

Establishment of the "Modern" Land System in Fengtian (Southern Manchuria) at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century: Development of Land Market in Manchuria

ENATSU Yoshiki

I. Han Bannermen Landlords in Fengtian

A large area of bannerlands and manors were owned by the Qing court and its nobles in Manchuria in the Qing period (1644-1911). Especially the Qing court controlled a vast area of manors, such as the manors of the Imperial Household Department (Neiwufu *guanzhuang*). Those lands belonged to the Three Tombs of the Qing Emperors (Sanling) were also controlled by the Qing court. These types of lands which belonged to the Qing court and its nobles were sometimes classified as "public land (*guandi*)" at the end of the Qing period. The domestic offices of the Qing dynasty (the banner offices) controlled these public lands. Therefore, first of all, we need consider the structure of the Qing banner system for the study of the land problems in Fengtian.

The eight banner system was the military and social organization of the Manchus, the ruling ethnic group of the Qing dynasty. All Manchus were separated into eight banners, by virtue of their tribal origin, and were under the control and protection of the banner in which they were enrolled. The eight banner system was initially composed of Manchus only. When the Manchu dynasty began to control a large number of Han Chinese and Mongols as it conquered the Han and Mongolian societies in southern and western Manchuria, Mongolian and Han banners were established by Huangtaiji (Taizong), a son of Nuerhaqi (Taizu), in 1635 and 1642, respectively.¹⁾

There were generally two large types of Han Chinese who were enrolled in the banner system. The first consisted of the former generals and soldiers of the Ming army. Some Ming generals such as Kong Youde, Sheng Kexi, and Geng Zhongming, who had defended the Liaodong (southern Fengtian) area from the Manchu, surrendered with their subordinate soldiers to the Manchu dynasty prior to the Qing advance into China proper. These former Ming gener-

als and soldiers, organized as Han bannermen, helped the Manchus establish the Qing dynasty in Beijing.²⁾

The second type of Han bannermen consisted of ordinary Liaodong peasants. When the Manchus conquered Liaodong, many Han Chinese landlords and peasants, especially those living in the Liaoyang and Shenyang districts, surrendered themselves and their lands to the Manchu dynasty so as to ensure their safety. These Han Chinese were also enrolled in the Han banners when the Qing dynasty reorganized the newly occupied lands into bannerlands and various types of manors.³⁾ The Han bannermen were usually permitted to manage and cultivate the land they had surrendered as long as they paid annual tribute to the Qing court and its nobles. The above two types of Han bannermen, the former Ming generals and soldiers and a large number of the Liaodong peasants, were under the control and protection of the Qing banners in which they were enrolled.⁴⁾

There were two reasons why the Manchu dynasty established the Han banners. The first was that they needed the Han Chinese military power. The number of Manchu soldiers was very small when the Manchu dynasty confronted the Ming army in Liaodong. In particular, the Manchus were strongly interested in the heavy weapons with which the Ming army was equipped.⁵⁾

The second reason was to establish an economic basis for their regime. The Qing dynasty founded various types of bannerlands and manors in Manchuria. These lands, later classified as "public land", included Manchu bannerman bannerland, manors of Manchu nobles, and manors of court offices such as the Neiwufu (Imperial Household Department), the Shengjing hubu (Board of Revenue in Shengjing), the Shengjing libu (Board of Ceremonies in Shengjing), and so forth. These lands in Manchuria were preserved for the Manchu dynasty and its bannermen in the early Qing period. Han Chinese were strictly prohibited from owning "public lands."⁶⁾ These "public lands" were meant to form the economic basis for the Qing dynasty, its nobles, and Manchu bannermen. The Qing dynasty expected Han bannermen to manage and till these lands for them.

It is noteworthy that a considerable number of influential persons in Fengtian society belonged to the Han banners at the beginning of the twentieth century, namely, Yuan Jinkai, Zhang Rong, and Zhao Erxun. Yuan Jinkai, a Han Plain Yellow bannerman (*hanjun zhenghuang qiren*) and a native of Liaoyang *zhou* (Liaoyang department), organized the local elite of Fengtian area, and endeavoured to support the Qing dynasty during the 1911 Revolution. He later became a high rank official of the Zhang Zuolin regime and Manzhouguo.⁷⁾ Zhang Rong, a Han Bordered Yellow bannerman (*hanjun xianghuang qiren*) and a native of Fushun *xian* (Fushun county), led the anti-Qing movement.⁸⁾ Zhao Erxun, a Han Plain Blue bannerman (*hanjun zhenglan qiren*) and a native of

Fenghuang *ting* (Fenghuang subprefecture), was the Governor-General of Dongsansheng (Manchuria) during that revolution.⁹⁾ All of them were the key figures of Fengtian local politics during the 1911 Revolution.

These Han bannermen were often powerful landlords. For example, Zhang Rong's family was regarded as the most wealthy landlord in Fengtian.¹⁰⁾ Zhang's family, hereditary commanders of the Han Bordered Yellow bannermen guards, lived in Fushun where they served the office of the Sanling (Office of the Tombs of Taizu, Taizong, and their ancestors) for generations, managing the Sanling and the vast area of land belonging to it. It is said that Zhang Qinshan, Zhang Rong's father, owned about 19,200 *mu* of land in Xifeng and about 10,000 *mu* around Fengtian city at the end of the Qing period. He also possessed two grain warehouses (*liangchan*) in Fushun and Xingjing and a brewery (*shaoguo*) in Tonghua.¹¹⁾ Owning a large area of land, Zhang Qinshan was deeply engaged in the commerce and manufacturing industry. Other members of the Zhang family were also well-known landlords. Zhang Qinyuan, Zhang Qinshan's younger brother, owned more than 5,600 *mu* of land in Xian in 1928.¹²⁾ Zhang Huanyu was also a powerful landlord in Fushun and was elected a member of the Provincial Assembly in 1909.¹³⁾

While Zhang Rong was a leader of the anti-Qing movement in Fengtian, Yuan Jinkai, a Han bannerman and landlord, was a leader of the Qing loyalists in Fengtian in the 1911 Revolution. He was not necessarily a big landlord, but he possessed more than 500 *mu* of land in his home village, Shanyaopu, in Liaoyang.¹⁴⁾ The wealthiest landlord in Liaoyang was Wang Chengxian, a Han Bordered Blue bannerman who owned at least 7,500 *mu* of land around the Liaoyang area.¹⁵⁾

There were many other Han bannerman landlords in Fengtian. Some of the powerful landlords in Fengtian had been managers (*zhuangtou*) of bannerland manors, including Tian Yugong and Ling Yunge. Both Tian and Ling belonged to the Han Plain Yellow banner; they were the former *zhuangtou* of the Neiwufu manors in Liaoyang and Suizhong respectively.¹⁶⁾ Amagai Kenzaburō, an investigator of the South Manchuria Railroad Company who inquired into the landholding structure of Fengtian, explained that some of the *zhuangtou* of the former manors, Han bannermen, were very wealthy, controlling land and peasants in rural communities. According to Amagai, "*zhuangtou*" sometimes implied the influential men of the local villages.¹⁷⁾

Clearly, by the end of the Qing dynasty, some Han bannermen had emerged as landlords and local elites in Fengtian: Why did it happen? In order to answer this question, we must examine the land system of Fengtian during the Qing period.

