

CLASSIFICATION **CONFIDENTIAL**
 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY REPORT
 INFORMATION FROM
 FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS CD NO.

50X1-HUM

COUNTRY China
 SUBJECT Economic - Land reform
 HOW PUBLISHED Booklet
 WHERE PUBLISHED Ta-lien
 DATE PUBLISHED 1948
 LANGUAGE Chinese

DATE OF INFORMATION 1948
 DATE DIST. 26 Sep 1949
 NO. OF PAGES 10
 SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT OF U. S. C. 21 AND 22, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Mu-ch'ien Tang-ti Cheng-ts'e Hui-pien (A Compilation of Present Party Policies), Northeast Bookstore. (FDB 403526 -- Information requested.)

CERTAIN PROBLEMS IN LAND REFORM

Jen Pi-shih

Land reform has been undertaken enthusiastically and much has been accomplished. The Central Committee has issued "An Outline of Land Laws" as a guide in this fundamental, far-reaching conversion, but many practical problems remain.

By What Criterion Are Classes of Rural Society To Be Delineated?

The Central Committee has recently reissued two 1933 documents, "How To Delineate Classes" and "Decisions on Some Land-Conflict Problems," which have been distributed as reference material. Although they date from 1933, these documents are, by and large, applicable at present; there are clear definitions as to landlords, kulaks, medium peasants, poor peasants, hired peasants, etc. The reason for distributing the documents is that in some places mistakes have arisen in classifying because classification standards have not been grasped, and therefore many persons have been given a wrong status; consequently, there is no clear distinction between the enemy and ourselves. Chairman Mao tells us to make clear the boundary between the enemy and ourselves and to isolate and divide the enemy, but not let ourselves stand alone. If many persons have been given a wrong status, that causes confusion in our ranks and is full of danger.

I will now cite a case history from Shansi-Suiyuan to show the seriousness of the danger. The administrative village of Ts'ai-chia-yai had 552 families, of whom 124 were reckoned as landlords and kulaks, that is, 22.46 percent. Under the former government, generally speaking, landlords would average 3 percent of the families, and kulaks 5 percent, making a total of 8 percent of the families and 10 percent of the population. In the other liberated areas, many landlords and kulaks have been converted and reclassified, so the proportion ought to be less than 8 percent. But in Ts'ai-chia-yai the number is nearly twice as much. Later the land-reform office made a reassessment on the basis of the two documents, finding that out of the 124 families, 11 landlord units were bankrupt or on the way thereto, while 20 kulak units were producing; thus 31

CONFIDENTIAL

STATE		NAVY	MARB	DISTRIBUTION									
ARMY		AIR	FBI										

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

were recatalogued as medium-plus and medium peasants. Thus the landlord and kulak families were reduced to 93, or 16.84 percent of the total. Then an assessment was made by reducing the time factor from the period beginning 1937 to one beginning 1940, thus reducing the number of landlords and kulaks in Ts'ai-chia-yai to 71 families, which was still 12.26 percent of the whole. If calculated by considering the landlords who worked for 5 years, and the kulaks who have not exploited for 3 years, the number would be yet smaller.

Ts'ai-chia-yai in Hsing Hsien had indeed a greater density of these privileged groups than the average localities. We must let its experience teach us to classify realistically, not enlarging the scope of our attacks or confusing the battle line of the revolution. Note this carefully.

How did the assessors in Ts'ai-chia-yai come to assign a wrong status? The causes for late down-grading of those 31 families may be listed as follows:

1. Fifteen families were wrongly reckoned because the grandfather and the father had exploited labor, but the present head of the family had done little or no exploiting of labor since before 1936, the year before the formation of the democratic anti-Japanese government.
2. Five families were wrongly reckoned because the head of the family in earlier years had enjoyed the life of a landlord or kulak, but had worked in later life, before the resistance to Japan, and had exploited labor very little or none at all.
3. Seven families were wrongly reckoned because the head of the family worked hard, exploited labor only slightly, and had many "merchant stalls."
4. Three families were wrongly reckoned because the head of the family had been very poor in early years and was bought or adopted by a landlord or kulak, but put his emphasis on laboring and had done little or no exploiting of labor.
5. One family was wrongly reckoned because the orphans and widow were unable to work, and for a time employed laborers. The head of the family, when grown, became a peasant, as was his father.
6. In cases where past economic status and exploitation of labor were hard to determine, political attitude often decided the up-grading or down-grading.

