

Spatial Layout and Historical Roles of Transportation Routes in the Taihang Revolutionary Base Area

Jiayi Sun¹, Zhiyuan Peng²

¹ School of History and Tourism Culture, Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, China

² Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing 100101, China

Abstract

Transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area were fundamental to wartime survival, political coordination and social organization, yet they remain understudied compared with military campaigns and state-building narratives. This paper analyzes the spatial layout and historical roles of these routes, arguing that they constituted a composite network rather than a single set of military roads. Drawing on historical geography, wartime social history and revolutionary history, the paper shows that mountain paths, village liaison lines, supply corridors, intelligence routes and cadre mobility channels together formed the logistical and political infrastructure of the base area. Their spatial layout followed a strategic logic of concealment, flexibility and nodal connection shaped by mountainous terrain and enemy pressure. More than channels of transport, these routes helped structure relations among villages, authorities, militias and communication points. The paper further suggests that contemporary red heritage interpretation should move from isolated memorial sites toward network-based understanding of wartime mobility and regional organization.

Keywords: Taihang revolutionary base area; transport routes; spatial layout; historical geography; wartime mobilization

1. Introduction

Revolutionary base areas are often remembered through political leadership, military struggle and mass mobilization. These dimensions are indispensable, but they rest on a more mundane foundation: the ability to move people, information, supplies and directives through difficult territory under threat. In the Taihang mountains, where topography was rugged and enemy pressure could be intense, transportation routes were not secondary logistical details. They were a core condition of political survival and military flexibility. Without routes, there could be no sustained coordination among dispersed settlements, no reliable supply circulation and no durable spatial presence of revolutionary authority.

This paper argues that the Taihang transport system should be understood as a composite territorial network. It included more than roads in the formal sense. Mountain trails, village liaison lines, relay points, intelligence paths and concealed supply channels all formed part of a wider infrastructure of movement. Such routes were socially produced: they relied on local knowledge, village cooperation, temporary adaptation and organizational trust. Their study therefore opens a useful window onto the relationship between geography, warfare and social organization in the anti-Japanese base area.

2. Literature Review and Perspective

Historical work on the Chinese revolution has richly examined mobilization, guerrilla warfare and state formation, while historical geography has shown how terrain and transport shape regional power. Yet the transport routes of base areas are often treated only instrumentally, as background to military events. This paper instead takes routes as an object of analysis in their own right. The route perspective allows us to see how political space was assembled through movement, communication and logistical repetition rather than through static territorial control alone.

In methodological terms, this approach resonates with recent heritage and regional studies that emphasize networks, corridors and nodal relations. The Great Tea Road research by Meng and colleagues, although focused on cultural heritage, is suggestive here because it demonstrates how lines, nodes and narrative systems can be analyzed together. Applied to revolutionary history, this means treating transport routes not merely as physical traces but as infrastructures of connection that linked authorities, villages, depots and memory. A route-based perspective can therefore illuminate

both wartime function and contemporary heritage interpretation.

3. Spatial Composition of the Taihang Route System

The Taihang route system was layered. Main interregional routes connected larger political and military nodes, allowing cadres, documents and supplies to move across broader sectors of the base area. Secondary routes linked county or district centers to villages, militia bases and service points. Tertiary paths, often temporary or highly localized, provided concealment, tactical maneuver and emergency retreat. This layering increased resilience. When one route was blocked or exposed, another could substitute. Such redundancy was not accidental; it was a strategic response to enemy surveillance, military campaigns and the volatility of wartime conditions.

Terrain strongly shaped route layout. Mountain ridges, valleys, passes and stream corridors offered both opportunities and risks. Some routes maximized concealment, others speed, and still others the ability to maintain contact with populated settlements that could provide support. Traditional village paths and older local circulation patterns were often incorporated into revolutionary use. This means that wartime transport infrastructure was partly improvised and partly inherited. The revolutionary route network was built within an existing social geography rather than superimposed upon an empty landscape.