II. The Basic Structure of the Land System in Fengtian in the Qing Period

(1) Banner Land System in Fengtian

As Table I shows, the registered population of Fengtian province was only 359,622 in 1741; it expanded to 10,238,309 in 1908 with an increase of about 28.4 times. Many peasants immigrated from places in China proper such as Shandong and Henan provinces to Manchuria during the Qing period and reclaimed vast area of land. As a result, the acreage of cultivated land in Manchuria rapidly increased. As Table II indicates, the acreage of registered cultivated land in Fengtian was 41,695,340 *mu* in 1908, while it had been only 2,524,321 *mu* in 1753, exhibiting an expansion of about 16.5 times within 150 years. While demographic analysis of Fengtian society in the Qing period is certainly of great importance to the study of Manchurian

history, the focus here will be the Qing period land system of Fengtian under which these increases in population and cultivated land were realized.

Even though the Qing land system of Fengtian was extremely complicated, we can summarize its basic structure in the following manner. According to Sudō Yoshiyuki, the entire land in Fengtian in the Qing period was divided into the "civil area" (*minjie*) and the "banner area" (*qijie*). The land in the "civil area" was regarded as "civil land" and was under the control of such civilian offices as county magistrates. Han civilians (*minren*) were supposed to be able to own only "civil land." On the other hand, the land in the "banner area" was considered "bannerland" in a broad sense or "public land," and it was under the control of the banner offices. "Public land" consisted of the bannerland for Manchu bannermen, various types of the manors owned by the Qing court and its nobles, and unreclaimed lands.¹⁸⁾ In short, only Manchu nobles and Manchu bannermen were able to own "public land." Most of the land in Fengtian was officially classified as "public land" in the Qing period; 21,997,681 *mu* out of 28,495,912 *mu* total in Fengtian (77.1 percent) was regarded as "public land" in 1887. The lands of the public manors, such as those of

Table 1 Registered Population of Fengtian Province by Year

Year	Population
1741 ¹⁾	359,622
1781 ¹⁾	789,093
1862 ²⁾	2,835,000
1887 ²⁾	4,451,000
1908 ³⁾	10,238,309
1931 ⁴⁾	16,366,175

- Source: 1) *Shengjing tongzhi* (Qianlong 48 edition), vol. 35 "Hu-kou."
 2) Liang Fangzhong, *Zhongguo lidai hukou tiandi tianfu tongji* (Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1980) pp. 264-66.
 3) *Manshū chihō-shi Maki 1*, (Kantō totoku-fu, 1911) p. 12.
 4) *Dongbei nianjian (Minguo 20 edition)*, (Dongbei wenhua-she, 1932) p. 150.

the Neiwufu, occupied about 10 percent of the "public land" in Fengtian in 1887 (2,230,198 *mu* out of the total registered "public land" of 21,997,681 *mu*).¹⁹⁾ Also, a vast area of the manorial lands owned by the Qing nobles were classified as bannerlands. It was generally the Han bannermen who managed and cultivated these manor lands. In addition, some parts of the land which had been newly reclaimed by Han peasants were also placed under the control of Han bannermen because these lands belonged to such Qing offices as the Sanling formerly.²⁰⁾

This situation changed after the Russo-Japanese War. At the end of the Qing period and after the 1911 Revolution, the acreage of the registered land increased enormously. Even though it was true that a considerable area of uncultivated land in this period was reclaimed by peasant immigrants from China proper, the rapid increase in registered acreage of cultivated land was, in fact, resulted from the change in record-keeping system. In other words, it was the result of a new land investigation carried out by the Fengtian provincial government after the Russo-Japanese War, whereby a large area of formerly unregistered land was discovered. Secondly, the "public land" was reorganized into "civil land" through the reorganization of the land system at the end of the Qing and after the 1911 Revolution. Consequently, the "public land" in Fengtian occupied only 1,018,675 *mu* out of 93,144,260 *mu* of the total registered land (only about 1 percent) in 1931. The point here is that a considerable part of the former "public land," which was reorganized into "civil land," fell into the hands of former Han bannermen, who had managed and cultivated them as "public land." Therefore, our question is, how did these Han bannermen establish their ownership of the lands which had been formally retained by the Qing court and its nobles? Through this in-

Table 2 Acreage of Registered Cultivated Land in Fengtian Province by Year

Year	Acreage (<i>mu</i>)
1661 ¹⁾	60,933
1685 ¹⁾	311,750
1724 ¹⁾	580,658
1753 ¹⁾	2,524,321
1851 ¹⁾	11,524,171
1887 ¹⁾	28,495,912
(Total Public Land	21,997,681
(Total Civil Land	6,498,231
1908 ²⁾	41,695,340
1931 ³⁾	93,144,260
(Total Public Land	1,018,675
(Total Civil Land	92,125,585

- Sources: 1) Liang Fangzhong, *Zhongguo lidai hukou tiandi tianhu tongji* (Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1980) pp. 380, 384-85.
 2) *Manshū chihō-shi Maki 1*, (Kantou totokufu, 1911) p. 140.
 3) *Dongbei nianjian (Minguo 20 edition)*, (Dongbei wenhua-she, 1932) p. 112.

quiry, we may be able to understand how some Han bannermen became powerful landlords in Fengtian at the end of the Qing period and after the 1911 Revolution. Before examining this question, I would like to explain the situation of the Han bannermen who managed the public lands in the Qing period.

(2) Han Bannermen as Pseudo-Landlords in the Qing Period

As mentioned above, when the Qing conquered Liaodong at the beginning of the seventeenth century, many landlords offered their allegiance and lands to the Qing in return for their protection. A large part of this land was owned by the Qing court and its nobles and organized as various kinds of manors. The former landlords became Han bannermen and were sometimes appointed as the manor managers. Peasants who had cultivated these lands under the landlords were also usually included in the banner system. They tilled the land as before under the control of the *zhuangtou* who were in fact the former landlords. It is also true that some of the former Ming soldiers were appointed as the *zhuangtou* of the manors for their meritorious deeds during the Qing's conquest.²¹⁾

There were two reasons why the Qing appointed the former landlords as the *zhuangtou* of the manors. The first was that the Qing dynasty could rule the lands and the cultivators more effectively through former power-holders, namely, landlords and influential people in villages. The second was that the Han people were generally skillful in agriculture. The Qing could utilize their skill by retaining some of the former Han landlords as manorial managers. The post of *zhuangtou* was hereditary, and its duties were to manage lands and peasants and to pay annual tribute to the Qing court and its nobles.²²⁾ The Qing tried to ensure the Manchus' financial dominance by establishing the manors as their financial basis.