To sum up: In the past, all sorts of factors have been used in classifying; except for exploitation of labor, none of these is valid. Thus it was that in Ts'ai-chia-yai 50 families, about 300 people, were included in the enemy camp. The result was to strengthen the enemy, not ourselves. What a mistake!

Remarks of peasant delegates revealed that the peasants were not pleased with the fact that so many persons were wrongly rated into the privileged class.

The example given above has been duplicated many times throughout our liberated areas. The only course is to acknowledge the errors and to make each one right, even though only one individual is affected.

The criteria used in the case cited were faulty. What then is the genuine standard to apply? There is only one standard for classifying into classes: one's relation to the means of production -- that is, whether one has such means or not; how much one has; of what sort it is; how it is used; and whether one is exploiting or being exploited. What is the means of production? The means of production in industry is factories, machines, raw materials, and other capital. In agriculture, the means of production is land, farm animals, tools, dwelling houses, etc. Whether one has the means of production or not, how much one has, of what sort, how used (self-tilled, tilled by hired labor, or rented

- 2 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

out), and whether one is exploiting or being exploited, these are the sole criteria for demarcating rural classes.

Based on this standard, it is very easy to distinguish class status in the villages. The principal classes can be demarcated as follows:

1. Landlords -- Those who possess much land, who do no manual labor, who rely on rental to exploit peasants, or who also take high interest on loans.
2. Kulaks (rich peasants) -- Those who possess much land, farm animals, and tools, and who take part in the chief labor, at the same time exploiting peasants and hired laborers. China's old-style rich peasants were strongly tainted with feudalism; they often took high interest on loans or rented out part of their land. On the one hand, they also labored, and thus were akin to the peasants; on the other, they practiced feudal or semifeudal exploitation, and thus were akin to landlords.
3. Medium peasants -- Those who possess land, farm animals, tools, who also labor, not exploiting other peasants, or doing it very little.
4. Poor peasants -- Those who possess little land, tools, etc., who work themselves, and also sell a portion of their labor.
5. Hired peasants -- Those who possess no land, animals, or tools, and who sell their own labor.

The principal class lines in rural society should be drawn according to these specifications. However, are those who rent out land or hire long-term employees to be treated uniformly as landlords and kulaks without exception? There are exceptions: orphans, widows, maimed, sick, and those unable to work; these may be permitted to rent out their little plots of ground. Moreover, physicians, elementary-school teachers, and artisans who own a little ground, but cannot cultivate it because of their occupation, cannot be counted as landlords or kulaks, even though they rent out or hire labor. Besides, there are complex circumstances, which need detailed definition; what we mention here are merely typical conditions.

How to distinguish between rich and medium peasants is a question that must be handled very carefully. Generally speaking, medium peasants do not exploit others; but those who do it only slightly or inadvertently must still be recognized as medium peasants. On this question, the Central Committee has recently adopted a more liberal policy; that is, those persons still will be counted as medium or medium-plus peasants if they exploit in a mild degree (such as employing a person to herd cattle or sheep; or do odd jobs, or work by the month; or one or two to work on a long term; or renting out a small parcel of land; or loaning out a little cash). If exploitation profits do not exceed 25 percent of a person's total income, he will still be counted a medium peasant or a medium-plus peasant. This is more liberal than the 1933 decision, which put the figure at 15 percent. Those whose exploitation profits exceed 25 percent for 3 consecutive years will be counted as rich peasants.

In new areas, for one year before the setting up of a democratic authority, landlords and kulaks who have gone bankrupt and become medium or poor peasants should be recognized as being of medium or poor-peasant status. If in a year their status is changed, it is because they were forced down by KMT oppression. But those who rise from the peasant class to the landlord and kulak class, that is, those who became rich by hard work and saving over a long period, must not be counted landlords and kulaks until after 3 years.

