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Education in a Minority Area
Grape County
Premier Chou En-lai Meets Ambassador Ngo Thuyen And Charge d’Affaires a.i. Tran Binh

Premier Chou En-lai and Vice-Foreign Minister Han Nien-lung met Ngo Thuyen, Ambassador of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam to China, and Tran Binh, Charge d’Affaires a.i. of the Embassy of the Republic of South Viet Nam in China, on March 30.

During the meeting, Ambassador Ngo Thuyen and Charge d’Affaires a.i. Tran Binh gave an account of the implementation of the Paris agreement on Viet Nam in the previous 60 days.

Premier Chou extended warm congratulations to the fraternal Vietnamese people on their tremendous victories in the war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation and in implementing the Paris agreement. On behalf of the Chinese Government, the Premier firmly supported the correct attitude and the just stand of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam for the thorough implementation of the Paris agreement and condemned the Saigon authorities for their acts of violating the Paris agreement with the support of the United States.

Premier Chou expressed his belief that the Vietnamese people’s cause for peace, independence, democracy and national concord will surely triumph.

Building More Counties Like Tachai

Hsiyang was the site of a recent meeting called by the Shansi Provincial Party Committee at which all the counties in the province exchanged experience in learning from Tachai.

In accordance with Chairman Mao’s instruction “In agriculture, learn from Tachai,” the meeting reviewed and summed up the mass movement of learning from Tachai throughout the province and studied the experience of Hsiyang County where the famous Tachai Production Brigade is located, in learning from Tachai and becoming a Tachai-type county.

The participants held that the basic experience of the Tachai Brigade becoming a national pace-setter in agriculture and Hsiyang County becoming a Tachai-type county is that they persist in carrying out the line of Chairman Mao’s proletarian revolutionary line, opposing the revisionist line, educating peasants with Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought and fully mobilizing the socialist enthusiasm of the peasants to take the socialist road. To run socialist agriculture well, it is necessary to persist in the general line of “going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism,” and to build a good leading group.

First Secretary of the Shansi Provincial Party Committee Hsieh Chen-hua called on the whole province to speed up the development of agriculture so as to make greater contributions to socialist revolution and construction.

Comrade Chen Yung-kuei spoke on the question of how to popularize the experience of Hsiyang in learning from Tachai. Chen is a famous labour model. Secretary of the Party Branch of Tachai Production Brigade, First Secretary of the Hsiyang County Party Committee, Secretary of the Shansi Provincial Party Committee and Member of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

He emphasized that a good job must be made of grasping the task of prime importance—the movement to criticize revisionism and rectify the style of work. He also stressed persisting in the spirit of the general line, doing it in a big way and not in a small way. To change production conditions on a big scale, it is necessary for the Party committees to have revolutionary vigour to transform nature, indomitable revolutionary will and a down-to-earth scientific attitude.

He also stressed that leading cadres at all levels should regard themselves as ordinary labourers, always take part in collective productive labour and fight shoulder to shoulder with the peasants.

Participants at the meeting expressed their unanimous determination to carry forward the mass movement to learn from Tachai and surpass Hsiyang and quickly transform more counties into Tachai-type counties.

Peking Communist Youth League Congress

The Sixth Peking Municipal Congress of the Communist Youth League of China was held between March 28 and April 3. The delegates elected the Sixth Municipal Committee of the League through full and democratic consultation.

A total of 2,201 Youth League delegates from various fronts in the city attended the congress. The size of this congress and the number of worker-peasant delegates and women delegates were the largest compared with all previous ones. Educated young people who have settled in the countryside, college students of worker-peasant-soldier origin, minority people and returned overseas Chinese were included among the delegates.

The congress summed up the experience gained in the youth movement and in building up the Communist Youth League in Peking since

(Continued on p. 22.)
Warm Congratulations on the Great Success of Samdech Sihanouk’s Inspection Tour of the Liberated Zone of Cambodia

CAMBODIA’S Head of State Samdech Norodom Sihanouk will arrive in Peking, China’s capital, today after an inspection tour of the Liberated Zone of Cambodia and a friendly visit to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, bringing with him the happy news of the heroic Cambodian people’s victory in their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation. With great warmth and joy, the Chinese people ceremoniously welcome the arrival of respected Samdech Sihanouk and warmly congratulate him on the great success of his inspection tour of the Liberated Zone of Cambodia.

