Vol.5 Iss.1 2024
Modern Law Research
https://doi.org/10.37420/j.mlr.2024.008

The Legal Positioning of Rural Collective Economic Organizations: History and Value

Feiran Ji*
School of Law, Shanxi University,Shanxi,China
***Corresponding author,E-mail:2297968815@qq.com**

Abstract
The establishment of long-term agricultural development and rural governance methods in China gave rise to a new kind of agricultural production organization with Chinese characteristics: the rural collective economic organization. The state's will and the large number of farmers' production methods have guided the rural collective economic organization through many major organizational revolutions, significantly altering China's traditional rural society. In addition to the home contract responsibility structure, there have been significant modifications in the meaning and scope of the rural collective economic organization. The current legal theoretical framework finds it difficult to account for the practical elements of rural collective economic organization, as these qualities are inherently contradictory. This article aims to clarify the legal connotation of the rural collective economic organization and establish its scientifically accurate legal positioning by sorting out the defining principles of the organization, its practical functions, and the theoretical categorization of its special legal status.

Keywords
Rural Collective Economic Organization, Legal Concept, Special Legal Person

1. Origin of the Issue

Based on the real national conditions, the rural collective economic organization is an institutional structure with Chinese features. It performs a crucial organizational role in carrying out the party's directives and policies concerning farmers, rural communities, and agriculture. In order to create a realistic plan that prioritizes the growth of agricultural and rural regions, the Party Central Committee has suggested revising the rural collective property rights system and putting the revitalization strategy into practice. The country's constructive stance toward promoting the establishment of rural collective economic groups to protect farmers' economic interests is made clear by the Law on Promoting Rural Revitalization. The country's policy orientation of encouraging farmers to participate in the governance of rural collective economic organizations and guiding them to clarify their status as market subjects is also evident in the opinions of the State Council and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Steadily Advancing the Reform of the Rural Collective Property Rights System. The nation has long considered protecting farmers' interests to be the primary goal of reform, encouraging the growth of the collective economy and the steady rise in farmers' income. Thus, creating rural collective economic organizations is a critical duty in the current rural economic activity and plays a significant part in the work pertaining to agriculture, rural regions, and farmers.

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

But during the course of their protracted growth, rural collective economic organizations—an essential legal concept—have always been ill-defined, both in terms of their fundamental meaning and the extent of their effect. This has given rise to a number of basic disagreements within the theoretical community about the subject status of these organizations, as well as a lack of legal support for addressing legislative and judicial difficulties concerning rural collective economic groups in the real world. The status of rural collective economic organizations as special legal persons is clarified by Article 96 of the Civil Code. However, the list of special legal persons is created using a closed enumeration structure, which makes it challenging to identify the distinctive qualities of rural collective economic organizations or to identify their commonalities.

Rural collective economic organizations have gained widespread recognition as a significant topic for different legal provisions in China's legislative actions. In addition to the Civil Code-based private law system that heavily affects rural collective economic organizations, a number of public law legislation that are embodied in the Constitution also have an impact on them. The success of several legislation pertaining to agriculture has been significantly impacted by their ambiguous legal stance. In light of this, the legal practice of creating rural collective economic organizations has long faced uncomfortable challenges including the virtualization of the field, a dearth of governance instruments, and hazy development prospects.

2. Historical Development of Rural Collective Economic Organizations

Legal notions have a distinct and historical significance. We shouldn't isolate rural collective economic groups' existing legal status from their historical growth trajectory. It is vital to reflect this concept's dynamic meaning through historical interpretation, find the value orientation concealed behind the legal standards, and incorporate its historical forms into actual logic in order to describe and understand it from a legal viewpoint.