- 3 -

CONFIDENTIAL **CONFIDENTIAL**

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

In old areas, landlords and kulaks who have, under the democratic government, begun to (1) bear burdens rightly, (2) reduce rent and interest, and (3) settle the attacks made on them, should have their status changed and be rated as peasants (medium, poor, or hired, as the facts demand). Landlords who, for a period of 5 years, have done farm labor and no longer exploit others should also have their status changed to peasants. Kulaks who for 3 years, have ceased exploiting, should also have peasant status. But those landlords and kulaks who still retain feudal possessions in quantity still must hand over their surplus property to be divided among the poor peasants. The decision as to whether landlords and kulaks, after changing their status, may be allowed to join peasant unions and poor peasant groups must be left for said organizations to investigate and decide individually on each case.

The 1933 regulations provided that young men from the privileged strata who served in the Red Army should not suffer discriminatory treatment. The same general principle, necessary changes having been made, applies now. Landlords and kulaks who serve 2 years, and intellectuals who serve one year, shall be treated as revolutionary veterans. Of course they must be loyal to our program.

Is there danger in the principle that landlords who work 5 years and kulaks who desist from exploiting for 3 years may change their status? I think not, because their land and property are already equally distributed (in the case of kulaks, just the surplus, not the entire possessions, is requisitioned), and during this number of years of work they can reorient their attitudes. Landlords and kulaks of the liberated areas, before having their status changed, should, except as specially permitted, be deprived temporarily of their war service privileges, but still be given tasks of helping behind the lines.

The Entire Group of Medium Peasants Should Be Firmly Bound Together

Liquidating the feudal class involves a fierce struggle. This struggle can be won only by relying on the poor and hired peasants as backbone and satisfying their demands, and by firmly uniting the medium peasants. At the eighth assembly of Communist delegates, the uniting of medium peasants was stressed, and the confusing of them with rich peasants was condemned as a bad error; it might lose them to the landlords and cause the revolution to fail.

Under the old government, medium peasants comprised about 20 percent of the population; in the old liberated areas, they comprised 50 percent, more or less. After a thorough land-distribution, the large majority of the rural people are medium peasants, exceptions being few. When we were fighting Japan, medium peasants contributed no little strength and money. Likewise, in fighting Chiang, they give much and their merit is great. In our Liberation Army, 30 - 40 percent are medium peasants. If we disregard their welfare, causing a rift between them and us, we will lose the war. In the setting of the economy of the New Democracy, in the transition from an individual to a collective economy, we must rely heavily on the old and the new middle-class peasants. They have a rich experience in production, which is worth learning by the poor and the farm laborers; they are fairly well equipped and can help the latter. In the future, the medium peasants will travel with us toward socialism. Therefore, they are our everlasting allies.

However, we know that in many places throughout the liberated areas, when land reform has been started, there have been leftist tendencies to impose on and exclude the medium peasants. Following are some examples:

1. Wrongly determining the status of certain medium peasants. For instance, in the case study of Ts'ai-chia-yai above, more than 50 medium and medium-plus peasants (including even a few poor peasants) were incorrectly rated as rich peasants or bankrupt landlords. In many places, having been wrongly classified, their property was confiscated. Some peasants were even flogged.

- 4 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

2. It was made clear that medium peasants were not wanted in the transaction of business. The medium peasants wondered whether they were wanted or not. Excluding old places where land equalization had already taken place, the poor and hired peasants go together and organized their own group, becoming the backbone of the land-reform movement. That was necessary. But in some places it turned out that the poor and hired peasants took charge of everything. That was wrong. For instance, only poor and hired peasants became members of delegates' meetings and committees; there were no medium peasants participating. Many important questions such as the determining of status, division of crops, assigning of duties, etc., were decided without the medium peasants having any voice in the matter; this caused them to feel that their fate was entirely in the hands of poor and hired peasants, and they showed much discomfort over this.

3. In assigning duties, the interests of medium peasants were not kept in view; their duties were made especially heavy. In some places, it appeared that assigning of quotas for public grain was done by only poor and hired peasant cells in conference. Consequently, because after land reform, the landlords and kulaks had no resources with which to meet any quota, the responsibility for public grain was all put on the heads of the medium peasants, and also even the responsibility for transporting it. This sort of doing will certainly arouse objections from the medium peasants.

