EISENMAN, Joshua. 2018. Red China's Green Revolution: Technological Innovation, Institutional Change, and Economic Development Under the Commune. New York: Columbia University Press.

Felix Wemheuer

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/chinaperspectives/11063>

DOI: 10.4000/chinaperspectives.11063

ISSN: 1996-4617

Publisher

Centre d'étude français sur la Chine contemporaine

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 December 2020

Number of pages: 60-61

ISSN: 2070-3449

Electronic reference

Felix Wemheuer, "EISENMAN, Joshua. 2018. Red China's Green Revolution: Technological Innovation, Institutional Change, and Economic Development Under the Commune. New York: Columbia University Press.", *China Perspectives* [Online], 2020/4 | 2020, Online since 01 December 2020, connection on 10 December 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/chinaperspectives/11063> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/chinaperspectives.11063>

helps reconsider the generic and thematic connections between 1950s and 1960s Cantonese cinema.

Chapters Five and Six expand outward, to Southeast Asia (*Nanyang* 南洋), and forward, to the late 1960s, to assess different strategies and developments in how filmmakers screened, and constructed, communities on-screen in Hong Kong cinema. The latter chapter helps with understanding how the “factory girl” series of films offer narratives articulating female emancipation and a fantasy of factory life, but perhaps more analysis on how these films posit that sacrificing oneself for capitalism is a noble pursuit would help illuminate their ideology in relation to local identity.

It would also have been interesting to see consideration of Mandarin left-leaning/left-wing films to enrich our understanding of the industrial and creative milieu of the time. Overall, Chang’s book contributes greatly to reassessments of Hong Kong film history and demonstrates the importance of archival research. Her screening communities lens focuses clearly on how different parties with different political affiliations, commercial considerations, and agendas all utilised cinema to take part in the construction of Hong Kong’s post-war communities.

■ Tom Cunliffe is a PhD graduate and early career researcher from SOAS, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London, WCH1 0XG, UK (229623@soas.ac.uk).

EISENMAN, Joshua. 2018.
*Red China's Green Revolution:
Technological Innovation,
Institutional Change, and
Economic Development Under the
Commune.*
New York: Columbia University Press.

FELIX WEMHEUER

In this book, Joshua Eisenman presents a revisionist approach to the Chinese People’s Communes era (1958-1983). One of his main goals is to question common narratives in Chinese and Western research that the communes would have been an economic failure and that only decollectivisation under Deng Xiaoping in the 1980s set agriculture on the right track. Eisenman is not motivated by nostalgia for so-called Maoist “egalitarianism.” Rather, he argues strictly in economic terms, claiming that the communes were a successful model to modernise agriculture, increase productivity in grain production, and promote the green revolution, at least in the 1970s. This institution would have allowed the state to enforce household austerity in the villages, reallocating these savings for investment in machinery, irrigation systems, fertilizers, small factories, or agricultural schools.

Eisenman introduces the reader to several changes in the commune system: For example, the period of the Great Leap Forward (GLF) (1958-61)

was characterised by over-saving and unproductive investments such as the steel campaign. The Rightist Commune (1962-64) in the aftermath of the famine resulted in under-saving. According to Eisenman, the best model was the Green Revolution Commune (1970-79) characterised by high saving rates allocated to useful and productive investments. In Chapter Four, he uses neoclassic economic growth models from Solow-Swan and Arthur Lewis to prove this argument. Most of the data sets in the book are taken from official Chinese statistics published in the 1980s.

In Chapter Five on politics, Eisenman argues that the communes would have been the “churches” of Maoism (p. 254). With rituals like songs, dance, or readings of the *Little Red Book*, the Party indoctrinated commune members to work hard, to be self-reliant, to consume little and to save resources. By doing so, politics contributed to the communes’ accumulation of capital. In the last part of the book, Eisenman argues that the communes did not face an economic crisis when Deng came to power after 1978. It would have been much more a political decision of the Party leadership to gradually dissolve the communes in order to bury the collectivist ideology of the Mao era.