Samdech Sihanouk’s tour is a great event in the current struggle of the Cambodian people against U.S. aggression and for national salvation, a great victory for the Cambodian people. With deep love for his motherland and confidence in the victory of the Cambodian people’s struggle, he stayed in the Liberated Zone of Cambodia for more than one month disregarding hardship and danger and visiting the provinces of Stung Treng, Preah Vihear and Siem Reap. He had cordial meetings with the leading members of the Cambodian National United Front and Royal Government of National Union in the interior and wide contacts with people from all walks of life in the Liberated Zone. He received a warm welcome. Of special significance is the fact that he joined the patriotic armymen and people of the Liberated Zone in the celebrations of the glorious third anniversary of the founding of the National United Front of Cambodia and the People’s National Liberation Army. With his own eyes, Samdech Sihanouk saw how the patriotic armymen and people of Cambodia were fighting with one heart and one mind under the banner of the National United Front, and gave them great encouragement. His inspection tour’s success is a strong impetus to the Cambodian people’s fight against U.S. aggression and for national salvation and a heavy blow to the traitorous Lon Nol clique.

This inspection tour is having great impact both inside and outside Cambodia. It eloquently proves once again that Samdech Sihanouk is the Head of State supported and loved by the Cambodian people, that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia is the sole legal government exercising power over the land of Cambodia. At present, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia under the leadership of the National United Front with Samdech Sihanouk as its chairman effectively controls nine-tenths of the territory containing eight-tenths of the population of Cambodia. The People’s National Liberation Armed Forces of Cambodia have become courageous and staunch armed forces, well-organized, well-trained and combat-worthy. The Liberated Zone of Cambodia is constantly expanding. The unity of the patriotic armymen and people is growing ever stronger. The situation is getting better and better in the Cambodian people’s war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation. Samdech Sihanouk’s successful inspection tour fully shows the unbreakable unity of the National United Front of Cambodia and the Royal Government of National Union with the people. It fully demonstrates that the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia is a legally representative government, and has smashed to smithereens the fallacy spread by the traitorous Lon Nol clique and the propaganda machines of the West that it is “a government in exile.”

It should be noted that while Samdech Sihanouk was inspecting the Liberated Zone of Cambodia, the crises of the Lon Nol traitorous clique were being aggravated. Besieged ring upon ring and subject to victorious attacks by the patriotic Cambodian armed forces and people, the Lon Nol clique is huddled up in isolated Phnom Penh, short of electricity and grain supplies. It is in a desperate situation and has to rely on U.S. airdropped supplies to bolster its tottering regime. The archtraitor Lon Nol who has tried frantically to suppress
the people and stepped up his fascist dictatorial rule, is in total isolation, opposed by the masses and deserted by his followers. Three years ago he staged a reactionary coup d'etat in an attempt to overthrow the Royal Government of Cambodia led by Samdech Sihanouk, but the result is just the reverse. Today, the raging flames of the war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation of the Cambodian people are spreading and fiercely burning under the Lon Nol clique's feet. The great success of Samdech Sihanouk's inspection tour and its powerful influence have thrown the clique into a worse panic than ever. The days of this handful of the scum of the nation who wreck the country and ruin the people are numbered.

The present situation inside and outside Cambodia is developing in the direction that is more and more favourable for the Cambodian people. The Cambodian people's struggle to safeguard national independence, sovereignty, peace, unification, neutrality and territorial integrity is completely just. The Cambodian question can only be solved under the conditions in which the fundamental national rights of the Cambodian people are fully respected. In his "Five-Point Statement" of March 23, 1970, Samdech Sihanouk put forward reasonable proposals, widely supported by the people throughout the world, for the solution of the Cambodian question. The dispatching of large numbers of aircraft by the U.S. Government to intensify the barbarous bombing of the Liberated Zone of Cambodia is a complete violation of the obligations it has undertaken in the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam. Moreover, it is absolutely futile. Any attempt by any reactionary force or any foreign interventionist to use the death-bed struggle of the Lon Nol clique to drag out the solution of the Cambodian question and obstruct the victorious forward march of the Cambodian people will prove to be a pipe dream and is bound to end in total failure.

The Chinese and Cambodian people are close comrades-in-arms and brothers. The Chinese people regard every victory of the Cambodian people as their own. In the future struggle, the Chinese people will, as always, firmly support the just struggle of the Cambodian and other Indochinese peoples till complete victory.

(April 14)

Samdech Sihanouk's Birthday
Greetings to Queen Kossamak

Samdech Sihanouk in his message of greetings announced that in February and March this year, he left Hanoi for the Liberated Zone of Cambodia and fulfilled a historic mission. Cambodia's patriotic armed forces and people are closely and inseparably united into a monolithic bloc; the N.U.F.C. is very strong; the C.P.N.L.A.F. have become a powerful army; U.S. imperialism will not be able to prevent the Cambodian people from liberating Phnom Penh sooner or later, and thereby liberating all Cambodia.

