and eternity beyond.[63]

1   Joyce, John., and Matthias, Peter, "The Fate of Murderers: Faithful Narrative of the Murder of Mrs. Sarah Cross, With the Trial, Sentence & Confession of John Joyce & Peter Mathias, Who Were Executed Near Philadelphia On Monday 14, March 1808." Philadelphia, [Pa.]: Printed for the purchasers, 1808, 8. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

2   Ibid, 11.

3   Joyce and Matthias, "Fate of Murderers," 12. "Joyce was arrested the same evening. Peter was taken up the next day, a mile or two out of town…"

4   Joyce and Matthias, "Fate of Murderers," 14.

5   Joyce and Matthias, "Fate of Murderers," 15.

6   Ibid.

7   Ibid.

8   Launched into eternity" was a commonly-used term to describe execution, with its origins dating back to 18th-century England when the Church took an emphasized role in public executions according to Vic Gartrell's, The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People, 1775-1868, Oxford [Uk.]: Oxford University Press, 2013.

9   Scratch 'Em, Toby. The Tickler, "Life & Adventures of John Joyce & Peter Matthias." Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Written by George Hembold under the pseudonym Toby Scratch 'Em, The Tickler was a satirical newspaper in Philadelphia that began publishing in 1807.

10   Joyce and Matthias, "Fate of Murderers," 15.

11   Nash, Gary B., Forging Freedom: the Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840. Cambridge, [Ma.].: Harvard University Press, 1988, 2. Even thirty-five years after the publication of Nash's Forging Freedom, Nash's work remains the leading authority on Philadelphia's free Black population during the early republic. ; Ibid, 137, from published federal censuses of 1790-1820. Included in

the city are the adjacent urbanized areas of Northern Liberties, Southwark, Moyamensing, and, for 1820, Spring Garden and Kensington.

12   Ibid, 143. By 1810, 9,653 free Black people lived in Philadelphia, as compared to the 82,221 white people living in Philadelphia at the time. While white Philadelphians still outnumbered their 10 to 1, the Black population in Philadelphia decadally increased 210% in 1800, as compared to the white population's 51% decadal increase. By 1800, black people in Pennsylvania were four times more likely to live in Philadelphia than their white counterparts.

13   Branagan, Thomas, Serious Remonstrances, Addressed to the Citizens of the Northern States, and Their Representatives: Philadelphia, [Pa]: Printed and published by Thomas T. Stiles, 1805.

14   Geggus, David Patrick (2002). Haitian revolutionary studies. Indiana: Indiana University Press. p. 72.

15   Committee for Improving the Conditions of Free Blacks Minute Book, 1790-1803, Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, ser. 1, reel 6, Philadelphia [Pa.]: Sept. 20, 1791; Feb. 28, 1792, 37-43. Historical Society of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia.

16   Salinger, Sharon V., "Spaces, Inside and Outside, in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," Journal of Interdisciplinary History 26, no. 1 (1995): 8, 14, 26–27, 30–31; Lapsansky-Werner, Emma J. Neighborhoods in Transition: William Penn's Dream and Urban Reality. New York: Garland Pub., 1994. Print.

17   DeLombard, Jeannine Marie. In the Shadow of the Gallows: Race, Crime, and American Civic Identity. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fj0kq. ; Melish, Joanne Pope, Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780–1860 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 204, 206.

18   Scratch 'Em, The Tickler.

19   DeLombard, In the Shadow of the Gallows, 143.

20   Allen, Confession, 6.

21   Allen, Confession, 36.

22   Allen, Richard, 1760-1831 The Life, Experience, and Gospel Labours of the Rt. Rev. Richard Allen. To Which is Annexed the Rise and Progress of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Containing a Narrative of the Yellow Fever in the Year of Our Lord 1793: With an Address to the People of Colour in the United States. Philadelphia: Martin & Boden, Printers, 1833, 5.

23   Allen, The Life, Experience, and Gospel Labours, 5.

24   Ibid, 7.

25   Ibid.

26   Ibid, 12.

27   Ibid,

28   Ibid, 14, 15.

29   By 1805, Allen's religious flock comprised 457 members.

30   Carey, Matthew, A short account of the malignant fever, lately prevalent in Philadelphia: with a statement of the proceedings that took place on the subject in different parts of the United States. Philadelphia [Pa.]: Printed by the author., 76, November 14, 1793.

31   Ibid, 77.

32   Ibid.

33   The use of the term 'black' in this context may not solely refer to race in this context. Throughout literary history, 'black' has meant wicked, evil, or dirty, which served more as a reflection of one's morality than of their skin color. For a full analysis of the semantic development of the word 'black', see Joyce A. Joyce. "Semantic Development of the Word Black: A History from Indo-European to the Present."

Journal of Black Studies 11, no. 3 (1981): 307–12. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2784182. However, Allen could be also using the word 'black' in a racialized, rhetorical context, responding to the prevailing stereotypes of Black immorality invoked in Carey's attack. Thus, Allen and Jones might instead be rejecting that notion that Black immorality was endemic among all Blacks at the time, thereby distancing himself and others from the "vilest of Blacks" Carey refers to as committing immoral acts during the yellow fever epidemic.. For a full discussion on the rhetorical structure of Allen and Jones's pamphlet, see Bacon, Jacqueline. "Rhetoric and Identity in Absalom Jones and Richard Allen's 'Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People, during the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia.'" The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 125, no. 1/2 (2001): 61–90. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20093427; Jones, Absalom, and Richard Allen. A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People: During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia, in the Year 1793: And a Refutation of Some Censures, Thrown Upon Them in Some Late Publications. Philadelphia: Printed for the authors, by William W. Woodward, at Franklin's head, no. 41, Chestnut-street, 1794.

34   Jones and Allen, Awful Calamity.

35   Newman, Richard S. Freedom's Prophet : Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers, 130. New York: New York University Press, 2008. Cohen, Daniel A., Pillars of Salt, Monuments of Grace: New England Crime Literature and the Origins of American Popular Culture, 1674-1860, 4, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006; DeLombard, In the Shadow of the Gallows, 153.

36   Allen, Confession.

37   Newman, Freedom's Prophet, 130.
38   Cohen, Daniel A., Pillars of Salt, Monuments of Grace: New England Crime Literature and the Origins of American Popular Culture, 1674-1860, 4, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.
39   Allen, Confession, 4.
40   Ibid, 12.
41   Ibid.
42   Ibid.
43   Allen, Confession, 30.
44   Newman, Freedom's Prophet, 201.
45   Articles of Association of African Methodist Episcopal Church of the City of Philadelphia, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (called Bethel Church)," Sept. 17, 1796, Letters of Attorney, 458–65, RG-17, ser. 17.419, Volume 8, Box 7. Records of the Land Office, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg.
46   Gordon, Sarah Barringer, "The African Supplement: Religion, Race, and Corporate Law in Early National America," 2015. Faculty Scholarship at Penn Carey Law. 1575. https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty_scholarship/1575
47   Allen, Richard to a Presiding Elder, Apr. 8, 1807, in J. Manning Potts, Elmer T. Clark, and Jacob S. Payton, eds., The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury in Three Volumes, vol. 3, The Letters (London, 1958), 367.
48   Articles of Association, 1796.
49   Ibid.
50   Ibid.
51   An Act to Confer on Certain Associations," Apr. 6, 1791, chap. 27, sec. 4, Acts of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, 40–43, esp. 41 ("objects"), 43.
52   Gordon, "The African Supplement," 403.

53   Allen, The Life, Experience, and Gospel Labours, 18-19.

54   Newman, Freedom's Prophet, 131, 132.

55   African Supplement, "Articles Improving, Amending, and Altering the Articles of Association of the African Methodist Episcopal Church," March 28, 1807, Letters of Attorney, 1-5, RG-17, ser. 17.419, Volume 5, Box 15. Records of the Land Office, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg.

56   Articles of Association, 1796.

57   Newman, Freedom's Prophet, 135.

58   Letter from Joseph Hopkinson, April 24, 1815, "African Church" file, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

59   Richard Allen and Jacob Tapisco, The Doctrines and Discipline of the African Methodist Episcopal Church African Methodist Episcopal Church First Edition. (Philadelphia: John H. Cunningham, Printer, 1817), 65.

60   Allen, Confession, 5.

61   Nash, Forging Freedom, 134, 221.

62   Allen, The Life, Experience, and Gospel Labours, 48.

63   Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks (1993). Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Emergent Bureaucracy in Counter Bureaucratism, From the Hundred Flowers to the Anti-Rightist Campaign
Shutong Wang

Introduction

The period between 1956 and 1957 was one of the most drastically transformative in the history of the People's Republic of China (PRC). Following Nikita Khrushchev's report, On the Cult of Personality and its Consequences, and his efforts at denouncing Stalin, Mao Zedong delivered his famous speech, On the Ten Major Relationships, in April 1956, announcing the need to streamline the Communist Party of China (CPC) while encouraging the democratic parties to supervise it.[1] Summarizing Mao's idea, the CPC spread the principle of "let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend" nationwide. It signaled the start of the Hundred Flowers Campaign.[2] In September, the 8th National Congress of the Party was inaugurated, resulting in a new Party constitution. Then, the sudden outbreak of the Hungarian Revolution further stimulated the desire for democracy and freedom of speech in Chinese society. After months of apparent normality, a Rectification Movement in May 1957 abruptly stirred up waves of mass discussions and demonstrations against bureaucratism, elevating the Hundred Flowers Campaign to a new height. However, with the start of the Anti-Rightist Campaign in June, freedom of speech quickly became a thing of the past. Eventually, the authorities labeled at least 550,000 individuals as "rightists," sentencing them to punishments and social death.[3] Suddenly, it seemed

all the steps previously taken toward building up a liberalized socialist republic had been in vain. This paper analyzes the causes of this reversal in course.

China's spring of academic research emerged after the country underwent reform and an economic opening in the 1980s. As the de facto Party Leader who created this historical transition, Deng Xiaoping and his colleagues sought to pass a definitive judgment over previous decades of the PRC. As Deng commented,

The necessity for the anti-Rightist struggle of 1957 should be reaffirmed. After the completion of the socialist transformation, there was indeed a force—a trend of thought—in the country that was bourgeois in nature and opposed to socialism. It was imperative to counter this trend. I have said on many occasions that some people really were making vicious attacks at the time, trying to negate the leadership of the Communist Party and change the socialist orientation of our country.[4]

He believed this campaign should be viewed as a turning point in Mao Zedong's correct leadership. The true mistake, if any, lay in the "magnification," or the broadening of scope, in assigning "rightist" labels. Following Deng's orthodoxy, many reformist CPC scholars, such as Wu Lengxi, composed memoirs or scholarship depicting Mao's mistakes in the magnification of the Anti-Rightist Campaign. They did not address the transition from the Rectification Movement to this later campaign, potentially suggesting that it involved a smooth collective decision-making process.[5]

Until recent years, mainstream scholars directed their criticism towards Mao Zedong's leadership. Historians, including Ye Yonglie and Yinghong Cheng, have argued the Hundred Flowers Campaign, or at least the Rectification Movement, together with the Anti-Rightist Campaign, was part of Mao's grand scheme to expose and eliminate critics.[6] Though not all Chinese scholars subscribe to this explana-

tion, they commonly explicitly or implicitly acknowledge Mao's supreme position and his obsession with power. Yen-lin Chung's metaphor of Mao as a "wayward king" is a notable example.[7]

Critical of these simplified interpretations, Maurice Meisner, Roderick MacFarquhar, Shen Zhihua, and other scholars outside of China provided more nuanced accounts of this period. On the one hand, some of their work places emphasis on Mao's original intention behind counter-bureaucratism. On the other, in-depth analyses of the complex senior-level struggle confront the conventional view of smooth collective decision-making or Mao's rule as a dictatorship. Through their work, a critical historical actor, the bureaucracy, becomes partially visible but receives little detailed examination.

To analyze what I term the "emergent bureaucracy" that emerged through the 1957 conjuncture, I organized my paper into two parts. The first, based on a comparative analysis of Mao's speeches and critical scholarship (MacFarquhar et al.), delves deeper into Mao's role to situate this novel historical actor within a broader political context. In the second part, I conduct an original quantitative and qualitative analysis of key historical documents like"Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji" (Collection of Rightists' Speeches at Beijing University) to deepen my investigation of the interactions between Mao, students, and Party Leaders at Beijing University during the May 19th Movement.[8] This enables me to identify key characteristics of this emergent bureaucracy, which I define as those who benefited from their privileged official positions and Party Memberships. Far from adhering to the Maoist doctrine of the "Mass Line," they gradually formed a de facto political collective by resisting efforts against bureaucratism.[9]

I argue that 1956-57 marked the transformation of individual privileged Party Members into a de facto political

bureaucratic force formed on the principles of counteracting Mao's Hundred Flowers Movement and the Rectification Campaign. Rooted in the new social relations and structural tensions of socialist China, members of this emergent entity played two important roles in 1957. Though unwilling to contest Mao's nominal authority directly, they attempted to produce misinformation when interfacing with their superiors. Confronting the masses that were supposed to be served, they tried to suppress any act that could challenge their position. In the context of senior-level disagreement, this emergent bureaucracy contributed to the historical shift from the Rectification Movement to the Anti-Rightist Campaign and the subsequent magnification of this purge. Thus, my analysis contributes to a better understanding of Mao's responsibility and challenges the common tendency among historians to refer to socialist China as a "Maoist regime."

1. Mao Zedong's Position

When taking an initial approach to the political movements in 1956 and 57, encountering Mao's participation is inevitable. Superficially, it is tempting to focus on the changes in Mao's thoughts from 1956 to mid-1957. Over time, scholars have sharply and sensitively emphasized the differences in Mao's statements in the successive campaigns. At the start of the Hundred Flowers Campaign, he sincerely invited the democratic party members to supervise the Party.[10] Then, in January 1957, he introduced a metaphor of "fragrant flowers" and "poisonous weed" to describe the appearance of society.[11] Eventually, in June, he issued an instruction, Organize to Counter the Furious Attacks from the Rightists, to initiate the Anti-Rightist suppression.[12] Such a selection of materials easily leads to an emphasis on Mao's central responsibility, given the prevailing preconceived notion of Mao's dictatorship. These shifts in tone were undeniably significant. Yet,

they often obscure other messages in his words.

Mao constantly discussed the issue of bureaucratism. In January 1957, when Mao spoke about the existence of rightist slogans and his metaphor of flowers and weeds, he first framed the problems within the Communist Party, denouncing those cadres who loved and only cared about competing for titles and promotion.[13] In May and June, when his attitudes were changing, he did not forget to talk about the issue of dogmatism among many comrades.[14] Further, it must be highlighted that before the Anti-Rightist Campaign, Mao even pushed for a Rectification Movement that mainly targeted bureaucratism, sectarianism, and subjectivism (widely referred to as Three Evils) among Party Members.[15] By attacking the bureaucratic working style, the self-serving factionalism, and the vice of making arbitrary decisions inside the CPC, he hoped to bring the Party back to its mass supporter base. Particularly, such a movement would include examining "the status of tackling the contradictions among the people," the conditions of practicing the Party's policy of Hundred Flowers, the phenomenon of not uniting each ethnicity, party, mass, and intellectuals, etc.[16] The participation of individuals who were not members of the CPC was welcomed; however, this participation "must [stem] from their willingness," and these individuals were allowed to quit whenever they desired.[17] Doctrines of the Mass Line and self-criticism remained the fundamental theoretical pillars regardless of other changes.

Mao's conception of rightists was minimal, and his proposed way of tackling them was hardly brutal. From the outset, he proposed two contradictions of very different natures: the contradiction among the people and the contradiction between ourselves and enemies.[18] The essential line of distinction was the definition of the people. For Mao in 1957, it was: "All the classes, strata, and social groups who supported, embraced, and participated in the course of so-

cialist construction."[19] Most of the population participating in the Hundred Flowers would have been classified as the people, for they did not want to overthrow the CPC leadership. Regarding protests and disturbances, he believed most should be attributed to the political or economic mistakes made by the Party, "nothing but subjectivism and bureaucratism." Further, he argued that "the last factor is the counter-revolutionaries."[20] As Mao envisioned in the first weeks of the Anti-Rightist Movement, the true counter-revolutionaries would only be a tiny portion of the population who belonged to the category of "anti-Communist, anti-people, and anti-socialism bourgeoisie rightists."[21] He believed these would only be "a few out of a hundred" and "the zealous ones might not exceed one percent."[22] Qi Benyu said, "Chairman Mao at the time said there were merely four to five thousand rightists."[23] Yet, the ultimate rule was not the estimated percentage but sufficient evidence.[24] In Mao's initial plan for the Anti-Rightest campaign, he expected a process of debates and criticism for these rightists who supposedly assumed an enemy position. It involved letting them speak up and then providing proper objections to make people understand the negative attitudes these rightists were promoting and why they were wrong, thus isolating them from the masses. The entire campaign, "if properly done, should only take around a month," then the focus would turn back to rectification within the CPC.[25] Even if some rightists did not regret it, "as long as they never serve as spies, not continuing any destructive actions, the government should still provide them employment, and not expropriate their citizen rights." This is because the result of many historical events that adopted extreme policies was not satisfactory."[26] Rather than suggesting a prolonged ruthless suppression that had historically resulted in punishing 550,000 or more individuals in 1957 and 58, the long-term primary target for the Chairman was still the bureaucratic elements in the CPC apparatus.