4. In dividing the crops, medium peasants were entirely left out. The medium peasants felt that they were needed to assist in attacking the landlords, and thus they lost much time from work. However, when it came to dividing the crops, there was no share for the medium peasants, and they were not even admitted to the crop-dividing meeting.

The aforesaid tendencies to impose on the medium peasants, neglect their interests, and exclude them are exceedingly dangerous; they are tendencies to an extreme anti-Marxist-Leninist, leftist adventurism. The attention of the entire party should be aroused. This erroneous tendency must be firmly corrected; otherwise, we will isolate ourselves and endanger the success of the revolution.

Rifts do exist between poor, hired, and medium peasants, but these can be solved. In the old social order, medium peasants did suffer from exploitation and oppression. In all revolutionary movements they were side by side with the poor and hired peasants, fighting under Communist leadership. The chief difference among them is that the poor and hired peasants were dissatisfied with the medium peasants' not being firm enough in the attacks upon landlords and kulaks, and at times seemed unstable and hesitant. This weakness really exists among the medium peasants. But by following Mao's maxims, leading them firmly against feudalism and also watching out for their interests, and educating them politically, they can be united for the struggle. Again, in land-equalization, it is possible that medium-plus peasants were not willing to surrender a portion of their land. Land-equalization is the most thorough, the best method of destroying the feudal system. In land equalization, the large majority of medium peasants neither gain nor lose; only a few medium-plus peasants must surrender a little land (their movable property cannot be touched); and the medium-minus peasants may gain a little land.

Medium peasants under the new government get many political, economic, and cultural advantages, so as a class they favor land-equalization. But, in carrying out the process, medium peasants must be consulted and their approval obtained. If in touching a portion of medium-plus peasants' land, they show objection, then give in, do not touch their land. When dividing crops, the poor and hired peasants should be told to take out a portion for the medium peasants, to preserve unity. In a word, in all questions, aim to hold the medium peasants together; understand that uniting 90 percent of the rural population is the fundamental requisite for abolishing feudalism and gaining victory. Whatever happens, keep the attack scope within the circle of the genuinely feudal exploiting class, never go beyond it. In regions originally KMT where the Liberation Army has now come, contract the attack scope. Attack the entire feudal apparatus and, as conditions justify, destroy the whole system.

- 5 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

To unite the medium peasants, avoid imposing on them or mistreating them as to status. Mistakes must be corrected. Blame these on lack of skill in classifying. Return confiscated articles as far as possible. If already consumed, make up to them out of what is taken from landlords. If medium peasants let a destitute peasant have some extra grain, let it be considered as a loan, or as charity.

Again, get the medium peasants to take an active part in all deliberative gatherings, and thus enjoy their political rights. They should comprise about one-third the number, poor and hired peasants constituting the other two-thirds, roughly reflecting the proportion of population. In older regions, where medium peasants predominate, let the proportion be reversed. Let them be in on all government groups. They may express opinions on all questions, but final decisions lie with the all-embracing rural assembly. Show respect to the middleers, never anger them, but hold them as a united mass.

Again, duties must be shared fairly (public grain, aid to the front line, etc.). On no account may landlords' and kulaks' work fall on medium peasants. This is what the latter dread most, and it is not fair. Poor and hired peasants need relief, but there cannot be too great disparity between them and the middle-class peasants. In any event, all assignments must be made in an all-inclusive gathering.

Fair treatment in all these matters, with some indoctrination, will hold the medium peasants. This ties in with Communist doctrine. Let all leader groups be on guard against infractions.

Methods of Attack Upon Landlords and Rich Peasants

In an economic sense, to destroy the landlords as a class is not an easy thing, it is bitter warfare. After the landlord class has been beaten politically, it does its best to survive in an economic sense, and often tries to stage a comeback. Landlords and kulaks do their best to bore into the government and the party: they give their daughters in marriage to cadresmen; they buy over stooges, bad cadresmen, and bad party members. If you plan to organize a poor peasant group and a peasant union to institute land reform, landlords and kulaks can also organize a bogus group and bogus union. Make a sham confiscation; put over a false division; and call an assembly "to attack landlords and kulaks." By these methods, they succeed in retaining land and property. Therefore, thoroughgoing land reform requires precise and skilled leadership. Only as the masses are really aroused can the feudal class be liquidated; no simple or impatient methods will do. Some old areas want to get it done before spring plowing this year. To do a thorough job in 2 - 3 years, however, will be doing well.