Although the Qing court and its nobles were maintained by their manors and received annual tribute from the *zhuangtou*, they were unable to participate in the actual governing of the manors. Rather, the real control over the manors was in the hands of the *zhuangtou*. Thus, in the manor system in Manchuria, the Qing dynasty faced a serious problem. Since the Qing nobles depended upon the manors which were organized under the control of *zhuangtou*, the dynasty had to ensure the power of the *zhuangtou* over the lands and peasants. On the other hand, the dynasty had to check the growth of *zhuangtou* power because it would infringe upon the Qing court and its nobles' ownership of the lands. The only thing that secured the Manchus' status as owners of the manors was their power as conquerors. Therefore, if their power as conquerors waned, their control over the manor lands would be precarious.

Actually, the Qing court and its nobles did lose the control over the manors early in the Qing dynasty. It was illustrated by the report of Sun Jiagan

in the mid-Qing period, which revealed much about the manors in Fengtian in general. (Sun Jiagan was appointed Xieban daxueshi [Assistant Grand Secretary] and Libu shangshu [a Minister of Personnel Ministry] during the time of Qianlong.)²³⁾ He reported the following:

But recently the bannermen (the Qing nobles) sue the tenant peasants for not paying annual tributes and try to confiscate these lands from the tenant peasants. On the other hand, the tenant peasants lodge objections against the bannermen's claims. As a matter of fact, all of those problems were caused by the subordinates of bannermen such as the slaves of the bannermen who were sent to the bannerlands (the manors) in Manchuria to collect annual tributes, the *zhuangtou* of the bannerlands who collect annual tributes from the tenant peasants, and the subordinates of the *zhuangtou*. If the peasants want to get good farmlands, they have to work hard to reclaim, fertilize, and cultivate those lands for two or three years. However, after they have finished cultivating those lands, the subordinates of the bannermen will sue the peasants for occupying the bannerlands. In this way, the bannerlands expand and the *zhuangtou* can get much of the annual tributes, but they offer less annual tribute to the bannermen. The bannermen were robbed of their lands and the tenant peasants suffer the severe collection of annual tributes by the *zhuangtou*. The *zhuangtou* and the subordinates embezzle the annual tributes and share them. Then they collect the next year's annual tributes from the tenant peasants to pay to the bannermen. The next year the *zhuangtou* are not able to collect the annual tributes. So the *zhuangtou*, being afraid of the reproach of the bannermen, report to the bannermen that the tenant peasants will not pay annual tributes. Therefore, the bannermen sue the tenant peasants for not paying annual tributes, and the tenant peasants lodge an objection against the bannermen. The bannermen are suffering from the lack of annual tributes although they have the bannerlands. On the other hand, the tenant peasants are threatened with the confiscation of their cultivated lands even though they pay annual tributes regularly. Only the *zhuangtou* and the subordinates of the *zhuangtou* can live a luxurious life by embezzling the annual tributes of the bannerlands.²⁴⁾

Sun Jiagan blamed the *zhuangtou* and their subordinates for embezzling the annual tribute they had collected from the peasants of the manors. Because of this embezzlement, the Qing nobles were not able to collect sufficient revenue. On the other hand, the *zhuangtou* had compelled the Han Chinese peasants to reclaim new lands, which were then merged as part of the manors. The *zhuangtou* made the Han Chinese peasants their tenants, and further burdened these peasants with the compulsory payment of annual tribute. Through this process,

the *zhuangtou* extended the lands of the manors that were actually under their rule. Under these circumstances, some of the *zhuangtou* accumulated wealth by exploiting the peasants, while the real owners of the manors (the Qing court and its nobles) were confronted with increasing financial difficulties. There might be some exaggeration in this memorial about the local power of the *zhuangtou*, but I think Sun's memorial seems to express the strong complaint of Manchu nobles about the problems of their manors in those days, even though Sun himself was not a Manchu noble.

The concentration of actual power over the manors in the hands of the *zhuangtou* continued until the later part of the Qing period. The following report by Zhang Tingxiang described these conditions in the Daoguang period.²⁵⁾ It was a typical characteristic of such reports that it blamed on the misconduct of the *zhuangtou*:

The *zhuangtou* of the Jinzhou manor, Gao Lin, had strong local power. His name was well known even in the Imperial court. He always blew his trumpet and kept many concubines. He treated the peasants harshly. Indeed, his unlawful deeds were innumerable.²⁶⁾

The documents above revealed that the manors did not necessarily nor properly function as the private economic basis of the Qing court and its nobles. Some *zhuangtou* actually behaved as pseudo-landlords in Fengtian local society. As Amagai reported, some *zhuangtou* were actually very wealthy and wielded considerable influence in the villages of southern Manchuria. Under such conditions, the Qing dynasty itself was inclined to reorganize the manorial and "public land" systems in Fengtian province after the Russo-Japanese War.

III. The Disposal of "Public Land" at the End of the Qing Period

Confronted by the crises of the Russian and Japanese invasions, the Qing government tried to reorganize its control over Manchuria. The basic structure of the Manchurian administrative system was reorganized from a military one to a civil one in 1907, which meant that this area was placed in the same administrative system as other provinces.²⁷⁾ As one of the key reform programs in Fengtian, the Qing government began to reorganize the "public land" as "civil land." As I explained, the reason for this reform was the Qing dynasty's realization that "public land" could no longer function as the private economic basis of the Manchus, especially because manor lands increasingly fell into the hands of the *zhuangtou* and other powerful Han bannermen. A large part of the "public land" was actually controlled by these pseudo-landlords, those Han bannermen on whom had been bestowed the right to manage the lands by the dynasty.

After the Russo-Japanese War, the Fengtian provincial government under the Qing made a full-scale land survey and sold a vast area of "public land" to private civilians. This project of "public land" disposal was carried on by the Fengtian provincial government under the Republic and, later, also by the Zhang Zuolin government.²⁸⁾

There were two purposes of this project. The first purpose was to certify ownership of specific land parcels; the titled groups would pay for the land and would have the responsibility for paying land taxes. This project was essentially a cadastral survey through which the Fengtian provincial government intended to establish land ownership and tax responsibilities. Moreover, through this project the government sought to increase its economic and political control over local landlords and villages.

The second purpose was to generate revenue. The Qing government had been interested in the disposal of "public land" as a financial source since the beginning of the twentieth century. In particular, it needed an enormous amount of money to implement various reform programs in Fengtian. According to the calculations of the second Governor-General Xi Liang in 1910, the Fengtian provincial government annually needed 2.5 million *liang* for the re-establishment of police system, 2.0 million *liang* for the establishment of new judicial system, and 4.4 million *liang* for the reorganization of the educational system.²⁹⁾ But how would the provincial government be able to make such a large amount of money? Xi Liang also indicated that the annual revenue of the Fengtian provincial government was only 15.8 million *liang* in 1908.³⁰⁾ Facing this financial crisis, the Qing bureaucrats in Fengtian province disposed of the "public land" as one of the financial resources. They could also expect certain amount of regular revenue through the land tax on the former "public lands."

The important point here is that the former Han bannermen, especially some of the *zhuangtou* of the manors, now had the opportunities to buy the land they had been controlling. By purchasing the ownership of "public land" or simply occupying these lands, some Han bannermen who had been pseudo-landlords would be able to acquire the status as true landlords.