Recognizing Mao's insistence on counter-bureaucratism and his initial proposal for a limited Anti-Rightist campaign, several questions must be raised: To what extent was this devastating campaign truly a product of this "supreme" leader? Were there other parties that should also be held responsible or even more responsible for the massive purge that historians observed?

2. The Hundred Flowers Contested

To approach these questions, it is essential to first shed light on the gradual power shifts within the Communist Party. The roots of such changes, as Qi Benyu recalled, can be traced back to 1953, when Gao Gang, previously the Secretary of the Northeast Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPC, fell out of power due to his sectarianism errors after a political power struggle within the Party Central with Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. This increased the latter's authority.[27] Later, in September 1956, during the first meeting of the 8th National Congress of CPC in Beijing, Liu presented the political report, and Deng made a statement on modifying the Party Constitution. This seemed to be a turning point in the Party's power dynamics, as Deng's report included strengthening democratic decision-making and opposition to individual cults as guiding principles.[28] Partially as a response to Khrushchev's report and by emphasizing the importance of the collective will, Mao's weight had sharply declined. As Maurice Meisner noted, "'guided by the thought of Mao Zedong' was deleted in the new Party Constitution," and the post of General Secretary of the Secretariat of the Central Committee (Central Secretariat) was established.[29] Deng Xiaoping was appointed to this crucial position. He and his subordinates would be responsible for drafting and ensuring the implementation of directives from the Political Bureau and reviewing and selecting documents and reports.[30] From

a political construction perspective, the Communist Party seemed to be on a more democratic track. However, this change was not necessarily positive regarding implementing the Hundred Flowers Campaign.

As my discussion indicates, Mao was dedicated to promoting the Hundred Flowers Campaign. It's evident from recent historiography and key primary sources that many central and local party cadres were unhappy with Mao's campaign from the outset. In 1956, Qi recalled that Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, and Peng Zhen complained, "Mao's speech at the Supreme State Conference (announcing the Hundred Flowers) were made without prior discussion, whereas previously anything was discussed within the party first…"[31] Lin Xiling, a well-known student rightist, noted, "80% of senior cadres do not agree with the Hundred Flowers; this is not groundless; Chairman Mao spoke it."[32] Nevertheless, Mao Zedong was determined to push for the Hundred Flowers Campaign. After the 8th Congress, despite him still being influential and irreplaceable, more confrontations arose between him and other cadres in the Party. In March, Mao held discussions with many groups of party and non-party representatives, specifically regarding the stagnant implementation of the Hundred Flowers Campaign due to "dogmatists' stubborn resistance."[33] Generally, as Shen Zhihua's book presents, while democratic party members increasingly applauded Mao's attitudes, more and more CPC comrades were found unwilling to accept criticism from society.[34] In April, after an inspection tour to the south, Mao expressed his anxiety to Wu Lengxi: "The comrades in the Party are afraid of poisonous weeds, which are the 'right,' while outside of the Party, people are afraid of the dogmatism, that's to say, the 'left.'"[35] Determined to intervene in the conjuncture, Mao spoke (or wrote) his famous line: "If we do not rectify, the Party will be ruined."[36] Somehow, he managed to gain permission from most senior leaders and launched the Rectification Cam-

paign.[37] However, this consent seemed superficial, as about half of the Political Bureau members later demonstrated their opposition through their actions.[38]

The myth of Mao's supreme leadership has been challenged at this stage. Mao still had irreplaceable symbolic and political importance, but within the CPC system, he was only an eminent member of the senior decision-making collective. Further, since 1956, from senior leaders to low-level functionaries, there was widespread antagonism against his Hundred Flowers principles and the subsequent Rectification Campaign. Ironically, Mao's attempt to summon his comrades to overcome the Three Evils of bureaucratism, sectarianism, and subjectivism helped foster a growing alienation from the masses.

Based on these understandings, rather than simply using the individualized term "bureaucrats" in 1956 and especially in 1957's context, it appears appropriate to introduce the designation of "bureaucracy," more precisely, an "emergent bureaucracy." A preliminary definition would be: Some who benefited from their privileged official positions and Party Memberships, far from adhering to the Maoist doctrine of the Mass Line, had gradually formed a de facto political collective on resisting efforts against bureaucratism. To elaborate on my points, in the following sections, I will examine how this emergent bureaucracy counteracts Mao's summon and eventually transforms the Rectification Campaign into an anti-rightist purge.

3. Strategies of Rejection and Magnification

Two clear strategies can be observed. The first, briefly presented in the previous section, occurred before the Rectification Movement, where this emergent bureaucracy reacted to the Hundred Flowers principles primarily with official loathing and rejection. However, when the Rectification Move-

ment was launched, a nominal agreement was reached in the Central Committee, and with the mass mobilization under this strong call for rectification, this strategy seemed no longer valid.

The second strategy appeared in June. Leveraging the immediate shift in focus from rectification to suppressing the so-called attacking bourgeoisie rightists, the bureaucracy amplified the purge to radically overturn the tide. From the senior level, an enormous quota of rightists was set. According to Qi, it would be 10% of each work unit.[39] Some other sources said that (by early July) at least initially, there was a 5 percent quota.[40] Regardless of the case, this quota number far exceeded Mao's estimation.

Despite not making statements against socialism or the Party, many individuals who actively participated in the Hundred Flowers Campaign were nonetheless victimized. One notable example was Wang Meng, a novelist labeled a rightist despite Mao's firm support and purged in 1958 for unknown reasons.[41] Famous sociologist Fei Xiaotong was the other example.[42] In his last interview, he recalled a discussion after being labeled a rightist. Sitting near a swimming pool, the Chairman comforted him, saying: "What's the matter of being a rightist? How many labels have I had? Those labels placed will eventually be removed."[43]

The magnification of the Anti-Rightist campaign quickly reached the entire country. Many people not only suffered from the hostile policies made by the top but also from some lower-level bureaucrats. An exemplary case was the Jiabiangou labor camp in Gansu province, a part of the re-education through the labor penal system created by a central order to re-educate some extreme rightists and counter-revolutionaries. Sebastian Veg's article has depicted some distinct mislabeled rightists: In Qi Shuying's case, she was persecuted for refusing her bureau chief's abnormal (sexual) demand; In Qi Yaoquan's case, previously the local Youth

League Secretary, he was labeled a rightist for irritating the County Secretary. Even some old revolutionaries, such as Li Tianqing, who fought against the Nationalists during the Civil War and the subsequent Korean War, were classified as rightists for various reasons.[44] In the name of Mao and socialism, bureaucrats tried their best to persecute anyone for disobedience. It is reasonable to believe that these magnified numbers would eventually end up in reports received by the central government, which led the leaders to make wrong forecasts, resulting in hundreds of thousands of victims. The magnification strategy was historically proven to be notorious but effective. Confirming this, Deng Xiaoping captured an essential part of the story.

4. At the Turning Point of History: Students and Emergent Bureaucracy in the May 19th Movement

The failed attempt at rejecting the Hundred Flowers principles and the success of the strategy of magnifying the anti-Rightist purge provided general insights into the emergent bureaucracy's continuous effort to counteract the Hundred Flowers Movement. However, a crucial period remains unexamined: late May and June 1957, the climax of the entire Hundred Flower—Rectification movement. This was precisely the time when senior leadership, including Mao Zedong, stepped towards initiating the Anti-Rightist Campaign.

The historiographical focus has generally been on the senior leadership struggles and social unrest that transformed Mao's attitudes.[45] Roderick MacFarquhar and Shen Zhihua have offered persuasive analyses of the former. However, when specifically discussing the student movements that started at Beijing University on May 19th and soon flourished across China's cities, most scholars have focused on senior Party officials' memoirs and internal reports. Little attention

is given to interactions between students, senior decision-makers, and members of the emergent bureaucracy. In this section, I attempt to fill this gap based on a qualitative and quantitative analysis of a contemporaneous official account of "representative rightists'" speeches by students at Beijing University, Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji to achieve an in-depth understanding of the emergent bureaucracy.[46]

1/Themes	Party's Leadership	Socialism	Rectification
Support or Likely Support	35	42	48
Unclear, Cannot Infer	7	7	1
Critical or Against	7	0	0

From the outset, adhering to Mao's conception of the "rightist" (see section 1), the extent to which these exemplary "rightists" were truly rightists must be questioned. As evidenced quantitatively, most of the 49 documented "rightist" individual students or groups hold a positive consensus on socialism and the Rectification Campaign.[47] Admittedly, though, there was more of a debate over the CPC's leadership among the students. As more than 70% of them were content with its dominance, it is hard to say whether most fit Mao's "rightist" designation: Party Communism was not their target; they self-identified with the people and did not question socialism at all. While many did come from previously bourgeoisie families, that alone was far from sufficient. Countless Communist revolutionaries were also born into landlord or bourgeois families.

Far from anti-socialism, most students pushed for a better-refined, idealistic version of socialism. Among their writings, the word "democracy" appeared frequently. Yet, the meaning of it was far from liberal democracy or other Western forms of social democracy. Throughout the entire

collection of speeches, elections are rarely mentioned. Even in cases where they are, most of the time, student activists merely asked for direct elections to the posts of certain junior officials or functionaries they disliked. The only individual who could be categorized as asking for an election to semi-replace the existing system of the People's Congress was Jiang Xingren from the Department of Biology, but just like all the others, he did not question the idea of socialism; instead, he believed his democratic solution would reinforce its realization.[48] The majority of student activists, in fact, focused on more concrete problems. Some, including Qian Ruping and Jiang Xingren, demanded more genuine public ownership (where workers truly control the production), while others questioned the allocation of jobs, the non-transparency of personal files, disrespect of the law or constitution, the biased teaching approach, dogmatic and mandatory political education, etc. All of these critiques were tied to denouncing the "Three Evils" of bureaucracy, sectarianism, and subjectivism in the Communist Party (which was precisely Mao's target in the Rectification Movement). Thus, it could be said that "democracy," in students' comprehension, was a largely enhanced mass supervision of politics under the Communist Party's Leadership, which would be effective in eliminating the existing Three Evils, thereby promoting the making of genuine socialism.

The fundamental similarities between the students' and Mao's views are apparent when comparing their general denunciations and commitments with a contemporaneous directive issued by the Central Committee. On May 16th, the latter informed its subordinates:

From facts that have been revealed… Party Members enjoyed privileges in terms of ranking, wage determination, promotion, treatment, etc. Party Members are ranked higher, while non-Party Members are ranked lower. Party Members are arrogant, while non-Party Members are submissive.

In schools, our Party's cadre instructors, assistant teachers, lecturers, and professors have lower qualifications and less knowledge, and rather than sincerely learning from the instructors and professors with higher qualifications and more knowledge, they assume an attitude of superiority. Though the above situation does not reflect the whole, it is pervasive.[49]

In the broader picture, most of these "rightists" aligned with these views and thus confirmed Mao's agenda.

Thus, Mao was far from absent in their discussions. Of the 49 exemplary "rightist" groups and individuals, 12 mentioned him. Interestingly, besides one critical person, most viewed Mao mainly as a positive figure. Students like Qian Ruping and Wang Shuyao deliberately drew upon Mao's words and examples to persuade their audience.[50] Some, however, had bolder and sharper discussions about him. One of the student leaders, Tan Tianrong, passionately urged students to support the Rectification Movement; he stated, "Our beloved comrade Mao Zedong is in a challenging position; the students must make sure the mass movement goes in the least harmful direction.[51] Another student, Zhang Jingzhong, even discussed the possibility of inviting "Chairman Mao" to the university with his friend.[52] The above account is indeed still far from fully summarizing the complexity of students' thoughts. However, it establishes that most were not rightists and were not made "rightists" until June.

Though the students did not extend their invitation in the end, Mao kept a close eye on the movement at Beijing University. Since the start, internal news reports had been continuously updated on the changing situation in universities. Party agents copied exemplary big character posters and summarized students' claims.[53] Mao appears to have become extremely concerned in the last ten days of May.[54] On May 25th, Mao spoke to the delegates of the Communist Youth League:

Your meeting was very successful… The Chinese Communist Party is the leading core of all Chinese people. Without this core, the socialist cause cannot succeed. Your meeting is a solidarity meeting, which will have a big impact on all Chinese youth. I congratulate you. Comrades, stay united, and bravely strive for the great cause of socialism. Any words or actions that deviate from socialism are completely wrong.[55]

A warning had been issued. As the birthplace of the student movement that had attracted Mao's attention, Beijing University's case likely had some influence on his position. The question is, why, considering students' genuine agreement with the Party's Leadership and socialism, did Mao feel there was an undesirable tendency present within the student movement?

Among the key factors that contributed to Mao's understanding, published memoirs have shown that members of the bureaucracy at Beijing University, who partially controlled information transmission, played an important role. Regardless of his direct target of accusation, Qi Benyu's complaint provides a general sketch: "While Deng Xiaoping was in charge of work, many documents, including some abnormal situations, were quickly sent to the Chairman [Mao] via internal channels. For a while, he could not figure out which were the truthful ones and which were the fake ones."[56] Mao's secretary, Chen Boda, recalled: "At the time, many big character posters appeared in Beijing University, the Xin Hua News Agency [in charge of producing internal news reports, Neibu cankao] and the Party Committee of Beijing University reported to the Central Committee, believing that the situation was difficult, and saying it had turned into the Hyde Park."[57] No records of what exactly the university's Party Committee had reported to Mao and others exist. Still, it certainly had a great stake in exaggeration and providing misinformation, considering it was the common immediate target of student activists' critiques. My following analysis

will show that they can be characterized as members of China's emergent bureaucracy.

With no signs of receiving directives from their superiors, leaders of the university's Party Committee showed a strong reluctance towards the students' participation in the Rectification Campaign. Since the start date of May 19th, while students were putting up big character posters, Deputy Secretary of the Party, Cui Xiongkun, backed by the Secretary of the Youth League Committee, Shi Yougang, immediately responded by saying: "We do not recommend this form of participation, because it is not good. Indeed, if someone does put up such a poster, we do not prohibit it."[58] His words soon produced a widespread sense of antagonism among the students. Not only accused of being irresponsible, he and, implicitly, the school's Party Committee, were charged with bureaucratism.[59] The fact that, as Deputy Secretary, Cui did not even know the number of Youth League members in the University strengthened their arguments.[60]

On the night of the 21st, responding to students' criticisms, the Party Secretary, Jiang Longji, publicly apologized in a speech. He then announced the committee's support for the students. This was a successful act: passionate students had flooded the dining hall, and they all applauded in the end. [61]Yet, the entire speech was merely a concession made on the leading collective's behalf, resulting from fear of escalating tensions. Fundamentally, these leaders did not agree with the students. Jiang soon used his actions to prove it. First, he used a play-dumb strategy. Though he promised to support the movement, he likely did nothing in the first few days.[62]Then, on the 25th, when students from the Western languages department organized an accusation meeting and bitterly revealed several tragic wrongfully purged cases brought on by the Three Evils, Jiang broke his silence and admonished against such actions retaking place.[63] Speaking to more than a disagreement over tactics, he posed several fierce

questions to the students: Were they denouncing the Communist Party? Was the meeting aimed to resolve the contradictions within the people – that is, social tensions among them – or to amplify them? Was it aimed to strengthen the Party's Leadership or weaken it? Did it seek to consolidate socialism or undermine it? He concluded by saying the students' meeting was "abnormal" and "unsound."[64] That night, a reporter interviewed Jiang about his assessment. Jiang optimistically stated: "After a week of activism [which could alternatively be translated as "riots"], the students are now mentally tired."[65] However, precisely due to his speech, the ruptures between the school leaders and students grew significantly. Students were unafraid of his threats and denounced him and the university's Party Committee more than ever. It is crucial to ask: what made the university's Party Secretary Jiang pose such a threat to the students? Or, more broadly, what made the university's Party Committee act against the student movement since its beginnings (by speaking against it and sending misinformation to the Central Committee)?

There were likely multiple concerns that converged into such decisions. Primarily, Jiang and other heads of the school arguably cared about their positions and privileges. Mao's warning on the 25th against deviating from the Party's Leadership line and socialism may have provided them sufficient courage to take action. However, other reasons and rationales likely contributed to their decisions. The most significant one was a possible belief that they were acting on behalf of the Party: rectification was acceptable only if it was carried out under the Party's Leadership; in Beijing University's case, this responsibility naturally fell on Jiang and Cui's backs. The student movement carried a high risk of losing control, and the chaos it caused could have eventually made both the Party's Leadership and socialism vulnerable. This resonates in Jiang's speech about the accusation meeting on the 25th. It also points to a possible rationale for providing

exaggerated information to Mao and other leaders: misinformation was necessary for ensuring the Party's greater good. Given their dual concern over their positions and imagined Party interests, Jiang and Cui's actions were likely their best available recourse. Yet, regardless of these possible considerations, a critical point remained clear: the objective function of the bureaucracy's actions was to suppress mass participation in the Rectification Movement. It was, of course, a conservative act. It left no room for the Mass Line or truthful self-criticism. These university leaders surely deviated from their commitment to the people, the supposed priority of their public service, and the core of Maoism.

