

# THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA WHO SHOULD OWN THE LAND?

A Unit of Study for Grades 8-10

**SUSAN MEISLER**  
**DAVID WAKEFIELD**



**NATIONAL CENTER FOR HISTORY IN THE SCHOOLS**  
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES**

# THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA WHO SHOULD OWN THE LAND?

A Unit of Study for Grades 8-10

**SUSAN MEISLER**  
**DAVID WAKEFIELD**

**NATIONAL CENTER FOR HISTORY IN THE SCHOOLS**  
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Introduction

Approach and Rationale . . . . .	1
Content and Organization . . . . .	1

## Teacher Background Materials

Unit Overview . . . . .	3
Unit Context . . . . .	4
Correlation to the National Standards for World History . . . . .	4
Unit Objectives . . . . .	5
Lesson Plans . . . . .	5
Introduction to <i>The People's Republic of China: Who Should Own the Land?</i> . . . . .	6
A Note on Pronunciation . . . . .	9
Maps . . . . .	11

<b>Dramatic Moment . . . . .</b>	<b>13</b>
----------------------------------	-----------

## Lessons

Lesson One: Whoever Owns the Land, Eats . . . . .	14
Lesson Two: Eating Bitterness, Speaking Bitterness: Gaining Peasant Support for the Communist Revolution Through Land Reform . . . . .	25
Lesson Three: The People's Communes: Two Points of View . . . . .	40
Lesson Four: The Family Responsibility System: The Return of Individual Household Management . . . . .	57

<b>Bibliography . . . . .</b>	<b>72</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

---

## LESSON ONE

### WHOEVER OWNS THE LAND, EATS

#### A. OBJECTIVES

1. The student will be able to describe the plight of the poor peasants prior to 1949.
2. The student will be able to distinguish between the different rural classes.
3. The student will use both primary sources and literature to understand the lives of the peasants.
4. The student will experience the logic of “whoever owns the land, eats.”
5. The student will examine the problem of rural poverty and suggest a more equitable system of land ownership.

#### B. LESSON ACTIVITIES

1. As the students walk into the classroom, hand each of them a color-coded slip of paper which will designate them as belonging to one of five classes: landlords, rich peasants, middle peasants, poor peasants, and landless agricultural laborers. (No further explanations are necessary at this point.)
2. Using the definitions below taken from the Agrarian Reform Law of the People’s Republic of China, define for the students the categories of peasants and landlords. Explain that the criterion used in this categorization was not wealth or landownership per se, but exploitation—that is, who exploits the labor power of others. Explain which color denotes which class:
  - a. *Landlord*: A person who owns land, but does not engage in labor, and who depends on the exploitation of others for his means of livelihood. Exploitation includes renting land, lending money, and hiring labor.

- b. *Rich peasant*: A person who generally owns all of his land, or owns part of his land and rents the rest from others. A rich peasant may exploit other peasants by hiring wage laborers, renting out land or lending money. Unlike a landlord, however, a rich peasant works some of the land himself.
  - c. *Middle peasant*: A person who owns some land which he cultivates while the rest is rented, depends mainly on his own labor for a living, and does not exploit others. A middle peasant may be exploited by having to pay land rent or loan interest.
  - d. *Poor peasant*: A person who may own part of his land, but often owns none at all, and must rent land to cultivate. A poor peasant is exploited in terms of land rent, loan interest or having to sell his labor to landlords and rich peasants for periods of time.
  - e. *Landless agricultural laborers*: A person who owns no land and who must sell her or his labor to others.
3. Share **Document A**, *The Ownership of Land* with students. Locate Zhejiang province and then explain that you will use it as the basis for dividing up landownership among the different classes.
- a. If there are 30 students in a class, 23 (77%) would be designated poor peasants, or landless hired laborers. Assuming that the desks represent land, they will “occupy” only 6 desks (20% of the land.)
  - b. Five students (17%) would be designated as middle peasants, so they would occupy 6 desks (19% of the land.)
  - c. One student (3%) will be a rich peasant and (s)he will occupy 2 desks (8% of the land).
  - d. The one remaining student (3%) will be the landlord and will occupy 16 desks (53% of the land.)

Since land is the basis of food production, whoever owns the most land is going to be the best fed. Divide the food (candy) according to the number of desks to illustrate the point.