Red China’s Green Revolution is a thoughtful provocation and should be discussed. To combine approaches from neoclassical economy, organisational theory, history, and politics is innovative, but not always easy to follow. The author presents himself as a “young Turk” challenging the field. However, he does not engage with major academic works related to his topic and even ignores them. For example, Kenneth Walker published several books and articles on grain production in the commune era, using official statistics from the 1980s, and re-evaluating them in a critical way (Walker 1984). Robert Ash also came to a much less rosy conclusion than Eisenman (Ash 1998, 2006: 993). This is also true for prominent Chinese scholar Wen Tiejun 溫鐵軍, who has argued that low agricultural prices helped the industries and cities to develop at the expense of the countryside (Wen 2000: 175-7). A key institution in this context was the state monopoly for the purchase and sale of grain, which is hardly mentioned by Eisenman.

Some scholars have argued that late Maoism in the 1970s was quite successful in economic and social development. However, if Eisenman wants to prove that the 1970s were more successful than the decollectivisation era, he should have compared both periods. Instead, his data sets end mostly in 1979 or 1983.

Eisenman argues that after the end of the GLF there is no evidence that commune members were “starving or too hungry to work” (xxiv). It seems to be true that no massive-scale deadly famine took place in China after 1962. I have proposed that the government had learnt lessons from the Great Leap to lower the peasants’ burden, to limit the growth of the urban population, and to import grain to feed the cities. These policies were more important to prevent famine than the slight increase in grain production per head (Wemheuer 2014: 142-7). A repetition of the Great Famine was avoided; however, several reports show that in some regions, peasants faced malnutrition and hunger even in the late commune era (Chen 1998; Fu, Hu, and Feng 2008). By the end of the Mao era, peasants ate fewer fine grains (rice and wheat) and more unpopular coarse grains (sweet potato etc.) than they had 20 years before (Ash 2006: 990). By international standards, the Chinese population could not eat their fill in the Mao era. Only in 1978 could China for the first time meet the minimum level of basic nutrition of over 2,400 calories a day per person, as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) (Nussbaumer and Ruthemann 2003, Vol. 1: 116).

In Eisenman’s book, we learn little about peasants’ reactions to changes in the commune system. However, several studies show that they developed a set of strategies to hide resources from the state such as stealing, “eating green”

(meaning unripe grain), and underreporting grain and land (Thaxton 2008; Gao 2013). According to Eisenman, honest peasants were working hard in the “churches of Maoism” because they were indoctrinated by the Party. However, his examples for quasi-religious rituals are mostly taken from the peak of the Cultural Revolution (1966–1969), and are not representative of the whole commune era. In any case, if Joshua Eisenman uses comprehensive empirical research and challenges previous research’s emphasis on resistance within the communes, he should at least mention and engage with these studies.

■ Felix Wemheuer is Professor of Modern China Studies at the University of Cologne. University of Cologne, Department of East Asian Studies, Albertus-Magnus-Platz, 50923, Cologne, Germany (felix.wemheuer@uni-koeln.de).

References

ASH, Robert (ed.). 1998. *Agricultural Development in China, 1949–1989: The Collected Papers of Kenneth Walker (1931–1989)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ASH, Robert. 2006. “Squeezing the Peasants: Grain Extraction, Food Consumption and Rural Living Standards in Mao’s China.” *China Quarterly* 188(December): 959–98.

CHEN, Dabin 陳大斌. 1998. 饑餓引發的變革：一個資深記者的親身經歷與思考 (Ji’e yinfa de biange: Yige zishen jizhe de qinshen jingli yu sikao, A Transformation That Was Caused by Hunger: Thoughts and Personal Experiences of a Senior Journalist). Beijing: Zhonggong dangshi chubanshe.

FU, Shanglun 傅上倫, HU Guohua 胡國華, and FENG Dongshu 馮東書 (eds.). 2008. 告別饑餓 1978 (Gaobie ji’e 1978, Farewell to Hunger 1978). Beijing: Renmin chubanshe.