To destroy the landlord class and feudal system, the chief point is to confiscate the landlord class's land, grain, farm animals, tools, etc., and requisition the kulaks' surplus property for distribution to the peasants. Most basic of all this is the division of the land. Do not let minor details delay pushing through this primary project. Even when this is out of the way, much remains to be done in the raising of living standards.

Many methods of attack now in use are not appropriate. It will not do to use the same methods on all. A distinction must be made between the methods for attacking landlords and those for attacking kulaks. The land law provides for cancelling all landlord ownership rights and confiscating their animals, tools, and all property. As for kulaks, besides equal division of their land, only their surplus property is taken, that is, surplus as compared with medium peasants' property, and not all of it confiscated. If they are treated just like landlords, not only is the distinction erased, but medium peasants also will be led into fear and instability, for the medium peasants are a stratum sandwiched between the rich peasants and poor peasants. When they have no better avenue of advancement, they will certainly want to attain to the position of rich peasants. If the kulaks are treated too roughly, medium peasants will become scared. So we must distinguish between landlords and kulaks.

- 6 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

Hereafter we can only take surplus property from kulaks, not sweep them out clean. Nor can we treat their farm increment as we do that of the landlords, for they themselves labor, and what they have accumulated is partly the result of their own work.

In attacking landlords, a distinction must be made between big, middle, and small, and between grasping and nongrasping. In dealing with big and grasping landlords, be more severe, as a warning to others, so that they will understand the sweep of land reform and not refuse to comply; or else talk them out of it. It is not necessary to bring the landlords before the assembly to make them surrender their land and goods. So long as they yield, nod, and obey the government and land law, all will be well.

Against the exploitation system of the landlord class we adopt a policy of abolition; but not against the landlords as individuals. In the case of individual landlords, except a few traitors and civil-war criminals condemned by the courts, we should, by the land law, give land and goods no more and no less than to the peasant, force them to work, and reconstruct them. For landlords, after joining the ranks of labor, are no small producing force, which we should not discard. Furthermore, if we do not give them the necessary land and goods, they will rob, steal, beg, cause social unrest, and the rural folk will suffer damage. Even criminals, if not marked for execution, should get their share; only thus will social order prevail. Our Communist-led revolution is better than all other revolutions in history because only we adopt the fairest and rightist policies, and increase to the highest degree society's productive power, so that everyone has enough to eat and wear, and had lodging, employment, and a motive for study, so that everyone will attain satisfaction in living. We do thus, first to secure satisfaction for the laboring people, and next to give the landlords a means of livelihood. Landlords who have some business left by which to make a living need not have land given to them. If the business is not enough to maintain them, they still need to receive a piece of ground.

There should be a distinction between treatment of new- and old-style kulaks. Poor peasants who, under the democratic government, rose to be new rich peasants by their own exertions should be treated in the land reform as medium-plus peasants, and their surplus land must not be touched without their consent. The production of new kulaks was developed under the democratic government; if such kulaks are now attacked, medium peasants will become unsteady. These new kulaks are no harm to us. In the future they will grow. In the past we have encouraged such kulaks (such as Wu Man-yu) to increase their production, and they have been very useful in steadying the medium peasants and stimulating their zeal for producing. Our future policy should be like this.

Policy Toward Trade and Industry

No risky policy should be adopted. In many places business has been injured. For example, when Kao-chia-pao in Shen-su District of North Shensi was taken by our troops, even small peddlers had property confiscated. That is a suicidal policy. The land law says: "Protect the property of those in trade and industry and their legitimate operations so they suffer no injury." All trade and industry should be protected, even that of landlords and kulaks, which should not be confiscated, but should receive protection from the people's government. The party is to confiscate only bureaucratic capital and the business of truly oppressive reactionaries. All enterprises needed for the national economy should be allowed to carry on. They should not be closed or destroyed. This policy applies to all liberated areas and to new areas. Let not the mistake of Kao-chia-pao be repeated. Shall the property of those who, when rent and interest were reduced, invested in business be now confiscated? No. We protect and encourage such enterprises, because they help China's economy. When attacking a landlord's profits, do not let him destroy his business enterprises.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

