A tale of two systems

China and Indonesia are two huge countries with very different experiences. China has had forty years of reform under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, whereas Indonesia has had a much slower pace of economic development. In China, the government has been effective in implementing land reform and ensuring that the peasantry have access to land. In Indonesia, the government has been less successful in implementing land reforms and ensuring that the peasantry have access to land. These differences have led to different outcomes in terms of economic development and social stability.

China's land reform has been successful in ensuring that the peasantry have access to land and that they have a voice in decisions about how that land is used. In Indonesia, the peasantry have less access to land and less say in decisions about how that land is used. This has led to greater social inequality in Indonesia compared to China.

China's economic growth has been driven by the peasantry, who have been able to access land and use it to generate income. In Indonesia, the peasantry have less access to land and less say in decisions about how that land is used. This has led to greater social inequality in Indonesia compared to China.

It is clear that the differences in land reform and access to land have had a significant impact on economic development and social stability in China and Indonesia. These differences are likely to continue in the future, as China continues to implement land reform and ensure that the peasantry have access to land, while Indonesia continues to struggle with land reform and access to land.

The introduction of the Household Responsibility System (HRS) marks a turning point in China's rural policy. A facilitate move from the commune-based administrative model to a more market-oriented approach to land reform. The HRS led to the redistribution of land from the state to the individual farmers. This led to an increase in agricultural productivity and a decrease in poverty in rural China.

In contrast, Indonesia's land reform has been much slower and less effective. The government has been less successful in implementing land reforms and ensuring that the peasantry have access to land. This has led to greater social inequality in Indonesia compared to China.

In the conclusion, the writer states that China's land reform has been successful in ensuring that the peasantry have access to land and that they have a voice in decisions about how that land is used. In Indonesia, the peasantry have less access to land and less say in decisions about how that land is used. This has led to greater social inequality in Indonesia compared to China. The differences in land reform and access to land have had a significant impact on economic development and social stability in China and Indonesia.