Mao did not appreciate the University's leaders' "good-hearted" mindset in providing misinformation. While he received reports from Xin Hua News Agency and Beijing University's Party Committee, he must have doubted the truthfulness of the information. This was likely why he dispatched his secretaries to investigate the university's case. Yet, this process took time. It was not until the last few days of May, after his speech on the 25th, that he got results: His secretary Chen Boda suggested the information had been exaggerated; developments at Beijing University were of minor severity and "not worth making a fuss over."[66] Now equipped with a better understanding, Mao remarked on the student movement:

Looking at the current situation, we should still encourage [the] outspoken, with the goal of rectifying the party, winning over the centrists, and isolating and dividing the rightists. However, our approach to the rightists should be gentle and subtle. Significant issues are unlikely to occur at Peking University. Among the school's professors and associate professors, 11% are right-wing, 39% are left-wing, and 50% are centrist… Among the 8000 students, only about 70 are rightists, with about 200 people supporting them.[67]

It was clear that the student movements at Beijing University, after a period of confusion and concern, did not ultimately influence Mao's perception of society in his ongoing Rectification Campaign. Yet, this by no means suggests the ineffectiveness of the emergent bureaucracy's influence on turning the Rectification Movement into the Anti-Rightist Campaign. Approximately five days of confusion had already led to the production of false signals (such as Mao's warning on the 25th), which would lead to the escalation of conflicts between students and members of the bureaucracy. Besides, and importantly, the student movement spread from Beijing University to universities across the country; if a sufficient number of university leaders were inclined to join or were already part of the emergent bureaucracy, then the fact that Mao had seen through the misinformation produced by Beijing University's Party Committee would have meant little. There were places where the university's Party Committees had taken a more radically conservative position. At Tianjin Nankai University, Beijing University was already officially portrayed as a state of "anarchy" "controlled by counter-revolutionaries."[68] Considerable amounts of misinformation were spreading across the country. This created more than enough political capital for Mao's senior-level opponents to utilize and, by leveraging other anxieties and discourses, to change the course of the Rectification Campaign.[69]

It did not take long for Jiang Longji and other members of the emergent bureaucracy to feel a sense of relief. On June 8th, acting on the collective leadership's behalf, Mao announced his attacks on the rightists.[70] A perfect chance to crack down on the critics emerged. Students were quickly classified as "rightists," and many had to take responsibility for their words from May. To what extent Jiang was dedicated to the anti-rightist hunt remains debatable. According to a biography that portrayed him as a respected educator, he was invited to meet with Mao Zedong (time not specified) and

obtained a rightist quota of one percent.[71] Superior directives must have arrived at Beijing University, and regardless of whether Jiang was willing to escalate or not, the purge numbers eventually reached 511, out of which 421 were students, approximately 5.3% of their total number.[72] Certainly, it was higher than the alleged 1% Mao quota or the previously mentioned 70 rightists. Jiang and his colleagues could not be excused from their vital roles in carrying out such a persecution.

One last topic merits exploration: for what exact reasons were non-rightist students made into "rightists"? Fundamentally, most of these student rightists were accused of "attacking the Party."[73] According to a Beijing Daily report, various attempts to "overthrow the Party Committee of Beijing University" were direct manifestations of such a crime.[74] The university committee's stubborn resistance in May now turned into a glorious act. They pruned students' speeches and posters and introduced sentences that contained any element of questioning the party to reinforce students' guilt. The true meaning of their words was never discussed. Even the entirety of the May 19th Student Movement was heavily criticized as if that was just how Mao Zedong had judged it.[75] However, other than the arbitrary and vague label of having attacked the CPC and after-the-fact explanations of class backgrounds and trivial factors such as naivete and arrogance (Tan Tianrong was famous for this, both among other students and members of the bureaucracy), many criticisms were commonly based on three meaningful differences between the student and Party narratives.

First, several students, such as Liu Qidi and Cui Depu, questioned previous purges in the PRC. Though students discussed general revolutionary purges such as the Counterrevolutionary Eradication Struggle, they often focused on mislabelled individuals rather than the question

of the righteousness of these campaigns. What they truly questioned were the cases of Hu Feng and Gao Gang-Rao Shushi, that is, specifically, the political purges.[76] These were the sensitive points upon which senior leaders had previously defined collective political correctness. Discussing the rightness or wrongness of those purged in these struggles would have required too much depth. The true tension that students' questioning invoked was the conflict between the traditional method (since the Yan'an period) of line struggle and a modern desire for jurisdiction justice, a tricky and entangled topic that the entire CPC leadership had been reluctant to make a firm choice on.[77]

The invocation of "Poland and Hungary" was also a key point of controversy. While senior leadership, including Mao, had been discussing the Polish and Hungarian incidents cautiously and, in the majority of cases, slightly negatively since the end of 1956, students viewed them positively.[78] Under the same symbol of "Poland and Hungary," it turned out that significantly different conceptions of these incidents were at play. For the CPC leaders, these were examples of the eruption of social tensions within the Hungarian and Polish socialist societies. Their negative attitudes primarily resulted from a perceived threat to the Party's Leadership and socialist public ownership of the economy. Ironically, as examined above, most of those exemplary student "rightists" did not genuinely question these. In their perspective, recent international incidents were merely rallying cries for mass supervision to ward off the Three Evils. The students' peculiar understanding produced some striking correlations. For example, according to Long Yinghua: "The May 19th Movement is the new May Fourth Movement; it is a Marxist Enlightenment in the current stage. It was born under the call of the Twentieth Congress (in the Soviet Union), occurred under the summon of the Hungarian Revolution, and realized under the cannon shot of our People's Congress and the wise

Party Central Committee and Chairman Mao…"[79] It is essential, however, to grasp the fundamental problem behind students' and officials' differences: a deep and persistent conflict between information control and open information access. Reading international information was a privilege enjoyed by junior and senior officials (the news report, Reference News, was an internal publication until 1980). If we take a more abstract view of this tension, it becomes a tension between trust in the people and their subjectivity and the need to consolidate the people's democratic dictatorship over counter-revolutionaries.

Finally, there was a profound divergence over the formulation of bureaucratism. Essentially, both groups' arguments answered these two central questions: One, is bureaucratism an implicit tendency or the semblance of an already existing oppressive bureaucracy? And two, what is the root of this bureaucratism or bureaucracy? In a talk addressed to the 8th Central Committee members, Mao said: "We must be aware, not to foster the bureaucratic style of work, not to form a noble stratum deviated from the people… whoever committed bureaucratism… the people have the justification to overthrown him."[80] Although Mao's attitude of justified rebellion against official misdoings was already apparent, one that would come up with increasing frequency in his later years in his choice of wording, at this stage, he saw bureaucratism only as a tendency, a mistake committed by some individuals; in the worst case, it would manifest as a future stratum, but not as a class. The published version of Mao's 1957 speech On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People (which was heavily modified and so no longer represents his stance, but rather the collective views of the Party Leadership) presents "the contradiction between the bureaucratic style of work and the people" as "also a contradiction among the people. Generally speaking, the contradictions among the people are contradictions formed based on

the fundamental conformity of the interests of the people."[81] This was the leading collective's definitive answer.

Regarding the roots of bureaucratism, Mao's vision appeared less visible, but collectively, the commonly circulated idea in the Anti-Rightist Campaign is available. This was the leading collective's definitive claim. Regarding the roots of bureaucratism, there were no records directly telling Mao's understanding, but collectively, the commonly circulated idea in the Anti-Rightist Campaign is available. Yao Wenyuan, a literary critic and in the 1960s a leading Maoist, wrote an article, "On Revisionism in Some Cultural and Creative Tendencies," in which he argued: "Of course, we should criticize bureaucratism… But bureaucracy is not a product of the socialist system, nor does it occupy a dominant position [in it]. Therefore, we should not demonize those who have been bureaucratic, nor should we describe bureaucratism as a dominant force, as if our society is at the mercy of the bureaucracy with no room to breathe."[82] Thus, we could conclude that for the mainstream of the CPC (including Mao and many later Maoist radicals) in 1957, there was no such class as bureaucrats (a bureaucracy), but only a bureaucratic tendency among the people. For them, bureaucratism was not rooted in the Chinese socialist political structure but rather in the remnants of the past social formation. Finally, bureaucratism did not constitute the dominant contradiction in society; the real acute social tension was still a class struggle between capitalism and communism, between the bourgeoisie and the CPC revolutionaries.

Some student rightists took a radical and distinct position from the mainstream CPC. To them, the issue of bureaucratism was no longer a matter of false tendencies or individual vices but a much more severe problem of an oppressive class of bureaucrats emergent from the existing socialist apparatuses, which should be handled as the most pressing systematic issue. A student from the Department of

Mathematics, Qian Ruping, offered a representative analysis:

To present my main arguments from Lenin's definition of class, let's look at the reality: 1. The control over means of production was mainly in the hands of prominent military and political figures – because it was not in the hands of the people; one worker does not have the right to intervene in the production process. 2. The distribution is unfair; there are people at the top who get too much based on what they deserve from laboring… 3. (meaning not clear) … 4. Does not trust the masses… to give an example, in terms of big character posters, why Secretary Cui's attitude is apathy…[83]

If one compares these different formulations of bureaucracy with Mao's pronouncements in the 1960s, the convergence is apparent; this provides a theoretical angle of inquiry into the grassroots formation of Maoism's maturity. However, at the time, this difference only provided an excuse for students to be persecuted. More importantly, if we consider the potential reasons behind these different formulations, we can see the fundamental contradiction within the PRC's socialist model: a theoretical vanguard position and the importance of the Party in keeping the country socialist versus, in reality, the privileges of Party Members, the gradual deterioration of revolutionary commitments, and the making of a bureaucracy alienated from the people.

Conclusion

Based on my analysis of the Beijing University case, I would develop my definition of my concept of an "emergent bureaucracy" as follows: 1) Emergent from a deviation from the Maoist Mass Line and self-criticism, individual bureaucrats formed a bureaucracy based on a collective rejection of the Hundred Flowers principles and the Rectification Movement.[84] 2) In particular, the essential criteria of belonging to the "emergent bureaucracy" consisted of a privileged

social position as a junior or senior-level Party Member and conservative actions in the Rectification and Anti-Rightist Campaign. 3) Members of the emergent bureaucracy, while not yet ready to directly challenge Mao Zedong's position in mid-1957, dared to influence senior decision-making through misinformation or to sabotage Rectification by suppressing the mass activisms. 4) It was 'emergent' because no signs of an explicitly political organization with an articulated program existed. 5) The new form of society had new contradictions. Behind the above-specified three key differences between student rightists and the Party mainstream, we have uncovered the three hidden fundamental contradictions: *a.* traditional method of purging vs. need for a modern, transparent jurisdiction; *b.* trust in people's subjectivity vs. practical concern on reinforcing democratic dictatorship over counter-revolutionaries; c. theoretical importance of the Party in the making of socialism vs. actual privileged Party Members and their abuse of power. These were closely tied to the PRC's socialist model and hence became the foundations of this emergent bureaucracy. 6) Thus, despite various apparent similarities, this emergent bureaucracy and other bureaucracies that existed throughout Chinese history (such as those of the Ming or Qing Dynasties) were fundamentally different.

My analysis of the emergent bureaucracy has brought much clarity to the history of Rectification and the Anti-Rightist Campaign. Fundamentally, it explains some of the students' attacks on the Party's Leadership. Though a significant divide was present inside the Party, identifying it was not an easy task for all students. In their daily contact, quite a number of those who represented the Party (Secretary Jiang, etc.) were members of this emergent bureaucracy. Rather than being deeply uncomfortable with the CPC, these "rightists" may have failed to distinguish the Three Evils from the larger Party apparatus in which they resided. If this were

true, the number of true rightists (following Mao's definition) would be further reduced.

My research also raises the question of the appropriateness of referring to the PRC as a Maoist regime. Though it may remain a relatively adequate designation for the country before 1957, exposing the emergence of a bureaucracy in mid-1957 suggests that applying the term beyond that year without necessary caution could produce potentially misleading interpretations. Discerning the power dynamics between true Maoists and the bureaucracy would thus be necessary before making a historical judgment and labeling a later period "Maoist."

Finally, my term helps clarify Mao Zedong's responsibility in the 1957 campaigns. It does not amount to his giving his final consent for the initiation of the Anti-Rightist Campaign, nor to the mistake of not promoting information transparency. Instead, it hinges upon his failure to act against the emergent bureaucracy (rather than bureaucratism) and its structural roots in the novel socialist social structure. The Chairman might have partially recognized it. Still, he was not yet convinced and prepared to tackle it in the most thorough way: no longer as a contradiction among the people but a contradiction between "ourselves" and the enemies. Mao finally determined to combat this bureaucracy in 1965, yet the students he summoned to rebellion were no longer the ones from 1957. His counter-bureaucratism indeed ended up in trauma for student activists. Many, such as Qian Liqun and Lin Xiling, became critical to Mao after 1980.

Notes:

1   Mao Zedong, "On the Ten Major Relationships," in Selected Works of Mao Zedong, vol. 5 (Beijing: Foreign Language Press; Marxists Internet Archive), https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-5/mswv5_51.htm.

2   Wu Lengxi, Xinde tansuo he zhengfeng fanyou [New discoveries and the Rectification and Anti-Rightist Campaigns] (Beijing: Zhongyang wenxian Chubanshe, 2016), 23.

3   "Fanyoupai Douzheng," Gongchandangyuan Wang, June 6, 2012.

4   Deng Xiaoping, "Remarks on Successive Drafts of the 'Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China'" (1980-1981), in The Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping, vol.2 (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1984; WordPress, 2013)

5   Deng Xiaoping, Hu Yaobang, Hu Qiaomu, et al., Guany jianguo yilai dang de ruogan lishi wenti de jueyi [Resolution on ccertain historical issues of the Party since the founding of the People's Republic of China] (1981), The Central Government of the People's Republic of China.

6   Ye Yonglie, Fanyoupai yundong shimo [The beginning and end of the Anti-Rightist Campaign] (Xining: Qinghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1995), 178.

7   Yen-lin Chung, "The Witch-Hunting Vanguard: The Central Secretariat's Roles and Activities in the Anti-Rightist Campaign," The China Quarterly 206 (June 2011): 391.

8   "Zhongguo gongchandang zhongyang weiyuanhui guanyu zhengfeng yundong de zhishi [The Central Committee of Communist Party of China's directory on the Rectification Movement]," People's Daily, May 1, 1957, https://cn.govopendata.com/renminribao/1957/5/1/1/#167617.

An important line of this report goes: [Through criticism and self-criticism, to achieve new solidarity on a new basis,' there should be a universal, in-depth, anti-bureaucratism, anti-sectarianism, and anti-subjectivism rectification movement in the entirety of the party, to elevate its ideological qualification of Marxism, and to improve the style of work, so as to fit the need of socialist transformation and socialist construction.] "Beijing Daxue Shehui Zhuyi Sixiang Jiaoyu Weiyuanhui, eds., Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji [Collection of Peking University rightists' speech] (Internal published, 1957).

9   "Mass line" is a Maoist principle, meaning to hear, to serve, to guide, and eventually, to be the people.

10   Appearance of society Mao Zedong, "On the Ten Major Relationships."

11   Mao Zedong, Zai sheng shi zizhiqu dangwei shuji huiyi hang de jianghua [Speech at the party secretary meeting of provinces, cities and autonomous regions], January, 1957. https://www.marxists.org/chinese/maozedong/marxist.org-chinese-mao-195701.htm.

12   Mao Zedong, Zuzhi liliang fanji youpai fenzi de changkuang jingong [Organize to counter the furious attacks from the rightists], June 8th, 1957. https://www.marxists.org/chinese/maozedong/marxist.org-chinese-mao-19570608.htm.

13   Mao, Zai sheng shi zizhiqu dangwei shuji huiyi shang de jianghua.

14   Mao Zedong, Shiqing zhengzai qi bianhua [Things are starting to change], May 15th, 1957. According to Shen Zhihua, it was only internally issued in June, not as other scholars usually believe, on May 15th. Mid-May was only the time when he started to draft this article, but this original version might have big differences from the circulated one; Shen Zhihua, Sikao yu xuanze: cong zhishifenzi huiyi dao fanyoupai yundong (1956- 1957) (1956- 1957) [Reflections

and Choices: The Consciousness of the Chinese Intellectuals and the Anti-Rightist Campaign (1956-1957)] (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2008), 553.

15   "Zhongguo gongchandang zhongyang weiyuanhui guanyu zhengfeng yundong de zhishi [The Central Committee of Communist Party of China's directory on the Rectification Movement]," People's Daily, May 1, 1957, https://cn.govopendata.com/renminribao/1957/5/1/1/#167617. An important line of this report goes: [Through criticism and self-criticism, to achieve new solidarity on a new basis,' there should be a universal, in-depth, anti-bureaucratism, anti-sectarianism, and anti-subjectivism rectification movement in the entirety of the party, to elevate its ideological qualification of Marxism, and to improve the style of work, so as to fit the need of socialist transformation and socialist construction.]"

16   Ibid. Corresponding line: "处理人民内部矛盾问题的情况．"

17   Ibid. Corresponding lines: "必须完全出于自愿" and "允许随时自由退出."

18   Mao Zedong 毛泽东, Guanyu zhengque chuli renmin neibu maodun de wenti 关于正确处理人民内部矛盾的问题 [On the correct handling of contradictions among the people], Feb 27th, 1957.