The "public land" was disposed of in the following manners. Table III, based upon the *Dongsansheng zhenglüe*, provides data concerning the disposal of "public land" in Fengtian at the end of the Qing period.³¹⁾ First of all, the provincial government specified the sixteen specific areas which had been regarded as "public land" under the traditional Qing land system. They called the undertakings of these land disposal "projects." I have numbered the projects which disposed of the lands in the sixteen areas in Table III. The entire land within these sixteen areas was sold to private citizens. We can classify these areas into three groups. The first group is that of originally unreclaimed lands which had been preserved for the Manchu bannermen (the areas num-

Table 3 Disposal of Public Land in Fengtian at the End of the Qing Period

(A) Areas Disposed of	(B) Year of Disposal	(C) Acreage of Land Disposed of	(D) Total Revenue	(E) Revenue in 1907 and 1908	(F) Land Price	(G) Land Tax
(1) Qianfang dongliu weihuang	1901-05	1,167,270 <i>mu</i>	1,451,029 <i>liang</i>	None	1 <i>liang</i> 2 <i>qian</i> per <i>mu</i>	2 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(2) Qianfang xiliu weihuang	1903-05	3,031,788 <i>mu</i>	1,186,798 <i>liang</i>	None		
(3) Dalinghe muchang	1901-02	509,190 <i>mu</i>	583,354 <i>liang</i>	None	The 1st class	4-1 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(4) Pansheyi kenwu	1903-07	574,211 <i>mu</i>	321,089 <i>liang</i>	None	2 <i>liang</i> 1 <i>qian</i> per <i>mu</i>	3-1 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(5) Jinshu guigongdi	1905-07	213,770 <i>mu</i>	328,291 <i>liang</i>	181,683 <i>liang</i>	The 2nd class 1 <i>liang</i> 4 <i>qian</i> per <i>mu</i>	4-2 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(6) Jinzhou guanzhuang	1906-	1,041,560 <i>mu</i>	1,800,000 <i>liang</i>	941,589 <i>liang</i>	The 3rd class	8-6 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(7) Niuzhuang weitang	1906-08	385,522 <i>mu</i>	207,230 <i>liang</i>	108,295 <i>liang</i>	7 <i>qian</i> per <i>mu</i>	8-6 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(8) Zhangwu qingzhang	1906-	2,637,499 <i>mu</i>	170,000 <i>liang</i>	43,062 <i>liang</i>	6 <i>qian</i> 6 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>	2 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(9) Fengxiu shanghuang	1907-	1,232,750 <i>mu</i>	Not decided	10,259 <i>liang</i> *	6 <i>qian</i> per <i>mu</i>	5-2 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(10) Fengxiu weitang	1907-	Not decided	Not decided	None	Same as Project (3)-(6)	2 <i>fen</i> per <i>mu</i>
(11) Dongliu fuzhang	1907-	Not decided	Not decided	150,000 <i>liang</i> *		
(12) Qianfang zasa Ketu wangqi	1902-04	625,000 <i>shang</i> 1,250,000 <i>zhang</i>	806,000 <i>liang</i>	Not received	The 1st class	660 <i>wen</i> per <i>shang</i>
(13) Xufang zasa ketu wangqi	1906-07	89,063 <i>shang</i> 140,640 <i>zhang</i>	189,204 <i>liang</i>	40,531 <i>liang</i>	4 <i>liang</i> 4 <i>qian</i> per <i>shang</i>	
(14) Keerqin zhenguo gongqi	1904-06	400,000 <i>shang</i>	327,037 <i>liang</i>	None	The 2nd class 2 <i>liang</i> 4 <i>qian</i> per <i>shang</i>	
(15) Tushen yetu	1906-	13,121 <i>fang</i>	Not decided	202,250 <i>liang</i>	The 3rd class	
(16) Xufang zasa ketu zhenguo gongqi hebei meng huhuang	1908-	200,000 <i>shang</i>	Not decided	9,565 <i>liang</i> **	1 <i>liang</i> 4 <i>qian</i> per <i>shang</i>	

* Shengping silver

** Shiping silver

Source: *Dongsansheng zhenglue*, juan 7, pp. 3a-5b. Reprint, vol. 9. pp. 5021-26.

bered 1, 2, 4, and 7-11). The second is that of lands owned by public manors such as the Neiwufu manor (the areas numbered 3, 5, and 6). The third group is pasture which had originally been held by Mongol bannermen (the areas numbered 12-16). A large part of these lands had already been cultivated by Han Chinese peasants. The provincial government established an office for each disposal project at the nearest district capital of the disposed area. The office was called Genwuju (the Office of Reclamation). The officials dispatched from the Genwuju surveyed land, examined the landholding structure, and decided on the ownership of land. Then, the provincial government would issue a deed to the certified landowner, who would pay the land price and be responsible for paying the land tax. As Table III shows, the disposal of the Fengtian "public land" was carried out from 1901 onwards through Projects 1 and 3. The provincial government further expanded the projects under the direction of the Genwu dazhen (The Minister of Reclamation), Ting Jie, from 1905 onwards.³²⁾

(i) Land Price and Tax

Column (F) of Table III shows the price of land sold in these projects. Each project had its own regulated land price. However, seven out of sixteen of the undertakings had the same fixed price for cultivated land (those numbered 3-6, 8, 10 and 11). The best quality land was sold for 2 *liang* 1 *qian* per *mu*, the second for 1 *liang* 4 *qian*, and the third for 7 *qian*. Unreclaimed lands in those areas were sold at considerably lower prices. The lands in the projects numbered 1, 2, 7, and 9 were sold at lower prices due to their low productivity and disadvantageous locations. Land which was originally pasture was sold at the same fixed price. The best quality land was sold at 4 *liang* 4 *qian* per *shang* (about 10 *mu*), the second at 3 *liang* 4 *qian*, and the third at 2 *liang* 4 *qian*. Also, the provincial government collected miscellaneous fees from the sale of the "public lands."

Our question is whether these land prices were reasonable compared to the contemporary real average land price of each area. We do not have a definite answer. However, we do have an example: according to a research conducted by the Fengtian Research Institute of Agriculture (Fengtian Nongshi Shiyanchang) in 1909, the average land price in Jinzhou prefecture was about 8 *liang* per *mu*.³³⁾ If this was the case, the Neiwufu's manors lands located in Jinzhou (Jinzhou manor) were disposed of at a price which was only about 20 percent of the real average land price in this area. Considering the case of the disposal of the Jinzhou manors, it is highly likely that the provincial government set the land price at a considerably lower level because the land was sold to those who had actually strong customary rights to the land in previous days.

Column (G) shows the land tax. The provincial government set the rate of the land tax from 1 *fen* to 8 *fen* per *mu* in Projects 1-11 according to the quality

and location of the land. For example, because of its fertility and good location, land in the former Jinzhou manors was very heavily taxed compared to other land. The Jinzhou region had been a well-developed agricultural area since the early Qing period, and a large part of the land there had already been reclaimed even before the establishment of the Jinzhou manors in 1669.³⁴⁾ At the end of the Qing period, the Jinzhou area enjoyed also the good access to the railroad which connected northern China and Shenyang.

