

LANDLORD AND PEASANT  
IN CHINA

A STUDY OF THE AGRARIAN CRISIS IN  
SOUTH CHINA

*By*

CHEN HAN-SENG

*Member of Research Committee,  
China Institute of Pacific Relations*

*With a Preface by*

FREDERICK V. FIELD

*Secretary, American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations*

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS  
NEW YORK

1936

X9(J):Z41  
G6  
12096

2096

Rev. ₹2.00

Dhananjayaram Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-012096

LANDLORD AND PEASANT  
IN CHINA

A STUDY OF THE AGRARIAN CRISIS IN  
SOUTH CHINA

*By*

CHEN HAN-SENG

*Member of Research Committee,  
China Institute of Pacific Relations*

*With a Preface by*

FREDERICK V. FIELD

*Secretary, American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations*

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS  
NEW YORK

1936

*First Published in 1936*

X9(J):(Z41)

G6

12096

*All Rights Reserved*

*Printed in China by Kelly & Walsh, Ltd., Shanghai*

## PREFACE

**I**T IS AN unfortunate truism of our times that we do not act quickly upon the facts and information brought forward by social scientists. We have at hand far more knowledge than we make use of. Faced with acute social situations we are all too likely to succumb to wishful thinking, to fasten on those parts of the picture with which we are in sympathy to the exclusion of the other parts and of the whole, to keep our noses so close to the scene that we cannot view it in historical perspective. Perhaps large sections of society are frightened by what there is to be seen and in consequence consciously or unconsciously turn their eyes away to the dream world of an acquisitive society.

Perhaps nowhere is this more true than in the realm of international affairs. There the game of sophistry has been an easy one for commercial opportunists to play. For it is only recently—in this country a matter of less than two decades—that significant portions of the public have become aware of some of the factors involved, and even today the system of democratic government has not extended directly to foreign relations except through the Senatorial power of veto. And within this ill-lighted realm, China has remained more than usually obscure. Felt for emotionally at the level of sentiment, regarded reverently for the age of its civilization, considered a thing of mystery beyond practical Occidental understanding, sought after with lust by profit seekers, China is scarcely *understood* by Americans.

## LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

This is not because the means for understanding it—at least in large part—are not at hand. It is because we have not made use of the knowledge and data at our disposal. It is because facts which speak for themselves are not heard. Dr. Chen Han-seng's study which follows is a case in point which I hope may prove the contrary. Here is a work of extraordinary importance and time-liness. It deals with the key to the socio-economic complex of China, the land problem; that is, the use to which the land is put, the ownership of it, tenancy, rent and other forms of taxation, and the effects of these phenomena on the people who live on the land. It deals with a question around which Chinese history—and indeed world history—is revolving. Dr. Chen presents facts which we accept as accurate either because of his own very high standing as a scholar or by comparison with other rural surveys which have been made in China. He draws certain inferences from these facts, some direct, some more remote. These inferences, being interpretations, cannot be verified with the same objectivity as can the facts on which they are based. But they can, nevertheless, be checked against the other things we know about China, about social and economic and political evolution, and about the forces and counter-forces which are involved in the Chinese equation. Dr. Chen's book, *if made use of*, will greatly advance our understanding of China and of the American relation to the Far Eastern situation.

Some of us will agree the whole way with Dr. Chen's interpretation and prognostication. Others of us will stop somewhere between the facts and what the author believes to be their ultimate meaning. What he has to say will not be easy for some to stomach, nonetheless it may be true. Conversely, others will be greatly pleased at the course of events he foresees, and to these I may suggest a particularly careful check on wishful thinking. But regardless of our presuppositions or inclinations, unless we can put this sort of study to social use, unless we can apply its conclusions, or else refute them in an equally scientific way, we are denying the whole intellectual basis of social action.

FREDERICK V. FIELD.

*New York, May 30th, 1936.*



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE .. .. .	iii
INTRODUCTION .. .. .	vii
CHAPTER I. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND OWNERSHIP AND USE .. .. .	1
CHAPTER II. THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL POSI- TION OF THE COLLECTIVE LAND- LORDS .. .. .	24
CHAPTER III. THE SYSTEM OF TENANCY .. .. .	42
CHAPTER IV. THE RENT AND PRICE OF LAND .. .. .	54
CHAPTER V. TAXES, TOLLS, AND TORTS .. .. .	73
CHAPTER VI. TRADE AND CREDIT .. .. .	84
CHAPTER VII. THE DECLINE OF WAGES AND THE LOSS OF LABOUR POWER .. .. .	97
APPENDIX. TABLES .. .. .	115
INDEX .. .. .	141

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to the Sun Yat-sen Institute and to Lingnan University, Canton for financial aid—the first in connection with the field investigation for this study, and the other in connection with the publication of this record of the findings. He also desires to acknowledge with gratitude the editorial and other assistance rendered by Mr. Bruno Lasker and Mr. W. L. Holland of the international research staff of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The help of these institutions and individuals does not imply, however, that any of them assume responsibility for statements of fact or opinion contained in this report.

CHEN HAN-SENG.

## INTRODUCTION

**T**HIS study concerns itself with Kwangtung Province, not only because of the intrinsic local importance of agrarian distress in that region but because this region shows most clearly the effects of imperialist economic penetration on rural life and the growth of class antagonisms in China itself. The province has some thirty-two million of population, the density being about twice that of France. It is one of the richest provinces, with fruits of various kinds, sugar cane, camphor, rubber, and other tropical products in addition to the principal cereal cup-rice. Vegetation grows more luxuriantly here than in any other part of China; the land is so intensively cropped that, except on the upland areas, rice is harvested two or three times a year; here the mulberry leaves are gathered seven or eight times during the year. Kwangtung has one of the best highway systems in China. In less than a year, with the Hankow-Canton Railway completed, its trade area will extend—so far as physical equipment is concerned—not only to the Yangtze Valley but also to the Tibetan Plateau.

In spite of this comparative wealth for reasons which this study will attempt to clarify, labour power is being lost at an alarming rate. Labour in South China is sometime jokingly spoken of as the principal "export commodity", since the remittance of part of the wages of emigrant workers from abroad constitutes one of the main money incomes of this part of China. Back in the

## LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

obscurity of more than a thousand years ago, Kwangtung was not only the first part of the country to carry on an overseas trade—first with the Arabs, then with the Portuguese, and finally with the British and other Western people—but millions of Kwangtung peasants have emigrated abroad. Most of the merchants, tin miners, and labourers on tobacco, sugar, and rubber plantations in British Malaya and Netherlands Indies, and most of the Chinese merchants, Chinese coolies, Chinese cooks, and Chinese laundry men in Australia and the Americas have come from this southernmost part of China. The rural situation here has been constantly compelling them to leave their homeland. But in recent times the discouragement of labour on the land of their fathers has become for these peasant people something more than an occasion for temporary labour overseas. It has taken on dimensions under which the land itself is in danger of losing its wealth-producing qualities, because its productivity can no longer be maintained. Not only will immigration restrictions, already severe in most of the countries to which Chinese have gone in the past, cut off what is left of this old safety valve for the constant population pressure of this region, but the pressure itself will increase as the ancient heritage, the land itself, deteriorates, and the privilege to cultivate it, to live with and on and from it, dwindles away. In the future, unless the agrarian problem is reasonably well solved, a new phase for both population movement and foreign trade must undoubtedly merge, with ominous consequences not only for China but also for the world at large.

Had there been an industrial development in China with its tempo and extent such as occurred in the United States of America before 1930, or such as was witnessed in the Soviet Union after that year, these rural proletariats and semi-proletariats in Kwangtung would not have gone to those distant European colonies to give up their bodies. The truth of the matter is that this artificial overpopulation has been inevitably created by a land monopoly without sufficient industrialization. In Kwangtung one-third of the peasant families possess less than five mow each, nearly half of the peasant families are entirely landless, and more than 60% of all the land cultivated is rented from landlords. The system of community land, especially the clan land in southernmost China, only aggravates the monopolistic situation. About 80% of the

## INTRODUCTION

Kwangtung peasants live together by their clans, because of their original tie to the clan land. Even today, of the total of 42,000,000 Mow of cultivated land in the province, 35% is the area of clan land and other kinds of public land. The annual rent of clan land in Kwangtung amounts to 126,000,000 Yuan; such a huge income from rent plus its annual interest, often doubles the combined income of both provincial and national revenues of Kwangtung. Such a powerful influence exerted by collective landlordism is not to be found in the history of landlordism in any European country.