19   Ibid. Corresponding line: "在建设社会主义的时期，一切赞成、拥护和参加社会主义建设事业的阶级、阶层和社会集团，都属于人民的范围…"

20   Yang Shangkun 杨尚昆, Yang Shangkun riji 杨尚昆日记 [Diar of Yang Shangkun] (Beijing: Zhongyang Wenxian Chubanshe, 2017), 284. The full section goes: "闹事原因，我们在政治和经济上犯错误，无非是主观主义官僚主义。不要一闹，就都说是反革命。兰州林业学校捉了几十个人，不好。有的是政策正确，是执行方法不好，太

生硬。最后一个因素才是反革命分子，或者坏分子的存在。 [(Mao said) The reasons for riots (are likely) nothing but subjectivism and bureaucratism. Do not label all dissent as counter-revolutionary. The Lanzhou Forestry School had dozens of people arrested. It is not good. Sometimes, the policies are correct but not carried out in the proper method, too brutal. The last factor is the counter-revolutionaries.]"

21   Mao Zedong毛泽东, Yijiuwuqinian xiaji de xingshi一九五七年夏季的形势 [The situation in summer 1957], July, 1957,https://www.marxists.org/chinese/maozedong/marxist.org-chinese-mao-195707.htm. Corresponding line:"反共反人民反社会主义的资产阶级右派．"

22   Mao, Zuzhi liliang fanji youpai fenzi de changkuang jingo　ng. Corresponding line:"反动分子人数不过百分之几，最积极疯狂分子不过百分之一."

23   Qi Benyu 戚本禹, Qi Benyu huiyilu戚本禹回忆录 [Qi Be　yu's memoir], chapter 7. Corresponding line:"毛主席当时说过，全国不过4、5千个右派."At the time, Qi was working as a secretaire in the Political Secretary Office (Zhengzhi mishushi 政治秘书室) of the Secretariat of the Central Committee;Ye Yonglie also confirmed this number of 4,000 in his book, specifically located in Mao's handwritten comment to a Central instruction issued on June 29th; Ye Yonglie, Fanyoupai yundong shimo, 263.

24   Mao, Shiqing zhengzai qi bianhua."Corresponding sentences:"所谓百分之一、百分之三、百分之五到百分之十的右派是一种估计，可能多些，可能少些。在各个单位内情况又互相区别，必须确有证据，实事求是，不可过分，过分就是错误。 [The so-called one percent, three percent, and five to ten percent of rightists are a kind of estimation, maybe more, maybe less. The situation varies between each work unit; there must be evidence, seek truth from facts, it should not be excessive, excessive is a mis-

take.]"

25   Zuzhi Liliang Fanji Youpai Fenzi De Changkuang Jingong. Corresponding line: "整个过程，做得好，有一个月左右就够了，然后转入和风细雨的党内整风。"

26   Mao, Yijiuwuqi Nian Xiaji De Xingshi. Corresponding line: "最后不能转变的那一部分资产阶级右派分子是死硬派，只要他们不当特务，不再进行破坏活动，也给他们一点事做，也不剥夺他们的公民权。这是鉴于许多历史事件采取了极端政策的后果，并不良好。"

27   Qi, Qi Benyu huiyilu, chapter 5. Liu Shaoqi, at the time the Secretary of the Secretariat of the Central Committee, and the Vice-Chairman of the Central People's Government, generally can be seen as the second in command in CPC for political affairs.

28   "Deng Xiaoping yu zhonggong bada 邓小平与中共八大 [Deng Xiaoping and the 8th Congress of CPC]," Deng Xiaoping Jinian Wang.

29   Maurice Meisner, Mao's China and After, 3rd ed. (New York: The Free Press: 1999), 170.

30   Yen-lin Chung, "The Witch-Hunting Vanguard: The Central Secretariat's Roles and Activities in the Anti-Rightist Campaign," 392. Important Note: After the 8th Congress, the previous Secretariat of the Central Committee (Zhongyang shujichu中央书记处) was renamed the Politburo Standing Committee of the Chinese Communist Party (Zhongyang zhengzhiju changweihui中央政治局常委会), and the new Central Secretariat had a different role, as described by Chung.

31   Qi, Qi Benyu huiyilu, chapter 7. Corresponding sentences: "据我当时在办公室听到的情况，刘少奇、邓小平和彭真他们就说，主席在最高国务会议讲话，没有经过讨论就出去了，以往什么事情都是先党内后党外，毛主席这次是先党外后党内了…"

32   Ye, Fanyoupai yundong shimo, 52.

33   Beijing Daxue Shehui Zhuyi Sixiang Jiaoyu Weiyua-nhui, Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun Huiji, 240. Corresponding sentence:"我前次曾经说过80%的高级干部不同意百花齐放，这不是没有根据的，这是毛主席自己说。"

34   Shen Zhihua, Sikao yu xuanze: cong zhishifenzi huiyi dao fanyoupai yundong, 483-490.

35   Wu, Xinde tansuo he Zhengfeng fanyou, 109.

36   Ibid, 79, 112.

37   Shen Zhihua, Sikao yu xuanze: cong zhishifenzi huiyi dao fanyoupai yundong, 517.

38   Roderick MacFarquhar, The Origins of the Cultural Revolution, vol.1, Contradictions Among the People (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), 248- 249.

39   Qi, Qi Benyu huiyilu, chapter 7.

40   Yinghong Cheng, "Quota, Class, and Political Violence in Mao's China," Journal of Chinese History (2023): 16.

41   Cui Jianfei崔建飞, "Mao Zedong wutan Wang Meng zuzhibu xinlai de qingnianren 毛泽东五谈王蒙《组织部新来的青年人》 [Mao Zedong's five talks on Wang Meng's (novel) The New Commer of Organization Department]," The Great Wall 长城 no.2 (2006), reprinted in The History of the People's Republic of China,

42   Sociology was banned as a subject of teaching in the 1950s. However, scholars still retained some freedom in their research. Many continued their work under the guise of other subjects, such as ethnology. Fei was an active supporter of the Hundred Flowers Movement, as this campaign granted him greater autonomy in conducting research and facilitating discussions. He never publicly criticized Mao or the Communist Party, and maintained some friendship with

Mao. Therefore, if Party Members in charge strictly adhered to Mao's definition, Fei would not have been a target of the Anti-Rightist Campaign.

43   "Fei Xiaotong fangtanlu 费孝通访谈录 [Interviews with Fei Xiaotong]," Southern Weekly, April 28, 2005, reprinted in Ai Sixiang 爱思想, accessed on October 22nd, 2023, http://www.aisixiang.com/data/68377.html. Corresponding lines are: "不要紧，右派有什么关系。我自己戴多少帽子啊。" "帽子戴上去，会飞掉的。"

44   Sebastian Veg, "Testimony, History and Ethics: From the Memory of Jiabiangou Prison Camp to a Reappraisal of the Anti-Rightist Movement in Present-Day China," The China Quarterly 218 (June 2014): 528- 530.

45   Can refer to Shen and MacFarquhar's publications.

46   The exact number may slightly vary due to difference in ways of interpretation, but generally, the patterns should remain unchanged.

47   This number excludes students from other universities and staff members

48   Beijing Daxue Shehui Zhuyi Sixiang Jiaoyu Weiyuanhu, Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji, 118-120.

49   "Zhonggong zhongyang guanyu duidai dangqian dangwai renshi piping de zhishi 中共中央关于对待当前党外人士批评的指示 [Directives of the CCPCC on how to treat criticism from personages outside the party]," (1957, May 16th), in Song Yongyi et al. eds., Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database, 1957—, 2nd ed. (Hong Kong: University Service Centre for China Studies, 2013), http://chinamovement.net/Default.aspx. English translation of original title adopted from the database content translation. Corresponding lines: "从揭露出来的事实看来··· 党员评级、评薪、提拔

和待遇等事均有特权，党员高一等，党外低一等。党员盛气凌人，非党员做小媳妇。学校我党干部教员助教讲师教授资历低，学问少，不向资历高学问多的教员教授诚恳学习，反而向他们摆架子。以上情况，虽非全部，但甚普遍。"

50　　Ibid, 28. Corresponding line: "看来我们亲爱的毛泽东同志处于十分困难的地位。"

51　　Ibid, 19.

52　　Beijing Daxue Shehui Zhuyi Sixiang Jiaoyu Weiyuanhu, Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji, 6, 65.

53　　Zhao Qian赵谦 et al., "Beijing daxue xuesheng zifade tiechu shubaizhang dazibao北京大学学生自发的贴出数百张大字报，要求学校积极开展整风 [Peking University students put up hundreds of posters spontaneous, requiring schools to actively carry out rectification]," Neibu cankao 内部参考 (Internal Reference), May 23rd, 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database; Big Character Posters (Dazibao大字报): This is a method of public expression that originated from the May 19th Student Movement. Typical Dazibao would feature sharp and critical text, ideally displayed on walls that attract the most attention within the work unit. From 1957 to 2000, it was the most common form of protest.

54　　 Shen Zhihua, Sikao yu xuanze: cong zhishifenzi huiyi dao fanyoupai yundong, 602-603.

55　Mao Zedong 毛泽东, "Zhongguo gongchandang shi quanzhongguo renmin de lingdao hexin 中国共产党是全中国人民的领导核心 [The CPC is the leading core of all Chinese people]," in Mao Zedong xuanji: Diwujuan 毛泽东选集：第五卷 [The Fifth Volume of Selected Works of Mao Zedong](Shanghai: People's Press, 1977), 430. Correspond-

ing paragraph:"你们的会议开得很好…中国共产党是全中国人民的领导核心。没有这样一个核心，社会主义事业就不能胜利。你们这个会议是一个团结的会议，对全中国青年会有很大的影响。我对你们表示祝贺。同志们，团结起来，坚决地勇敢地为社会主义的伟大事业而奋斗。一切离开社会主义的言论行动是完全错误的。"

56   Qi, Qi Benyu huiyilu, chapter 7. Corresponding sentences:"邓小平主持党的工作，大量材料，包括一些不正常的情况，很快就从党内渠道报送到主席这里来了。主席一时也弄不清哪些是真的，哪些是假的。"

57   Chen Xiaonong陈晓农 eds., Chen Boda zuihou koushu huiyi陈伯达最后口述回忆 [Chen Boda's last verbal memoir] (Hong Kong: Sun Global Publishing Hong Kong Limited, 2005), 148. Original lines:"当时北京大学出现了许多大字报，新华社和北京大学党委向中央反映，认为情况严重，说是北大已成了海德公园了"; At the time,"Hyde Park" was commonly used by Party Members to describe the chaotic bourgeoisie politics.

58   Yu Dunkang余敦康, Gei wuhan daxue Zhang Shouzheng de xin给武汉大学张守正的信 [A Letter to Zhang Shouzheng of Wuhan University], 20 May 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database. Corresponding sentence:"我们不提倡这个形式，因为它不好，但如果有人贴大字报，我们也不禁止."

59   Zhao Qian et al.,"Beijing daxue xuesheng zifade tiechu shubaizhang dazibao."

60   Yu Dunkang, Gei wuhan daxue Zhang Shouzheng de xin.

61   Zhao Qian et al.,"Beijing daxue xuesheng zifade tiechu shubaizhang dazibao."

62   Beijing Daxue Shehui Zhuyi Sixiang Jiaoyu Weiyuanhu, Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji, 97.

63   Wang Guoxiang 王国乡, "Beijing daxue minzhu yundong jishi北京大学民主运动纪事 [Chronicles of Peking University pro-democracy events]," (1957, June 3rd) in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database.

64   "Beida bufen xuesheng jianchi kongsuhui- Jiang Longji yixihua zai beida xuesheng zhong you yinqile xinde fengbo北大部分学生坚持控诉会——江隆基一席话在北大学生中又引起了新的风波 [Some students at Beijing University uphold the accusation meeting- Jiang Long Ji's remarks at Beijing University caused new controversy]," Neibu cankao内部参考 (Internal Reference), May 27th, 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database.

65   Lei Peng 雷朋, "Beijing daxue biaomian xingshi siqu huanhe, dan shitai zheng yunniang kuoda北京大学表面形势似趋缓和，但事态正酝酿扩大 [The situation at Beijing University relaxing on surface, yet the situation fermenting the expansion]," Neibu cankao内部参考 (Internal Reference), May 27th, 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database.

66   Chen Xiaonong eds., Chen Boda zuihou koushu huiyi, 148. Corresponding line: "没什么大不了的，不值得大惊小怪。"

67   Lin Ke 林克，Lin Ke riji 林克日记 [Lin Ke's diary] (manuscript), 42, quoted in Shen Zhihua, Sikao yu xuanze: cong zhishifenzi huiyi dao fanyoupai yundong, 608.

68   Wang, "Beijing daxue minzhu yundong jishi." Corresponding lines: "无政府状态" and "被反革命分子所控制."

69   Mac Farquhar and Shen Zhihua had made much analysis on this transition.

70   Mao, Zuzhi liliang fanji youpai fenzi de changkuang jingong.

71   Wang Ge王戈, Wang Zuoren 王作人, Jiang Longji de zuihou shisinian江隆基的最后十四年 [The last fourteen

years of Jiang Longji] (Beijing: Writers Publishing House, 2015), 109.

72   Ibid.

73   "Beida jizhong pipan guangchang fandong jituan北大集中批判 "广场" 反动集团 [Peking University focuses on criticizing the "square" reactionary clique]," Beijing Daily, July 21st, 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database. Corresponding phrase: "向党进攻."

74   Ibid. Corresponding line: "要推翻北大党委会."

75   Ibid.

76   "Beijing daxue xuesheng yiyou yuan yaoqiu xuexiao jiji zhengfeng biancheng dui Hu Feng wenti he Gao Rao shijian zhenxiang de bianlun北京大学学生已由原要求学校积极整风变成对胡风问题和高、饶事件真相的辩论 [The Beijing University Students turned the original request of school active rectification to debate about the truth of the problem of Hu Feng and event of Gao/Rao]," Neibu cankao 内部参考 (Internal Reference), May 24th, 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database; Hu Feng: A famous leftist literary critic in the Republican Era and Mao Era; Gao Gang: A senior CPC official, originally in charge of the North East Bureau. Rao Shushi: A senior CPC official, originally head of the Organization Department of the CPC. Gao and Rao were purged after failing a political struggle.

77   By this traditional method, I am referring to the non-transparent purging of officials after serious doctrine struggles. People in these cases were usually not charged for committing clearly defined crimes but for taking a wrong ideological and political position.

78   Mao Zedong 毛泽东, Mao Zedong zai bajie erzhongquanhui shang de zongjie fayan毛泽东在八届二中全会上的总结发言 [Mao Zedong's summary remarks at the second Plenary Session of the Eighth Party Congress], November 5th, 1956, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist

Campaign Database; Long Yinghua　　, Wu yijiu yundong shi xinde wusiyundong "·　　" 　　　[The "May 19 Campaign" is the new May 4 Movement], May 1957, in Song Yongyi, Chinese Anti-Rightist Campaign Database.

79　　Ibid. Corresponding sentence: "五·一九'运动, 是新的'五四'运动, 是现阶段的马克思主义启蒙运动, 它是在'二十大'号召下产生的, 它是在'匈牙利革命'号召之下发生的, 它是在我们的'人大'和英明的党中央和毛主席的一声炮响下发生的…"

80　　Mao Zedong毛泽东, Zai zhongguo gongchandang dibajie zhongyang weiyuanhui dierci quanti huiyi shang de jianghua在中国共产党第八届中央委员会第二次全体会议上的讲话 [Address to the Second Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China], November 15th, 1956, https://www.marxists.org/chinese/maozedong/marxist.org-chinese-mao-19561115.htm. Original line: "我们一定要警惕，不要滋长官僚主义作风，不要形成一个脱离人民的贵族阶层。谁犯了官僚主义，不去解决群众的问题，骂群众，压群众，总是不改，群众就有理由把他革掉"

81　　Mao, Guanyu zhengque chuli renmin neibu maodun de wenti.

82　　Yao Wenyuan, On Revisionism in Some Cultural and Creative Tendencies, quoted in Cai Xiang, Revolution and Its Narratives: China's Socialist Literacy and Cultural Imaginaries, 1949-1966 (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016), 119-120.

83　　Beijing Daxue Shehui Zhuyi Sixiang Jiaoyu Weiyuanhui, Beijing daxue youpai fenzi fandong yanlun huiji, 3. Corresponding lines: "言归正传，写下主要论点，由列宁关于阶级定义出发，试看现实：1. 生产资料占有，主要掌握在军政要人手中--- 因为并不掌握在群众手中，一个工人并无权干预生产。2. 分配不合理，高者有不合劳动应得报酬者… 3. … 4. 对人民不信任…只要举一例，就

大字报来说，为什么崔书记态度冷淡…"
84   Criticism and self criticism was an important part of ideal Maoist political participation.

Imagining the Possibilities of the Post-Marxist Moment: Anarchism, Castoriadis, and the Project of Autonomy

Yoora Do

Introduction

"It is not a matter of deducing the revolution, but of making it. And the only factor making a connection between these two elements about which we, as revolutionaries, can speak is our own activity, the activity of a revolutionary organization."

- Cornelius Castoriadis, "Recommending the Revolution " in *The Castoriadis Reader,* 2010, p. 130.