4. To further dramatize the consequences of this inequity, read to students from **Document B**, a selection from William Hinton's *Fanshen*. Show students Shanxi (Shansi) on the map, where Long Bow Village is.
5. In class, allow the students to discuss in their groups what changes, if any, should be made in the land ownership situation.
6. Discuss the following issues:
  - a. Contrast the lives of landlords and rich peasants with that of poor and middle peasants.
  - b. How does the selection about "crop watching" demonstrate the importance of the harvest?
  - c. In what ways were poor peasants exploited by the rich peasants and landlords?
7. Either in class or as homework, ask each student to list up to five changes that should be made given his/her class perspective. At the beginning of the next class, have the students assemble in random groups and try to come up with a unified solution to the problem of unequal land ownership. This should prove difficult!

**C. EXTENDED ACTIVITIES**

1. Use the selection from General Zhu De, "Exploitation of the Peasants" (**Document C**), as the basis for a diary entry that might have been written by a poor peasant.
2. Use the chart in **Document A** to draw three circle graphs showing land distribution in Shanxi (Shansi), Guangdong (Kwangtung), and Kiangsi (Jiangxi) provinces. Locate the three provinces on the map.

**D. VOCABULARY**

exploitation  
peasant  
landlord  
gentry  
cultivation

millet  
maize  
*Fanshen*  
subsistence

**E. EVALUATING THE LESSON**

1. Informal evaluation through class discussion.
2. Students will write a short paragraph (quickwrite) explaining and describing the condition of the peasant.
3. Use any of the “Extended Activities” listed above.

## THE OWNERSHIP OF LAND

(Primary Source)

These figures are from a report in the 1930s<sup>1</sup>

Province	Landlords		Rich Peasants		Middle Peasants		Poor Peasants	
	<u>% families</u>	<u>% land</u>						
<b>Chekiang</b>	3	53	3	8	17	19	77	20
<b>Shansi</b>	.03	25	2	5	68	61	30	9
<b>Kwangtung</b>	2	53	4	13	12	15	74	19
<b>Kiangsi</b>	6	47	6	18	20	21	68	15

Generally speaking, for the whole of China, landlords and rich peasants, forming about 10% of the population, occupied 55% to 65% of the land. If you do not wish to accept these figures, there are those made some years ago by the National Land Commission of the Chiang Government. This commission, investigating conditions in eleven provinces, found that 1500 big landlord families owned on an average over 333 acres per family . . . the average ownership of over 700,000 peasant families in the same districts showed the average to be 2.6 acres.

<sup>1</sup>C. Brown and T. Edwards, *Revolution in China 1911-1949* (London: Heineman Educational Books, 1983)

**A DOCUMENTARY OF REVOLUTION  
IN A CHINESE VILLAGE**  
(Primary Source)

Based on the author's personal observations, the description of Long Bow Village in Northern China depicts the impoverished state of Chinese peasants in 1948.

Counting noses among the 200-odd families one could ordinarily tally up about a thousand persons altogether. This meant that on the average there was one acre of land for every man, woman, and child.<sup>2</sup> The crops from this one acre, in a good year, were ample for the support of a single person, considering the very low standard of living that prevailed. But the poor who rented land or worked out as hired laborers got less than half the crops they tilled, while the rich got the surplus from many acres.

... The fields were divided into countless narrow strips and plots, each one owned by a different family. Land was so valuable that the peasants found it necessary to build stone walls as high as 15 feet to hold back a few feet of earth and make it level.

Although no level ground roads and paths led out through the fields, no hill fields could be reached with a cart, and farm implements had to be light enough for one man to carry. The plows, harrows, seeders, and other equipment used were all light enough to be picked up with one hand and were made entirely of wood except for the point of the plow itself. All of these implements, although in use for centuries, were still only supplementary to the main tool, the hoe, handed down almost unchanged since prehistoric times. The hoe used in Long Bow was a great iron blade weighing several pounds and fastened to the end of a stick as large as a man's wrist. This tool, which was designed to turn soil and sod, was also used for the delicate work of thinning millet and weeding corn.

The crops grew only on what was put into the soil each year; hence manure was the foundation of the whole economy. The chief source of supply was the family privy, and this became, in a sense, the center of the household.