2.1 Land Reform and Private Ownership of Land by Farmers (1950-1952)

China launched a massive land reform program after the new democratic revolution won across the nation and under the direction of the Communist Party of China. At the 8th Central People's Government Committee meeting in June 1950, the "Land Reform Law" was approved, giving farmers who owned little or no land across the country the legal right to take it away from landlords based on predetermined criteria. The land reform directly led to the economic abolition of the landlord class, therefore reconciling the stark class differences between farmers and landlords and reestablishing the "peasant economy" in rural regions. Although farmers were enthused about output as a result of this campaign, the intrinsic problems with the small-scale peasant economy could not be adequately addressed. Moreover, these disadvantages tended to get worse as a result of the increased division of ownership of the means of production. For instance, individual farmers in regions with very limited land resources tended to be poorly organized, produce on a small scale, had trouble adopting new production technology, and have weak risk aversion, all of which made it difficult to increase labor productivity. In regions with comparatively ample land resources, shortage of production equipment was a common problem. The employment of agricultural equipment and horse

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

power was clearly incompatible during the production season since work had to be focused.Individual households producing separately would delay agricultural timing, reduce production efficiency, and affect the final agricultural output.

To overcome the aforementioned difficulties, farmers voluntarily formed agricultural production mutual-aid groups to ensure the normal operation of agricultural production. The following qualities of this mode of production are evident: First of all, farmers created it on their own initiative, free from official compulsion; to put it another way, the state's will is not a guiding force. Second, without changing the system of ownership of the means of production, it substitutes a certain level of worker collaboration for totally decentralized individual activities. Thirdly, the quantity of input used in the means of production continues to be the main factor in determining the mode of income distribution.

It should be emphasized that no true rural common economy has yet been formed, and mutual-aid groups for agricultural production cannot be understood as any type of historical collective economy. The rural collective economic organizations are still in their embryonic stage. At this point, the state's major objective is to shatter the highly concentrated means of production in the hands of a few number of people. This will make it easier to construct a top-down, unified kind of rural communal economy later on.

2.2 Agricultural Production Cooperatives (1953-1957)

Drawing on the Soviet experience of constructing collective farms and implementing agricultural collectivization, the central government started to progressively promote cooperation and collectivization in the agricultural production sector based on the spontaneously formed mutual-aid groups by farmers. In order to fully incorporate agriculture into the cohesive system of large-scale socialized production, this method aspired to entirely overthrow conventional agricultural and small-scale farming techniques. There are two aspects to this stage's analysis.

The initial agricultural production cooperative phase (henceforth referred to as "primary cooperatives") was the first stage. Primary cooperatives, which were characterized by their semi-socialist characteristics, combined and consolidated the administration of different privately held means of production by farmers based on mutual-aid organizations, with revenue divided in accordance with the proportion of inputs like labor and land. The official establishment of agricultural collectivization as a key policy for the Party Central Committee to develop agriculture was marked by the passing of the "Resolution on the Development of Agricultural Production Cooperatives" by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in December 1953.

Under deliberate governmental leadership, the initially fragmented rural sector started to evolve into a coherent and large-scale component of the national economy. Primary cooperatives essentially acknowledged and validated the organizational innovations of farmers in the process of autonomous production, retaining more aspects of the original mutual-aid groups and the state leaving the original production organization forms largely intact. But since then, the state has taken the lead in the process of agricultural collectivization, replacing farmers. The "top-down" developed primary cooperatives showed more traits of uniform standards and enforcement than the "bottom-up" established mutual-aid organizations.

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

In the second phase, the shift was made to Advanced Agricultural Production Cooperatives, or "Advanced Cooperatives." During this period, the primary means of production were transferred from private ownership by cooperative members to a single, homogenous communal ownership. With the abolition of land compensation and share-based dividend payments and the complete implementation of a work-based distribution system, the rural communal economy was formally established. Adopted at the Third Session of the First National People's Congress in June 1956, the "Model Constitution for Advanced Agricultural Production Cooperatives" mandates that farmers who wish to join the cooperatives turn over their private land, draft animals, large agricultural implements, and other major means of production to the cooperative. This was a reflection of how the state's intent was becoming more and more evident in forcing agricultural collectivization. The "one-size-fits-all" approach to policymaking led to a great deal of uncertainty when it came to grassroots implementation. In reality, a lot of places pushed farmers into becoming members of Advanced Cooperatives, which goes against the voluntary mutual benefit idea. A regressive scenario in agricultural productivity resulted from the astoundingly quick expansion of Advanced Cooperatives under increasing pressure from the government to local levels, significantly breaking objective economic rules. Building on the resource distribution scheme of basic cooperatives, which distributed resources according to several elements of production, Advanced Cooperatives essentially represented a more comprehensive and radical movement of cooperation and collectivization. This marked the official beginning of the historical development of China's rural collective economic organizations.