In the wake of the social movements of the 1960s, the Left found itself in crisis. With widespread disillusionment with socialist projects of the Eastern bloc and Marxism in general, the era marked the beginning of the "post-Marxist moment," replete with heavy undertones of structuralist despair. The 1970s gave way to the consolidation of the global neoliberal consensus, uniting the parliamentary Right and Left in their unassailable endorsement of the free market. Yet, this atmosphere of uncertainty—however ominous and pervasive—did not signal the death of radical left politics; instead, the Left seems to have found alternative ways to resume and revitalize its project. In particular, as demonstrated by recent anti-globalization protests such as Occupy Wall Street (2008), anti-authoritarian and anti-centrist movements that expressly reject the top-down organizational structure of Marxism have taken center stage—movements that prioritize traditional anarchist principles such as autonomy, voluntary

association, self-organization, mutual aid, and direct democracy. Indeed, anarchism—although the term itself is not explicitly mentioned by most activists—arguably seems to have taken the place of Marxism as the driving philosophy behind contemporary progressive movements.

In this paper, I explore the political and philosophical significance of anarchism in the post-Marxist moment, with particular reference to the ideas of Cornelius Castoriadis. In particular, I argue that anarchist theory enables a radical renewal of leftist politics by, on the one hand, maintaining the same revolutionary optimism that characterized Marx's thought, yet on the other, rejecting its dogmatism and teleological conception of history. Ultimately, I maintain that anarchist theory produces a new conception of autonomy not as the product of a cataclysmic break with the past that has yet to occur, but as an attitude of freely questioning and creating the rules of collectivity that must be practiced in the here and now. Finally, I explore how anarchist theory may be applicable to the modern context, particularly in its implied challenge to the validity of identity politics.

A History of the Conflict Between Marxists and Anarchists

Despite their similar commitment to anti-capitalism, idealism, and the project of liberty and equality, Marxists and anarchists have experienced enduring strife due to fundamental theoretical differences. Their antagonistic relationship expressed itself in pre-revolutionary days in the divisions between Proudhon and Marx, reaching its height in the bitter fight between Bakunin and Marx in the International Workingmen's Association (later called the First International)[1] in the 1870s.[2] At the center of this conflict was the role of the state. That is, while Marx contended that workers must seize the state to establish and consolidate proletarian rule at the

beginning stages of socialism, Bakunin—in line with his an-
archist beliefs—believed that such a "dictatorship of the pro-
letariat" would ultimately produce new forms of oppression.[3]
Firmly opposed to any kind of state including parliamentary
representative democracies, the anarchists maintained that
"despotism resided not so much in the form of the State, but
in the very principle of the State and political power."[4] This
critique persisted well into the twentieth century, as anar-
chists denounced the Soviet Union for imposing yet another
form of hierarchical power on workers and diminishing
their autonomy in the workplace. Castoriadis, for instance,
contended that the relationship between the Soviet state and
its people was yet another manifestation of the exploitative
relationship of director versus executant—a power dynamic
that characterizes all undemocratic societies. In lieu of such
"state socialism" or any kind of representational organization
(e.g., political parties), anarchists demanded a new politics
featuring non-statist and direct forms of democracy in which
workers themselves would manage their own affairs.

　　　　Another important conflict revolved around the is-
sue of class. Although both schools of thought agreed that
the proletariat had an important role to play, Marx saw the
proletariat as the exclusive leading agent of revolution,
whereas Bakunin argued that other social strata (e.g., peas-
ants, intellectual declasses, the unemployed, etc) could lead
the struggle as well.[5] This critique of the narrow conception
of class in Marxist theory has been continued by modern
anarchist theorists such as Laclau and Mouffe. In particular,
they argue that contemporary politics is no longer character-
ized solely by the struggles of the proletariat, but is rather
fragmented by a series of different movements composed of
different populations.[6] In addition, both classical and modern
anarchists have advocated for combating domination not only
in the workplace (the sphere that Marxists tend to primarily
focus on), but in all social relationships that manifest in our

everyday lives, including the private sphere.[7]

Lastly, anarchists have distinguished themselves from Marxists in their commitment to rejecting hierarchy even during the process of revolutionary action; in other words, for anarchists, the spirit that embodies the end goal of liberation must also be embodied in the means deployed to achieve it. David Graeber captures this sentiment in his observation that Marxism has tended toward "theoretical or analytical discourse about revolutionary strategy," while anarchism has tended toward "ethical discourse about revolutionary practice."[8] That is, anarchism demands that the desired future social relations and practices of the group be reflected by and implemented in its present modes of organization—a mode of organizing also known as "prefigurative politics."[9] For example, many anarchist groups today make decisions via a "consensus process" that first and foremost respects the need for a diversity in perspectives; in this process, group members focus on devising a concrete plan of action that may not be wholeheartedly embraced by everyone, but is nevertheless a plan that no one feels is a fundamental violation of the group's principles. Another prominent example can be found in the 1999 Seattle WTO Protests, in which activists intentionally adopted a decentralized form of organization to stay true to their anti-centrist philosophy.[10] In essence, anarchists attempt to form "the structure of the new society within the shell of the old," refusing to let the imperfect conditions of their current circumstances deter them from at least attempting to carry out their vision.[11]

Cornelius Castoriadis and His Intellectual Trajectory

This contemporary shift from Marxist to anarchist patterns of thought can be clearly traced in the intellectual trajectory of one particular revolutionary theorist: Cornelius Castoriadis. Although Castoriadis never explicitly labeled

himself as an anarchist, his gradual disillusionment with Marxism and later outright criticism of it as an anti-revolutionary ideology renders him a figure that is well-positioned to ground my discussion of anarchist politics vis-a-vis Marxism.

Like many leftists of the late twentieth century, Castoriadis started out as a committed Marxist. However, a year after joining the communist party in Greece in 1941, he decided to leave, accusing it of chauvinism, authoritarianism, and centralism.[12] While he joined a Trotskist group thereafter, hoping to avoid the disillusionment he had experienced in the communist party, he was disappointed yet again. In 1949, Castoriadis cut all ties with Marxism, forming an autonomous group in France called Socialisme ou Barbarie, which criticized apologists who clung to Marxism in the name of the "true thought of Marx" while ignoring its real-life effects in justifying and legitimizing totalitarian regimes. In the end, Castoriadis abandoned the term "socialism" altogether. Instead, he advocated for the project of individual and collective autonomy, in which all social institutions would be re-examined and re-instituted according to the conscious deliberation of the members of the community themselves.[13] The revolutionary optimism that initially led him to Marxism had later led him to repudiate it and, in its place, create new ways of sustaining political hope.

The Radical Philosophy of Castoriadis

The philosophy of Castoriadis and Socialisme ou Barbarie inspired and rejuvenated many progressives feeling lost in the wake of Marxism; it has even been cited as "probably the single most important theoretical influence on the student insurrectionaries of May 1968" by some scholars.[14] In the following section, I attempt to explain the immense revolutionary thrust of his work by exploring its three major tenets: the

rejection of "Absolute Knowledge," a belief in "constrained creativity," and the redefinition of "revolution."

a) Rejection of "Absolute Knowledge"

At the baseline of Castoriadis's philosophy is a rejection of "Absolute knowledge"—that is, the "acceptance… that there is no meaning given as a gift or any guarantee of meaning, that there is no meaning other than that created in and through history."[15] His refusal to blindly embrace any inherited category of thought manifests itself in his rejection of the thought of both classical anarchists (such as Bakunin and Kropotkin who relied on essentialist understandings of human nature) and Marxists (who depended on a teleological understanding of history). On the one hand, Castoriadis revolutionized the anarchist tradition itself by distinguishing himself from Bakunin and Kropotkin—nineteenth-century thinkers who believed that a rational social logic formed the basis of human development. For instance, both Bakunin and Kropotkin claimed that this logic could be found in the natural instinct in humans toward cooperation.[16] In essentializing human nature as fundamentally benign, they envisioned a free society that would allow "man's immanent humanity and rationality finally to be realized."[17] Castoriadis, in stark contrast, would have denounced their belief in such a concept as "human nature." Indeed, he argued that the institution of society is always the result of autonomous action by human beings, not by extra-social sources such as human nature, God, or "Reason" that humans have historically concealed their agency behind.

More importantly, Castoriadis's rejection of "Absolute Knowledge" informed his criticism of Marxism and its teleological conception of history. In particular, Castoriadis accused teleology of abolishing time and erroneously believing in its inherent capacity to alter the conditions of the

world. Because teleology wrongly presupposes that the end is already determined, he lamented that, within this framework, historical time becomes "a simple abstract medium of successive coexistence or a mere receptacle for the dialectical sequences."[18]

Depicting the historical determinism of Marxists as essentially a psychological comfort mechanism which absolves the current generation of any responsibility, Castoriadis distinguished himself by accepting uncertainty and defining theory as the "uncertain attempt to realize the project of elucidating the world."[19] In this sense, he argued that "revolutionary praxis is…not required to produce the complete and detailed scheme of the society it intends to establish"[20]—a stab at the infeasible attempt by Marxism to outline a predetermined blueprint for its revolution.

In line with his embrace of uncertainty, Castoriadis also set himself apart from Marxists by accepting the possibility of change within his theory. In fact, even during the period in which he identified as a Marxist, Castoriadis made a commitment to defending traditional Marxist positions "so long as a new examination has not persuaded [me] that these positions must be abandoned."[21] Indeed, this position describes precisely what he did later in his life, when he replaced the Marxist principles he once adhered to with new ones that better suited the needs of the movement. In other words, he refused to be a "philosopher who wants to be radical (yet) remains a prisoner" of a definitive theory.[22] He thus established that revolutionary theory maintains its value only insofar as it is dynamic—never absolute and constantly open to modification according to the development of the movement: "without development of revolutionary theory, no development of revolutionary action."[23] In this regard, he characterized true democracy as a tragic regime that explicitly renounces its self-institution as a closed or static society based on religious or transcendent ideas. Instead, he accepted

that democratic society is constantly subject to change, even if that change is regressive and reactionary.

In sum, by rejecting all forms of "Absolute Knowledge" and all narratives that privilege the role of external entities in shaping society (e.g. gods, ancestors, etc), Castoriadis urges us to confront our own agency as the force which has always instituted and continues to institute the world we live in. He thus envisioned an "autonomous society" that would be characterized by "explicit and lucid self-institution,"[24] in which its members are fully aware that they determine their own lives via conscious reflection, deliberation, and discussion.

b) Belief in Constrained Creativity

Castoriadis's philosophy also contains a nuanced understanding of the world as neither completely deterministic nor completely random. The most fundamental starting point for this theory involves a belief in the possibility of creation or the emergence of the new—a premise that boldly challenged the cynicism of structuralism. In this context, he drew an important distinction between "self-reference" and "reflectiveness." The former, he claimed, simply denoted the process of the subject actively referring to itself (and thereby distinguishing itself from others) and was necessarily implied in that every subject has the property of self-finality.[25] The latter, however, implied the possibility of actively putting oneself, one's activity, and the social boundaries that surrounds oneself into question—in other words, the capacity for reflective self-representation and deliberate activity. This latter capacity of "reflectiveness" constituted the basis of the project of autonomy for him, which, in essence, demands human beings to recognize the power of their imagination in creating new institutions and transforming old ones. Thus, on the one hand, Castoriadis's belief in the creative potential of

the human imagination became the basis of his revolutionary optimism, or, alternatively, his assumption that another world is possible. In response to the question of whether society will be able to properly take advantage of this potential to coherently addresses the problems it faces, he maintained that although we cannot know for certain, what we do know is that "all societies in history have been capable of giving coherent responses to the problems of their globality."[26] Castoriadis thus demonstrated a confident optimism that humans have historically been able to and will continue to tap into their imaginative capacities to propel movements of liberation.

On the other hand, despite his deep-rooted faith in human creativity, Castoriadis also shrewdly realized that such creative powers are constrained. While humans have the ability to explicitly question the existing social imaginary significations[27] or self-evident truths of their contemporary world, Castoriadis explained that this act necessarily takes place under constraints imposed by historical conditions, such as language and time, which define and delimit the possible scope of action.

Autonomy on the Individual Psychical Level

In order to understand Castoriadis's radical politics and his conception of constrained creativity, it is useful to refer to his psychoanalytic discussion of the subject. Namely, in the context of Lacan's statement that "The Unconscious is the discourse of the Other," Castoriadis posited that, in the field of psychoanalysis, the discourse of the Other represents an oppressive force that leads the subject to be expressed by someone else rather than express himself. As a result, he noted that some have been led to conceptualize "autonomy" as the phenomenon of my discourse replacing the discourse of the Other which dominates me.

In contrast to this position, Castoriadis held that such a total elimination of the discourse of the Other is impossible because "the Other is each time present in the activity that 'eliminates' him."[28] In other words, "my" discourse could never entirely be "mine," as every subject is always necessarily in contact with others in a society and history that precedes both him and his quest for "his" own pure discourse. Thus, Castoriadis established that autonomy is not the "ideal person who has become a pure Ego once and for all"[29] and is entirely unaffected by the Other, but rather a real person who establishes a new relation between his discourse and the discourse of the Other—in essence, one who consciously reorganizes the Other's discourse and accepts its mixture with his own so that he can become responsible for what he says.

Autonomy on the Social-Historical Level

Just as Castoriadis maintained that individuals achieve autonomy in relation to other people, he also held that autonomy on the social-historical level is realized in the context of the presence of other people and institutions that define us. According to Castoriadis, because no individual can escape the symbolic dimension (which is comprised of the discourses of the Other) he is placed into, no society—not even the "higher phase" of society that some call communism—can escape "this second-order symbolism represented by institutions."[30] In other words, since no subject can create a new society on the basis of nothing, an automatically self-legislating society that no longer requires institutions to facilitate collective discussion and choice is a myth. The attempt of Marxists to "leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom" or "mark the end of prehistory and the entry into its true history"[31] is, thus, nonsensical. In the view of Castoriadis, society is characterized by "the tension of instituting society and of instituted society (of history made

and of history in the making),"[32] but there will always be a distance between the two at any given moment. Because this distance guarantees no "final" form of social relations, he denounced any effort to abolish this distance and eliminate the complex mass of oppressive systems overnight as a mere fantasy.

Yet, at the same time that Castoriadis claimed that such instituting activity is constrained by social-historical conditions, he nevertheless acknowledged that the possibility of change—no matter how gradual or constrained—is always present and, thus, the very point of revolutionary action. For instance, on the level of the individual, Castoriadis described psychoanalysis as a "practico-poetic activity" that is intended to transform the individual and bring out his reflective capabilities that will, ultimately, empower him to interrogate his unconscious thoughts and emerge as a truly autonomous subject.[33] This transformative goal of psychoanalysis, Castoriadis explained, ought to also serve as the goal of radical politics. In short, politics must aim to construct an autonomous society that consciously reflects on and rebuilds itself—to redefine history as the realm of alterity.

Castoriadis thus refused to submit to theoretical simplicity through his insistence that the world is certainly limited by, but not necessarily determined by, human significations. Avoiding a simplistic replacement of Marxism yet also denying structuralist nihilism, Castoriadis urges us to take on the difficult task of relying on our system of significations to change that very system.

c) Redefinition of "Revolution"

Lastly, in line with his theorization of "constrained creativity," Castoriadis redefined the term "revolution" as not a cataclysmic break from the past, but an attitude of autonomy that can be practiced on the level of everyday life—a

change that rendered the task of "revolutionary action" significantly less daunting. Totalizing systems such as Marxism (in which each element in society only gains significance in relation to the others) have no choice but to depict revolutions as cataclysmic ruptures; there may be several attempts at revolution, but true success is only achieved through "the revolution" that overthrows the totality of society. Anarchism and Castoriadis's thought in particular encourages us to think about revolution not as a "thing," but an "action." Such action need not subvert entire governments; instead, it can materialize in pursuits as simple as the creation of "alternative forms of organization,...new forms of communication, less alienated ways of organizing life"[34] that challenge some forms of domination and, in doing so, reconstructs social relations to reflect that challenge. In particular, Castoriadis argued that instead of discussing the historical inevitability of socialism or non-socialism, one must immerse oneself in the domain of "making/doing."[35] In other words, we must refuse to submit to nihilism whenever we do not foresee our actions resulting in "the" cataclysmic break; rather, we ought to realize our attempts to create autonomous communities in the present. Insofar as "we find ourselves, at this precise place…, among these people, within this horizon,"[36] Castoriadis demanded that we make a practical effort to revolutionize this horizon without torturing ourselves to try to determine the indeterminable character of far-away horizons on paper.

Moreover, in making this attempt, he advocated for applying such revolutionary action in all spheres of social activity taking place in everyday life. In other words, he believed in direct action that extended not only to the workplace, but also to the home, the neighborhood, interpersonal relationships, and local councils—aspects of daily existence that are often neglected by those "who are obsessed solely by strikes, 'political' events, or 'international' crises."[37] Such a position requires that, even on a micro-level, we must take

care to democratize people's activities and reject any trace of vanguardism such that "autonomy" can be realized to the greatest extent possible—even if it cannot be realized in a thoroughgoing fashion on a macro-level. Revolution, in this sense, becomes less of a product of any particular theory than an attitude in which one actively demonstrates faith in the possibility of achieving one's desired society.

Finally, Castoriadis noted that an integral part of revolutionary action is establishing that we engage in such action already. Rather than endorse the "absurd idea" that people react with solely passivity towards capitalist violence, Castoriadis urged us to highlight the ongoing efforts of people to democratize their lives.[38] He would have thus deeply appreciated Graeber's claim that "anarchist social relations and non-alienated forms of action are all around us"[39]—an observation which demonstrates that manifestations of direct democracy, mutual aid, and creativity have always been and will never cease shaping the mode of human interaction. As Graeber notes, the nineteenth century "founding figures" of anarchist thought never considered themselves the inventors of an unprecedented doctrine.[40] Indeed, there are countless examples of democratically organized resistance against domination throughout all of human history, and such resistances—no matter how small—constitute "revolution" in Castoriadis's terms.