Under such a monopolistic system of agricultural land, we must think of tax and rent as fundamentally of the same character; most of the taxes are being directly and indirectly extorted from the farm land and assessed according to its size. The land tax in Kwangtung has been greatly increased by two new policies. The first is the recent extensive building of public roads, with the pretext of improving rural communications but primarily for facilitating military movements. The second is the reorganization of village administration under the beautiful name of rural self-government; however, it is chiefly for furthering the purpose of taxation. Within the past five years the total tax burden has trebled, and this burden is being largely shifted upon the shoulders of peasants who have to pay rent. The rent, which is usually paid in grain, amounts to 50-57% of the entire harvest. No one can mistake this for a capitalistic rent. Such a high rent, together with all its consequent burdens, crushes the peasant and sends him to the usurer. In any one district of the province, 60-90% of all the peasant families are in debt. Many peasants have to seek a loan in grain; others have to pawn their clothes, furniture, and even hoes, rakes, harrows, ploughs, etc. The usual interest charged on a loan in grain is 30% for six months; the monthly interest of the pawn shop is 2 to 3%; sometimes as high as 6%. No one can think of such high rates of interest as being capitalistic, or possible in any capitalistic country. The bankrupted peasants rapidly give up their land through the process of mortgage; as landless peasants not taken in or "absorbed" by industry are ever on the increase, wages in general are falling down, and rents in all forms are rising. Thus, bankruptcy repeats itself and accelerates the process, till the speed of rural proletarianization, or in China

## LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

to be more exact, the speed of pauperization, far exceeds that of peasant exodus and possible industrialization. The present system of land monopoly in China can only bestow perpetual ownership to a selected few, and simultaneously force perpetual indebtedness upon an ever growing mass.

As it is clear, in this land monopoly it is rent and not capital that sways the entire economy. The non-capitalistic relations prevailing in China are further reflected and registered in the extreme smallness of the farm unit. This inadequate size of cultivation physically excludes the possibilities of rural credit and hinders the free play of capital itself. Of course the mere size of a farm cannot tell whether agriculture is capitalistic or pre-capitalistic. The criterion should rather be the content and condition of production, such as the nature of the crop, implements, fertilizers, intensity of labour power, etc. Thus in the United States the farm unit in the north is smaller than in the south, but capitalistic agriculture is certainly more developed in the north. Though since the Civil War the size of the farm in the south has been considerably reduced, southern agriculture has become more capitalistic. For here, after the reduction of the cultivated area, there comes a higher percentage of labour power in the total cost of production. But the situation in China is entirely different. Though the remnant of primitive commune farming is fast disappearing, though the patriarchal self-subsistence farming in many interior regions is also crumbling down, individual rural entrepreneurs pursuing a capitalistic farming are very rare; the dominating form of Chinese agriculture is still that of farming for simple commercial production. Owing to the exorbitant charge of rent, the poor and middle peasants cannot secure adequate land to employ all their available labour power, and to make full use of even their antiquated implements. In Kwangtung even the rich peasants cultivate only 25 Mow per family or less than 4 Mow per working person. The average cultivation per family among the middle peasants is 12 Mow, and among the poor peasants less than 6 Mow. Taking the peasantry as a whole, only 1% cultivates more than 50 Mow per family, 29% from 5 to 10 Mow, and no less than 43% cultivates not more than 5 Mow. A vast majority of the peasantry, all of the poor peasants and a good many of the middle peasants, are actually pining away on tiny plots of land.

## INTRODUCTION

On such ridiculously small farms, the producers can only curse the evils of commercial agriculture, but can never attain a real capitalistic development.

When we say that the Chinese agrarian economy is not yet capitalistic, we must not mistake it, however, as being still purely feudalistic. No one can deny the fact that for ages already the mode of classical feudalism in China has been distorted. As early as five centuries before the Christian era, extensive internal trade and various practices of usury fostered the growth of a new economic organism, a commercial agriculture, which witnessed the beginning of an interplay of forces: rent, tax, price and interest. The landlords who live on rent, the bureaucrats and militarists who live on taxes of the most diversified nature, the traders and compradores who live on the manipulation of prices, and the usurers who live on exorbitant interests, have become interlocking, even more so than the directors of modern monopolistic capital. But the money accumulated by these people, just like the money remitted home from the overseas Chinese, has been largely and preferably turned into land purchases. This process of land concentration can only perpetuate a pre-capitalistic system of agrarian economy.

Modern international trade had been carried on in Kwangtung for nearly one hundred years before the Yangtze ports were set up to trade with western capitalistic nations. From the middle of the 18th Century to the middle of the 19th, Canton was practically the only place in China open for foreign commerce; all the imports of opium and cloth and all the exports of tea and silk went through the hands of Hong Merchants. These Hong people in Canton, the forerunners of a like type, the present-day compradores, flourishing in Amoy and Ningpo, in Shanghai and Hankow, and in Tientsin, feverishly piled up their wealth through commissions and squeeze. Perhaps the most illustrious Hong man was Howqua, whose full name was Wo E-woo (1769-1843); in his honour the British firm of Jardine, Matheson and Company has taken its Chinese name E-woo. According to the *Indian Mail* (London, Jan. 6, 1844, p. 264), "he has left about 26,000,000 dollars, the fruit of his own industry, to his two sons, the eldest only sixteen". But this enormous accumulation has dwindled away; much of it has been used for land purchases and for rent collection.

## LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

Foreign commerce has undoubtedly accelerated the accumulation of wealth, which under Chinese conditions, only aggravates land concentration. Of all Chinese provinces Kwangtung has been subjected to the influence of international trade the longest time; it is no wonder that of all the fertile regions of the country, Kwangtung has gone the greatest distance in class differentiation.

It is well known to all students of modern Chinese history that foreign commerce has brought in its train far-reaching influences of the industrial capital. The increasing imports of factory manufactured articles has wrought the decline of handicraft industries all over China. The metal worker, whether iron, copper, tin or silver, the potter and tile-maker, the painter and furniture-maker, the tailor and tanner, the rope-maker and wood-carver, and especially the silk-reeler and cotton-weaver, all have had their future narrowed and eclipsed by the onslaught of modern industrial goods, most of them being foreign. This means an ever decreasing income from household production, or from the auxiliary work of the peasantry. During the World War, hand-weaving witnessed a sudden revival, because the prices of imported textiles had been advanced by war conditions. At that time, there were, for instance, nearly ten thousand peasant women at the hand looms in one single town of Fatshan, in the district of Nan-hai. But now China is receiving all the effects of dumping from capitalistic nations in the midst of their own economic crisis. The prices of imported textiles in Kwangtung have dropped in the last few years by more than half; handweaving therefore can no longer maintain itself. In addition to a drastic wage cut of the Fatshan weavers, about eight thousand women have been thrown out of work. The unemployed in the towns are now being driven back again towards the countryside, from where they have originally come. Certainly, under the present circumstances, modern trade is intensifying the process of rural pauperization on a gigantic scale hitherto unheard of.

Back in the Seventies of the last century, after several Yangtze ports had been opened to foreign commerce, Chinese trade and usury capital no longer limited its sphere of operation to internal markets but began to link itself with foreign commerce and industrial activities. Hence several powerful compradore organizations, such as the China Merchants Steamship Navigation



## INTRODUCTION

Company, have come into existence. In fact about this time, with the advance of foreign influences, a new type of bureaucrat, the compradore type, has sprung up. The first and most famous representative of this type was Li Hung-chang. Unlike his teacher and superior officer, Tseng Kuo-fang, who was still of the old and feudal type, he built up his ascendancy in political and financial matters through the help of compradores and the assistance of foreigners; on more than one occasion he even acted as a compradore himself. He must be accredited also as the first bureaucrat who introduced modern military weapons in suppressing the successive peasant revolts. In this import of foreign arms and ammunitions we may trace perhaps the most dreadful effect brought by industrial capital upon the Chinese rural life. The expeditions which have quelled the Taipings in the Yangtze provinces, the Mohammedans in the upper Yellow River valley, the Boxers in Hopci, Shantung and Honan, and other minor disturbances, testify that the secret of success lies in the ability and opportunity of utilizing destructive instruments furnished by the Western arsenals. When Li Hung-chang was viceroy in Kwangtung, at the time of the Boxers, the Canton government was Hongkong's as well as Macao's best customer for munitions; but he urgently requested the British and Portuguese authorities to refrain from selling the same to "the potential wrong-doers".