---

<sup>2</sup>The acres mentioned here and throughout the text of the unit are English acres, each being equivalent to six Chinese *mu*.

Long Bow privies were built in the form of a deep cistern, topped with timber, or stone, and provided with a single narrow slot at ground level for both deposition and extraction. Here night soil in liquid form accumulated all winter. Legendary in the region were the landlords so stingy that they would not allow their hired men to defecate in the fields but made them walk all the way back to the ancestral home to deposit their precious burden. Other landlords would not hire local people on a long-term basis because local people were wont to use their own privies while a man from outside used that of his employer.

Animal manure, together with any straw, stalks, or other waste matter, was composted in the yard. So highly was it valued that old people and children constantly combed the roads and cart tracks for droppings which they scooped up and carried home in baskets. This need to conserve every kind of waste and return it to the land was responsible for the tidy appearance of the streets and courtyards even though the walls were crumbling and the roofs falling in. Nothing, absolutely nothing, was left lying around. Even the dust of the street was swept up and thrown on the compost heap or into the privy, for village dust was more fertile, by far, than the soil in the fields.

The clothes that people wore and the food that they ate were all products of the village land. Even the gentry, who possessed for festive occasions silks and satins imported from the South, donned for everyday wear the same homespun cottons that served to clothe their servants and their tenants. Though styles did evolve over the centuries, the basic workday clothing changed little. In summer everyone wore thin jackets and pants of natural cotton bleached white or dyed blue or black with indigo. Long Bow women liked to wear white jackets and black pants, but this was by no means universal . . .

In cold weather everyone wore clothes padded with cotton. These made people look twice as big as they really were and provided warmth in two ways, first by the insulation of the thick layer of cotton and second by the lice which made themselves at home in the seams. Since the padded clothes could not be washed without taking the lining out — a major operation — it was almost impossible to get rid of lice from day to day. Their constant biting and the interminable scratching that accompanied it generated a fair amount of heat. On any warm day in winter a large number of people could always be found sitting in various sunlit corners with their padded jackets

across their knees. There they hunted the lice, picked them out, and crushed them expertly between their thumbnails.

Children under five were exposed from below in all weather because their padded clothes were not sewn together at the crotch. The slit, which ran upward from just above the knees to a point a little below the tip of the backbone, was very convenient when nature called but was drafty in winter. It must be said, however, that the children didn't seem to mind at all and ran about in the bitterest weather just as if they were all sewn in like their elders.

... Shoes were also made of cotton cloth but, because the soles consisted of many layers sewn through and through with hemp thread, they were as tough as any leather and lasted from four to six months even with hard wear on the mountain roads. Only the women had no need for such heavy shoes. Their feet were bound, the toes bent under, and the bones stunted so that they formed a crushed stump not more than two or three inches in length. Women walked as if on stilts. They could not run at all. Yet widowed women among the poor often had to work in the fields from dawn until dark. Foot binding came to an end almost everywhere in the period between the two world wars but even in 1945 young girls with crippled feet could still be found in the mountain counties of Shansi.

The food eaten in Long Bow was very simple. Since maize was the major crop everyone ate corn dumplings, called keta, in the morning, and corn meal mush, or noodles made of corn at noon. At night they ate millet porridge with a few noodles in it. After the wheat harvest in July everyone ate noodles for several days, but this was considered quite a luxury and only the most fortunate carried the custom on into August. These same families were the only ones who ate three meals a day throughout the year. Most people cut down to two meals, or even one when winter set in. Thus undernourished they moved about as little as possible and tried to conserve their strength until spring.

In addition to the cereal grains people ate salt turnip all year round, cabbage when they had it, and other vegetables such as eggplant, scallions, chives, and wild herbs in season. But these were simply garnishment to the main dish which was always corn, millet, or wheat. The big problem facing

the peasants over the years was not to obtain some variety in their diet, but to find anything to eat at all. They often had to piece out their meager harvest of grain with bran, chaff, wild herbs from the hills or even the leaves from the trees or tree bark as the ch'un huang (spring hunger) set in. Each day that one survived was a day to be thankful for and so, throughout the region, in fat years and in lean, the common greeting came to be not "Hello" or "How are you?" but a simple, heartfelt "Have you eaten?"

The following are only a few incidents culled at random from the life stories of peasants with whom Hinton talked.