4. Functional Roles of the Routes

The first role of the route system was logistical. Grain, medicines, printing materials, clothing and military supplies had to circulate despite scarcity and enemy threat. Transport routes made this possible, but not through roads alone; they depended on village stations, human carriers, local guides and safe houses. The second role was communicative. Orders, intelligence and reports moved through the same or related networks, allowing dispersed units to remain coordinated. In a guerrilla environment, delayed communication could be strategically disastrous, so route reliability was politically significant.

The third role was organizational. Transport routes linked villages to authorities and thereby contributed to the production of governable space. They made tax collection, cadre movement, mobilization campaigns and relief distribution feasible. In this sense, the routes were not merely military supports; they were part of how the base area was socially and politically integrated. They made revolutionary territory legible and operational, even when control was fluid and contested.

5. Routes, Villages and Social Participation

The route system could not function without local society. Villagers provided shelter, information, carrying labor and route knowledge. Relay stations and contact points depended on trust, secrecy and repeated cooperation. This embeddedness is historically significant because it shows that wartime mobility was socially organized rather than technically autonomous. Transportation routes reveal a practical dimension of mass participation often overshadowed by formal political narratives. Support for the revolutionary movement was not only expressed through slogans or meetings; it was enacted through the repeated maintenance of channels of movement.

At the same time, participation carried risks. Villages along key lines faced surveillance, reprisals and material burdens. The route system therefore also redistributed danger. Some settlements became strategic because of their location, and this shaped local wartime experience. A route-based perspective makes such uneven exposure visible. It reminds us that revolutionary geography was lived through ordinary spaces and daily obligations as much as through battlefield events.

6. Strategic Logic of Spatial Layout

The layout of the Taihang routes followed a clear strategic logic: rely on terrain, avoid enemy concentration, connect key nodes and preserve flexibility. Concealment mattered, but so did social connectivity. A route hidden from the enemy but isolated from supportive settlements would be difficult to sustain. Conversely, a socially embedded route that was too exposed could become a liability. The wartime network therefore emerged from a continual balancing of secrecy, accessibility, redundancy and local support. This balance explains why some routes were semi-permanent while others remained provisional and adaptable.

Such strategic geography also shaped the internal organization of the base area. Authorities had to think in terms of reachable distances, reliable relays and defensible corridors. Political space was thus structured by movement capacity. The map of the base area cannot be understood only through administrative divisions; it must also be understood through the route network that made those divisions actionable. Territory, in wartime, was as much a function of circulation as of formal jurisdiction.

7. Implications for Red Heritage Interpretation

Contemporary red heritage work often focuses on memorial halls, battle sites or residences of major figures. While these are important, they can inadvertently fragment the historical experience of the base area. A route perspective would allow heritage interpretation to connect dispersed sites through narratives of movement, communication and survival. Walking paths, digital maps, oral histories and cross-county exhibitions could reconstruct how people, goods and directives actually moved through the Taihang region. This would make the history of the base area more spatially intelligible and socially grounded.

Such an approach would also broaden the range of historical actors made visible. Instead of emphasizing only commanders and political leaders, route-based interpretation could highlight couriers, villagers, porters, station keepers and local guides. Their work was indispensable to revolutionary endurance, yet it often remains underrepresented. Network-based heritage interpretation can thus make the history more inclusive without weakening its political significance.

One further implication concerns memory geography. Because routes are less visually monumental than buildings, they are often harder to commemorate. Yet their very diffuseness is historically meaningful. It reflects the distributed and collective character of wartime survival. Heritage practice should therefore experiment with forms of representation capable of making linear and networked history perceptible, including mapping, itinerary-based interpretation and landscape signage.

The route perspective also helps connect military history with social history. Logistics, intelligence and mobility are sometimes treated as technical matters, but in the Taihang case they were inseparable from local cooperation and everyday labor. Recognizing this connection enriches our understanding of how revolutionary legitimacy was built and maintained in difficult wartime conditions.