(ii) Acreage of Land Disposed

Column (C) indicates the acreage of land which has been sold in these projects. According to the figures in Column (C), at least 7 million *mu* of land was sold by 1908, not counting the sale of former pasture lands. The provincial government continued to sell the former "public land" thereafter. The total acreage of registered land in Fengtian was about 40 million *mu* in 1908. The above figures show how widespread the disposal of public land was at the end of the Qing period. If we assume that the average acreage of a field that one household cultivated in Fengtian was about 20–30 *mu*, 7 million *mu*, the total area of land sold, was equivalent to the acreage of about 230,000–350,000 households' fields.³⁵⁾

(iii) The Provincial Government's Revenue from the Disposal of "Public Land"

Columns (D) and (E) show the provincial government's revenue from this project. According to Column (D), the provincial government had already received about 4 million *liang* by 1908 through the sale of "public land" in areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8. Also, about 1.8 million *liang* was expected through the disposal of the Jinzhou manors (project 6). Xi Liang's report later confirmed that the provincial government actually received more than 1.48 million *liang* by 1909 through the disposal of the Jinzhou manors.³⁶⁾ Column (E) indicates that the total revenue from the disposal of "public land" in 1907 and 1908 was about 1.64 million *liang*. As mentioned above, according to Xi Liang's report, the revenue of Fengtian province in 1908 was about 15.8 million *liang*.³⁷⁾ Therefore, these figures show how important the revenue from the disposal of "public land" was to the provincial government's finances in those days. The revenues from the disposal of "public land" provided a vast amount of money for implementation of reform programs in Fengtian at the end of the Qing.

(iv) The Establishment of Land Ownership by the Former Pseudo-Landlords

The next important question is who had the right to purchase the former "public land." The basic principle the Qing government adopted was to re-organize the "public land" into "civil land" without destroying the existing social hierarchy and order of rural communities. As a result, the people who had actually controlled "public land" in villages were granted first priority in the purchase of the land. I would like to consider this point in the case of the Neiwufu manors.

According to the *Zhengzhi guanbao* and the *Dongsansheng zhenglüe* written by Xu Shichang, the *zhuangtou* (managers) were granted the first priority to purchase the manor lands of the Neiwufu which they had previously managed. If the *zhuangtou* could not afford the purchase price for a particular piece of land, then the right of purchase would be passed to the tenants of the manors. If neither the *zhuangtou* nor the tenant intended to purchase the land, the provincial government would sell this land in open market.³⁸⁾ Why were the *zhuangtou* given the right to buy the land? First of all, many of the ancestors of *zhuangtou* had been the landowners in this area in the Ming period and commended themselves to the Manchu dynasty with their lands when the Qing conquered. Because of these historical facts, the *zhuangtou* were granted special rights to the land. The second and more important reason was that it was most of the *zhuangtou* who actually controlled the land and peasants in the Qing period. They were already functioning as landlords and formed the local ruling class in the area. As Amagai Kenzaburō mentioned, the Neiwufu manor *zhuangtou* were generally wealthy and thus the most capable of meeting the purchase price and tax.³⁹⁾

Unfortunately, there is currently no document that systematically records the names of those who acquired ownership of the former Neiwufu manor lands. We do, however, have fragmentary records concerning the disposal of the Neiwufu manors located in Jinzhou. The Jinzhou manors were formally controlled by 216 *zhuangtou* and each of them was supposed to manage 3,900–5,400 *mu* of land.⁴⁰⁾ As Table III indicates, about 1.35 million *mu* of the Jinzhou manor land was disposed of in 1906 to 1909.

The *zhuangtou* had to evaluate the benefit and cost that the disposal of the manor lands might bring them. The benefit was that they would acquire the official ownership of the land. The cost incurred was the land price and tax. Xi Liang wrote in his memorial that some of the *zhuangtou* schemed to obstruct the disposal of Jinzhou manors because they did not want to pay the land price and tax for the land they had actually been controlling. In addition, some of the *zhuangtou* could not afford to buy the land and, therefore, they resisted the dis-

posals of the manor lands.⁴¹⁾ It was natural that they were afraid of losing their rights to the land. However, according to Xi Liang's report, some *zhuangtou* of the manors were, on the contrary, eager to purchase the manor lands that they had been managing, and many of them had the economic, political, and social power to do so. They welcomed the disposal of Jinzhou manors because this would give them juridical ownership of the land. Furthermore, some *zhuangtou* who did not have enough money to purchase the vast area of the land they had been managing could borrow money from merchants. After these *zhuangtou* bought the land with loans from merchants, they sold part of it to the merchants in order to settle their debt.⁴²⁾

Given the fact that the *zhuangtou* were granted first priority in acquiring landlord status, many tenants of the manor resisted this project because they were also afraid of losing their customary rights to the land. In the Qing period, some of the manors' tenants whose families had been cultivating the land since the establishment of the manor or had reclaimed the land were generally permitted to cultivate the land as long as they paid rent. Moreover, the *zhuangtou* were not able to raise the rent at will. This type of tenancy, called "permanent tenancy" (*yongdian quan*), was very common in Fengtian in those days.⁴³⁾ However, once the *zhuangtou* acquired full ownership of the land through the disposal of the manor lands, the tenants' right to the land became precarious. Regarding the strong misgivings of the manor tenants, the Qing government issued deeds to those tenants, which officially confirmed their permanent tenancy on the land the tenants had been cultivating even after the disposal of the manor lands to the *zhuangtou*.⁴⁴⁾ In addition, some wealthy tenants were also allowed to purchase parts of the manor lands.⁴⁵⁾

According to Xu Shichang's memorial, a *zhuangtou* of the Jinzhou manor named Xu Chungsheng, a Han Plain Yellow bannerman, had previously controlled about 3,000 *mu* of manor land. When the Jinzhou manors were disposed of, both Xu and the manor's tenants insisted on their right of purchase. As a result, more than 1,100 *mu* of land was purchased by Xu's family, while more than 1,800 *mu* of land was bought by 153 tenants.⁴⁶⁾

Also, according to a 1937 investigation conducted by the Land Bureau of the Manzhouguo government (Manshūkoku Tochikyoku), one former *zhuangtou* of the Jinzhou manor named Ling Yungge, a Han Plain Yellow bannerman, controlled more than 9,000 *mu* of manor land in Suizhong during the Qing period. An ancestor of Ling Yunge had been a soldier of the former Ming general, Kong Youde, and in 1669 he was appointed the *zhuangtou* of the Jinzhou manor in Suizhong area for his meritorious deeds during the Qing's conquest. On this occasion, both the *zhuangtou* Ling Yungge and the tenants of the manor claimed their rights to purchase the land. The tenants claimed that their ancestors immigrated into this area from Shandong in 1663 and that they reclaimed and cultivated the land even before the establishment of the Jinzhou manors. After ne-

gotiations between Ling Yunge and the tenants, the tenants of the manors were permitted to buy only about 640 *mu* of land, while Ling's family was allowed to retain the rest.⁴⁷⁾ The above cases clearly indicate that some powerful *zhuangtou* of the Jinzhou manors, Han Plain Yellow Bannermen, actually purchased a large part of the former manor land, as the Qing officials expected.