On Identity Politics: The Modern Implications of Anarchist and Castoriadis's Thought

The emphasis of anarchist and Castoriadis's thought on questioning existing systems and creating new ones has significant implications for modern social movements. In particular, it has the potential to seriously question the validity of identity politics (or any essentialist politics that takes for granted pre-given or inherited categories) that seems to

dominate the modern Left. A number of contemporary anarchist thinkers have underscored the importance of abandoning the notion of stable foundations, fixed categories, and essentialist identities that dismiss contingency in politics. For instance, Alain Badiou argues that political change occurs when "subjects detach themselves from existing social ties and identities" and "become consumed by a political process that destabilizes existing socio-political conditions."[41] Similarly, Jacques Rancière identifies politics as the activity of dislocating existing social relations.[42] Ernesto Laclau, finally, maintains that political identities are "not the outcome of the logic of history or the rational development of social forces," but the result of "a hegemonic articulation among actors engaged in political struggle."[43]

Castoriadis—although never explicitly commenting on the modern phenomenon of identity politics—expressed a similar distaste towards blindly accepting pre-given political categories, most notably through his rejection of class essentialism. Namely, he dismissed the Marxist notion that the proletariat is the sole depositary or primary agent of the revolutionary project in the current day. In particular, he explained that the overwhelming majority of the population in modern capitalist societies could not be described as "the proletariat" in the traditional Marxist sense, as almost everyone had become a wage earner. In his view, modern capitalism had not developed an opposition between two clearly separate groups (bourgeoisie and proletariat), but had instead become a complex "bureaucratized society with a pyramidal, hierarchical structure.[44] Thus, he concluded that the only relevant way to differentiate between the mass of wage earners is to look at their attitude toward the established system.[45] This led him to repudiate Orthodox Marxist categories that would characterize the vast majority of workers who belong to the intermediate strata within the pyramid today as non-revolutionaries. As an alternative, he called for a non-essentialist definition

of "revolutionary agent" as anyone who believed in combating—not accepting—the system.

On a theoretical level, this refusal to unquestioningly accept inherited systems of categorization poses a fundamental challenge to all forms of identity politics (extending beyond class to include race, gender, etc). As Graeber explains, in the contemporary world with the rise of post-Marxism, the dominant way in which one makes a political claim is to assert some group identity.[46] However, as he points out, what we call "identities" are largely those aspects that are forcibly imposed upon people. In the United States, most identities are products of a history of oppression. For instance, a person labeled as "Black" is constantly (and, on many occasions, unwillingly) reminded of his identity as "Black" at any given moment, which leads all of his attempts at self-invention to occur within these restrictive racial constraints.[47] The Zapatista rebels of Chiapas and their revolt in 1994 offer another telling example of the oppressive effects of identity. Graeber explains that the Zapatistas—a group of rebels demanding radical democratic transformation of the international community—were immediately redefined as a band of Mayan Indians protesting for indigenous autonomy.[48] Although the rebels' vision encompassed much more than merely indigenous rights, their identity as "indigenous" was the only factor deemed important by the international media, humanitarian organizations, and politicians. In effect, these rebels were told that as Maya, "the only possible political statement they could make to non-Mayas would be about their Maya identity itself."[49] The prospect of them transcending their indigenousness and trying to change the broader nature of political possibilities was seen as inconceivable.

The Zapatistas's efforts to achieve true autonomy—to establish a community in which they would be free to determine for themselves what sort of people they wish to be—were thus derailed. Indeed, the role of "identities" in modern

politics is precisely to hinder the act of collectively imagining how we would constitute ourselves and our community in the absence of such identities. As Castoriadis explains, the institutions of a society are validated insofar as individuals participate in its social imaginary significations. An individual's proclamation that "I am something" (e.g., U.S. citizen, a Southern business owner, an African American woman, a gay student) acquires meaning through and—in turn—legitimizes such self-representations, which have their basis not in objective reality but historically instituted concepts (e.g., race, gender, sexuality, nationality) that underpin our social imaginary.[50] To internalize such a proclamation is, therefore, to leave uninterrogated the socially constructed nature of such concepts.

The crisis of contemporary Western society, Castoriadis argued, lies in the fact that the social imaginary significations (or "identities") with which it characterizes its members is "crumbling apart, flattening out, and becoming empty and self-contradictory."[51] In other words, the traditional and inherited categories that constitute modern "identities" are increasingly incompatible with today's social realities and the needs of individuals; the vocabulary of modern politics no longer provide the means to make sense of the world. For instance, feminist movements that seek to elevate the status of the "woman" inevitably encounter their limits insofar as the traditional signification of "woman" has become outdated and contradictory to the needs of the group it refers to today; for example, one cannot call for the equality of "woman" and "man" if the term "woman" itself was instituted such that it only took on significance in relation to "man" in the first place. Likewise, racial equality movements that prize "Black power" face a dead end when their wish to transcend the disadvantages of "Blackness" in contemporary America conflict with their acceptance of the socially instituted category of "Black" (and "race" in general). To overcome such

obstacles, it is paramount to remember that these identities were instituted in the context of perpetuating oppression to begin with. As a result, any group that seeks to autonomously define itself must ultimately rid itself of the baggage of such inherited identities and the oppressive significations they hold. Anarchist thought—as well as the works of Castoriadis—may act as valuable resources, empowering them to imagine the identities that they themselves wish to take on and re-constitute a world in which they are able to do so.

Conclusion

The Left is not dead. Unburdened by the structuralist despair that threatened to paralyze the movement after the demise of Marxism, anarchism—with the help of notable theorists such as Cornelius Castoriadis—has paved a way to carry on the revolutionary energy of the past. Amid the constant confrontation of our imagination against the forces that attempt to permanently institutionalize it, Castoriadis provides us with tempered yet radical hope that our imagination may prevail. A renewed definition of "liberation" and "autonomy," a confidence in the possibility of change despite its slow, constrained, and uncertain nature, and a conviction that such change can still be meaningful on the scale of everyday life are only some of the many tools that anarchism offers us in the post-Marxist moment.

1   Founded in 1864, the First International was a class worker union primarily led by Karl Marx that aimed to unite diverse revolutionary currents.

2   Here, Marx accused Bakunin of organizing a secret conspiracy behind the scenes, while Bakunin claimed Marx had already dominated and manipulated the General Council of the International. Specifically, while the anarchists and Marx agreed that the International should promote labor unions, Marx demanded that every national branch of the International form a political party to run in elections, while Bakunin opposed this measure (See Price, 2017).

3   Saul Newman, "Anarchism, Poststructuralism and the Future of Radical Politics," The Johns Hopkins University Press, vol. 36, 2 (2007)

4   Ibid, p. 7.

5   Ibid.

6   Ibid.

7   Nathan Clough and Renata Blumberg, "Toward Anarchist and Autonomist Marxist Geographies by Nathan Clough & Renata Blumberg," ACME, vol. 11, 3 (2012)

8   David Graeber, "Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology," Prickly Paradigm Press (2004), p. 6.

9   Nathan Clough and Renata Blumberg, "Toward Anarchist and Autonomist Marxist Geographies by Nathan Clough & Renata Blumberg," ACME, vol. 11, 3 (2012)

10   Ibid.

11   Ibid.

12   Vangelis Papadimitropoulos, "From Resistance to Autonomy: Power and Social Change in the Work of Castoriadis and Foucault," International Journal of Innovative Studies in Sociology and Humanities, vol. 3, 11 (2018)

13   David Graeber, "Fetishism as social creativity," SAGE Publications, vol. 5, 4 (2005)

14   Ibid, p. 409.
15   Cornelius Castoriadis, "The Logic of Magmas and the Question of Autonomy" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 316.
16   Ibid.
17   Saul Newman, "Anarchism, Poststructuralism and the Future of Radical Politics," The Johns Hopkins University Press, vol. 36, 2 (2007), p. 13.
18   Cornelius Castoriadis, "The Social Imaginary and the Institution" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 202
19   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Marxism and Revolutionary Theory" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 149
20   Ibid, p. 165
21   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Presentation of Socialisme ou Barbarie" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 37
22   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Marxism and Revolutionary Theory" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 146
23   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Presentation of Socialisme ou Barbarie" in , 2010, p. 37
24   Cornelius Castoriadis, "The Logic of Magmas and the Question of Autonomy" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 314
25   Cornelius Castoriadis, "The State of the Subject Today," in World in Fragments: Writings on Politics, Society, Psychoanalysis, and the Imagination
26   Cornelius Castoriadis, "An Introductory Interview," in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 31
27   According to Castoriadis, society is instituted through a "magma of social imaginary significations." Such significations, which have their predominant basis in language, establish social norms that the individual psyche learns to internalize in order to become a socialized individual. These significations provide human society with a coherent understanding of the world, offer criteria for 'truth' which answer

questions regarding its own existence, and pattern social relations and human behavior.

28   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Marxism and Revolutionary Theory," in in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 182

29   Ibid, p. 179

30   Ibid, p. 189

31   Ibid, p. 185

32   Ibid, p. 184

33   Warren Breckman, "From the Symbolic Turn to the Social Imaginary: Castoriadis's Project of Autonomy," in Adventures of the Symbolic: Post-Marxism and Democratic Theory, ch. 3

34   David Graeber, "Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology," Prickly Paradigm Press (2004), p. 40

35   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Marxism and Revolutionary Theory," in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010.

36   Ibid p. 176

37   Cornelius Castoriadis, "An Introductory Overview" in in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 28

38   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Recommencing the Revolution" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010

39   David Graeber, "Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology," Prickly Paradigm Press (2004), p. 76

40   Ibid, p. 3.

41   Saul Newman, "Anarchism, Poststructuralism and the Future of Radical Politics," The Johns Hopkins University Press, vol. 36, 2 (2007), p. 14.

42   Ibid, p. 14.

43   Ibid, p. 15.

44   Cornelius Castoriadis, "Recommencing the Revolution" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 129

45   Cornelius Castoriadis, "An Introductory Overview" in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 27

46   David Graeber, "Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology," Prickly Paradigm Press (2004), p. 101
47   Ibid, p. 102
48   Ibid, p. 103.
49   Ibid, p. 103.
50   Cornelius Castoriadis, "The Crisis of Western Societies"in The Castoriadis Reader, 2010, p. 261
51   Ibid, p. 262

DIO O IL DUCE? POPE PIUS-XI AND THE RISE OF EUROPEAN FASCISM

Noah Maxwell

It is difficult to imagine a history of the 20th century in Europe without the scourge of fascism. Leaders like Francisco Franco in Spain, Ante Pavelić in Croatia, and Adolf Hitler in Germany not only brutally curtailed the rights of their own citizens, but led violent campaigns against their ethnic and political enemies. Indeed, the Spanish White Terror, the slaughter of Serbians in Croatia, the extermination of roughly six million Jews across the continent, and even the Second World War itself can be laid at the feet of these fascist leaders. These regimes and the violence, authoritarianism, and hyper-nationalism that characterized them all had a common ancestor: Italian fascism. In 1922, Benito Mussolini rose to power after his infamous March on Rome, and then took to suspending political opposition and coalescing the powers of state around himself. In doing so, he not only became the first fascist leader in Europe, but also a model for the burgeoning far-right parties across the continent.[1] Indeed, Hitler credited Mussolini as a political inspiration, often saying, "he might not have come to power at all had he not followed Mussolini's political example."[2] Hitler's adoration of il Duce, "the leader" in Italian, was such that Hitler even placed a bust of Mussolini next to portraits of his German heroes in the Reich Chancellery.

Thus, to understand the emergence of European fascism and the great destruction it precipitated during the Second World War, it is critical to look to Benito Mussolini's rise to power in Italy. Before he founded the Partito Nazionale Fascista, the Fascist Party, Mussolini was

actually a socialist: at the start of the First World War, he edited a socialist newspaper and even called the conflict an "imperialist war."[3] The war, though, had a lasting impact on both him and Italy as a whole. His experience in the Italian military turned him into a voracious nationalist with strong anti-Bolshevik leanings, while at the same time the war wreaked havoc on Italy: "Some 650,000 soldiers had perished; returning veterans swelled the ranks of the unemployed; nearly two million Italians found themselves out of work."[4] Making matters worse, Italy was governed by a weak parliamentary coalition known for its history of "squabbling legislators." Mussolini's claim to leadership grew out of this "post-war disorder and economic hardship which reigned in Italy," and in 1922 he organized the famous March on Rome whereby fascists descended on the capital city to "take by the throat the miserable political class."[5] Fearing utter chaos, King Victor Emmanuel III gave in to the fascist demands and made Mussolini the Prime Minister on October 31, 1922. However, Mussolini did not immediately dive into authoritarianism; the future of the regime was still very unclear. At this point, "fascism was still a protean movement, not yet the stark regime it would become. No one … had any idea … that Italy stood on the threshold of a dictatorial rule."[6] The world's first fascist leader had come to power, but the future might of European fascism was still largely unforeseeable.

One of the most important influences that would shape Mussolini's consolidation of power was the Catholic Church. In the same year that Mussolini became Prime Minister, Pope Benedict XV's sudden death brought together the College of Cardinals to elect a new Bishop of Rome. After fourteen rounds of voting, they selected a relatively unknown man who had been a Cardinal for just one year: Ambrogio Cardinal Ratti, Archbishop of Milan, who took the name Pius XI.[7] The dire post-war situation in

Europe afforded him no honeymoon period: the widespread destitution and unemployment, the political instability in many of the nascent states established by the Treaty of Versailles, and the rising specter of communism in Eastern Europe all gave the Church cause for concern. Because of the Holy See's physical location in Rome, Pius XI also had to navigate Italy's tumultuous internal politics. At the time of his election, there was a deep enmity between the Vatican and the Italian government which stretched back to 1870, when the newly-unified Italian government conquered the Papal States and denied the Church's right to territorial sovereignty.[8] Despite this tension between the Church and the state, though, the Italian population was still vastly Catholic, which gave the Vatican a massive influence over the country's affairs. The deep piety of the Italian people begs the question: what role did the Church under Pius XI play in Mussolini's rise to power? Given the inspirational relationship between Mussolini and the rise of fascism across the continent, the stakes of this question could not be higher; indeed, it asks what role the oldest and most powerful institution of Christianity in the world played in paving the way for European fascism and the destruction that followed from it.

With near consensus, scholars have answered this question by critiquing Pope Pius XI's relationship with Mussolini and his government to varying degrees. Even before his papacy had ended, William Teeling argued that the pope had acquiesced to Italian fascism and "become more and more friendly with the leader of [the] Totalitarian State"[9] because, "terrified of Bolshevism, [he] saw in Mussolini a worthwhile weapon to fight it."[10] According to Teeling, Pius XI's motivating fear of communism was rooted in his experience as the Papal Nuncio to Poland at the close of the war, during which time the invading Red Army approached Warsaw. Although many diplomats and other clergy members

fled the city, then-Monsignor Ratti decided to stay in Warsaw with the people. The Russian advance was halted in a last minute counteroffensive by the Polish forces, but Teeling argues that the near-disaster experience made an indelible anti-communist mark on Pius XI. Because of his first-hand experience with Bolshevism, the Pope had "an intense hatred of Communism and Russia,"[11] which left him willing to accept any political alternative to communism in Italy – even Mussolini's strikingly totalitarian regime. Daniel Binchy furthered this tough-on-communism but weak-on-fascism narrative, and in 1939 he wrote in his otherwise laudatory elegy of the recently-passed Pontiff that, "His three years as Nuncio in Warsaw led him to exaggerate … the practical … menace of Communism and to underestimate the dangers that threaten European civilization and peace from the other forms of totalitarianism."[12] Even before the disastrous effects of fascism had fully come to fruition, scholars like Teeling and Binchy critiqued Pius XI as a leader who was so concerned with the rise of communism that he was willing to turn a blind eye to, and even tacitly support, the rise of fascism.

As time passed, historians elevated these critiques into condemnation. In 1965, Karlheinz Deschner published a damning analysis of Pius XI's role in the rise of fascism, arguing that he not only accepted the Mussolini government, but actively worked with the fascists in order to subdue the potential of Italian communism. Deschner describes the relationship as an alliance, and goes so far as to say that, "This unholy Catholic alliance with the supposedly lesser – Fascist – evil led to the greatest catastrophe in human history: the Second World War and the Holocaust."[13] Most recently, David Kertzer published his Pulitzer Prize-winning book, The Pope and Mussolini, which built on the previous scholarship by interweaving material from the newly opened Vatican Archives. Using documents from the Holy See's

ambassadors and aides, he argues that the Church and the fascist state shared a symbiotic relationship through which the Vatican regained territorial integrity for the first time since 1870 and Mussolini gained the political support of the Catholic masses. Ultimately, Kertzer comes to a similar conclusion as Deschner: despite that Pius XI and Mussolini "made an odd couple," their working relationship was so close that it was not only a "partnership" but a joint "clerico-Fascist revolution."[14] Thus, the scholarship of Pius XI paints him as permitting, if not facilitating and benefiting from, the rise of fascism in Italy, and subsequently across Europe more generally.