Finally, route analysis can support comparative work across other revolutionary base areas. Different terrains and political contexts likely produced different transport logics. Comparing those patterns would deepen our understanding of how geography shaped revolutionary organization across China rather than only within the Taihang region.

A further analytical gain comes from treating transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area as a problem of territorial coordination rather than as a single-sector issue. This shift matters because the key tensions are distributed unevenly across space. Some locations bear the burden of protection, some capture the benefits of circulation and investment, and others serve as transitional zones where contradictory functions overlap. Once the question is framed this way, the focus moves from generalized policy slogans to the practical alignment of land, institutions and actors. In the present case, local villagers, cadres, couriers, militias and red heritage institutions do not simply respond to one policy signal; they negotiate multiple and sometimes conflicting priorities embedded in a path-node-base area structure.

The case also demonstrates the importance of temporal layering. What appears to be a contemporary challenge is often the cumulative outcome of earlier decisions, inherited infrastructures and long-term shifts in social organization. Reading transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area historically therefore improves interpretation. It prevents scholars from reducing present conditions to immediate market pressure or current policy design alone. Instead, it encourages an explanation in which historical trajectories, material legacies and institutional sequencing remain visible. This temporal sensitivity is especially useful when the available evidence includes historical geography, revolutionary history and route-based interpretation, because such materials reveal process and staging rather than only end-state outcomes.

Another implication concerns the role of intermediate scales. Research often oscillates between micro-description and broad national narratives, but the most consequential mechanisms may lie in

between. For transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area, the intermediate scale helps reveal how decisions are translated, negotiated and unevenly implemented. It is also the scale at which coordination failures become visible: actors may share broad goals while diverging sharply over instruments, timing and acceptable trade-offs. Paying closer attention to the path-node-base area configuration would therefore make explanation more precise and policy recommendations more realistic.

The findings further suggest that social participation is not an optional supplement to expert planning. In many cases, the viability of intervention depends on whether the relevant social actors possess incentives, trust and practical capacity. This is particularly true where military history, everyday social participation and network-based interpretation cannot be resolved through technical optimization alone. The behavior of local villagers, cadres, couriers, militias and red heritage institutions shapes how policies are interpreted on the ground, which opportunities are taken up and which forms of resistance emerge. A stronger account of participation therefore deepens both analytical explanation and institutional design.

Methodologically, the study also benefits from combining conceptual interpretation with grounded regional evidence. A purely theoretical discussion would miss the specificity of local conditions, while a purely descriptive account would struggle to explain broader relevance. By bringing together historical geography, revolutionary history and route-based interpretation, the present analysis is able to speak to general debates without abandoning place-based complexity. This balance is important for area-focused scholarship that seeks wider academic significance while remaining attentive to historically and geographically specific processes.

From a policy perspective, the case argues against uniform solutions. Spatially differentiated systems require differentiated interventions, even when the overall objective is shared. What matters is not only what should be protected, activated or coordinated, but where, by whom and through which institutional sequence. In practice, this means that the next stage of work on transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area should emphasize network mapping, oral history recovery and corridor-style red heritage presentation. Such priorities are more likely to generate durable outcomes than one-size-fits-all programs that ignore local capacity and spatial heterogeneity.

The discussion also invites comparison with other regions and cases. Comparative work would help clarify which observed patterns are specific to local history and which reflect more general mechanisms. This is especially relevant where military history, everyday social participation and network-based interpretation appears in varied forms across different territories. Comparison could reveal whether similar tensions are resolved through different institutional arrangements, or whether certain configurations repeatedly produce parallel outcomes. For that reason, the present case should be seen not only as a stand-alone study but also as a platform for broader comparative inquiry.

Finally, future research could extend the present argument by integrating richer forms of evidence and more explicit cross-scalar analysis. New datasets, archival materials, field observation and actor-centered interviews would all help test the robustness of the claims made here. Yet the basic conclusion would likely remain: transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area is best understood as a relational process shaped by uneven space, layered history and mediated coordination. That conclusion provides a coherent basis for future work on network mapping, oral history recovery and corridor-style red heritage presentation and for more historically grounded forms of public interpretation or policy design.