Chairman Mao says: "Because China's economy is backward, the capitalist economy of the vast petty and medium bourgeois class, even after nationwide revolutionary victory, for a long period of time must be allowed to exist. Moreover, according to the division of labor in the national economy, those activities that are useful should be developed. No part should be lacking in the total economy." We must make this point clear to the laborers and peasants, showing them why there should be business, on the principle of temporary benefit being subordinate to long-term advantage. For instance, in the case where a landlord operates a furnace, peasants could benefit temporarily by confiscating and dividing up the equipment. If we allow that sort of thing, it outwardly appears as if we are following the line of the masses; but in fact it is a case of "tailism" (tail wagging the dog). We must lead the peasants to see the value of the furnace. Taken apart, it is of no use, and even the individuals have no coal to burn. Thus the economy of the freed areas is harmed.

We say that economy of the liberated areas must be independent and autonomous; we cannot be the colony of a colony. We can be politically and militarily strong so long as our economy does not rely on others. To make our economy independent, all forms of industry and farming must be developed, enough food and necessities produced for both the people and the army, and a balance of trade preserved (there should be an excess of exports and no buying of goods from Chiang regions or from the US).

Having industrial and agricultural products, trade becomes necessary, in order that the whole economy may flourish. In the liberated areas the trade company has not yet been able to set up stores everywhere, and there are many irregularities in the state-owned and cooperative stores. As a result private merchants are still necessary. Of course they exploit; the shops of merchants do not produce any goods, they merely share in capitalist profits or exploit both producer and consumer. With hoarding and speculating, the harm becomes worse. However, the problem is not to destroy business, but to guide it. We must control all profits, so that merchants become useful to us without exploiting us. As to small shopkeepers and peddlers, they are poor; their livelihood is on a par with that of poor peasants, or medium and medium-plus peasants. What happened at Kao-chia-pao was absolutely wrong; after business was destroyed there, the common people had to go to other towns to trade, at great inconvenience. So toward business we must adopt the policy of protection and guidance, never destruction, which is suicidal. Business should be taxed, but equitably, so as not to hinder maintenance and growth. Anything else is wrong.

The Problem of Intellectuals and Enlightened Village Elders

Among intellectuals are many from landlord and kulak homes. What policy shall we adopt in regard to them? Teachers, scientists, engineers, artists, etc., although they generally come from capitalists homes, are brainworkers. The people's government should protect brainworkers and use them in the service of the democratic republic.

Those in free occupations make their living by their own knowledge and skill. In LMT territory the vast majority of such persons have a difficult time, being circumscribed politically, and many are unemployed. Opportunities for scientific creativeness and invention are very scarce. A small fraction run after the reactionaries; but most of them are dissatisfied with rotten reaction and US imperialism, and are sympathetic with the revolutionary movement, or are neutral. These people can be captured. If we lead them carefully in politics and thought, educate and reconstruct them, their knowledge and skill can serve the Chinese Republic of the New Democracy.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 8 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

As to students, judging by student movements and our experience, the vast majority are dissatisfied with Chiang's reactionary and autocratic rule, and favor democracy. The three big student movements of last year came just at the time of our rural land reform. Many prorevolutionary students, including many from privileged homes, did not oppose changing the land system, but even actively worked for democracy, because they came to see that land reform was a fundamental factor in the democracy which they were seeking. Many other students, seeing the revolution's growth, and seeing that the nation was being led by the Communist Party and that the Chinese People's Republic was gaining such strength, were also able to accept progressive thinking and gradually swing over to the democratic side and oppose US imperialism and Chiang Kai-shek's rule. Among the masses of students there are some antirevolutionary special-duty elements, but very few. Members of the San Min Chu I Youth Corps in the schools are not all firmly antirevolutionary. Only a small fraction are incorrigibly reactionary. Therefore, we ought to help students and intellectuals to advance, and attract them into the anti-imperialistic, democratic struggle.

We are in the midst of building a nation of the New Democracy; already the liberated areas contain 160 million people, and that number is still growing. In 3 - 5 years the revolution can achieve a nationwide victory. This demands many intellectuals -- just as a hospital needs to have trained workers of various kinds -- and also a railway. The liberated areas need railways and agricultural improvement, and all this calls for many educated specialists. We must seek trained talent for the New Democracy.