GAO, Wangling 高王凌. 2013. 中國農民反行為研究 (1950–1980) (Zhongguo nongmin fanxingwei yanjiu (1950–1980), Research on the Counter-behaviour of Chinese Peasants). Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press.

WALKER, Kenneth. 1984. *Food Grain Procurement and Consumption in China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NUSSBAUMER, Josef, and Ruthemann GUIDO. 2003. *Gewalt, Macht, Hunger: Schwere Hungerkatastrophen seit 1845* (Violence, Power, and Hunger: Catastrophes of Hunger since 1845). Innsbruck: Studienverlag.

THAXTON, Ralph. 2008. *Catastrophe and Contention in Rural China: Mao’s Great Leap Forward Famine and the Origins of Righteous Resistance in Da Fo Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WEMHEUER, Felix. 2014. *Famine Politics in Maoist China and the Soviet Union*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

WEN, Tiejun 溫鐵軍. 2000. 中國農村基本經濟制度研究 (Zhongguo nongcun jiben jingji zhidu yanjiu, Research on the Basic Economic System of Rural China). Beijing: Zhongguo jingji chubanshe.

ZHANG, Letian 張樂天. 1998. 告別理想：人民公社制度研究 (Gaobie lixiang: renmin gongshe zhidu yanjiu, Farewell to Ideals: Research on the System of the People’s Communes). Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe.

VANDENABEELE, Valérie. 2019. *La société d'après : politique sino-tibétaine et écologie au Yunnan* (Society Post-Pudacuo: Sino-Tibetan politics and ecology in Yunnan).

Paris: Presses universitaires de Paris Nanterre.

KATIA BUFFETRILLE

This book is the fruit of a thesis defended at the University of Paris X-Nanterre in 2014. Valérie Vandenabeele studied Pudacuo 普達措, China’s first national park, situated in Kham, eastern Tibet (now the Diqing Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture 迪慶) and created on the initiative of The Nature Conservancy, a United States NGO. The author concentrated her research on three Tibetan villages, one situated inside the park and two others on its periphery.

A general introduction is followed by three long sections. The first studies the way in which peripheral areas are integrated in the People’s Republic of China and presents the history of the region using the accounts of inhabitants and official annals, then goes on to examine the creation of the Shangri-la tourist park and its transformation into an “earthly paradise,” instrumentalising the cultural identity of Tibetans. The second section focuses on the Tibetan populations that live in the park and on its periphery, their traditional way of life as farmers and stock breeders, then their adaptation to the modern world and to the economy of tourism brought about by the creation of the park. The author questions “the tourist rhetoric based on the widespread cliché that Tibetan Buddhist beliefs include respecting other living beings and converge with conservation” (p. 221). The third and final section deals with the way in which the park was received in China, describing the process of its creation and the integration of the “local populations into contemporary society under cover of ecology and tourism” (p. 335).

One cannot but congratulate the sinologist Valérie Vandenabeele for her choice of this innovative subject. However, since she neither speaks nor reads Tibetan, she has – with the exception of Western sources – based her work mainly on Chinese sources and interviews held in Chinese, which has led her to study this Tibetan territory through a Chinese prism, that is, that of the coloniser. Strongly Sino-centred references therefore lead her to place the Tibetans in the “Tang Era” (p. 48) rather than in their royal era and in “Yunnan” (p. 81) rather than in Kham, or, more seriously, to create amalgams between Chinese and Tibetan representations, such as this one on p. 25: “the Sinogram *she*, ‘society,’ which in the past designated ‘territorial god’ (...). Although this representation is conveyed by Chinese script, it should be seen in a Tibetan context where communities are also structured around ‘territorial gods.’” The author does not explain the precise way in which her Tibetan informants use the Chinese word *she* 社 (do they know of this ancient meaning, or is it just her making the connection?), nor does she investigate the respective content of these representations. Yet the “territorial god” in Tibet has been