On the basis of imported military weapons, a modern army has been gradually built up in China. But due to the remnants of feudalistic relationship, the commanders of new troops simply constitute themselves as a group of militarists who are often simultaneously landlords and compradores. Yuan Shi-kai was the first and most famous representative of the Chinese militarists. After him a host of big and little warlords, countless as the stars, have spread throughout the provinces. A new type of landlord is rising from among these militarists, fattened as they are from tax incomes, loan commissions, and squeezes from soldiers' payments. These new landlords are far more powerful than the landlords who belong to the old gentry, because they can now collect their rents more effectively by direct force. It is said that in Kwangtung, every division general, nearly every brigade general, and even most of the regimental lieutenants, possess large tracts of land in their home or neighboring districts. Whenever and wherever such land

## LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

purchases are being made, and these are always extraordinary large transactions, the land price and consequently also the rent tend to rise generally. Thus a new wave of land concentration is going on. In Meu-ming, for instance, one division general who is still serving in the Kwangtung provincial army, receives from his land possession a total amount of rent every year something like 1,800 piculs of unhusked rice; the entire rent yielded by all the private land of this district aggregates not more than 682,000 piculs. Many people know that a military chief in Kwangtung owns real estate property in Hongkong to the value of 20,000,000 Yuan; but few have learned the fact that this same son of Mars also enjoys an immense domain of agricultural land in his home district. This district happens to border French Indo-China, and since his land extends over the national boundary, he is paying land tax to the colonial government of France.

The militarists with their subordinate bureaucrats are constantly demanding more and more taxes and loans, in order to make new purchases of arms and ammunitions, which are absolutely necessary to them for suppressing the peasant revolts and for maintaining themselves in power. As the tax burden and consequently the rent becomes more and more oppressive, as the financial and political measures taken by the militarists and bureaucrats assumes more and devastating proportions, the magnitude of peasant bankruptcy is enlarging constantly. Before the wide-spreading revolts of the bankrupted peasants as well as the middle peasants who do not have enough land to work upon, the ruling class, with whom all those who wish to maintain the *status quo* are in sympathy, can find its last defensive means only in the superior military weapons imported from capitalistic nations. Thus since the middle of last century, revolts—munitions—taxes, or, taxes—munitions—revolts have whirled themselves into a vicious circle. Of course, China is not the only country where life consists of vicious circles and the progress of breaking them. But under the present conditions, China as a whole is not making any progress in this respect. This may be illustrated by the most recent case of Kiangsi, a province immediately north of Kwangtung. Professor C. Dragoni of Rome, accredited on a mission to the Nanking government on the recommendation of the League of Nations in 1933, has made the following observations. In the regions of Kiangsi recovered from

## INTRODUCTION

the Communists, the present authorities "try to re-establish the former owners in possession in every case where it is possible to do so. For this purpose, they admit that ownership can be proved not only in the normal way, *e.g.* by deeds and documents, but also in much more simple and informal ways. This happens not only when boundary lines are preserved, but also when they have been completely destroyed". "What renders matters worse is that the Committees (of Rural Reconstruction) are recruited from the gentry, who naturally will be disposed to act in the interests of their class and not in the interests of the smaller people. The latter will certainly be in a worse plight than they were before the Communist occupation. On the whole, not only will the old system come back, with all its defects, but a worse system will take its place". (Annexes to Report of League's Technical Delegate on his Mission in China, Nanking, April, 1939, p. 220-221).

Chinese militarists and bureaucrats, a great majority being themselves landlords and compradores, can never and will never help to liberate the peasants from their bondage. They only desire to keep up, as far as they possibly can, a status of land monopoly, which is the basis of their exploitation. In the eyes of foreign capitalists, however, they are almost indispensable as they are instrumental in "maintaining peace and order" and in making China "safe for trade". It is plain and inevitable that the imperialists, who urgently seek a profit as immediate as it can be, would not side with the revolting peasants, but would rather render a ready hand to assist the war-lords who are also landlords. Furthermore, since the general crisis of the capitalistic world has revealed its hideous face in China, the process of foreign military and financial invasion is being doubly quickened. Hence Chinese industrial capital is doomed to recede and decline; Chinese agriculture cannot expect a better fate. Even the rich peasants in China who, under American conditions such as found in the era of "Westward Movement", might be expected to develop a sort of capitalistic farming, are now diminishing their area of cultivation as well as their labour power. They cannot afford to run the risks which are almost sure to come from economic and political uncertainties. Also they cannot stand the onslaught of the ever increasing imports of agricultural products. In 1933 China had to receive food from abroad amounting to no

## LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

less than a quarter of her total imports, not counting the huge quantities of smuggled sugar. Many of the Chinese rich peasants rather lease out a part of their land, to insure an easier and safer income from rent. Thus, an atavistic feature has to be reckoned with in the present Chinese agrarian economy. Those who started a few decades or even a few years ago as rural entrepreneurs, have now involuntarily surrendered themselves to a system of feudalistic exploitation.

Almost every one of these economists and historians who have studied the Chinese situation, has discerned therein an abundance of feudalistic remnants; but only a few scholars have not neglected the multiple colonial character in Chinese political economy, which is in fact contributing more than any other factor towards the tenacity, and even intensity, of the existing feudalistic relationship. The problems of China and India to-day are not as analogous to those of England and France before industrialization, as Professor R. H. Tawney has suggested in his *Land and Labour in China*, (London, 1932, pp. 78-79). The Chinese peasants are suffering from feudalism as well as from capitalism, from a crisis of underproduction in China and also from a crisis of overproduction abroad, and moreover, they are suffering as a colonial people under foreign domination. Even though we should take Prof. Tawney's view that the disorders of Chinese agriculture are acute in degree but not unique in kind, e.g. the disintegration of Chinese agrarian economy characteristically resembles the *ancien régime*, let us not forget the history of that great French Revolution which set free the French peasants from their feudalistic bondage. Undoubtedly, those who understand that which Professor Dragoni has correctly observed in the almost up-to-date case of Kiangsi, can no longer entertain any reformist moonshine for China.

In his report, *China and the Depression* (published as a Supplement to *The Economist*, London, May 19, 1934), Sir Arthur Salter, recently economic adviser to the Nanking government, sees China as a country in which the process of being "de-capitalized" is going on most rapidly; he sees China as a colony with an economic status much lower than India. His "modest ambition" is that "peace and order and wise direction" should help China soon to attain an Indian standard. On one hand, he realizes, "the foundation of China's economic life is, and must remain, her agricultural pro-

## INTRODUCTION

duction. Her fundamental problem is to increase the farmers' production, whether by improving the conditions under which they produce food or by supplementary handicraft-work. Real industrial development must be based principally upon the farmers' purchasing power". On the other hand, he also recognizes "the very small margin of production over consumption", which at present is swiftly diminishing because of famine, war and taxation. The truth is that there is hardly any prospect for a land reform; and as we know, the future of Chinese handicraft industries is anything but bright. But Sir Arthur instinctively fears any sort of revolution, especially when it takes place in a colonial country. So, he is quite emphatic in his advice; he asserts that "China should proceed by stages—and not jump her stages". Will the Chinese peasants follow his advice and submit themselves further, or will they fight for their own interests, which after all are the interests of the nation and indeed of the world? The essence of the agrarian problem and of the agrarian crisis in China, is how a national liberation movement can be successfully conducted to abolish the basis of all colonial and feudalistic exploitations. For these exploitations prove to be the fundamental obstacle in developing agriculture in China to a higher level, and to raising the living of 400 million people to a higher standard. It is absolutely necessary to remove this obstacle, thereby liberating the productive forces of the country, and putting an end to the evils of "cheap Oriental labour"—necessary not only in the subjective sense of the word, but also in the objective sense, for the removal is inevitable, and no power on earth can prevent it.

CHEN HAN-SENG.

## APPENDIX

TABLE I  
PEASANT FAMILIES OF 152 VILLAGES IN 38 DISTRICTS OF THE  
PROVINCE OF KWANGTUNG.