A practical implication of this analysis is that monitoring frameworks should be redesigned around process rather than only outcome. In work on transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area, the temptation is often to evaluate success through a narrow indicator that is easy to report. Yet many of the most consequential dynamics unfold through adjustment, negotiation and uneven implementation. A more process-oriented framework would ask how local villagers, cadres, couriers, militias and red heritage institutions respond over time, where bottlenecks emerge, and which forms of coordination prove durable. Such an approach would not abandon measurable outcomes; rather, it would situate them within the institutional and spatial trajectories that actually produce them.

There is also a strong argument for integrating qualitative interpretation more explicitly with structural analysis. Large patterns matter, but they do not explain themselves. Meanings, expectations

and local understandings shape how strategies are translated into action. In contexts marked by military history, everyday social participation and network-based interpretation, the categories used by planners, scholars and residents may not fully align. Paying attention to these interpretive differences would help explain why formally similar interventions can generate divergent results. It would also encourage more reflexive scholarship, especially when research seeks to inform policy or public understanding.

A related question concerns institutional memory. Places and systems develop routines, habits of coordination and established narratives that can either support or obstruct reform. For transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area, these inherited patterns influence what types of change appear feasible, legitimate or desirable to different participants. Examining institutional memory would therefore deepen the analysis of continuity and change. It would also provide a more realistic basis for recommending future interventions, because policies that ignore prior organizational experience often fail to gain traction even when they appear technically sound.

The significance of spatial heterogeneity deserves further emphasis. Unevenness is not merely background variation; it actively shapes causal relationships. The same intervention may generate productive adaptation in one zone and tension or inefficiency in another. This is why a path-node-base area perspective remains indispensable. It allows the analyst to distinguish between generalized trends and place-specific mechanisms. In the present study, such differentiation is essential for moving beyond broad characterization toward more discriminating explanation and more credible policy design.

Another promising direction lies in linking empirical analysis with clearer normative criteria. Debates about transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area are rarely value-neutral, because they involve judgments about what should be protected, prioritized or transformed. Making those normative premises explicit would improve scholarly clarity. It would help readers understand whether arguments are driven mainly by efficiency, equity, heritage value, resilience, participation or some combination of these. In cases shaped by military history, everyday social participation and network-based interpretation, such transparency is especially important because different stakeholders may endorse different principles while using similar language.

The argument advanced here also speaks to methodological pluralism. No single method can capture the full complexity of transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area. Quantitative indicators reveal distribution and scale, archival or documentary materials reveal sequencing and intention, and close observation reveals the everyday practices through which broader patterns are sustained or altered. Combining these approaches is demanding, but it is also one of the clearest ways to bridge regional specificity and broader theoretical relevance. That is particularly true when the available evidence includes historical geography, revolutionary history and route-based interpretation and when the research aims to support both explanation and application.

At the level of governance, coordination should be understood as an active and resource-intensive process rather than a rhetorical aspiration. Calls for coordination are common, but they often obscure the institutional labor needed to align priorities, share information and manage conflict. In the case of transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area, effective coordination would require clearer responsibility, more stable channels of communication and stronger mechanisms for balancing costs and benefits among local villagers, cadres, couriers, militias and red heritage institutions. Without such arrangements, even well-formulated strategies risk remaining fragmented in practice.

In the longer term, scholarship on transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area would benefit from stronger attention to scenario thinking. Present conditions should not be treated as fixed baselines. Economic restructuring, demographic change, technological shifts and environmental pressures may all alter the relevance of current strategies. Building scenarios would not predict the future with certainty, but it would help test the robustness of proposed interventions. This is particularly valuable for work concerned with network mapping, oral history recovery and corridor-style red heritage presentation, where institutional flexibility may be as important as immediate optimization.