IV. The Disposal of Public Land after the 1911 Revolution

During the 1911 Revolution, the Republican government confirmed the privileged right of the former Qing court over those manors and the Sanling lands. Those lands were now called the Imperial Estates (*huangchan*). Therefore, even after the 1911 Revolution, the former Qing court possessed a large area of land in Manchuria.⁴⁸⁾ Even though the former Qing court was the biggest landlord in this area, they did not have the actual power of control over the land. In fact, however, the former officials of the Imperial Household Department and the Sanling office hereditary controlled the lands. In particular, the managers of the manors and the Sanling lands had influential power over the lands. Peasants who cultivated these lands also had hereditary and customary rights over these lands. The real structure of property rights over the Imperial Estates was very complicated.

The Republican government and the Zhang Zuolin regime, then, tried to dispose of the Imperial Estates. They insisted that a large part of the Imperial Estates originally had the character as "public land." The government began to sold these lands to the common citizens. Now, part of the former Imperial Estates was reorganized as "civil lands (*mindì*)." In other words, even after the 1911 Revolution, the disposal of "public land" to the common civilians was continually carried out by the local government under the Republic and the Zhang Zuolin regime. The Guandi Qingzhangju (the Bureau for the Disposal of Public Land) was established for this purpose in 1915. A report of the Land Bureau of Manzhouguo explained the actual process of the disposal of "public land" conducted in Fengtian province after the 1911 Revolution. According to this report, 11,775,000 *mu* of the former "public land" in Fengtian was sold to common persons from 1913 through 1924. The former manors owned by the Qing offices and its nobles were completely disposed of through those undertakings. The Fengtian provincial government generated about 18,000,000 *yuan* through the disposal of "public land" from 1915 through 1923.⁴⁹⁾ According to Sonoda Kazuki's estimation, the annual revenue of the Fengtian provincial government in 1910s was about 10,000,000–15,000,000 *yuan*.⁵⁰⁾ Therefore, the provincial officials after the 1911 Revolution were also strongly interested in this project as a means of raising revenue. As a result, only prominent Fengtian local bureaucrats such as Wang Yongjiang could assume the position of the Director General of the Bureau for the Disposal of Public Land.⁵¹⁾

Like the cases of the disposal of “public land” at the end of the Qing period, the Fengtian provincial government under the Republic and the Zhang Zuolin government gave the first priority of the purchase of the former “public land” to those who actually controlled the lands. By doing so, the Fengtian government tried to reorganize the former “public land” into “civil land” without destroying the existing order of local society. It is highly possible that the former Han bannermen who had managed the former “public land” further extended their control over the lands through the disposal of “public land” after the 1911 Revolution.

On the other hand, it was also these high rank provincial officials themselves who could buy a large part of the former “public lands” through this project. For example, according to Amano Motonosuke’s investigation in 1928, influential officials in the Fengtian provincial government such as Zhang Zuolin, Gao Qinghe, Zeng Youyi, and Zhang Huanxiang owned vast area of lands in Fengtian province at that time.⁵²⁾ A large part of the lands those officials owned was originally classified as “banner areas” in the Qing period. Therefore, it is highly likely that, taking advantage of their status as high bureaucrats of the Fengtian local government, they bought or simply occupied the former “public land” and became big landlords.

V. From Pseudo-Landlords to Landlords: the Case of the Zhang Family

Some Han bannermen such as the *zhuangtou* of the manors were given the opportunity to purchase or simply to occupy vast area of the former “public land” they had managed. Here, I would like to return to the case of the Zhang family:

As mentioned, the Zhang family had vast landholdings in the Fushun, Xian, and Xifeng areas at the end of the Qing period.⁵³⁾ And from the Zhang family came several powerful personalities in modern history of Manchuria. For example, Zhang Rong was arrested in 1905 for attempted assassination of the five Qing ministers at Beijing station, and escaped from capital punishment since he was a son of the high rank official of the Sanling. He was a leader of the Revolutionary Alliance in Fengtian during the 1911 Revolution and was killed by the subordinates of Zhang Zuolin.⁵⁴⁾ Zhang Huanxiang, a cousin of Zhang Rong, graduated from Japan’s military academy (Rikugun Shikan Gakkou) and became a high rank official of the Zhang Zuolin regime and Manzhouguo.⁵⁵⁾

The Sanling office controlled a large area of lands in Fengtian and Jilin provinces in the Qing period. They believed that there was a long belt of the *longmo* from Zhangbai Mountain through Zhaoling (the tomb of Huantaiji) in Fengtian and that the *longmo* was a stream of special energy, *longqi*, which sustained the Qing dynasty. Zhangbai Mountain was the Manchu people’s spiritual homeland. The Qing dynasty carefully preserved the *longmo*. The Sanling of-

fice controlled the areas in which the *longmo* passed through. It is very interesting that the Zhang family possessed a large area of land where the *longmo* had been considered to pass through.⁵⁶⁾ It is highly likely that, after the 1911 Revolution, the Zhang family established their territory where the Sanling office originally controlled. The following case confirms this hypothesis.

A document (No. 32765) of Fengtian-sheng gonshu (The Office of Fengtian Province) deposited in the Liaoning-sheng dang'an guan (the Archival Museum of Liaoning Province) dealt with the incidents concerning this land. *Zhaoling yaochai guandiandi* spread out west side of the Zhaoling and covered about 30,000 *mu*. The land of *Zhaoling yaochai guandiandi* was supposed to supply firewood and tiles to Zhaoling. But, in fact, the officials of the Sanling invited many Han peasants as tenants and collected annual tributes from them.

According to the documents, the Zhang family actually controlled a large area of these lands. A land register of *Zhaoling yaochai guandiandi* confirms that Zhang Rong and Zhang Huanbai, Zhang Rong's elder brother, held more than 2,000 *mu* of the lands. At the beginning of the Republican period, Zhang Huanbai tried to sell the lands he controlled to Japanese businessmen, Nishimiya Fusajirō and Kodera Soukichi. However, since selling of land to foreigners was illegal at that time, they were prosecuted by the Fengtian provincial government. According to this *dang'an* document we can certify that the Zhang family actually held a part of the Sanling's lands, *Zhaoling yaochai guandiandi*, at the beginning of the Republican period.⁵⁷⁾

Given the above case, it is not strange that some powerful landlords in Fengtian at the beginning of the twentieth century were Han bannermen. The explanation above may also be applicable to other Han bannermen who had managed the "public lands." As discussed, there was a vast area of "public land", controlled by a considerable number of Han bannermen who functioned as "pseudo-landlords" in the villages in Fengtian during the Qing period. When the "public land" was disposed of, these Han bannermen were usually granted first priority in purchasing the lands they had managed. It is reasonable to suppose that influential Han bannermen such as Yuan Jinkai, Tian Yugong, Ling Yunge, and Zhang Jinshan acquired full ownership of their lands through this process. Forming the core of the Fengtian local elite, some of these Han bannermen landlords began to wield power in provincial politics in the early twentieth century.