District	Number of Villages	Number of Families	Number of Peasant Families			
			Owners (a)	Tenants (b)	Agricultural Labourers (c)	Total
Ying-teh	8	474	142	278	37	457
Hwei-yang	2	185	88	71	3	162
Hsing-ning	1	200	140	60	—	200
Mei-hsien	2	275	183	80	12	275
Chiao-ling	2	265	102	138	25	265
Tien-peh	15	602	137	281	52	470
Sin-i	6	648	126	339	79	544
Meu-ming	43	3,191	884	1,639	242	2,765
Yang-kiang	2	129	70	22	16	108
Yun-fou	2	100	20	80	—	100
Lo-ting	3	2,900	1,070	720	405	2,195
Sin-hsing	1	30	10	20	—	30
Kao-yao	2	1,550	485	545	240	1,270
Teh-king	2	290	120	110	50	280

(a) Peasants most or all of whose holdings are owned by their families.

(b) Peasants who lease all or most of the land they cultivate.

(c) Peasants who depend on wages as the principal source of livelihood.

APPENDIX

District	Number of Villages	Number of Families	Number of Peasant Families			
			Owners (a)	Tenants (b)	Agricultural Labourers (c)	Total
Hoh-shan	1	1,500	100	1,300	—	1,400
Shun-teh	5	3,150	295	1,983	300	2,578
Chung-shan	6	1,875	435	1,009	61	1,505
Tai-shan	12	1,224	224	737	63	1,024
Wu-chwan	2	137	73	20	25	118
Tan-hsien	1	100	100	—	—	100
Kiung-tung	1	50	40	7	3	50
Cheng-mai	1	100	60	6	4	70
Ting-an	1	145	75	30	30	135
Lin-kao	1	380	260	80	40	380
Loh-hwei	1	115	95	12	3	110
Kiung-shan	1	50	49	1	—	50
Hwa-hsien	7	859	113	482	69	664
Kuh-kiang	3	798	161	377	60	598
Wung-yuen	2	870	182	472	116	770
Nan-hsiung	1	42	10	25	7	42
Jen-hwa	2	116	9	101	6	116
Wu-hwa	2	175	42	89	10	141
Ping-yuen	1	550	120	320	10	450

(a) Peasants most or all of whose holdings are owned by their families.

(b) Peasants who lease all or most of the land they cultivate.

(c) Peasants who depend on wages as the principal source of livelihood.

APPENDIX

District	Number of Villages	Number of Families	Number of Peasant Families			
			Owners (a)	Tenants (b)	Agricultural Labourers (c)	Total
Loh-chang	4	427	249	122	17	388
Ju-yuen	1	125	12	102	11	125
Lien-hsien	1	600	420	85	35	540
Kai-ping	1	224	112	80	5	197
Kwang-ning	3	325	27	190	108	325
Total of 38 Districts	152	24,776	6,840	12,013	2,144	20,997
Per Cent of Different Peasant Families			32.6%	57.2%	10.2%	100%

Per Cent of Peasant Families to the Total of Village Families

84.7%

(a) Peasants most or all of whose holdings are owned by their families.

(b) Peasants who lease all or most of the land they cultivate.

(c) Peasants who depend on wages as the principal source of livelihood.

TABLE 2A  
PEASANT FAMILIES IN SIXTY-NINE VILLAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF PAN-YU

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
Nan-pu	150	8	95	2	105
Shen-shan	450	22	406	—	428
Lo-chi	160	—	150	—	150
La-ya-kang	770	—	462	—	462
Yang-mei-kang	72	—	13	—	13



APPENDIX

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
Siang-kang	130	8	96	—	104
Huang-pien	108	21	53	20	94
Yun-pien	93	—	88	—	88
Yuen-tseng	45	15	20	5	40
Hoh-pien	150	10	78	12	100
Peng-pien	200	25	105	50	180
Pei-shan	140	20	58	6	84
Chi-sha	256	14	210	22	246
Tu-hwa	300	30	240	30	300
Lung-tu	300	40	100	140	280
Sia-chu	420	88	235	13	336
Lung-tien	70	5	44	—	49
Cho-kao-hwei	57	10	30	6	46
Sung-pei-kang	26	2	22	—	24
Sung-kang	27	—	27	—	27
Chien-tse	50	30	10	2	42
Kong-tseng	300	200(a)	90	10	300
Kong-pu	100	8	80	6	94
Heng-yuen	200	4	115	1	120
Kiu-tseng	137	25	60	—	85

(a) These families have some orchard lands near their houses, only 3 or 4 of them have rice fields.

## APPENDIX

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
San-meng	350	30	250	20	300
Yo-chi	300	10	50	—	60
Tang-shan	800	144	331	5	480
Ling-pien	350	74	171	—	245
Kang-sin	70	—	53	—	53
Hwa-lung	600	25	295	30	350
Shan-ou	75	—	16	—	16
Tseng-pien	200	8	167	5	180
Mei-shan	88	5	80	—	85
Sha-tien-kang	119	7	105	2	114
Pei-sha-tang	230	3	212	—	215
Ta-pu-ta	70	—	70	—	70
Lo-tseng	160	5	149	—	154
Hsieh-chia-chwan	240	20	200	—	220
Si-yuen-tseng	62	5	45	12	62
Mei-tien	170	16	121	8	145
Wu-lung-kang	280	28	168	84	280
Chang-sha-pu	130	20	100	10	130
Chang-kang	85	2	28	10	40
Tsun-chi-yuen	22	1	18	3	22
Sha-tsun	716	50	333	257	640

## APPENDIX

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
Shi-chi	2,400	300	600	300	1,200
Pang-kiang	1,100	33	363	264	660
Sin-chia	750	10	430	160	600
Lung-hsian	1,500	15	1,308	147	1,470
Kwei-tien	127	96	18	6	120
Ka-tseng	254	45	161	20	226
Kin-pu-tu	60	14	37	3	54
Kiang-pei	105	10	60	10	80
Li-ko	1,400	40	896	184	1,120
Kong-tei	450	60	168	52	280
Siu-kong	200	30	100	20	150
Tang-yai	110	8	75	15	98
Pei-tseng	400	40	320	40	400
Peng-hu	4,065	—	3,590	10	3,600
Yuan-yai	300	30	210	30	270
Pei-tang	140	13	110	7	130
Chi-shan	1,300	100	350	50	500
Mo-chiang	243	80	80	20	180
Tsun-ko	370	—	360	—	360
Kiup-pi	42	—	27	15	42
Song-kang	436	80	260	10	350

APPENDIX

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
Shi-ma	1,121	390	515	70	975
Yu-lung-chwan	270	104	156	—	260
Total of 67 Villages	26,971	2,536	16,043	2,204	20,810
Per Cent of Different Peasant Families		12.0%	77.4%	10.6%	100%
Per Cent of Peasant Families to the Total of Village Families		77.2%			

TABLE 2B  
PEASANT FAMILIES IN TWENTY-TWO VILLAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF HWA-HSIEN

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
S-Sian	216	17	136	17	170
Shu-ling	350	100	200	—	300
Chu-kao-pu	120	—	60	—	60
Siao-pu-li	330	3	294	3	300
Ping-shan-liang	205	28	112	20	160
Li-pei	300	48	192	—	240
Yang-O-tseng	1,000	140	490	70	700
San-chi	400	30	240	30	300
Siao-tung-fu	200	30	120	—	150
Ma-chi	620	120	330	—	450

APPENDIX

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
Huang-chi-shan	680	100	280	—	380
Chu-tseng	220	40	120	—	160
Tien-mei	880	198	475	119	792
Wen-den-kien	250	—	148	37	185
San-hwa	1,380	331	773	—	1,104
Ya-wu	450	121	284	—	405
Long-tu	600	72	468	—	540
Shi-ku(a)	800	40	160	—	200
Sho-kiang-tang	475	213	214	—	427
Lian-tang	600	50	400	50	500
Sin-chuan	45	5	40	—	45
Kuan-Lo-pu	200	30	120	—	150
Total	10,321	1,716	5,656	346	7,718
Per Cent of Different Peasant Families		22.2	73.3	4.5	100%

(a) 600 out of these 800 families are half-merchants and half-peasants.