2.3 The People's Commune (1958-1984)

There was a certain consistency and urgency in the chronology of the People's Commune movement, which started soon after China's agricultural cooperation program was completed. The People's Commune movement got its start when smaller cooperatives merged into bigger ones. Many areas started to remove obstacles to cooperation amongst advanced agricultural cooperatives and participate in larger-scale joint collaboration in order to address production issues as the shortcomings of these cooperatives became more obvious and the initial reform objectives became unachievable. Following approval from the national government, the People's Commune movement quickly expanded across the nation. The proportion of rural homes in the country that had joined the People's Commune by the beginning of 1958 was 99.1%. Despite the early successes of the People's Commune, the mismatch between production relations and productive forces could not be reconciled because of the commune's overemphasis on comprehensive functions, which went beyond what the productive forces could support at the time.

The combination of political and economic functions, which served as both the fundamental unit of economic production and the organizational form of the popular political authority, was the People's Commune's most notable characteristic. The commune served as the fundamental accounting unit in the early phases of the People's Commune movement. Later, as a result of constant modifications, a three-tier ownership structure including the People's Commune, production brigades, and production teams eventually came into being, with the production team acting as the fundamental accounting unit. This arrangement was referred to as the "three-tier ownership system with the team as the basis." This method significantly impacted the following growth trajectory of rural collective economic organizations and established the frame-

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

work for China's rural economic organizations.The old custom of "imperial power not extending below the county level" was broken with the introduction of the People's Commune system, which signified the first instance in history of state power being extended down to the village level. Ownership of the means of production was transferred from households to the commune as a result of this process. When rights and duties are considered, it can be seen that the People's Commune eventually substituted private rights with public authority as the primary action rationale for farmers, so restricting their options inside a defined dwelling space for the duration of their lives.

2.4 Reform and Opening-up, Household Contract Responsibility System (1985-2016)

In actuality, given the historical circumstances of the period, the People's Commune was unable to carry out the duties assigned to it by the state. The eventual breakdown of the People's Commune was an unavoidable historical tendency, brought about by the combined pressure of farmers' desires for autonomy and strict planning and orders from above. The "separation of political and economic functions" was scheduled to take place gradually and in stages in addition to the family contract responsibility system. [1]

The inherent logic of the separation of political and economic functions is to separate the administrative management functions from the economic construction functions of the People's Commune. Township governments, village committees, and village groups carry out the People's Commune's original administrative administration duties, while rural collective economic organizations at different levels handle the economic construction duties. The "Notice on Rural Work in 1984" issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China made clear that rural collective economic organizations could not be temporarily founded in places where the necessary circumstances were not satisfied. The construction of rural collective economic organizations after the reform and opening-up lagged behind the village committees from the start of the reform and, to some extent, existed in a dependent relationship with the latter. This was in contrast to the village committees' role as policy guides when they were first established.

3. Value Reconstruction of Rural Collective Economic Organizations

The distinctiveness of rural collective economic organizations in the legal system and their originality in the jurisprudential framework are determined by their practical attributes. Their legal status as a unique kind of civil law issue has to be updated to meet contemporary needs. Gaining a deeper comprehension of a subject involves more than just translating ideas that are static into synonyms. Actually, one action that aids in the growth of that objective presence is the comprehension of a subject. We cannot standardize and identify the objective phenomena that exist in society within the parameters of legal categories unless we create a dynamic and organic relationship between theory, norms, and reality.

3.1 Basic Principles

At the moment, the naturally occurring rural collective economic organizations serve as the foundation

1 On October 12, 1983, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the State Council issued the "Notice on Implementing the Separation of Political and Economic Functions and Establishing Township Governments," stating that "the work of separating political and economic functions and establishing township governments should be carried out in conjunction with the election of representatives to the township people's congresses, and should be completed by the end of 1984."