VI. Conclusion

A large part of the land in Manchuria was organized as "public land" under the banner system in the Qing period. The land was preserved for the Qing court, its nobles, and its bannermen. Free buying and selling of the lands was, therefore, strictly prohibited. Han civil people were not allowed to buy and

own the bannerland in this area. Under the bannerland system, some powerful Han bannermen such as the *zhuangtou* of the manors and the officials of the Sanling actually controlled the lands.

The Qing government has begun to dispose of these lands since the beginning of the twentieth century. And the local governments under the Republic and the Zhang Zuolin regime took over this project. The bannerland was reorganized into civil land. One who paid land price and land tax for a particular parcel of land acquired its title and ownership. The influential local elite of Han bannermen mentioned above were usually granted the first priority to purchase the land they had controlled. Many of them indeed paid money for the lands and established their land ownership. The provincial governments raised enormous amount of money through the disposal of the public land.

Lands in Manchuria were turned into commodity. In other words, land market has been established in Manchuria since the beginning of the twentieth century. People could buy and sell lands freely through market. Accumulating the amount of land they held, some high rank officials and powerful local elite in Fengtian began to wield great influence in provincial society. Landholding became an essential part of one's wealth in local society. However, the existing order of local society was basically reserved because a large part of the lands were disposed of to the former Han bannermen who had managed the "public land" under the banner system in the Qing period. High officials of Manzhouguo such as Yuan Jinkai and Zhang Huanxiang emerged in the provincial politics after the 1911 Revolution through the transformation of the land system, from the bannerland to civil land.

Notes

- 1) Oda Man *et al.*, eds., *Shinkoku gyōsei-hō* (The Administrative Regulations of the Qing Government), Rinji Taiwan kyūkan chōsa-kai, 1905-1914, vol. 4, p. 275, pp. 277-78. Recently, Hosoya Yoshio has discussed the history of the eight banner system. Hosoya Yoshio, "Manju Gurun to Manshū-koku" (Manju gurun and Manzhouguo), in *Rekishī no naka no chiiki* (Regions in History), Iwanami-shoten, 1990, pp. 105-136.
- 2) Ura Ren'ichirō, "Kangun (Ujen Cooha) ni tsuite" (A Study of Han Bannermen), in *Kuwabara hakase kanreki kinen tōyōshi ronsō*, Kōbundō, 1930, pp. 815-30. Recently, Wang Zhonghan, Chen Jiahua, and Fu Kedong have also discussed the general features of Han bannermen and their history during the Qing period. Wang Zhonghan, "Guanyu manzu xingcheng zhong de jige wenti" (Some Problems in the Formation of Manchu People), Cheng Jiahua and Fu Kedong, "Baqi jianli qian niulu renkou chutan" (Preliminary Investigation into Manchurian Niulu and its Population before the Establishment of the Eight Banner System), Cheng Jiahua and Fu Kedong, "Baqi hanjun gaolue" (A Study of the Han Banners), in Wang Zhonghan, ed., *Manzu-shi yanjiu ji* (Collective Works of the Study of the Manchu's History), Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1984.
- 3) *Ibid.*
- 4) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Naimufu kanshō* (The Manors of Imperial Household Department), Minami manshū tetsudō kabushiki kaisha, 1914, pp. 11-21.
- 5) Ura, pp. 822-28.

- 6) Sudō Yoshiyuki, *Shindai Manshū tochi seisaku no kenkyū* (The Study of the Qing's Land Politics in Manchuria), Kawade shobō, 1944, pp. 2-3. Amagai Kenzaburō, *Kōsan* (The Lands Owned by the Qing Court), Minami manshū tetsudō kabushiki kaisha, 1915, pp. 2-6.
- 7) *Fengtian tonzhi* (Local Gazetteer of Fengtian), comp. Wang Shunan *et al.*, 260 *juan*, 1934. Reprint, 5 vols, Shenyang gujiu shudian, 1983. (Reprint) vol. 4, p. 3645. Sonoda Kazuki, *Hōten-ha no shinjin to kyūjin* (New and Old Generations of Fengtian Political Group), Manshū nichichi Shinbun-sha, 1922, p. 84.
- 8) Qin Chengzhi, "Xinhai geming yu Zhang Rong," (The 1911 Revolution and Zhang Rong), in Zhongguo renmin zhengzhi xieshang huiyi quanguo weiyuanhui wenshi shiliao yanjiu weiyuanhui, ed., *Xinhai geming huiyilu, di 5 ji*, (Memoirs of the 1911 Revolution, vol. 5), Zhonghua shudian, 1963, pp. 592-611. p. 592.
- 9) *Fengtian tongzhi* (Reprint), vol. 4, p. 3617.
- 10) Sonoda Kazuki, *Hōtenha no shinjin to kyūjin*, p. 101.
- 11) Qin Chengzhi, "Xinhai geming yu Zhang Rong," p. 592.
- 12) Amano Motonosuke, *Manshū keizai no hattatsu* (The Development of the Manchurian Economy), Minami manshū tetsudō kabushiki kaisha, 1932, p. 41.
- 13) *Fengtian tongzhi, juan 160*, p. 51. Reprint, vol. 4, p. 3725.
- 14) Zhou Junshi (trans. by Zheng Ranquan), *Higeiki no kōtei Fugū* (Puyi, A Tragic Emperor), Kōbunsha, 1984, pp. 186-87.
- 15) Li Wenzhi, ed., *Zhongguo jindai nonyeshi shiliao* (Collected Sources of Agricultural History in Modern China), Sanlian shudian, 1957, vol. 1, p. 194. *Liaoyang xianzhi, juan 13*, p. 4b. Reprint, vol. 2, p. 538.
- 16) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Naimufu kanshō*, p. 134. Tahara Teijirō, *Shinmatsu minsho chūgoku kanshin jinmeiroku* (A Directory of Chinese Officials at the End of the Qing and the Beginning of the Minguo Periods), Chūgoku kenkyukai, 1918, pp. 72-73. Amagai Kenzaburō, *Chūgoku tochi monjo no kenkyū* (Studies on Chinese Documents on Land), Keisō shobō, 1966, p. 800. Amagai Kenzaburō, *Suichūken ryōkaton kanshō shōkachi chōsa hōkoku-sho* (The Report of an Investigation into the Former Public Manor Lands in Lingjiatun of Suizhong County), Tochi seido chōsa-kai, 1939, p. 23.
- 17) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Chūgoku tochi monjo no kenkyū*, p. 800, pp. 807-14.
- 18) Sudō Yoshiyuki, *Shindai manshū tochi seisaku no kenkyū*, pp. 2-3, p. 12.
- 19) Liang Fangzhong, *Zhongguo lidai hukou tiandi tianhu tongji*, Shanhai renmin chuban-she, 1980, p. 395.
- 20) A large number of the Sanling officials and its guards were Han bannermen. The office of the Sanling controlled the tombs of the Qing Emperors in Fengtian and a vast area of land in the eastern part of Fengtian Province and in the southern part of Jilin Province. The lands in these areas were considered as sacred because they were located between the tombs of the Qing Emperors and the Zhangbai Mountain, the legendary birthplace of the Manchu. Reclamation of land in these areas was strictly prohibited by the Qing court, but this rule was actually violated by Han peasants and the Han bannermen of the Sanling themselves in the later Qing period. Amagai Kenzaburō, *Kōsan*, pp. 209-62.
- 21) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Naimufu kanshō*, pp. 11-21.
- 22) *Ibid*, p. 141, pp. 162-66.
- 23) Arthur W. Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (1644-1912)*, United States Government Printing Office, 1944, vol. II, pp. 672-73.
- 24) Sun Jiagan, "Baqi gongchan shu" (Memorials regarding the Eight Banner Lands) in *Huangchao jingshi wenbian, juan 35*, pp. 10b-11a. Reprint, *Huangchao jingshi wenbian* in *Jindai zhongguo shiliao congkan, di 74 ji*, Wenhai chuban-she, 1964, vol. 3, pp. 1278-80.
- 25) Zhang Tingxiang was a *jinshi* from Zhili in the Yongzheng period. Zhu Baojiong, Xie Peilin, ed., *Mingqing jinshi timing beilu suoyin*, Shanghai guji chuban-she, 1963, p. 421.
- 26) Zhongguo kexueyuan Jilinsheng fenyuan lishi yanjiusuo and Jilin shifan daxue lishixi, ed., *Jindai dongbei renmin geming yundong-shi* (Revolutionary Movements of People in the Modern