TABLE 3  
PROPORTION OF LANDLESS PEASANT FAMILIES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Villages	Total Peasant Families	Landless Peasant Families			Per Cent. of Landless in Total of Peasant Families
		Agricultural Labourers	Tenants	Total	
Nei-tien	148	10	97	107	72.3

## APPENDIX

Villages	Total Peasant Families	Landless Peasant Families			Per Cent. of Landless in Total of Peasant Families
		Agricultural Labourers	Tenants	Total	
Nan-pu	105	0	70	70	66.7
Ting-lung-fong	87	16	36	52	59.8
Sha-tien-pang	114	2	64	66	57.9
Pei-shan	73	10	29	39	53.4
Kwei-tien	60	10	18	28	46.7
Lung-tien	95	20	23	43	45.3
Kang-sin	52	7	14	21	40.4
Kin-tseng	105	4	26	30	28.6
Huang-pien	84	4	20	24	28.6
Total	923	83	397	480	52.0

TABLE 4  
 LANDLESS FAMILIES AMONG DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES  
 (Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)

Peasant Class(a)	Total Number of Families		Landless Families		Per Cent. of Landless Families to the Total	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Rich	109	107	20	19	18.3	17.8
Middle	202	193	58	52	28.7	26.9

(a) As more fully explained in the text, p. 8, for present purposes "middle peasants" are those whose holding corresponds to the minimum of land area which if owned suffices to support a family of average size for the village if planted to the usual major crop of that village. A "poor" family is one whose land holding is below this potential income—the income from auxiliary sources normally being negligible. A "rich" family is one whose land holding at least equals that of the minimum and which employs either one or more labourers all the year around or a number of day labourers in seasonal work exceeding the average employed by middle peasants in that village.

APPENDIX

Village	Total Number of Families in Village	Number of Peasant Families			
		Owners	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total
Huang-chi-shan	680	100	280	—	380
Chu-tseng	220	40	120	—	160
Tien-mei	880	198	475	119	792
Wen-den-kien	250	—	148	37	185
San-hwa	1,380	331	773	—	1,104
Ya-wu	450	121	284	—	405
Long-tu	600	72	468	—	540
Shi-ku(a)	800	40	160	—	200
Sho-kiang-tang	475	213	214	—	427
Lian-tang	600	50	400	50	500
Sin-chuan	45	5	40	—	45
Kuan-Lo-pu	200	30	120	—	150
Total	10,321	1,716	5,656	346	7,718
Per Cent of Different Peasant Families		22.2	73.3	4.5	100%

(a) 600 out of these 800 families are half-merchants and half-peasants.

TABLE 3  
PROPORTION OF LANDLESS PEASANT FAMILIES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Villages	Total Peasant Families	Landless Peasant Families			Per Cent. of Landless in Total of Peasant Families
		Agricultural Labourers	Tenants	Total	
Nei-tien	148	10	97	107	72.3

APPENDIX

Villages	Total Peasant Families	Landless Peasant Families			Per Cent. of Landless in Total of Peasant Families
		Agricultural Labourers	Tenants	Total	
Nan-pu	105	0	70	70	66.7
Ting-lung-fong	87	16	36	52	59.8
Sha-tien-pang	114	2	64	66	57.9
Pei-shan	73	10	29	39	53.4
Kwei-tien	60	10	18	28	46.7
Lung-tien	95	20	23	43	45.3
Kang-sin	52	7	14	21	40.4
Kin-tseng	105	4	26	30	28.6
Huang-pien	84	4	20	24	28.6
Total	923	83	397	480	52.0

TABLE 4  
 LANDLESS FAMILIES AMONG DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES  
 (Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)

Peasant Class(a)	Total Number of Families		Landless Families		Per Cent. of Landless Families to the Total	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Rich	109	107	20	19	18.3	17.8
Middle	202	193	58	52	28.7	26.9

(a) As more fully explained in the text, p. 8, for present purposes "middle peasants" are those whose holding corresponds to the minimum of land area which if owned suffices to support a family of average size for the village if planted to the usual major crop of that village. A "poor" family is one whose land holding is below this potential income—the income from auxiliary sources normally being negligible. A "rich" family is one whose land holding at least equals that of the minimum and which employs either one or more labourers all the year around or a number of day labourers in seasonal work exceeding the average employed by middle peasants in that village.



APPENDIX

Peasant Class(a)	Total Number of Families		Landless Families		Per Cent. of Landless Families to the Total	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Poor	493	540	286	326	58.0	60.4
Agricultural Labourers	82	83	82	83	100.0	100.0
Total	886	923	446	480	50.3	52.0

TABLE 5  
COMPARISON OF OWNER AND TENANT FAMILIES AMONG DIFFERENT  
PEASANT CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)

Peasant Class	Owner Families		Per Cent		Tenant Families		Per Cent	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Rich	55	57	50.5	53.3	54	50	49.5	46.7
Middle	75	75	37.1	38.9	127	118	62.9	61.1
Poor	116	117	23.5	21.7	377	423	76.5	78.3
Total	246	249	30.6	29.6	558	591	69.4	70.4

TABLE 6  
COMPARISON OF OWNED AND LEASED LANDS FARMED BY DIFFERENT  
PEASANT CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)

Peasant Class	Number of Mow Owned		Per Cent		Number of Mow Leased		Per Cent	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Rich	1,182.2	1,115.5	40.8	40.8	1,712.1	1,617.5	59.2	59.2
Middle	748.5	673.0	30.3	29.7	1,719.5	1,594.3	69.7	70.3

APPENDIX

Peasant Class	Number of Mow Owned		Per Cent		Number of Mow Leased		Per Cent	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Poor	509.8	525.0	18.1	17.2	2,306.2	2,530.7	81.9	82.8
Total	2,440.5	2,313.5	29.8	28.7	5,737.8	5,742.5	70.2	71.3

TABLE 7  
COMPARISON OF OWNED AND LEASED LANDS FARMED BY DIFFERENT  
PEASANT CLASSES  
(Eight Representative Villages (a) in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)

Peasant Class	Number of Mow Owned		Per Cent		Number of Mow Leased		Per Cent	
	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933	1928	1933
Rich	1,043.2	958.8	38.3	37.9	1,679.1	1,570.0	61.7	62.1
Middle	665.6	603.1	28.3	27.8	1,682.7	1,567.2	71.7	72.2
Poor	415.1	436.2	16.1	15.5	2,167.0	2,387.1	83.9	84.5
Total	2,123.9	1,998.1	27.8	26.6	5,528.8	5,524.3	72.2	73.4

(a) Lung-tien and Kwei-tien excluded.

TABLE 8  
LEASED LANDS FARMED BY DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES  
(In the Villages of Kang-sin and Kiu-tseng, 1933)

Peasant Class	Irrigated		Non-irrigated	
	Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent
Rich	37.0	35.6	67.0	64.4
Middle	240.5	68.5	110.8	31.5
Poor	316.3	60.2	209.2	39.8
Total	593.8	60.5	387.0	39.5

APPENDIX

TABLE 9  
LAND OWNED BY DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class	Number of Families	Mow Owned	Per Cent of Families	Per Cent of Mow Owned
Agricultural Labourers	83	—	9.0	—
Poor	540	540.5	58.5	22.1
Middle	193	689.8	20.9	28.3
Rich	107	1,212.0	11.6	49.6
Total	923	2,442.3	100.0	100.0

TABLE 10  
LAND POSSESSIONS IN DIFFERENT SIZES OF HOLDINGS  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class		Mow 0	Mow 0.1—5.0	Mow 5.1—10.0	Mow 10.1—20.0	Mow 20.1—30.0	Mow 30.1—50.0	Above 50 Mow	Total
Rich	Families	19	27	27	17	8	5	4	107
	Per Cent	17.8	25.2	25.2	15.9	7.5	4.7	3.7	100.0
Middle	Families	52	96	35	10	—	—	—	193
	Per Cent	27.0	49.7	18.1	5.2	—	—	—	100.0
Poor	Families	326	193	18	3	—	—	—	540
	Per Cent	60.4	35.7	3.3	0.6	—	—	—	100.0
Agricultural Labourers	Families	83	—	—	—	—	—	—	83
	Per Cent	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Total	Families	480	316	80	30	8	5	4	923
	Per Cent	52.0	34.2	8.7	3.3	0.9	0.5	0.4	100.0

## APPENDIX

**TABLE 11**  
**AVERAGE NUMBER OF MOW OWNED PER FAMILY AMONG DIFFERENT**  
**PEASANT CLASSES**  
**(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)**

Peasant Class	Mow Owned	Families	Average Mow per Family
Poor peasants and Agricultural Labourers (a)	540.5	623	0.87
Middle	689.8	193	3.57
Rich	1,212.0	107	11.33
Total	2,442.3	923	2.65

(a) In this table poor peasants and agricultural labourers are classed together, although as seen in the previous tables the labourers' families own no land, on the principle that in demonstrating the average land possession for the different classes, the labourers are to be classed with others of the poor peasants who have no longer any land of their own.