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

for the unique legal person status of these groups, which strengthens the rule of law. The legislation establishes their subject status. Providing systematic theoretical direction for pertinent legislation is the aim of establishing the legal status of rural collective economic organizations. Legal conceptions and common language are fundamentally different from one another because legal notions are not written representations derived from intuitive human experiences. The corresponding objective existence cannot become a topic of law or find a position in the theoretical framework of jurisprudence unless pertinent ideas are understood in the context of the interaction between legal norms and legal relations.

The original intention of the state in establishing the rural collective economic organization system is to safeguard farmers' interests and develop agricultural production, aiming to achieve comprehensive development in rural areas under the framework of socialism. If there is a deviation from this purpose in current legislation, it would deviate from the basis for the existence of rural collective economic organizations, leading to negative impacts on their development trends. As the country completes poverty alleviation and enters a new era of rural revitalization, rural collective economic organizations should play a more prominent role in the work related to agriculture, rural areas, and farmers. Firstly, as an important engine for promoting rural economic growth and the management entity for collective land resources, rural collective economic organizations possess the organizational advantages of intensification, which is conducive to promoting the promotion and application of new and advanced agricultural technologies. Secondly, by obtaining the status of a special legal person and reforming their internal organizational structure, rural collective economic organizations can also more efficiently integrate resources from various parties, improve economic efficiency, and promote high-quality development in agricultural production. Thirdly, rural collective economic organizations can clearly divide the work with village committees, cooperate and restrain each other, actively explore linkage and cooperation models between grassroots organizations, and jointly leverage their respective advantages under the leadership of village-level party organizations. Starting from the rural areas themselves, they can narrow the gap between urban and rural areas and promote coordinated urban and rural development. In summary, rural collective economic organizations play an important role in promoting agricultural modernization, driving farmers' income growth and prosperity, and accelerating rural development.

To legally interpret the concept of rural collective economic organizations, it is necessary to show basic respect and recognition for the existing legal system, ensuring seamless integration with national laws that have already been promulgated to avoid intractable conflicts and loopholes. Firstly, rural collective economic organizations should comply with the relevant legal norms of the Constitution and related laws. Article 8 of the Constitution clearly stipulates the responsibility of rural collective economic organizations to integrate resources under the collective ownership system and the household contract responsibility system, as well as the right of members of rural collective economic organizations to independently carry out production and business activities. Therefore, the risk of "generalization" is the main challenge in re-recognizing and re-defining rural collective economic organizations. Secondly, rural collective economic organizations should also comply with the relevant legal norms of civil laws centered on the Civil Code. Unlike general legal person organizations that determine membership based on participation or capital contribution, the acquisition of membership in rural collective economic organizations mostly depends on household registra-

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

tion factors and contracting relationships, with the transformation of "farmers into shareholders" to obtain "basic member shares". Therefore, the acquisition of membership has a considerable degree of passivity. This requires rural collective economic organizations to fully implement the basic principles of equality and fairness stipulated in the Civil Code, and not infringe on the legitimate rights and interests of farmers' collectives. The ultimate realization of the value of rural collective economic organizations lies in their transformation into legal persons, shaping them into entities that coalesce the collective will of farmers and represent them in the unified national market.

Since the modern Western bourgeois revolution, the concept of "equality for all" has gradually become a social consensus. At the same time, this idea has also been applied in the field of law, becoming the logical starting point for civil legislation in various countries in modern times. Rousseau divided the "inequality" among humans into natural or physiological "inequality" and spiritual or political "inequality". The latter arises from certain conventionally established socio-cultural psychologies and is a reflection of social objective existence out of alignment with productive relations and productive forces in subjective consciousness. However, regardless of the reasons, it is unacceptable to categorize people based on their innate physiological characteristics or status. China implements a socialist system with the people as the masters, pursuing not only formal equality but also substantive equality among individuals as the value pursuit of legislation. Eliminating institutional and ideological discrimination caused by the "peasant identity" is an important part of China's agricultural legislative work. Rural collective economic organizations should not only be defined in theory, but their connotation should also be examined in practice. Only when rural collective economic organizations can safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of farmers, promote the improvement of their social status, and enhance their sense of happiness and fulfillment, can they be recognized by the state and society.

3.2 Basic Functions

Although legal persons share the status of legal subjects with natural persons, they only exist within the empirical legal system and are constructs of the law. As special legal persons, rural collective economic organizations have undergone numerous significant morphological transformations throughout history. The internal structure, organizational form, and other inherent attributes of rural collective economic organizations in their current state are not completely stable. Therefore, it is not practical to legally define them from a structuralist perspective. In the author’s opinion, a more secure approach is to refine the concept of rural collective economic organizations based on a functionalist approach from an external perspective by examining their actual functions.

Rural collective economic organizations serve as custodians of farmers' collective assets in practice. According to the Model Charter for Rural Collective Economic Organizations, resource assets, operating assets, non-operating assets, rural collective economic organizations' own assets, and other assets constitute the collective assets. Among them, own property is the fundamental asset for rural collective economic organizations to maintain their daily activities. Other assets are usually smaller in quantity and lack commonality, so they are not within the scope of discussion. The integration of functions of rural collective economic organizations aims to establish specific management methods for the first three types of assets, determine

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

the rights and obligations of rural collective economic organizations, and further clarify their subject status in civil legal relations.

Resource assets refer to land [1]collectively owned by farmers. Against the backdrop of the reform of "separating the three rights," a situation has emerged where ownership, contracting rights, and management rights of collective land are distributed among different civil subjects. [2] Practice has proved that the reform of "separating the three rights" has successfully addressed issues such as the difficulty in scaling up agricultural production and promoting the dissemination of advanced production technologies since the implementation of the household contract responsibility system. However, it has also transformed the two-way legal relationship centered on land rights into a complex legal relationship,Increased the management cost and the governance difficulty virtually.This necessitates that rural collective economic organizations, as the parties contracting out collective land, effectively fulfill their responsibilities, safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of farmers' collectives, and ensure the smooth operation of the national land system.Firstly, rural collective economic organizations should regulate the land they contract out in a reasonable manner to avoid imbalances in the area and quality of land contracted by the contractor. Secondly, they should oversee the production and operation activities of the managers to ensure that the land is developed and utilized in a reasonable, sufficient, and sustainable manner. Finally, rural collective economic organizations should serve as an intermediary organization between the state and farmers in matters related to land. They are responsible for handling daily affairs related to collective land and implementing the land use control system on behalf of the state in accordance with the Land Administration Law.

Operational assets refer to the assets collectively owned by members and used for business operations, including houses, buildings, machinery and equipment, tools and instruments, agricultural infrastructure, enterprises invested and established by the collective, as well as the asset shares and intangible assets held by other economic organizations. For such assets, rural collective economic organizations should adopt market-oriented means to actively expand their scale, thereby driving the increase in income for organization members. It should be noted that rural collective economic organizations, as special legal entities, should independently bear civil responsibilities limited to their operational assets and fulfill bankruptcy and liquidation procedures when necessary.

Non-operational assets refer to the facilities and resources collectively owned by members and used for public services such as education, science and technology, culture, health, and sports. Nowadays, the primary social contradiction in China has transformed into a contradiction between the people's ever-growing need for a better life and unbalanced and inadequate development. Solving the problem of farmers' food and clothing is no longer the main goal of rural economic development. Strengthening rural infrastructure construction and comprehensively improving the quality of life of farmers should also become an important function of rural collective economic organizations in the new era.

1 In a broader sense, forests, mountains, grasslands, wastelands, and beaches can all be considered as part of the land category. For the convenience of writing, this section will refer to them collectively as land.

2 As mentioned earlier, the collective of farmers lacks the legal subject status in civil law, and rural collective organizations act as their representatives to express the collective will and exercise ownership rights on behalf of the collective subjects.

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

4. Theoretical induction

Once a rural collective economic organization qualifies as a special legal entity, the next question that arises is the determination of its legal entity type. Separate research is needed for rural collective economic organizations, which are sub-items of special legal entities, to clarify the theoretical attribution of their legal entity type.

Based on different criteria, rural collective economic organizations can be mainly classified as follows.

According to the organizational form, they can be divided into: (rural) shareholding (economic) cooperatives, limited liability companies with (rural community-based collective) ownership, limited liability companies limited by shares with (rural community-based collective) ownership, (rural) joint-stock cooperative companies, (rural) economic cooperatives, rural collective economic organizations with the nature of people's communes, and other types.

Based on their actual functions, they can be categorized into: rural collective economic organizations with developed industries, intermediary rural collective economic organizations, and new-type rural collective economic organizations.

The fundamental categorization of legal entities in the continental legal system is their division into public and private categories. Three factors often determine the foundation of classification: the establishment act, the purpose of the act, and the identification of the legal person. Rural collective economic organizations should be classified as private legal persons in theory based on this norm. First off, China's applicable civil laws serve as the foundation for the creation of rural collective economic organizations. Secondly, rural collective economic organizations are established based on the volition of farmers. The fact that the state's will has played a significant role in the founding process does not mean that we can ignore the farmers' subjective initiative. Thirdly, achieving the shared interests of its members is the goal of rural collective economic organizations. Even while members' shared interests and the public interests of society intersect, collective ownership in the framework of a socialist legal system can only be viewed as a transient method of attaining public ownership during the primary stage. As such, it is impossible to compare the shared interests of a subset of individuals with the interests of the entire population. Some scholars believe that rural collective economic organizations are public legal persons with some private law characteristics. It is true that rural collective economic organizations are distinct from ordinary private legal persons by their public law status, which we cannot overlook. It should prioritize, if not mainly, economic growth, as the phrase "collective economic organization" implies that it is an economic organization as opposed to a political or social one. Therefore, it is appropriate to assess rural collective economic groups as "private legal persons with some public law characteristics."

5.Conclusion

In order to accomplish the objectives of national government and significantly increase the income level of Chinese farmers, rural collective economic organizations—a unique type of economic organization—were founded in China under particular social and historical circumstances. They are granted specific legal

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

personhood by the Civil Code, which is a prerequisite for effectively carrying out their duties in “agriculture, rural areas, and farmers” in light of the changing situation. Because it is hard to find a place for them within the existing theoretical framework, discussions in the theoretical community on the legal positioning of rural collective economic organizations should neither strictly apply existing theoretical frameworks nor completely deny the rationality of their existence. Rural collective economic organizations should be legally defined as grassroots mass economic cooperation organizations that are established through the voluntary transfer of collective property rights under the direction of the state’s will, in compliance with the Constitution and laws, with the goal of preserving and increasing the value of collective property and increasing individual income. These organizations combine social practice and theoretical exploration.

Funding

[1]National College Students' Innovation and Entrepreneurship Training Program: "Research on Local Legislation Issues in the Organic Connection between Poverty Alleviation and Rural Revitalization in Shanxi"（Project number 202210108008）.

Reference

[1]Selected Important Documents Since the Founding of the People's Republic of China. (1993). Volume 4. Central Literature Publishing House.

[2]Gao, M., & Lu, Q. (2019). “China’s rural collective economy: 70 years of development and implications.” China Rural Economy, 10, 20.

[3]Ma, X. (1999). “Fifty years of rural China: the path of agricultural collectivization and institutional changes.” Contemporary Chinese History Studies, Z1, 75.

[4]Zhang, L., & Cheng, M. (2022). “The establishment and termination of special legal persons in rural collective economic organizations.” Journal of Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics (Social Science Edition), 35(5), 79.

[5]Wen, S. (2022). “On the special structure of rural collective economic organizations as legal persons.” Politics and Law, 10, 21.

[6]Zhu, Q. (2016). General Introduction to Civil Law (2nd Edition). Peking University Press, 418.

[7]Ding, G. (2021). “Research on several important issues in the legislation of rural collective economic organizations.” Journal of Hunan Agricultural University (Social Science Edition), 23(4), 67.

[8]Guo, X. (2022). “The characteristics, development trends, and supervision mechanism construction of rural collective economic organizations.” Rural Economy, 4, 46.

[9]Han, D., Han, L., Shi, D., & Wang, Y. (2017). “The construction and improvement of corporate governance in rural collective economic organizations.” China Land Science, 31(7), 6.

[10]Qu, M. (2018). “Research on the corporate system of rural collective economic organizations.” Tribune of Political Science and Law, 36(2), 31.

© 2024 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)