- Northeast Provinces), Chengwen chuban-she, 1973, p. 11.
- 27) *Shinkoku gyōsei-hō*, vol. 1 (Part 2), pp. 94-98.
- 28) I examined the disposal of public land in Fengtian at the end of the Qing period and after the 1911 Revolution in the following articles. Enatsu Yoshiki, "Shinmatsu no jiki, tōsanshō nanbu ni okeru kanchi no jōhō no shakai keizaishi teki imi" (The Social-economic Significance of the Disposal of Public Lands in the Southern Three Northeastern Provinces at the End of the Qing Dynasty), *Shakai keizai-shi gaku*, vol. 49-4, 1983, pp. 28-47. Enatsu Yoshiki, "Shingai kakumei go, kyū hōtenshō ni okeru kanyūchi no haraisage ni tsuite" (The Disposal of Public Land in Fengtian Province after the 1911 Revolution), *Hitotsubashi ronsō*, vol. 98-6, 1987, pp. 23-42.
- 29) Zhongguo kexueyuan lishi yanjiusuo di san suo, ed., *Xi Liang yigao caogao* (Collected Works of Xi Liang), vols., Zhonghua shudian, 1959, *juan 7*, (document number 1131). Reprint, vol. 2, pp. 1248-51.
- 30) *Ibid*, *juan 7*, (document number 1021). Reprint, vol. 2, p. 1117.
- 31) Xu Shichang, *Dongsansheng zhenglüe* (The Administration of the Three Eastern Provinces). Reprint, 12 vols., Chengwen chuban-she, 1965, *juan 7*, pp. 3a-5b.
- 32) *Ibid*, *juan 7*, p. 14a.
- 33) Fengtian nongshi shiyanchang, ed., *Fengtian quansheng nongye diaocha shu, di 1 qi* (The Report of an Investigation into Agriculture in Fengtian Province, Part 1), Fengtian, 1909, vol. 5-2, p. 40a.
- 34) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Suichūken ryōkaton kanshō shōkachi chōsa hōkoku-sho*, p. 8.
- 35) The average acreage of a field which one household cultivated in Guangning and Yizhou in Jinzhou area was about 20-30 *mu* at the end of the Qing period. *Fengtian quansheng nongye diaocha shu, di 1 qi*, vol. 5-2, p. 46b-47a.
- 36) *Xi Liang yigao caogao, juan 7*, (document number 910). Reprint, vol. 2, pp. 975-76.
- 37) *Ibid*, *juan 7*, (document number 1021). Reprint, vol. 2, p. 1117.
- 38) Xu Shichang, *Dongsansheng zhenglüe, juan 7*, p. 9a.
- 39) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Chūgoku tochi monjo no kenkyū*, pp. 809-10, p. 814.
- 40) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Naimufu kanshō*, p. 36, pp. 109-10.
- 41) *Xi Liang yigao caogao, juan 7*, (document number 910). Reprint, vol. 2, pp. 975-76
- 42) *Ibid*.
- 43) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Suichūken ryōkaton kanshō shōkachi chōsa hōkoku-sho*, p. 8.
- 44) *Ibid*, p. 6, p. 24.
- 45) For example, in Dashicaotun of Suizhong county, some tenant peasants of the Jinzhou manors were allowed to buy all manor land in their village. (Manshūkoku) Kokumin sangyōbu nōmushi ed., *Kōtoku 4 nendo Kengishi minaraisei nōson jittai chōsa hōkoku-sho, Kīnshū-shō Suichū-ken* (The fourth year of Kotoku edition, The Report of the Actual Situation of the Agricultural Village by Probational Servants of the County, Suizhong County in Jinzhou Province), 1938, pp. 232-41.
- 46) Xu Shichang, *Tuigengtang congshu* (Collected Works of Tuigengtang), *juan 20*, pp. 27a-28b.
- 47) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Suichūken ryōkaton kanshō shōkachi chōsa hōkoku-sho*, p. 14, pp. 39-42.
- 48) Amagai Kenzaburō, *Kōsan*, pp. 209-62.
- 49) Manshūkoku Tochikyoku, *Manshū ni okeru tochi seido gaiyō* (An Overview of the Land System in Manchuria), 1935, pp. 42-53.
- 50) Sonoda Kazuki, *Hotenshō zaisei no kenkyū* (A Study of the Finances of Fengtian Province), Hotenjihō-sha, 1927, Appendix p. 1.
- 51) Sonoda Kazuki, *Hotenha no shinjin to kyūjin*, pp. 131-32.
- 52) Amano Motonosuke, *Manshū keizai no hattatsu* (The Development of the Manchurian Economy), Minami manshū tetsudō kabushiki kaisha, 1932, p. 41.
- 53) Qin Chengzhi, "Xinhai geming yu Zhang Rong," p. 592.
- 54) *Ibid*.
- 55) Gaimushō jōhō-bu, ed., *Gendai chūka minkoku, manshū teikoku jinmeikan, shōwa 12 nen ban* (A

Directory of Contemporary Republic of China and Manzhouguo, 1937 edition), Tōa dōbunkai, 1937, pp. 658-659.

- 56) Qin Chengzhi, "Xinhai geming yu Zhang Rong," p. 592.
- 57) I examined the case of the *Zhaoling yaochai guandiandi* in the following article. Enatsu Yoshiki, "Shingai kakumei go kyū hōten-shō ni okeru kanchi no haraisage" (The Disposition of Public land in Fengtian after the 1911 Revolution), *Tōyōshi kenkyū*, vol. 53-3, 1994, pp. 103-127.