**TABLE 12**  
**DECREASE IN AVERAGE NUMBER OF MOW OWNED**  
**(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)**

Peasant Class	Average Mow Owned per Family		Index for (1928=100) 1933
	1928	1933	
Poor Peasant and Agricultural Labourers (a)	0.91	0.87	95.6
Middle	3.79	3.57	94.2
Rich	11.83	11.33	95.8

(a) See note, table 11.

**TABLE 13**  
**TOTAL AREA OF LAND CULTIVATED BY DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES**  
**(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)**

Peasant Class	Families		Mow Cultivated	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Poor	540	64.3	3,055.7	37.9

APPENDIX

Peasant Class	Families		Mow Cultivated	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Middle	193	23.0	2,267.3	28.2
Rich	107	12.7	2,733.0	33.9
Total	840	100.0	8,056.0	100.0

TABLE 14  
NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF LAND HOLDINGS OF DIFFERENT SIZES CULTIVATED  
BY DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class		Mow 0.1—5.0	Mow 5.1—10.0	Mow 10.1—20.0	Mow 20.1—30.0	Mow 30.1—50.0	Mow 50.1—100.0	Above 100 Mow	Total
Rich	Families	8	21	26	24	18	8	2	107
	Per Cent	7.5	19.6	24.3	22.4	16.8	7.5	1.9	100.0
Middle	Families	36	66	71	16	4	—	—	193
	Per Cent	18.6	34.2	36.8	8.3	2.1	—	—	100.0
Poor	Families	320	156	53	8	3	—	—	540
	Per Cent	59.3	28.9	9.8	1.5	0.5	—	—	100.0
Total	Families	364	243	150	48	25	8	2	840
	Per Cent	43.3	28.9	17.9	5.7	3.0	1.0	0.2	100.0

TABLE 15  
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MOW CULTIVATED PER FAMILY AMONG DIFFERENT  
PEASANT CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class	Mow Cultivated	Families	Average Mow Per Family
Poor	3,055.7	540	5.7

APPENDIX

Peasant Class	Mow Cultivated	Families	Average Mow Per Family
Middle	2,267.3	193	11.7
Rich	2,733.0	107	25.5
Total	8,056.0	840	9.6

TABLE 16  
AREA DEVOTED TO CHIEF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN DIFFERENT VILLAGES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Village	Rice		Wheat, Cotton, Taro & Peanuts		Fruits		Vegetables	
	Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent
Nan-pu	1,378.4	98.9	15.0	1.1	—	—	—	—
Mei-tien	864.8	77.4	250.9	22.5	—	—	1.0	0.1
Ting-lung-fong	488.5	76.9	135.0	21.2	—	—	12.0	1.9
Sha-dien-kong	875.9	74.3	289.2	24.5	—	—	14.5	1.2
Kiu-tseng	709.9	66.6	340.0	31.9	0.6	0.1	15.4	1.4
Huang-pien	395.6	63.1	63.9	10.2	125.3	20.0	41.7	6.7
Kwei-tien	95.5	46.3	12.2	5.8	15.7	7.6	83.1	40.3
Kang-sin	176.6	40.6	251.5	57.9	1.4	0.3	5.0	1.2
Pei-shan	404.8	37.8	—	—	665.5	62.2	—	—
Lung-tien	89.8	27.5	—	—	237.3	72.5	—	—
Total	5,479.8	68.0	1,357.7	16.9	1,045.8	13.0	172.7	2.1

## APPENDIX

**TABLE 17**  
**AREA DEVOTED TO CHIEF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AMONG DIFFERENT**  
**PEASANT CLASSES**  
**(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)**

Peasant Class	Mow Cultivated	Rice		Wheat, Cotton, Taro & Peanuts		Fruits		Vegetables	
		Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent
		Rich	2,733.0	1,788.0	65.4	234.1	8.6	672.4	24.6
Middle	2,267.3	1,599.9	70.6	446.1	19.7	182.0	8.0	39.1	1.7
Poor	3,055.7	2,091.9	68.4	677.3	22.2	191.4	6.3	95.1	3.1
Total	8,056.0	5,479.8	68.0	1,357.7	16.9	1,045.8	13.0	172.7	2.1

**TABLE 18**  
**AVERAGE NUMBER OF MOW OWNED PER PERSON AMONG DIFFERENT**  
**PEASANT CLASSES**  
**(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)**

Peasant Class	Mow Owned	Number of Persons	Average Mow Per Person
Poor Peasants and Agricultural Labourers(a)	540.5	2,928	0.18
Middle	689.8	944	0.73
Rich	1,212.0	692	1.75
Total	2,442.3	4,564	0.52

(a) See note, table 11.

**TABLE 19**  
**AVERAGE NUMBER OF MOW CULTIVATED PER PERSON AMONG DIFFERENT**  
**PEASANT CLASSES**  
**(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)**

Peasant Class	Mow Cultivated	Number of Persons	Average Mow Per Person
Poor	3,055.7	2,686	1.14

APPENDIX

Peasant Class	Mow Cultivated	Number of Persons	Average Mow Per Person
Middle	2,267.3	944	2.40
Rich	2,733.0	692	3.95
Total	8,056.0	4,322	1.86

TABLE 20  
VILLAGE FAMILIES CLASSIFIED  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Class	Number of Families	Per Cent of Total
Landlords <sup>(a)</sup>	35	2.9
Rich Peasants	107	8.8
Middle Peasants	193	16.0
Poor Peasants	540	44.7
Agricultural Labourers	83	6.9
Others	251	20.7
Total	1,209	100.0

(a) Only the residential individual landlord families in the villages.

TABLE 21  
LAND OWNED BY LANDLORDS AND PEASANTS  
(Villages of Kang-sin and Kiu-tseng, 1933)

Class	Irrigated		Non-irrigated	
	Mow	Per Cent.	Mow	Per Cent.
Landlord	94.1 <sup>(a)</sup>	61.3	59.5 <sup>(a)</sup>	38.7
Rich Peasant	77.0	63.0	45.3	37.0
Middle Peasant	115.8	53.6	100.0	46.4

(a) Only those owned by individual and residential landlords.



APPENDIX

Class	Irrigated		Non-irrigated	
	Mow	Mow	Per Cent.	Per Cent.
Poor Peasant	78.8	37.3	132.5	62.7
Total	365.7	52.0	337.3	48.0

TABLE 22  
FORMS OF RENT PAYMENT IN RICE VILLAGES AND IN VILLAGES WITH  
OTHER MAIN CROPS  
(Eight Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Villages	Mow Under Tenancy	Rent in Rice		Rent in Money	
		Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent
Four Rice Villages (a)	3,459.1	1,802.2	52.1	1,656.9	47.9
Four Villages of Other Main Crops (b)	1,254.8	44.9	3.6	1,209.9	96.4
Total	4,713.9	1,847.1	39.2	2,866.8	60.8

(a) Nan-pu, Mei-tien, Ting-lung-fong, and Sha-dien-kong.

(b) Lung-tien, Pei-shan, Kong-sing, and Kwei-tien.

TABLE 23  
FORMS OF RENT PAYMENT ACCORDING TO CLASS OF PEASANTS  
(Ten Representative Villages of the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class	Mow under Tenancy	Rent in Rice		Rent in Money	
		Mow	Per Cent	Mow	Per Cent
Rich	1,617.5	273.0	16.9	1,344.5	83.1
Middle	1,594.3	732.2	45.9	862.1	54.1
Poor	2,530.7	1,281.9	50.7	1,248.8	49.3
Total	5,742.5	2,287.1	39.8	3,455.4	60.2

APPENDIX

TABLE 24  
FALL IN PRICES OF FIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS  
(Ten Representative Villages of the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)

Product	Price		Index for 1933 (1928=100)
	1928	1933	
Rice	7.00	4.50	64
Peanut	5.20	4.40	85
Potato	1.60	0.80	50
Taro	2.00	1.50	75
Turnip	1.00	0.50	50

TABLE 25A  
NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF FAMILIES OF DIFFERENT CLASSES IN DEBT (a)  
(Ten Representative Villages of the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

	Land- lords (b)	Peasants			Agricultural Labourers	Total	Others	Grand Total
		Rich	Middle	Poor				
Total Number of Families	35	107	193	540	83	958	251	1,209
Number of Families in Debt	2	52	102	318	19	493	38	531
Per Cent of Families in Debt	5.7	48.6	52.8	58.9	22.9	51.4	15.1	43.9
Total Indebted- ness (Yuan)	700	23,904	19,810	53,354	1,592	99,360	5,313	104,673
Average Indebted- ness per Family (Yuan)	20.0	223.4	102.6	98.8	19.2	103.7	21.2	86.6

(a) Since almost none of the debts are incurred to capitalize the farming business with the exception of those of a few "rich" peasants, the term "in debt" may here be read as synonymous with "borrower."