- There were three famine years in a row. The whole family went out to beg things to eat. In Chinchang City conditions were very bad. Many mothers threw newborn children into the river. Many children wandered about on the streets and couldn't find their parents. We had to sell our oldest daughter. She was then already 14. Better to move than to die, we thought. We sold what few things we had. We took our patched quilt on a carrying pole and set out for Changchih with the little boy in the basket at the other end. He cried all the way from hunger. We rested before a gate. Because he wept so bitterly a woman came out. We stayed there three days. On the fourth morning the woman said she wanted to buy the boy. We put him on the k'ang. He fell asleep. In the next room we were paid five silver dollars. Then they drove us out. They were afraid when the boy woke up he would cry for his mother. My heart was so bitter. To sell one's own child was such a painful thing. We wept all day on the road.
- I almost starved to death. One day I lay on the street. A cart came along. The driver yelled at me to move. I was too weak. I didn't care if he drove over me or not. He finally had to drive around me.
- During the famine we ate leaves and the remnants from vinegar making. We were so weak and hungry we couldn't walk. I went out to the hills to get leaves and there the people were fighting each other over the leaves on the trees. My little sister starved to death. My brother's wife couldn't bear the hunger and ran away and never came back. My cousin was forced to become a landlord's concubine.

- I and the children worked for others thinning millet. We got only half a quart of grain. For each meal we cooked only a fistful with some weeds in it. The children's stomachs were swollen and every bone in their bodies stuck through their skin. After a while the little boy couldn't get up. He just lay on the k'ang sick with dysentery and many, many worms, a whole basin full of worms crawled out from his behind. Even after he was dead the worms kept coming out. The little girl had no milk from me, for I had nothing to eat myself, so, of course, she died.

People could not speak of the past without weeping. Nor could one listen to their stories dry-eyed. Yet, as the details piled up, horror on horror, one's senses became dulled. The barbarity, the cruelty, the horror of the old life was so overwhelming that in time it ceased to shock. One began to take for granted that worms crawled from dying children, that women and children were bought and sold like cattle, that people were beaten to death, that they fought each other for the leaves on the trees. The impossible took on the aura of the commonplace.

The most terrible thing about the conditions of life in Long Bow in those days was not any single aspect of the all but universal misery; it was that there was no hope of change. The fearful tragedy played and replayed itself without end.

William Hinton, *Fanshen: A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966) by permission of Monthly Review Foundation

## EXPLOITATION OF THE PEASANTS (Primary Source)

The first excerpt comes from the recollections of General Zhu De; the others are accounts given thirty years later to a Swedish writer in a village in Shaanxi Province.

Most of Kiangsi is mountainous, and the crops are poor. The landlords took as much as 70% of the crop as rent, and most peasants had to borrow from them at high rates of interest each year, so that they and their sons and their sons' sons were bound by debt in perpetual servitude to the landlords. The peasants were so poor that they sopped up every drop of fat in cooking pans and could afford to buy only a handful of salt at a time. They would dissolve a pinch of salt in a bowl of water and dip their bits of vegetable in it when they ate. They were gaunt, half-naked, and illiterate, and lived in dark, insanitary hovels in villages surrounded by high mud walls which had only one gate.

. . . we did not have our own land. We rented it. For three generations, we rented the same land. . . . People hated the landlords, but there was no way of getting round them. "As long as we have our daily food", people said, "we must do as our masters say. They own the land and the oxen." Wang (the landlord) was called "Wang the Bloodsucker." Everybody owed him money. As long as you owed him money, you could not get permission to leave the village in order to look for another landlord who perhaps gave better terms. . . . The landlords ate up people's work.

What happened was that every year we had run out of corn and had to borrow from the landlord, paying the loan back after harvest. The interest varied a bit from year to year, depending on what sort of harvest it had been. The lowest interest was when we borrowed 300 jin and repaid 390, and the highest was when we borrowed 300 and paid back 450. The worse things were for us, and the worse the crop, the higher the interest we had to pay. In that way, the landlord always gained. . . He always won. When we had paid our rental, our debt and the interest on it, there was not a great deal left.

C. Brown and T. Edwards *Revolution in China 1911-1949* (London: Heineman Educational Books, 1983). Reprinted with the kind permission of Heinemann Publishers.