Strikingly, though, scholars thus far have largely overlooked the words of Pius XI himself, instead relying on a psychoanalysis of his time in Poland or the documents of others working in the Vatican. Although these sources give valuable insights into the vision and workings of the Pontiff, they fail to tell the whole story of his relationship with fascism. An analysis of Pius XI's own words in his many encyclicals shows that, while he was certainly concerned about communism, he by no means supported the fascist government. In fact, he vigorously advocated for a society that was in opposition to fascism. Assuming the throne of Saint Peter in the wake of the politically, economically, and – most importantly – socially catastrophic First World War, Pius XI was determined to restore the Catholic foundations of European society. To do so, he envisioned a system of universal Catholic education and an active and engaged laity which, facilitated by local bishops through an organization known as Catholic Action, would not only profess Catholicism but zealously act upon the faith in all aspects of their daily lives. When his mission of reviving Christianity in Europe came into conflict with the fascist desire to make the state the supreme authority over people's lives, Pius XI harshly rebuked the growing dangers of Mussolini's

government. Thus, Pius XI neither permitted nor supported the rise of fascism; to the contrary, he was committed to furthering his own vision of a society founded on Christian principles, which directly opposed the ideology and hopes of Mussolini.

THE PAPAL PLAN

Pope Pius XI's first act as the Bishop of Rome was a dramatic one: he delivered the traditional Urbi et Orbi speech on the external balcony of St. Peter's Basilica to a crowd gathered from all over the world.[15] For the previous fifty years, since the territorial dispute between Italy and the Papal States arose in 1870, newly-elected popes had symbolically given the address from the inside balcony of St. Peter's Basilica, not out in the open air for the world to hear. In breaking this tradition, Pius XI showed both an openness to rapprochement with the Italian government and a concern for the state of the world more generally. This outward-cast focus would come to define his papacy as he sought to lead Europe in rebuilding – socially, politically, and morally – from the destruction of the First World War.[16]

His initial attempt at doing so was in December of 1922, when he issued his first papal encyclical, Ubi arcano Dei consilio (When in the Inscrutable Designs of God). To begin, he acknowledged the unresolved political anxieties in Europe: "The nations of the earth have not as yet found true peace. … Small nations complain that they are being oppressed and exploited by great nations. The great powers … contend that they are being judged wrongly and circumvented by the smaller."[17] However, Pius XI did not interpret the international tensions of the interwar years as mere politics; rather, he believed that they reflected more profound problems with society's moral underpinnings. More specifically, he identified a rise in impious sexual ethics:

"Too often," he asserts, "we have seen both the sanctity of the marriage tie and the duties to God and to humankind … forgotten."[18] As a result, the fabric of society was being challenged in fundamental ways: for example, he cited "the destruction of purity among women and young girls, as is evidenced by the increasing immodesty of their dress and conversation and by their participation in shameful dances."[19] Despite their personal nature, these sins did not just affect the individuals involved but had a far larger and more dangerous impact on society itself: "The inordinate desire for pleasure, concupiscence of the flesh, sows the fatal seeds of division not only among families but likewise among states."[20] Indeed, Pius XI argued that the tensions within and between countries that he was addressing were not rooted in mere political differences, but were a manifestation of individual "human infirmities"[21] that had been amplified into national shortcomings.

Pius XI continued on to contend that this moral and sexual demise was not caused by the First World War, but by the more insidious development of secular liberalism that preceded and even contributed to the cause of the conflict. He posits that "the theory that all authority comes from men, not from God," fundamentally weakened the foundations of society, and that "because men have forsaken God and Jesus Christ, they have sunk to the depths of evil."[22] In particular, he was concerned with liberal reformers' abrogation of the Church's authority over institutions like marriage and education throughout the 18th and 19th centuries. By making marriage "a mere social contract," secular states had "menaced and undermined … the stability and unity of the family" and welcomed the resultant increase in "acts of sinful lust and soul-destroying egotism."[23] Similarly, by removing the Church's control over education, he claimed that secular states had done away with any "possibility of ever laying a solid groundwork for peace, order, and prosperity, either

in the family or in social relations"[24] Without the crucial
corrective foundation of Christian principles, European
countries fell prey to the sinful natures of their people and
gave way to the rampant sectionalism, materialism, and
nationalism that boiled over into the First World War. Thus,
Pius XI argued that weakening the Church's control over
education and marriage in turn weakened society, leading not
only to the calamities of the First World War but also to the
continued moral demise and political tension that lingered
after the conflict. To remedy these moral issues – and thereby
the political strife and international conflict of the interwar
years – Pope Pius XI offered a three-pronged plan for the
future of the Church's relationship with European society:
Catholic education, Catholic Action, and political neutrality.

Protecting and promoting Catholic education and
the Church's influence over young people was by far the
foremost concern of Pius XI. In his eyes, the problems
facing European civilization were too immense to be
solved by any simple, expedient solution; a long-term
reorganization of society was necessary, and this began
with planting the seed for a Catholic-minded, God-fearing
next generation. Although this belief permeated his papacy
from its inception, he most clearly expounded on them in
1929 in Divini illius magistri (On the Christian Education
of Youth). In the encyclical, Pius XI defended the right of
the Church to control education. He explained that there are
three "necessary societies … into which man is born: …
the family, civil society … [and] the Church,"[25] each with
their own purpose, function, and – most importantly – role
in education. Yet, he was unambiguous in his assertion of
which institution holds the most authority: "First of all,
education belongs preeminently to the Church."[26] The
Church, he argued, has the responsibility of shepherding
each person towards salvation, and the supernatural nature of
this duty unquestionably trumps the worldly concerns of the

family and the state. In this sense, education is not just the memorization of certain creeds or theological dogmas, but rather the formation of a Christian soul and, more broadly, a Christian society:

Education consists essentially of preparing man for what he must be and for what he must do here in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created. … From this we see the supreme importance of Christian education, nor merely for the individual, but … for the whole of human society, whose perfection comes from the perfection of the elements that compose it.[27]

Accordingly, Pius XI expected for governments to yield to the Church's dominion over education. Rather than administering secular schools, he said that states should fulfill their rightful role of forming good citizens through a broad, vaguely defined "civic education" by which governments "provide information having an intellectual, imaginative and emotional appeal."[28] Classrooms, however, should be run by the Church or by the laity in Catholic schools. Indeed, he made it clear that schools outside of the Church's oversight were doomed to become "agents of destruction,"[29] and thus for the good of not only each individual but for society as a whole, "the State should respect the inherent rights of the Church … concerning Christian education."[30] Unequivocally, then, the Pontiff stated in Divini illius magistri that European governments should surrender their claims to state-run education systems in deference to the authority of the Church, and instead rely on Catholic-run schools.

Providing for Catholic education was important because it would form young people into good Christians who would make it to Heaven, but Pius XI believed that such Catholic-educated, pious Christian adults also had a critical role to play in worldly affairs before they found salvation. He recognized that while the laity was a flock that

needed shepherding by the Church, the Catholic faithful could also be a power force in shaping society. Indeed, he wrote in Ubi arcano Dei consilio that the "great activity of the apostolate … by prayer, … the religious press, personal example, [and] works of charity, seeks in every way possible to lead souls to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and to restore … His sovereign rule over the family and over society."[31] In some ways, this idea of an active laity was nothing new: the Church's flock had always been expected to live out the principles of Catholicism in all aspects of their daily lives. In fact, in the 13th century Saint Thomas Aquinas described such involvement in the extracurricular works of the Church as the fulfillment of the sacrament of confirmation: "Confirmation, which all the laity ordinarily receive, is called the sacrament … of Catholic action, of the lay apostolate, of the Christian's mature participation in the public work of the Christian community."[32] Yet, Pius XI's dedication to creating an energized laity dwarfed that of any pope before him. He revolutionized the structure of the laity by building the organization known as Catholic Action, which facilitated the work of everyday Catholics through the direction of local bishops. Before the formal creation of Catholic Action, the work of the laity was decentralized through various independent associations and organizations focused on specific tasks, such as education, healthcare, or charity.[33] Pius XI's initiative incorporated these separate associations into one larger umbrella organization, through which local clergy members could direct the laity's work. Thus, through Catholic Action, "The laity were called not to independent action, but to co-operation with Church interests as defined by the hierarchy."[34]

The cultivation of Catholic Action was not just a mere agenda item for Pope Pius XI; it was a defining aspect of his papacy. Indeed, he would come to be known as the "Pope of Catholic Action."[35] As Jesuit Joseph Schuyler explained in

1959, the Pope realized that "if the Church's life was to be in the market place and the contested arenas of modern thought as well as in the sanctuary, obviously it had to be lived by the laity who were there."[36] Accordingly, Pius XI began his campaign for Catholic Action in his earliest encyclical by praising the "whole group of movements, organizations, and works so dear to Our fatherly heart" which he said "ought not only to continue in existence, but ought to be developed more and more."[37] In 1925, he repeated his call to action in more passionate terms, urging Catholic lay people to "fight courageously under the banner of Christ the King … fired with apostolic zeal … to win over to their Lord those hearts that are bittered and estranged from Him."[38] Even in his ardent defense of the Church's role in education in Divini illius magistri, he tied his concern about the Christian formation of young people to Catholic Action by highlighting the role of the lay apostolate in supporting and staffing Catholic schools.[39] The organization was so important to Pius XI that he even raised the stakes of living up to the expectation that confirmed Catholics involve themselves in the work of the Church, declaring that "a Catholic who was not was not apostolic was to that extent not a complete Catholic."[40] Alongside Christian education, then, Pius XI defined his papacy with a commitment to reinvigorating and reorganizing the participation of the laity in the missions of the Church through Catholic Action.

  It is important to keep in mind, however, that Pius XI's work regarding education and the laity was being conducted amid the uneasy political landscape of the interwar years. Maintaining political neutrality, then, was crucial. In his first encyclical, he made clear that he had no interest in politics or in governing over states: "The Church does not desire, nor ought she to desire, to mix up without a just cause in the direction of purely civil affairs."[41] Moreover, he asserted that the Church would work with any form of

government – whether it be a monarchy, republic, or even a fascist dictatorship – because "the Catholic faith … can easily be reconciled with any reasonable and just system of government."[42] Thus, Pius XI refused to endorse any political parties, even the nascent Christian Democratic and Catholic parties which professed fierce anti-fascism and a willingness to collaborate with the clergy over civil affairs. He feared that doing so would tie the Church to the volatile political fortunes of any one party or regime. His reasoning for this neutrality was steeped in history, particularly the memory of "the injury done to Catholicism when it [was] allowed to become a political label" during the French Revolution.[43] To protect the long-term interests of the Church, Pius XI had to keep himself above the turbulence of party politics.

Moreover, he believed that any regime was viable for Catholics to support so long as it afforded the Church enough latitude to operate freely within society. Just as he hesitated to endorse any friendly political parties, he was likewise wary of condemning hostile parties unless they proved themselves to be irreversibly anathema to the precepts and missions of the Church. It was for this reason that Pius XI was so opposed to communism: because they are "avowedly hostile to revealed religion, … the Communists … place themselves by their doctrines outside the possibility of Catholic support."[44] Rather than being indelibly scarred by his near-collision with the Red Army in Warsaw, Pius XI opposed communism because it unquestionably threatened the robust existence of the Church in society. Therefore, his anti-communism – instead of being the motivating principle of his worldview – was simply a function of his wider belief that the Church must maintain political neutrality unless a party or ideology was radically antagonistic to Catholicism's place in society.

If he was going to reconstitute the basis of European society on Christian foundations, then this political neutrality

would be essential not only in words but in actions as well. Specifically, securing the Church's control over education and Catholic Action's right to organize across the continent would require maintaining strong, amicable diplomatic relations with the various post-war regimes across Europe. To do so, Pius XI relied on what Professor Giuliana Chamedes describes as "concordat diplomacy,"[45] whereby the Holy See negotiated legal agreements across the continent which clearly defined the Church's relation to each state. Although each concordat had country-specific details, they largely all looked alike and contained guarantees of the Church's right to found confessional schools, the right for Catholic Action associations to be formed, and some level of government funding for the Church.[46] Growing on the heightened diplomatic role that his predecessor, Pope Benedict XV, had cultivated during the First World War, Pius XI oversaw the signing of concordats with a number of countries: Austria,[47] Poland, Latvia, Mussolini's Italy,[48] and even Nazi Germany.[49] The diverse range of regime types that the Vatican signed concordats with – from diverse republics to nation states to fascist dictatorships – clearly demonstrates that Pius XI was not concerned with the triumph of one ideology, party, or governance style; he wanted solely to protect and promote the rights of the Church.

THE COLLISION WITH FASCISM

Unfortunately, Pius XI was not the only leader of the interwar years who wanted to radically transform society. Benito Mussolini had his own vision for solving the massive problems facing Italy in the wake of the First World War which revolved around enlarging the power of the state dramatically. In his eyes, the parliamentary system was too inefficient and weak to lead the country through the tumultuous aftermath of the war; Italy needed a powerful

central government headed by a strong leader who would quell partisan squabbling. Indeed, he was the father of fascist totalitarianism, famously declaring, "Everything in the State, Nothing outside the State, Nothing against the State!"[50] However, Mussolini did not immediately become a dictator. It is important to note that the fascists did not necessarily have broad support in 1922 when he rose to power; his ascent to the prime ministry was the result of a threatened coup, not an election of any sort. Before he could take complete control of the state, he needed to widen his coalition of support in order to build legitimacy.

In a country so widely Catholic as Italy, endearing himself to the Church and to its faithful would be essential for the long-term success of his regime. At the time of Mussolini's rise to power, the most powerful counterbalance to fascism in Italy was the Catholic party, Partito Popolare Italiano. Despite being an avowed atheist, Mussolini quickly cozied up to Catholicism in the hopes that he could prove himself to the Catholic faithful and thus neutralize his opposition. He began to restore symbolic privileges of the Church which previous liberal reformers had stripped away: he had crucifixes placed in classrooms and hospital rooms, he permitted Catholic chaplains to join military units, and increased the state allowances given to clergymen.[51] Perhaps more interesting were the personal acts of his purported faith that he performed, such as baptizing his children and even forcing his wife to be baptized.[52] Still, though, Mussolini needed to go to greater lengths to prove his Catholic credentials if the former-socialist, personally-atheist leader was going to win over the pious public. Indeed, he needed to enact policies that were favorable to the Church.

The Roman Question gave him the perfect opportunity to do so. Since the capture of papal-controlled Rome by the unified Italian government in 1870, the Holy See had suspended diplomatic relations with Italy. The popes

since the invasion argued that territorial sovereignty was absolutely necessary for the Church to carry out its mission of leading souls to salvation, and that the city of Rome was its rightful territory. For over fifty years, each pope had called himself a "prisoner of the Vatican" and in protest refused to venture outside of its walls.[53] These longstanding questions of who controlled 'the Eternal City' – Italy or the Vatican – and how much territory, if any, the Church would have still persisted at the start of Mussolini's prime ministry. Knowing that resolving these tensions with the Church would endear his regime to the Catholic population, Mussolini opened covert negotiations with the Vatican. Pius XI, in the spirit of his concordat diplomacy, was happy to negotiate with il Duce with the hope that he could not only carve out a sovereign papal realm in Rome but, more importantly, also pursue his continent-wide agenda of reviving society's Christian foundations in Italy. Indeed, his sights were set on more than just the Roman Question: Pius XI sought to reestablish the Church's control over Italian education that liberal reformers had done away with and to protect the right of Catholic Action to operate freely.

Thus, in 1929, the Lateran Accords were signed. The most noted aspect of the agreement was that the Holy See was granted territorial sovereignty through the creation of Vatican City as it stands today. Yet, the agreement was far wider in its reach than just solving the Roman Question: it declared Catholicism as the state religion, granted the Church power over education and marriage, recognized Catholic Action's right to organize, and even paid the Church 750 million lire.[54] Clearly, there were massive benefits for Pope Pius XI, but Mussolini did not leave the negotiating table empty-handed. Most importantly for him, the landmark achievement of resolving a fifty year-long conflict gave his regime political legitimacy: "From the very first day after the signing of the Treaty, Mussolini made it quite clear

that he intended to use the Lateran Treaty … as something useful for his Italian State."[55] Not only did the agreement make him seem like a capable leader, but it buttressed the pro-Catholic facade he had been projecting. Indeed, "devout Italian peasants flocked to church to pray for the man who had given back God to Italy and Italy to God."[56] Thus, this monumental agreement with the Church solidified his support among the Catholic population. It is precisely because of this political boon that the Lateran Treaty afforded to Mussolini that historians have condemned Pius XI as a collaborator with fascism. Given the size of the Pope's influence over the Italian people, scholars argue that his decision to work with Mussolini in order to secure political and financial privileges for the Church indefensibly galvanized the legitimacy of fascism in Italy.

While the success of the Lateran Accords certainly benefited Mussolini's political standing, extrapolating that Pius XI was therefore an ally of fascism ignores the Pope's undeniable anti-fascist activity. In one sense, this critique overlooks the vision that Pius XI dedicated his papacy to producing: a European society re-founded on Christian principles, with the fear of God and a respect for religion as its core values. This worldview was fundamentally incompatible with fascism, and thus promoting it was an act of anti-fascism in and of itself. Moreover, this critique omits from the historical record the serious conflicts that emerged as the contrasting visions of Pius XI and Mussolini collided with one another. Indeed, Pius XI flagrantly critiqued Mussolini and his ever-stronger fascist regime whenever the state began to encroach on what the Pope had claimed to be the realm of the Church. In these clashes and the ensuing papal encyclicals, Pius XI's anti-fascism and disdain for Mussolini's regime fully came to fruition.