(b) Not including corporate landlords.

APPENDIX

TABLE 25B

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF PEASANT FAMILIES IN DEBT  
(Fifteen Villages of Hwa-hsien, a District North of Pan-yu, 1934)

Village	Number of Families	Number of Families in Debt	Per Cent
S-sian	170	153	90
Shu-ling	300	200	66.6
Siao-pu-li	300	120	40
Ping-shan-liang	160	64	40
Li-pei	240	144	60
Yang-o-tseng	700	350	50
Ma-chi	450	360	80
Tien-mei	792	554	70
Wen-dan-kien	185	56	30
Ya-wu	405	284	70
Long-tu	540	432	80
Shi-ku	200	140	70
Sho-kiang-tang	427	299	70
Lian-tang	500	250	50
Sin-chuan	45	30	66.6
Total	5,414	3,436	63.4

APPENDIX

TABLE 26  
PROPORTION OF LAND MORTGAGED DURING FIVE YEARS, 1928-1933  
(Ten Representative Villages of the District of Pan-yu)

Peasant Class	Mow owned in 1928	Mow mortgaged during 1928-1933	Per Cent of Area Mortgaged
Poor	521.8	28.1	5.4
Middle	765.3	27.4	3.6
Rich	1,289.2	62.0	4.8
Total	2,576.3	117.5	4.6

TABLE 27  
COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF LABOURERS HIRED BY DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class	Per Cent of Families	Per Cent of Day-Labourers Hired	Per Cent of Yearly-Labourers Hired
Poor	64.3	15.2	—
Middle	23.0	16.5	—
Rich	12.7	68.3	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 28  
COMPARISON OF HIRED LABOUR POWER USED BY DIFFERENT PEASANT CLASSES

Peasant Class	Number of Families	Mow Cultivated	Units of Day Labour per Day per Family	Units of Year Labour per Year per Family	Average Number of Units of Day Labour per Family	Average Number of Units of Day Labour per Mow Cultivated	Average Number of Units of Year Labour per Family
Poor	540	3,055.7	2,355	—	4.4	0.8	—
Middle	193	2,267.3	2,192	—	11.4	1.0	—
Rich	107	2,733.0	10,585	76	98.9	3.9	0.7
Total	840	8,056.0	15,132	76	16.1	1.9	0.1

APPENDIX

TABLE 29

COMPARISON OF HIRED LABOUR POWER USED IN RICE- AND FRUIT-GROWING REGIONS

(Five Villages of the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Peasant Class	Average Number of Units of Day Labour per Family		Average Number of Units of Day Labour per Mow Cultivated		Average Number of Units of Year Labour per Family	
	Rice(a)	Fruit(b)	Rice	Fruit	Rice	Fruit
Rich	68.8	151.0	2.49	5.41	0.17	1.61
Middle	17.0	19.4	1.24	2.86	—	—
Poor	6.9	2.2	1.06	0.77	—	—
Total	16.1	44.2	1.55	4.36	0.02	0.42

(a) Three rice-growing villages: Mei-tien, Nan-pu, and Sha-dien-kong.

(b) Two fruit-growing villages: Pei-shan and Lung-tien.

TABLE 30

COMPARISON OF WAGES EARNED BY MALE AND FEMALE AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS

(Ten Representative Villages of Pan-yu, 1933)

Agricultural Labourers			Wages		
			Minimum	Maximum	Average
Year Labourers, rate (Yuan, per annum)			60.0	160.0	100.0
Day Labourers (Yuan, per day)	in busy seasons	Male	0.5	1.8	1.0
		Female	0.3	0.8	0.6
	at ordinary times	Male	0.3	0.8	0.5
		Female	0.2	0.4	0.3

APPENDIX

TABLE 31  
 LANDLORD AND PEASANT FAMILIES WHOSE MEMBERS HAVE VOCATIONS OTHER  
 THAN IN AGRICULTURE  
 (Ten Representative Villages of Pan-yu, 1933)

Class	No. of Families with Members Whose Vocation is Outside Agriculture	Such Members Engaged					
		as Coolies, Soldiers, Peddlers, or Shopkeepers		in a Profession (b)		in Industry, Trade, Civil or Military Official Positions	
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Landlords(a)	15	7	46.7	6	40.0	2	13.3
Rich	62	50	80.7	11	17.7	1	1.6
Middle	107	103	96.3	4	3.7	—	—
Poor	350	344	98.3	6	1.7	—	—
Agricultural Labourers	54	54	100.0	—	—	—	—
Total	588	558	94.9	27	4.6	3	0.5

(a) Only individual residential landlords.

(b) Including not only occupations recognized as professional in Western lands but also letter-writing, fortune-telling, ceremonial occupations, the lesser forms of teaching, etc.

APPENDIX

TABLE 32

THE CHANGE IN ECONOMIC STATUS FOR THE FAMILIES OF ALL CLASSES(a)  
(Ten Representative Villages of the District of Pan-yu, 1928 to 1933)

Class		Number of Families in 1933								No. of Families Increased Through Property Division	
		Landlords(b)	Rich Peasants	Middle Peasants	Poor Peasants	Agricultural Labourers	Others	Emigrants	Total		
		35	107	193	540	83	251				
No. of Families in 1928	Immigrant							1		1	
	Others	252	3	2	4	23	2	223		257	5
	Agricultural Labourers	82				4	73	3	2	82	
	Poor Peasants	493		1	2	480	6	13	1	503	10
	Middle Peasants	202		8	170	29	2			218	16
	Rich Peasants	109	4	95	16	4		2		121	12
	Landlords(b)	30	28	1	1					30	

(a) In this table the figures on the dotted line represent the families whose economic position has not much changed during the five years under review. Except those under the item "others," the figures above this dotted line represent the families whose economic position has risen, and the figures below it indicate the families whose economic position has worsened during the same period.

(b) Only individual residential landlords.

## APPENDIX

### TABLE 33

**CHANGE IN THE PROPORTION OF FAMILIES OF THE DIFFERENT ECONOMIC CLASSES  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1928 and 1933)**

Class	Per Cent in Total Number of Families		Index for 1933 (1928=100)
	1928	1933	
Landlords(a)	2.6	2.9	111.5
Rich Peasants	9.3	8.8	94.6
Middle Peasants	17.3	16.0	92.5
Poor Peasants	42.2	44.7	105.9
Agricultural Labourers	7.0	6.9	98.6
Others	21.6	20.7	95.8
Total	100.0	100.0	—

(a) Only individual and residential landlords.

### TABLE 34

**VOCATIONS OF HEADS OF FAMILIES NOT MAINLY SUPPORTED BY AGRICULTURE  
(LANDLORDS AND PEASANTS)  
(Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)**

Vocations	Number of Families	Percentage of Total Number of Non-Agricultural Families
Coolies, soldiers, peddlers, shop-keepers	177	72.2
In a profession(a)	45	18.4
In Industry, trade, civil or military official positions	23	9.4
Total	245(b)	100.0

(a) See note to Table 31.

(b) Six families have been excluded because their vocations are not exactly known.



APPENDIX

TABLE 35  
 PRESENT VOCATIONS OF PEASANT FAMILIES EMIGRATED DURING THE  
 LAST TWENTY YEARS  
 (Ten Representative Villages in the District of Pan-yu, 1933)

Vocations	Number of Families	Percentage of Total Number of Non-Agricultural Families
In industry, trade, civil or military official positions, and professions	—	—
In agriculture	25	30.5
Coolies, soldiers, peddlers, shopkeepers	57	69.5
Total	82	100.0

## INDEX

- | A   | C  |
|---|--|
| Agreements, loan, 65.                               | Children, selling of to pay rent, 60, 61, 62, 95.  |
| Agricultural production, decline of, 2, 3, 97, 98.  | Clan, land owned by the, 27-33, 50.                |
| "    products, chief, Area devoted to, 129, 130.    | Clan Lands, location of, 34.                       |
| "    products, fall in price of Five, 133.          | "    "    irrigation of, 35.                       |
| "    implements, pawning of, 93, 95.                | "    "    rent collected on, 35, 43.               |
| "    labourers, 4, 8.                               | "    "    economy, 36.                             |
| "    labourers, comparison of wages earned by, 136. | "    "    deeds of, 28.                            |
| "    labourers, cash income of, 100.                | Clans, indebtedness to, 36, 91, 92.                |
| "    tenants, percentages of, 3, 4.                 | "    acquiring of land by, 28, 29.                 |
| Assessment, Tax, 49.                                | "    economic influence of, 37, 38, 39.            |
|   | "    judicial functioning of, 40, 43.              |
|   | Confiscation, of land without payment, 76, 77, 78. |
|   | Crops, rotating and commercial, 11, 12.            |
|   | Contracts, written, oral, 43, 45.                  |
|   | Credit, facilities for, 87.                        |
| B   | D  |
| Bids, for leases, 44.                               | Debts, 88, 89.                                     |
| Borrowing, <i>see</i> loans.                        | Debt, number and proportion of families in, 134.   |
| Bureaus, Tax Collecting, 75.                        | Deposits, rent 44-47, 50.                          |
| "Black Ticket Fees", 81.                            |  |
| Building, tenants proportion for dyke, 59.          |  |

## INDEX

- Disputes, clan, 29.  
 Dykes, tenants proportion for building, 59.
- E
- "Education land", 24, 25.  
 Entertainment, of landlords, 46.  
 Emigrants, land holdings of, 20.  
 Estimates of land, for sustenance, 9, 11, 12.  
 Exploitation, *see* Usury.
- F
- Facilities, credit, 87.  
 Families, number and proportion of, in debt, 133, 134.  
 " economic status of, 5, 138, 139.  
 " heads of, not supported by agriculture, 139.  
 " percentages of, 6, 7, 8.  
 " classification of, 8, 131.  
 " comparison of, 9.  
 " income of, 21.  
 " Owner and Tenant, comparison of, 124, 125.
- Fields, mulberry, 66.  
 Fish, market price of, 86, 87.
- G
- Grain, rent in, 44, 48, 54-56, 59-62.  
 Girls, peasant, buying of, 112.
- H
- Holding, size of, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, 128.  
 Holdings, investigation of, 13, 17, 18.  
*Hwei*, membership of the, 26, 27.
- I
- Improvements, compensation for, 51, 52.
- Implements, pawning of, 93, 95.  
 Income, cash, of labourers, 100.  
 Indebtedness, 88, 89, 90, 91.  
 Industrial development, 1.  
 Insolvency, permanent, 88.  
 Interest, on loans, 89, 90, 91.
- K
- Kwangtung, peasant families of 152 villages in, 115, 116, 117.  
 " competition with Hong Kong, 1.  
 " natural conditions in, 17.  
 " industrial development of, 1.  
 "Kwei-kwan", enclosed establishment, 64.
- L
- Labour, cost of, 12, 13, 105.  
 " conscription of, 78, 79.  
 Labourers, agricultural, 4, 8.  
 Labourers, women, prevalence of, 91, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108.  
 " hired, 5.  
 " hired, comparison of number of, 135.
- Land, possession, decrease of, 10, 11.  
 " " statistics, 22.  
 " ownership, concentration of, 10, 70, 71, 72.  
 " owned by Landlords and Peasants, 131, 132.  
 " and Labour, 8, 12, 13.  
 " demand for, 18.  
 " use, scale of, 14.  
 " fertility, variation of, 18, 20.  
 " rents, dependence on, 21.  
 " mortgaged, proportion of 1928-1933, 135.  
 " distribution, disparity of, 23.  
 " subletting of, 47, 48, 51.  
 " joint ownership of, 52, 53.

## INDEX

- Land, price of, 103.  
 " owned and leased, comparison of, 124.
- Landlords, private, 20, 24.  
 " absent, 65, 75.  
 " collective, 20, 24.  
 " entertainment of, 46.  
 " land owned by, 131, 132.  
 " with vocations other than agriculture, 137.
- Leased land, proportion to total land area, 6.
- Leases, bids for, 44.  
 Lease, tenure of, 50.  
 Lease, transfer of, 51, 52.  
 Lessors, standing of, 50.
- Liankwang Geological Survey*, 1.
- Living, cost of, 100.
- Loans, 2, 36, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94.  
 " , agreement, 65.
- M
- Mai-ti-hwei* 91.  
*Mei-hsien*, chronicle of, 27.  
 Money-lending, *see* loans.  
 Mortgages, of land, 95, 96, 135.  
 Mow, average number of, cultivated, 128, 129.  
 " average number owned per person, 130, 131.  
 " owned per family, 127.  
 " decrease in average, 127.
- Mulberry fields, turning into Rice fields, 67.
- N
- National Government, influence of, 3.
- O
- Ownership, corporate, 25.
- P
- Pawn shops, 87, 92, 93.  
 Payment, intermediate form of, 54.  
 Peasant Class, hired labour used by, 135.  
 " " number of hired labourers of, 135.  
 " " total area cultivated by, 127, 128.  
 " " rent payments by, 132.  
 " " land owned by, 126, 127, 131.  
 " " comparison of owned and leased land, 124, 125.  
 " " leased land farmed by, 125.
- Peasant families, emigrated, present vocations of, 140.  
 " " in Hwa-Hsien district, 121, 122.  
 " " predominance of, 2, 4, 5, 115.  
 " " in Pan-yu district, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.  
 " " landless, 122, 123, 124.
- Peasant, The Chinese, 4.  
 Peasants, middle status of, 9.  
 " , rich, land possessed by, 9, 10, 11.  
 " , poor, land possessed by, 9, 10, 11.  
 " , middle, land possessed by, 10, 11.  
 " , exploitation of the, 30, 42, 43, 97.  
 " , exodus of, 109, 111.
- Pigs, price of, 86.  
 Presents, to landlord, 45, 60.  
 Prices, of Five agricultural products, fall in, 133.  
 Production, cost of, 63.

## INDEX

Production, agricultural, decline of, 2,  
3, 97, 98.  
Products, chief, Area devoted to, 129,  
130.  
Purchase, length of periods for, 62.

### R

Remittances, from overseas, 67, 71, 84,  
85, 91.  
Rents, collection of, 44, 61, 63.  
    " payment of, in Rice Villages,  
        132.  
    " payment of, according to class  
        of peasants, 132.  
    " , High, 66.  
    " , in cash, 48, 49, 54, 55, 56, 63, 66.  
    " , income from, 24, 25, 36.  
    " , increase or reduction of, 67, 68.  
    " , in grain, 48, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60,  
        61, 62.  
    " , payable in advance, 44, 48.  
    " , Share, 57, 58, 59.  
    " , selling of children to pay, 60, 61,  
        62, 95.  
Requisitions, by military, 79.  
Responsibility, family, 31.  
Rice Cultivation, 6, 14, 15, 16, 103.  
Rice, and Fruit growing, hired labour  
used by, 136.  
    " and Fruit, income from, 48.  
    " production, cost, 12, 14, 15, 16.  
    " " , Japan and China,  
        comparison, 14.  
Rights, Shore, disputes over, 64.  
Road-Building, assessment for, 76, 77,  
78, 79.

### S

Self-government, rural, 40, 41.  
*Sha-kuo-chuan*, 63, 64, 75.  
*Sha-tien*, 22, 29, 30, 75, 81.

*Siao-wu*, 57, 58.  
Silk, and cocoons, price of, 66.  
Social Organizations, land of, 25, 26.  
Sources of Income, Auxiliary, 108, 109.  
Speculation, commercial, 55.  
Status, economic, change in, 138.  
    " " change in proportion,  
        139.

### T

Taxes, collection of, 40, 74, 75.  
    " , Land and Dyke, 59, 81, 82, 83.  
    " , Various, 73, 74, 79, 80.  
Tenancy, hereditary, 51, 52, 53, 57, 58.  
    " , system of, 42, 43, 46.  
Tenants, proportion of, 3, 4.  
Transfers, of lease, 51, 52.  
*Tsan-kaio*, 29.  
*Tso-ke*, system of, 59, 60.

### U

Usury, 92, 93, 94, 95.

### V

Village, families classified, 131.  
Villages, statistics of cultivation, 12.  
    " , Survey of, 2.  
Villages, Rice, rent payment by, 132.  
Vocations, of Peasant families emigrat-  
ed, 140.

### W

Wages, 47, 48, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102,  
103, 104, 105.  
Wealth, concentration of, 18, 20.

**CHECKED**  
**2003-04**