There are many unemployed youths in the better homes of the countryside. Just so they comply with our program and take our training, they can be used in our work. But they must be kept out of important positions and carefully watched, lest bad ones among them vitiate our efforts.

We must avoid, in our zeal for abolishing feudalism, excluding all who have any connection with the system. That would harm the people's movement. At the same time, we must train the youth of peasants and laborers, and workers who have experienced the benefits of the overturn, seeking out the best for the bearing of responsibility. We must not depend on ready-made intellectuals.

During the resistance to Japan, when rent and interest were reduced and the three-three system was in vogue, intelligent village elders like Li Ting-min joined our government and assemblies. Now, in war against Chiang and in land reform, are they unwanted? They have fought alongside us against Japan, against Chiang, and suffered with us; we must now respect them. Land must be divided, but they must not be attacked; their errors may be criticized, but they themselves must not be touched. Only the oppressors, hated by the people, must be dealt with severely. Those who loyally work with us, like Li Ting-min, may go on; those who do not, will suffer. By this inclusive policy we more truly represent the whole people.

The Problem of Beating and Killing

The Communist Party staunchly opposes beating and killing and mutilation of criminals; these are feudal practices. Only feudal lords and militarists carry out such practices. The European and American revolutions of a century ago proclaimed the slogans of protection for the person and abolition of mutilation. Our Communist revolution, on a higher scale, will of course decry all such practices. Why bring up the matter seriously? Because bad elements who have slipped in have caused many abuses of this kind.

- 5 -

CONFIDENTIAL **CONFIDENTIAL**

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

In taking a stand against indiscriminate killing, we do not say that no one ever may be killed. Bad oppressors and antirevolutionaries universally condemned and sentenced by government agencies must be executed, with public statement of their guilt. Otherwise, the revolution's social order cannot be maintained. But reckless killing cannot be done. Killing does not solve problems. Our duty is to solve problems of oppression and injustice, but exclusive of large-scale slaughter of enemies at the front. Much killing and mistaken killing solve no problems, postpone solution and even cause a temporary setback. Such killing alienates the masses, arouses antagonism, goes against Marxism-Leninism and the party line.

Landlords and kulaks, (numbering more than 30 million,) comprise about 10 percent of the population. In the old feudal society of China, they relied wholly or in large part upon exploitation for livelihood. After that old system is done away with, and they receive land portions the same as any other peasant and depend on their own labor for a living, they can be changed gradually into a power for creating wealth and benefiting society. If we kill at will landlords and kulaks who do not stand out against our program, we will lose the sympathy of the masses, isolate ourselves, lose some of the nation's labor resources, and reduce the production of wealth. And when, through killing of the breadwinner, the family cannot make a living, society has an added burden.

We must also oppose beating. In mass movements, when out of righteous-indignation, a hated oppressor is beaten by the mob, the Communist Party should not forbid or hinder, but should sympathize with the mob's righteous anger; otherwise, we will lose touch with the masses. But Communists and democratic government workers, in ordinary circumstances, should not organize beatings. We must, at suitable times, explain to the masses that, taking the long view, they should educate landlords and old-style kulaks who have surrendered; we are liquidating the class, not the individuals. Put those fellows to work; look upon them as a labor resource; and force them, in laboring, to change themselves. Only thus will the last vestiges of feudalism be wiped out, and our work will be highly successful.

It is a good plan to have the masses take part, in our party assemblies, in investigations concerning mistakes by cadres and party members in the rural districts. Those men have served us well in carrying out their commission, but have also committed many offenses against the village folk. They lack supervision, or do not heed it. Sometimes the rural masses who have been fooled and beaten give these fellows a sound thrashing in recompense. Now let it be clearly understood that in altercations with party workers, tongue-lashings are permissible, but not corporal flogellation.

Besides, the masses should have a direct voice in dismissing or proposing dismissal of party workers. The masses may accuse the bad ones before the courts. We persuade the masses not to beat; but unless they are given this right, they will not dare to criticize. In a word, let the fighting be done by words, not blows. Thus all will be put on a basis of democratic legality.

- E N D -

- 10 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL