



# 改革开放四十年社会变迁与社会治理

---

**编者按：**改革开放 40 年来，中国社会发生了宏大而深远的变迁。这些变迁不仅表现在整体意义上的城镇化水平、阶层结构的转型、人口年龄结构的老化等方面，而且还表现在农村内部人地关系、城乡社区居民类型、城市经济构成，以及社会运行模式等方面。总之，这种划时代变迁的规模之大、程度之深、速度之快，是世界历史罕见的。

在巨大的社会变迁之下，作为把控社会运行的工具，作为防范社会风险的手段，社会治理需要面对新情况新问题而不断创新，以处理好改革稳定与发展的关系问题，并通过对各种矛盾的化解而提升社会进步的水平与质量，在以人民为中心的发展思想指导下，把中国顺利导入现代化强国。

如何看待改革开放 40 年中国的社会变迁与社会治理？社会治理研究如何回应社会变迁问题？《中国社会科学评价》编辑部本期邀请了中国社会科学院社会发展研究院院长张翼研究员担任主持人，邀请全国人大社会建设委员会副主任委员、中国社会科学院学部委员李培林研究员，教育部学位管理与研究生教育司司长、中国人民大学社会学理论与方法研究中心教授洪大用，复旦大学社会学系主任李煜教授，浙江大学公共管理学院教授、浙江大学社会治理与社会政策研究中心研究员林卡等参与笔谈。五位学者的文章《改革开放四十年我国阶级阶层的变化》、《为治理实践提供更加深入的学理支撑》、《社会转型与社会治理格局的创新》、《社会流动的“质”与“量”》、《中国社会发展的新时代与包容性发展》分别从阶层结构变化、社会转型、社会流动、包容性社会政策等方面阐述了适应于社会变迁的要求而创新社会治理的问题。现整组文章以“改革开放四十年社会变迁与社会治理”笔谈刊出，以飨读者。

部分文章系根据作者在“改革开放 40 周年社会变迁与社会治理”研讨会上的发言整理并经作者修订而成。

---

# 改革开放四十年我国阶级阶层的变化

李培林\*

改革开放 40 年来,我国阶级阶层结构的变化有五大趋势和特点:

第一,我国从一个农业农民大国转变为一个进入工业化后期的国家。农民和非农从业人员的比例,从“七三开”转变到“三七开”,在全部从业人员中,农业劳动者的比例已经下降到 28%。完成这样一个巨变,欧洲的主要工业化国家经历了 150 年左右的时间,我国仅用了 40 年的时间,所以这是一个非常快速的、剧烈的变动,但是这并不意味着中国已经非常接近一个现代化的国家。我最近看了巴西的资料,巴西现在城市化水平已经达到了 85%,务农的农业劳动力已经下降到 10% 以下,但是它还没有被国际上承认是一个现代化国家,因为巴西还没有解决农民的穷困问题,尽管巴西农户土地规模要比我们大很多,但是那些大土地所有者基本上都是公司,还不是普通的农民。我国要实现现代化,就要在未来发展中解决好让农民普遍富裕起来的问题,这条路还很长。

第二,非农从业人员结构本身发生了深刻变化。以第三产业为主的所谓“白领”职工不仅超过了“蓝领”职工,而且很快会超过农民和“蓝领”职工之和。在后工业化社会的研究中,这一结果意味着中产阶级的形成、大众消费潮流的到来、阶层意识的变化等大的判断。它实际上带来了一系列新的社会学议题,而且这些议题直到目前仍然是具有争论的一些议题。

第三,适应现代化发展要求的社会分层体系基本形成。但目前中产阶级或中等收入群体无论以何种标准衡量,都还没有超过全部从业人员的 40%。比如如果我们按一个统一的标准来测量,把中等收入群体定义为全国居民收入中位数的 75%—200% 这个区间的人群,根据 2015 年的数据,中等收入群体在中国占 38.2%,在俄罗斯占 56.5%,在巴西占 43.9%。扩大中等收入群体,建设“橄榄型”分配格局,在这方面中国还面临着很多挑战。

第四,我国仍然是社会流动率较高的国家。目前社会流动的频率、速度和规模都有所减缓,但从国际比较来看,社会分层结构的转型和变化仍然具有很大的潜力和空间,还不能作出社会阶层结构固化的判断。让每一个人凭着自己的努力、机遇、能力、业绩,都能够改变自己的命运,这是一个社会具有社会活力和流动性的很重要的标准,也是中国梦的一部分。最近《社会学研究》上发表了这方面最新的研究成果,结论是总体社会流动率还是在上升的,但代际流动率有所下降,这也是我们需要关注和反思的新趋势。

第五,社会分层结构的变化显示出叠加的复杂特征。也就是说,我国的社会分层结构,既有工业化初期特征、工业化后期特征,也有后工业化时期的特征,这为准确把握我国现阶段的社会分层特征、矛盾、趋势增加了难度。比如我们如果把第三产业都定义成白领,那我国已经进入后工业社会了,但农业劳动力还有 28%,农村居民还有 41% (这还是按照进城半年以上农民工就属于城市常住人口计算的),这是典型的工业化中期特征。所以要真正实现工业化、现代化还有很长的路要走。

几点启示和说明:

\* 作者李培林,中国社会科学院学部委员、研究员(北京 100732)。

首先，我们这次社会分层的研究，主要的关注点没有放在横断面的高低分层上，而是放在了纵向的历史变化上。社会分层，顾名思义就是要分出高低之层，无论是英国社会学家戈德索普的所谓新韦伯分层体系，还是美国社会学家赖特的新马克思主义分层测量模型，主旨都是要分出高低之层，中国学者在这方面也做了大量探索性研究，比如陆学艺教授领导的课题组曾根据对经济资源、社会资源、文化资源的占有状况进行的十大阶层划分等。但我们觉得，在一个大变革时期，动态的历史性变化可能对我们理解当前的社会更有意义。

其次，我国社会学已经做了大量的社会分层研究，这是改革开放社会学研究的一个经典主题，主要还是为了反映社会变迁和结构转型。但是我现在觉得，社会学的研究需要扩展应用领域。比如像社会分层，现在最有前景的应用领域就是消费的社会分层，国内消费对目前我国经济增长贡献率已经超过 60%，但我们至今对大众消费的决定因素、影响因素以及消费观念、消费行为、消费市场等，都还没有非常深入的研究。这是需要改变的。

最后，要引入大数据等新的研究方法来推进社会分层的研究。现在国内外的社会分层研究，多数都是依赖大规模的全国抽样调查数据，需要大量的人力、财力和物力投入。随着社会的变化，这种基于入户访谈的抽样调查变得越来越困难了。另一方面，随着新媒体的发展，手机和互联网似乎成为人们生活须臾不可缺少的了，意见表达、舆论形成、民心向背等社会心态，似乎在按照我们所陌生的还不熟悉的规则在发展。比如，在美国的大选中，所有按照传统民意调查抽样方法显示的调查结果，都与大选结果相抵牾。基于互联网和新媒体利用大数据等新方法进行社会分层的研究，是亟需要加强的一个方面。迄今为止，社会科学在此领域还没有突破性的成果，我希望在这方面大家共同努力。

## 为社会治理实践提供更加深入的学理支撑

洪大用\*

2016 年 5 月 17 日，习近平总书记在哲学社会科学工作座谈会上发表重要讲话指出：“当代中国的伟大社会变革，不是简单延续我国历史文化的母版，不是简单套用马克思主义经典作家设想的模板，不是其他国家社会主义实践的再版，也不是国外现代化发展的翻版，不可能找到现成的教科书。我国哲学社会科学应该以我们正在做的事情为中心，从我国改革发展的实践中挖掘新材料、发现新问题、提出新观点、构建新理论，加强对改革开放和社会主义现代化建设实践经验的系统总结……提炼出有学理性的新理论，概括出有规律性的新实践。这是构建中国特色哲学社会科学的着力点、着重点。”<sup>①</sup>我们建设和发展中国特色社会学，也应该直面中国社会建设和社会治理实践，促进理论与实践的良性互动。

\* 作者洪大用，中国人民大学社会学理论与方法研究中心教授（北京 100872）。

① 习近平：《在哲学社会科学工作座谈会上的讲话》（2016 年 5 月 17 日），北京：人民出版社，2016 年，第 21—22 页。

**Constructing a Chinese Hermeneutics and Forming a Chinese School**

• 4 •

Editor's note: Since the reform and opening up, with the introduction of contemporary Western hermeneutics into China, hermeneutics has increasingly become the methodological basis for various disciplines. However, existing studies are carried out mainly within Western interpretation traditions or contexts. Chinese scholars expect to draw wisdom from Chinese traditional cultural resources and build China's contemporary hermeneutics on the basis of absorbing the theoretical achievements of Western hermeneutics. On Dec. 17, 2018, the symposium on "the Construction of Chinese Hermeneutics: Approaches and Methods" organized by the Chinese Social Sciences Press was held in Sanya. At the symposium, the approaches and methods used in the construction were discussed from the perspectives of literature, historiography, and philosophy, and emphasis was placed on how the construction of a Chinese hermeneutics could be possible.

Issues such as the hermeneutic theory of Chinese literature and art, the grand narrative in world history, concept creation in historical interpretation, the publicity of interpretation, the neglected approaches of Chinese hermeneutics, and the change in direction of Chinese classical interpretation were discussed. The editorial board of *Social Sciences in China Review* selected a few speeches, changed them into papers after authors' revision, and published them in this column to share with readers.

Professor Zhu Xiaoyuan from the Department of History of Peking University pointed out that since the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the development of world history in China has experienced three stages: the exploration of laws, knowledge-based world history, and research-based world history. Now it is entering the fourth stage, namely the hermeneutics of world history. China is rich in historical thoughts, many of which are methodologically applicable to the hermeneutics of world history in China. China's world history must be read and written by Chinese scholars, based on history, driven by real needs, and use specific analysis to destabilize Western-centric theory to make Chinese voices heard in world history studies.

Professor Meng Zhongjie from the Department of History of East China Normal University, from the dimension of the history of concept creation, used the "pilot concept" in Koselleck's hermeneutics to demonstrate that in the popularization of an interpretation a long process is required before people can embrace a concept. When some important concepts in interpretation eventually form a "collective unit," they can be transformed into the basis for today's public interpretation. The rapid development of current technology may accelerate the evolution of the pilot concept. Perhaps we do not need 100 years to achieve a popularized interpretation, but it still takes time to digest.

Professor Gan Chunsong from the Department of Philosophy of Peking University believes that since ancient times Chinese hermeneutics has not been unpopular. Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism in Chinese traditional culture have elements of hermeneutics. In modern China, scholars have also pursued an interpretation of the Confucian tradition at different levels, but they may also have different compulsory interpretations and depart from the subject. The key is the decisive role of the interpreter's position in interpretation. The true interpreter should consciously get rid of the value projections of "emotion" and "respect" and treat texts with an objective and scientific attitude. The construction of the hermeneutic system, how to treat the ancient Chinese interpretation tradition, how to treat the transformation of the interpretation system caused by the academic transformation in modern China, and the analysis of the role of the interpretation subject are all important for us to analyze the possible development direction of Chinese hermeneutics.

**Social Changes and Social Governance in the 40 Years of Reform and Opening up**

• 22 •

Editor's note: In the 40 years of reform and opening up, great and far-reaching changes have

taken place in Chinese society. These changes are reflected not only in the overall level of urbanization, the transformation of the hierarchical structure, and population aging, but also in the rural man-land relationship, urban and rural community types, urban economic composition, and society's mode of operation. In short, the scale, depth, and speed of this epoch-making change are rare in world history.

Under the influence of great social change, as a tool for controlling social operations, and as a means of preventing social risks, social governance needs to constantly innovate in the face of new situations and problems in order to deal with the relationship between stability and development during reform. Through resolving various contradictions to enhance the level and quality of social progress, and under the guidance of people-centered development thinking, China will successfully become a powerful modern state.

How to view China's social changes and social governance over the 40 years of reform and opening up? How does research on social governance respond to social changes? In this issue, the editorial board of *Social Sciences in China Review* invite Zhang Yi, the dean of the Social Development Research Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, as the host. In addition, five scholars were invited to participate in the dialogue in writing: Li Peilin, the deputy director of the National People's Congress Social Construction Committee and Member of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; Hong Dayong, director of the Department of Degree Management and Postgraduate Education of the Ministry of Education and of the Research Center for Sociological Theory and Method at Renmin University of China; Li Yu, chair of the department of Sociology at Fudan University; and Lin Ka, professor of the School of Public Administration and a research fellow at the Center for Social Governance and Social Policy Research, Zhejiang University. They discuss the issues of innovating with social governance to address social changes in terms of hierarchical structure change, social transformation, social mobility, and inclusive social policy in their articles: "Changes in China's Social Class in the 40 Years of Reform and Opening Up" (Li Peilin), "Provide More In-Depth Academic Support for Social Governance Practices" (Hong Dayong), "Social Transformation and Innovation with Social Governance Patterns" (Zhang Yi), "The 'Quality' and 'Quantity' of Social Mobility" (Li Yu) and "The New Era and Inclusive Development of Social Development in China" (Lin Ka).

Some of these articles were reorganized and revised by authors based on their speeches at the symposium on "Social Changes and Social Governance in the 40 Years of Reform and Opening Up" and published in this issue to share with readers.

### **The Internationalization of Contemporary Chinese Philosophy and the Establishment of Subjective Consciousness**

Nie Minli • 35 •

### **The Debate on "Reverse Analogical Interpretation" and the Misunderstanding of Essentialism in the Comparison of Chinese and Western Philosophy**

Song Kuanfeng • 38 •

The discussion on the research method of the history of Chinese philosophy around "reverse analogical interpretation" has not led to substantial progress in thought. The root cause lies in the ambiguous and unclear statements of "reverse analogical interpretation," "interpreting Chinese philosophy with Western philosophical concepts," and "interpreting Chinese philosophy with Chinese philosophical concepts." In the inevitable comparison between Chinese and Western philosophy in the research on the history of Chinese and Western philosophy, the most influential and misleading thought premise is essentialism. Once researchers really get rid of essentialism, they will realize that Chinese philosophy and Western philosophy, which are mutually referenced, never appear as holistic existences. It has always been a certain Chinese philosopher, a certain school of philosophy, a certain Western philosopher, or a certain form or type of philosophy that acts as the target of reference.

### **Towards What Kind of Spatial Sociology: The Four Scenarios of Space as a Sociological Object and Reflections**

Ying Licheng • 50 •

Although "spatial sociology" has existed as a concept for more than a hundred years, the