One final consideration is the importance of communicative clarity. Research on transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area often crosses disciplinary boundaries, which means that

key concepts may carry different meanings for historians, planners, geographers and policy practitioners. Clarifying concepts is not a stylistic luxury; it is part of analytical rigor. When conceptual language remains vague, comparison becomes difficult and practical recommendations are easily overstated. Greater terminological precision would therefore improve both scholarly debate and the translational value of this kind of research.

It is equally useful to think about institutional durability. Some interventions achieve rapid visibility but fade because they are not supported by stable organizational routines or financial commitment. In work on transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area, durability should be treated as a criterion of success in its own right. That criterion draws attention to maintenance, training, inter-organizational trust and long-term incentives, all of which are easily overshadowed by short-term achievement metrics. A more durability-oriented perspective would make proposed strategies more credible.

The case also suggests that uncertainty should be incorporated more explicitly into analysis. Scholars often prefer clean explanatory narratives, yet real territorial and institutional systems are shaped by incomplete information, delayed feedback and unanticipated interactions. Recognizing uncertainty does not weaken the argument. On the contrary, it makes the analysis more realistic and helps identify which conclusions are robust across changing conditions and which remain contingent. That distinction is especially important for policy-oriented research.

Finally, the broader academic value of the study lies in its capacity to connect a grounded case to larger debates without collapsing local specificity. If treated carefully, transportation routes in the Taihang revolutionary base area can inform not only area studies but also wider methodological and theoretical conversations about region, mobility, governance and social meaning. The point is not to universalize one case too quickly, but to show how carefully interpreted regional evidence can refine more general arguments.

A final research direction would be to reconstruct route networks in greater cartographic detail and to relate them more carefully to oral testimony, local memory and wartime administrative change. Such work would not only enrich historical geography; it would also provide stronger foundations for public interpretation. By showing how paths, relay points and settlements worked together, route reconstruction can make the operational geography of the base area more visible and analytically persuasive.

8. Conclusion

The transportation routes of the Taihang revolutionary base area formed a layered and adaptive network that underpinned wartime logistics, communication, governance and social mobilization. Their spatial layout was shaped by the interaction of mountainous terrain, enemy pressure, local support and organizational strategy. Understanding these routes as a network rather than as isolated roads deepens both historical analysis and contemporary red heritage interpretation. It reveals that revolutionary space was produced not only through political decisions and military action, but through the repeated labor of connection.

References

1. Meng, L., Jia, Z., Hu, X., Zhang, B., & Cao, L. (2026a). Constructing heritage narrative corridors of the Great Tea Road in Central Shanxi based on a dual-value-multilayer network framework. *npj Heritage Science*, 14, 420. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s40494-026-02646-w>
2. Mitter, R. (2013). *Forgotten Ally: China's World War II, 1937-1945*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
3. Meng, L., Du, Z., Jia, Z., & Cao, L. (2025). Spatial mechanisms and coupling coordination of cultural heritage and tourism along the Jinzhong segment of the Great Tea Road. *Heritage*, 9(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage9010007>
4. Chen, Y.-fa. (1986). *Making Revolution: The Communist Movement in Eastern and Central China, 1937-1945*. University of California Press.
5. Selden, M. (1971). *The Yen'an Way in Revolutionary China*. Harvard University Press.
6. Meng, L., Zhang, B., & Cao, L. (2026b). Establishing linear cultural heritage corridors by integrating cultural and ecological values: A case study of the Jinzhong section of the Great Tea Road. *Land*, 15(2), 293. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land15020293>
7. Party History Research Office of the CPC Central Committee. (2011). *History of the Communist Party of China, Vol. 1*. CPC History Press.
8. Van Slyke, L. P. (1967). *Enemies and Friends: The United Front in Chinese Communist History*. Stanford University Press.
9. Shanxi Institute of Historical Records. (2015). *History of the Taihang Revolutionary Base Area*. Shanxi People's Publishing House.
10. Esherick, J. W. (1995). Ten theses on the Chinese revolution. *Modern China*, 21(1), 45-76.
11. Bianco, L. (1971). *Origins of the Chinese Revolution, 1915-1949*. Stanford University Press.