Mussolini's consolidation of power began in 1925, after a group of his supporters murdered the leader of the

socialists, Giacomo Matteotti, who had publicly decried how the fascists rigged the 1924 parliamentary elections. Despite intense uproar from the opposition coalition, King Victor Emmanuel III was unwilling to remove him from power or call for a new election, which effectively allowed Mussolini and the Partito Nazionale Fascista to dominate the parliament. In an impassioned speech he mocked his nearly-powerless opponents, saying, "You believed that fascism was finished … but you will see … Italy … wants peace, wants tranquility, wants calm. We will give it this … through love if possible, and with force if it becomes necessary."[57] Soon after, Mussolini censored the press, outlawed political opposition, replaced labor unions with fascist syndicates, and exiled liberal and socialist activists.[58] As he strengthened his control of the government, he also began to embolden his public image. Rather than just being seen as a prime minister, he began to project a vision of himself as "the new Caesar, the man who would return Italy to its ancient grandeur."[59] In some schools, students even began to recite transformed Lord's Prayers that likened the fascist leader to Christ:

I believe in the high Duce – maker of the Black shirts – and in Jesus Christ his only protector. Our Savior was conceived by a good teacher and an industrious blacksmith. … He came down to Rome. On the third day, he reestablished the state. He ascended into the high office. … I believe in the wise laws, the Communion of Citizens, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of Italy and the eternal force. Amen.[60]

In the eyes of Pope Pius XI, this adoration of the Prime Minister was inching closer and closer to becoming the deification of Mussolini, which he believed would conflict with the piety of Italian Catholics. In response, he issued in December of 1925 an encyclical titled Quas Primas (In the First), which inaugurated the celebration of a new Church

holiday acknowledging the authority and dominion of Christ: the Feast of Christ the King. While this celebration certainly had theological ends, it was also undeniably political. His hope was that the occasion would remind everyday Christians and political leaders alike that, "[God] is the very truth, and it is from Him that truth must be obediently received by all mankind."[61] He argued in the encyclical that in terms of obedience to God, "There is no difference … between the individual and the family of the State; for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ."[62] Therefore, political leaders must recognize the authority of God and neither make laws which harm the Church nor make themselves into an idol that could divert the reverence of the faithful to an earthly ruler instead of their heavenly ruler. To that point, Pius XI sharply wrote, "If … the rulers of nations wish to preserve their authority, to promote and increase the prosperity of their countries, they will not neglect the public duty of reverence and obedience to the rule of Christ."[63] The encyclical itself was a subtle, yet clear, strike at Italian fascism, as it emphasized that there is only one indomitable leader: God, not Mussolini. Yet, the institution of a new, annually-celebrated feast was a profound, far-reaching step of anti-fascism. Pius XI noted that while his encyclicals generally "reach only a few and the more learned among the faithful, feasts reach them all; the former speak but once, the latter speak every year – in fact, forever."[64] By creating a holiday that draws the eyes of Catholics toward God and away from Mussolini's growing-deification, the Pope was purposefully planting a seed of anti-fascism among the everyday, working class Catholics that Mussolini so badly wanted to draw into his coalition of support.

At the same time, Quas Primas was a personal warning to Mussolini himself that Pius XI would not tolerate the replacement of God with fascism. Yet, Mussolini paid

him no mind, and continued to consolidate power and authority in the state by directly competing with Catholic education and associations. Despite the fact that in the Lateran Accords he would agree to the Catholic Church's claim to a monopoly over education, Mussolini was interested in controlling education himself. Like Pius XI, he knew that to create a lasting change in society he would need to mold the next generation and indoctrinate them with a devotion to the state; he wanted to indelibly form the young people of Italy into fascists. To that end, he established the Opera Nazionale Balilla in 1926. This "aggressively national" organization, to which membership was mandatory for all boys between the ages of six and eighteen, oversaw the "preparation of a young generation in matters military and … political so as to will them to the defense of Fascist Italy."[65] The new organization stood in direct contrast to the youth associations that had been established under Catholic Action, and thus served as a fascist counterbalance to the children's Christian instruction.

Mussolini's efforts to strengthen fascism also took aim at Catholic Action directly. Even after the signing of the Lateran Accords, which guaranteed the organization's right to operate freely, the Ministry of the Interior began to investigate its leaders and their political views. Fascist prefects and state police likewise began attending Catholic Action meetings and would report detailed information to the Ministry.[66] This state pressure came alongside a coordinated propaganda campaign that tied Catholic Action to the recently-dissolved, pro-clerical Partito Popolare Italiano. The fascists argued that the organization was "a cover for the old [Catholic] Party" and that its branches were "engaging in illegal union activity."[67] Mussolini knew that this was not the case, since the prefect and police reports largely indicated that Catholic Action was not engaging in political activity.[68] Still, he followed through with attacks on the

organization because he recognized that it was successfully inspiring an increase in devotion among the laity, and that this more fervent Catholicism in line with Pius XI's vision of a Christian post-war society was fundamentally incompatible with his desire for an unchallengeable fascist state.

Mussolini's rhetoric against Catholic Action soon turned into violence. Tension had long been brewing on Italian university campuses between the fascists and those who affiliated themselves with Catholic Action, but in 1931 this tension boiled over into physical conflict. On May 27, the Young University Fascists "invaded Catholic clubs, … invaded the editorial offices of the Jesuit periodical, the Civiltà Cattolica, … [and] attacked the Italian Catholic University Federation headquarters."[69] Using this fascist-spurred violence as an excuse, Mussolini ordered on May 30 that all youth organizations established by Catholic Action – including those for both children and college-aged students – be disbanded.[70] The next day, state police began visiting local Catholic Action offices to deliver Mussolini's decree, shut them down, and even seize membership rolls and documents.[71] This dramatic breach of the Lateran Accords was immediately condemned by the Pope, who took the opportunity to cast the fascist violence and abuse of power as the "first manifestation of … an education that is the antithesis of Christian and civil education, and entirely given to hate, to irreverence, and to violence."[72] Thus, Pius XI drew a line in the sand between the teachings of the Church and those of Mussolini: the fascist beliefs that organizations like the Opera Nazionale Balilla were carving into the culture of Italy were not only irreconcilable with the Christian society he was trying to rebuild, but also violent and dangerous in nature.

Despite the strong initial protests of the Pope, the fascist state maintained the suspension of Catholic Action organizations. Therefore, faced with the permanent

dissolution of what he believed to be a crucial means for reinvigorating Christianity in Europe and remedying the political foment of the interwar years, Pius XI resorted to issuing a jolting encyclical, Non abbiamo bisogno (We Do Not Need), just one month later. To begin, he refuted the fascist propaganda that described Catholic Action as politically motivated, calling their claims, "inventions, falsehoods, and real calumnies diffused by the hostile press of the party, which is the only press free … to dare to say anything."[73] The supposed political activity of Catholic Action was mere pretext, he argued, saying that the real intention of the government pressure was "to tear society away from Catholic Action … and from the Church."[74] Pius XI did not just condemn their actions; he went further and denounced their ideology as the "pagan worship of the state."[75] Fascism, he argued, was becoming a sort of public religion that "rebels against the directions of higher religious authorities" and thus it "cannot in any way be reconciled with Catholic doctrine and practice."[76] The impact of this statement cannot be overstated: in such an overwhelmingly Catholic country, the Pope declared that the government's core ideology was fundamentally incongruous with the Church.

Alongside critiquing the state's actions and beliefs, Pius XI also attacked Mussolini personally. In his argument that the purported political activity of Catholic Action was just a pretext for stifling the Church's role in society, he cited Mussolini's rhetoric: "This … is made all the more explicit and categorical … by the individual who not only represents all, but who can do all, and who confirms it in official … publications, … and by communications to representatives of the press."[77] Of course, Mussolini's approval of the attacks on Catholic Action was obvious, given that by 1931 Italy was clearly under a dictatorship. Yet, Pius XI implying that Mussolini played an active role in suppressing the Church,

rather than vaguely blaming the government or fascists at-large, was a clear attempt at tarnishing his personal reputation. Still, the Pope was not done; he even went so far as to question the sincerity of Mussolini's newly-professed Catholic faith. Although Pius XI appreciated Mussolini's symbolic actions of piety – such as baptizing his family and refurnishing classrooms with crucifixes – he found il Duce's anti-Catholic policies reprehensible enough to publicly call his bluff, writing, "One is a Catholic in name only … who adopts and develops a programme with doctrines and maxims so opposed to the Church … and who misrepresents, combats, and persecutes Catholic Action."[78] In terms of political consequences, these subtle attacks on Mussolini's character were the most dangerous aspect of the encyclical in the eyes of the fascists, because they threatened the very god-like, unassailable image of Mussolini that the dictatorship rested on.

Taking into account Pope Pius XI's critiques of the fascist state's actions, ideology, and even its leader, it is clear that Non abbiamo bisogno was a powerful anti-fascist publication that imperiled the Catholic population's support for fascism, which Mussolini needed so desperately. While Pius XI, in keeping with his commitment to keep above party politics, chose not to formally condemn the Partito Nazionale Fascista as a political organization, his strong rebuke of their actions and their beliefs served as a blunt reminder that if they continued suppressing Catholic Action, fascism would fall into the same category as communism: fundamentally unsupportable for Catholics.

In response to this pressure, Mussolini backed down. Roughly one month after the encyclical was published, the state announced that not only would Catholic Action associations be reinstated across the country, but that ecclesiastical authorities would be given even more control over the education system.[79] By September of 1931, then,

Pope Pius XI had effectively warded off Mussolini's imperilment of the Church's place in Italian society, by not only protecting but bolstering both Catholic education and the laity's right to participate actively in civic affairs.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, however, Pius XI failed to create the European society that he hoped for. In fact, when he died in February of 1939, the situation across Europe could not have been farther from his vision of a peaceful continent reconstituted on Christian principles. An axis of fascist leaders had come to power and built authoritarian, hyper-nationalist regimes, and were soon to plunge the continent into the deadliest conflict in human history. Given that the Catholic Church was an institution with immense moral authority and wielded a monumental influence over the culture and politics of Catholic-dominated countries, it is no surprise that historians have turned their focus toward the Holy See in trying to understand how the deadly ideology of fascism first emerged in Italy. The existing scholarship on the relationship between the Vatican and Italian fascism has overwhelmingly condemned the papacy of Pius XI for permitting, if not actively supporting, Mussolini's consolidation of power. However, this characterization of the Pope obscures his determined anti-fascism.

Through an analysis of his encyclicals, it becomes clear that Pius XI actively combatted the rise of fascism through his advocacy of a Christian-based international order in the wake of the First World War. By promoting an

increase in Catholic-run education, the reinvigoration of lay Catholics' involvement in civil affairs, and the maintenance of the Church's neutrality from political parties, Pius XI sought to cultivate a strong role for the Church in European society, which had otherwise fallen into moral decline. By doing so, he believed he would build not only a more robust Church, but a more pious, and thereby more peaceful, culture across the continent. His hope that Catholicism would ultimately order society, though, stood in stark contrast to Mussolini's desire to create a strong fascist state that would unquestionably rule over the Italian people. When their dueling conceptions of a rightfully-ordered society came into conflict with one another, Pope Pius XI unabashedly fought to protect the interests of the Church from the fascist state's encroachment. Certainly, the Vatican lost this battle in the long-term since fascism continued to fester in Italy and ultimately spread to countries like Spain and Germany, but it would be deeply inaccurate to say that Pius XI supported its emergence or refused to lift a finger in opposition. Instead, the Pope actively crusaded against the rising specter of fascism, and should thus be remembered as an adversary to Mussolini and to fascist leaders all across Europe.

Endnotes

1   Albert Robertson, "The Rise of Italian Fascism and Its Influence on Europe." The Digital Public Library of America, 2017.

2   "Rethinking Fascism: The Italian and German Dictatorships," in Rethinking Fascism (De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2022), https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110768619, pg 87.

3   Charles F. Delzell, "Remembering Mussolini," The Wilson Quarterly (1976-) 12, no. 2 (1988), pg 121.

4   Delzell, pg. 122.

5   Delzell, pg. 122, 124.

6   Richard Drake, "Julius Evola, Radical Fascism, and the Lateran Accords," The Catholic Historical Review 74, no. 3 (1988), pg. 403.

7   Teeling, pg. 72-75.

8   "The Settlement of the Roman Question," Bulletin of International News 5, no. 17 (1929), pg. 405-406.

9   William Teeling, Pope Pius XI and World Affairs (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1937), pg. 1.

10   Teeling, pg. 128.

11   Teeling, pg. 5-6.

12   Daniel A. Binchy, "Pope Pius XI," Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review 28, no. 109 (1939), pg. 7-8.

13   Karlheinz Deschner, God and the Fascists: The Vatican Alliance with Mussolini, Franco, Hitler, and Pavelic (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2013), pg. 13.

14   David I. Kertzer, The Pope and Mussolini: The Secret History of Pius XI and the Rise of Fascism in Europe (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), pg. 68.

15   William Howard, Pope Pius XI and World Peace, First (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1938), pg. 77-79.

16   Howard, "Pope Pius XI and World Peace," pg. 87-88.

17   Pius XI, "Ubi Arcano Dei Consilio," The Holy See, Dec.23,1922,https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/en-

cyclicals, pg. 7, 11.
18   Ibid., pg. 13.
19   Ibid., pg. 14.
20   Ibid., pg. 24.
21   Ibid., pg. 19.
22   Ibid., pg. 28.
23   Ibid., pg. 29.
24   Ibid., pg. 30.
25   Pius XI, "Divini Illius Magistri," in Sixteen Encycli-
cals of His Holiness Pope Pius XI, 1926-1937 (Washington,
D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1929), pg. 6.
26   Ibid.
27   Ibid., pg. 4-5.
28   Ibid., pg. 18.
29   Ibid., pg. 29.
30   Ibid., pg. 18.
31   Pius XI, "Ubi Arcano Dei Consilio," pg. 54.
32   S. J. Joseph B. Schuyler, "The Role of the La-
ity in the Catholic Church," The American Catholic So-
ciological Review 20, no. 4 (1959): 290–307, https://doi.
org/10.2307/3709285, pg. 301.
33   Laura Gellott, "Defending Catholic Interests in the
Christian State: The Role of Catholic Action in Austria, 1933-
1938," The Catholic Historical Review 74, no. 4 (1988), pg.
576.
34   Ibid., pg. 577.
35   Maurice Curtis, "Miraculous Meddlers: The Catholic
Action Movement," History Ireland 18, no. 5 (2010): 34–37.
36   Schuyler, "The Role of the Laity in the Catholic
Church," pg. 289.
37   Pius XI, "Ubi Arcano Dei Consilio," pg. 54-55.
38   Pius XI, "Quas Primas," The Holy See, Dec. 11, 1925,
https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals,pg.24.

39   Pius XI, "Divini Illius Magistri," pg. 32.
40   Schuyler, "The Role of the Laity in the Catholic Church," pg. 301.
41   Ibid., pg. 12
42   Pius XI, "Ubi Arcano Dei Consilio," pg. 65.
43   "The Policy of Pius XI," The Round Table 25, no. 97 (December 1934): 44–59, https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533408450716, pg. 57.
44   Ibid, pg. 56-57.
45   Giuliana Chamedes, "The Vatican and the Reshaping of the European International Order After the First World War," The Historical Journal 56, no. 4 (2013), pg. 956.
46   Chamedes, pg. 971.
47   Gellott, "Defending Catholic Interests in the Christian State."
48   "Text of the Lateran Treaty of 1929," https://www.uniset.ca/nold/lateran.htm.
49   Chamedes, pg. 972.
50   Delzell, pg. 127.
51   Kertzer, pg. 50.
52   Ibid.
53   "The Settlement of the Roman Question," pg. 405.
54   "Text of the Lateran Treaty of 1929."
55   Teeling, pg. 134.
56   Delzell, pg. 128.
57   Kertzer, pg. 77.
58   Delzell, pg. 127.
59   Kertzer, pg. 80.
60   Master Clark, Fascist Spectacle: The Aesthetics of Power in Mussolini's Italy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), pg. 64-65.
61   Pius XI, "Quas Primas," pg. 7. Emphasis mine.

62   Ibid, pg. 18.
63   Ibid.
64   Ibid., pg. 21.
65   James W. Miller, "Youth in the Dictatorships," The American Political Science Review 32, no. 5 (1938): 965–70, https://doi.org/10.2307/1948232, pg. 968.
66   Albert C. O'Brien, "Italian Youth in Conflict: Catholic Action and Fascist Italy, 1929-1931," The Catholic Historical Review 68, no. 4 (1982), pg. 627.
67   Ibid., pg. 629.
68   Ibid., pg. 628.
69   Ibid., pg. 630.
70   Ibid., pg. 631.
71   Arnaldo Cortesi, "Pius XI Charges Fasciti With Hate and Violence; Four Bombings in Bologna," The New York Times, June 1, 1931, http://timesmachine.nytimes.com.
72   Ibid.
73   Pius XI, "Non Abbiamo Bisogno," in Sixteen Encyclicals of His Holiness Pope Pius XI, 1926-1937 (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1931), pg. 19.
74   Ibid., pg. 19.
75   Ibid., pg. 22.
76   Ibid., pg. 24.
77   Ibid., pg. 20.
78   Ibid., pg. 25.
79   "Italo-Vatican Pact to Be Issued Soon," The New York Times, September 2, 1931.