

光復初期臺灣土地改革過程中的 幾個問題：雷正琪函件解讀

黃俊傑*

這篇論文的論述以雷正琪函件為中心，分析光復初期臺灣土地改革過程中，所呈現的現象。本文第二節從雷正琪函件的內容中提出三個具體問題，並以這三個問題作為導引，在第三節交代了臺糖公司土地的由來。本文第四節經由對農民之所以對臺糖公司不滿的分析，探討在光復後的國家資本主義之下，臺灣農民與臺糖公司之間的緊張關係，固有其日據時代的歷史原因與光復後農民生活的困苦作為背景，但更重要的是臺糖公司憑藉國家資本與公權力，任意撤佃或經由中間人放租牟利等行徑，都加深農民的怨恨。

本文第五節中發現，雷正琪函件含有一個更為基本的問題，這就是光復初期國民政府所推動的公地放領政策，與當時以農產品外銷賺取外匯的經濟政策之間，實有無可協調的矛盾性存在。雷正琪這個美籍專家，完全站在土地改革的本位立場看問題，終於無意中引爆了這個地雷。

本文第六節接著分析農復會——邀請雷正琪來臺的機構——在土地改革中所扮演的角色，結果我們發現：農復會在土地改革中，主要的作用在於專家的協助、政策的配合與協調以及經費的補助等三個方面。農復會基本上不是土地問題的最終決策者。從農復會對臺糖土地案的處理，我們看到了農復會技術官僚的長處與局限性。

- 一、前言
- 二、雷正琪函件的內容
- 三、日據背景與臺糖公司土地的由來
- 四、國家資本主義之下農民與臺糖公司的緊張關係
- 五、光復初期土地改革政策與經濟政策的矛盾
- 六、農復會在土地改革過程中的角色
- 七、結論

* 國立臺灣大學歷史系教授

**Problems with Land Reform in Taiwan during
the 1950s: A New Reading of Wolf Ladjinski's
Letter to Chiang K'ai-Shek**

Chun-chieh Huang

Abstract

This essay examines some problems of land reform in early 1950s. The second section presents three problems manifested in Wolf Ladjinski's letter to Chiang K'ai-shek. The third section explains the origins of land ownership of the Taiwan Sugar Company. The fourth section analyzes the farmers' discontents toward the Taiwan Sugar Company. Their discontents had many factors, to be sure, such as lingering oppressions inherited from the Japanese colonial policies, but the main causes of the farmers' sufferings were abuses of power by the Taiwan Sugar Company, such as arbitrary cancellations of land contracts with farmers and embezzlements of rentals through intermediaries.

The fifth section specifies a serious problem in the Ladjinski letter — the recommendation of "land to the tiller" policy from an American perspective of land reform. This policy conflicted with exportation of agricultural products for foreign currencies. The sixth section explicates the awkward role the Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction (JCRR) played in land reform. Although it was JCRR that invited Ladjinski, what this organization did was limited to inviting experts for advice, coordinating various policies, and distributing

economic aids; basically it was not an organization geared for land reform. Whatever JCRR offered to solve the problems incurred by land reform revealed its strengths and shortcomings.