Cambodian Head of State Samdech Norodom Sihanouk and Princess Monique Sihanouk arrived in Hanoi from the Liberated Zone of Cambodia for an official visit to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on April 6. On the eve of the birthday of Her Majesty Queen Sioumuth Kossamak (April 9, 1973), Samdech Sihanouk sent her a special message of greetings the excerpts of which are as follows:

On the occasion of your august birthday, your son and his family, His Excellency Penn Nouth, Prime Minister of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia, and his family, His Excellency Vice-
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Premier Khieu Samphan, His Excellency Minister Hou Youn, His Excellency Minister Hu Nim, all members of the National United Front of Cambodia, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia and the Cambodian People's National Liberation Armed Forces, which represent the whole Khmer people, have the great honour to extend to you with the most profound respect and veneration their most fervent wishes of good health and long life.

On the occasion of your birthday this year, 1973, I can add to my wishes a very important news of historic significance.
In February and March this year, I was able to make a "long march" from Hanoi to the very vast liberated zone in Cambodia by taking a historic trail.

I left Hanoi towards the middle of February 1973, and during the month of March 1973, I had the great fortune and great honour to live in the midst of our people and by the side of the heroes and heroines of our National Resistance (the N.U.F.C., the R.G.N.U.C. and the C.P.N.L.A.F.), especially in the provinces of Stung Treng, Preah Vihear and Siem Reap.

Today, it is for the very reason of sending this message of birthday greetings to you that I am back in Hanoi, from where I have the great fortune and great pride to announce first to you and also to the whole Khmer nation the news of the success of my historic mission on Cambodian soil.

During my stay in the Liberated Zone of our Cambodia, I happened to listen to foreign broadcasts. The "free world" broadcasts said that in Cambodia, U.S. aircraft essentially attacked so-called north-Vietnamese "columns of tanks and military trucks" "trying to infiltrate into south Viet Nam" and also the people's forces assaulting certain "positions" of the army of the traitors. I repeat that I saw with my own eyes U.S. aircraft (including B-52s) operating night and day in places far from the "Ho Chi Minh trail," far from the "infiltration highways to south Viet Nam" and far from the front of the Cambodian war. It is a real undertaking of genocide. Throughout my stay, U.S. aircraft, especially B-52s, AC130s and F-105s — each more deadly than the other — never ceased strafing, shelling and bombing extensively our villages, fields, rice fields, forests, mountains, rivers and streams, highways and trails.

In truth, I had more than 50 per cent chance to be killed because of the incessant strafing and bombing by B-52s, AC130s and F-105s of the U.S. Air Force based in Thailand. Many of the strafings and bombings were carried out one or two kilometres from where I stayed. The nights were as "rough" as the days. I survived thanks to the extremely effective, vigilant, devoted and affectionate protection by our valiant people, our heroic combatants (C.P.N.L.A.F.) and the equally heroic leaders of our resistance in the interior. Allow me to thank them wholeheartedly for having helped me accomplish my historic mission with total success.

This historic mission has the greatest importance both internally and internationally. The success of my historic trip and stay in Cambodia, realized within the framework of the struggle for national liberation carried out by the N.U.F.C., is a very serious setback for U.S. imperialism and its lackeys, for all our enemies outside and inside the country.

I am now in possession of very important material evidence which clearly shows the formidable reality of the N.U.F.C., the R.G.N.U.C. and the C.P.N.L.A.F., that is to say, the National Resistance of the Khmer people, and which totally and irreversibly explodes the enemy's cleverly fabricated propaganda and his odious lies and slanders. This reality differs from the mean lies of the propaganda of U.S. imperialism and its Phnom Penh lackeys as white from black.

I am in possession of photographs, films and tapes which will be presented to the whole world and which clearly prove that:

— Norodom Sihanouk, the Buddhist monks, the population, youth, combatants (C.P.N.L.A.F.), cadres of the N.U.F.C., ministers of the R.G.N.U.C. and leaders of the interior resistance love each other and are closely and inseparably united into a monolithic bloc and in-destructible national union.

— The C.P.N.L.A.F. comprise only combatants fired by the purest patriotism, the most absolute abnegation, and have become a powerful, well-organized, well-built, well-equipped and well-trained army.

— The R.G.N.U.C. is not a government "in exile" but a government which actually exists inside Cambodia in the midst of the people of Cambodia, which is fully supported and affectionately helped and protected by them, and which is administering a very vast national territory.

— The people's power (our new democracy in conformity with the political programme of the N.U.F.C.) is solidly and definitively established in the Liberated Zone and is arousing the enthusiasm of the Khmer people.

— Norodom Sihanouk is solemnly and definitively recognized by the whole interior National Resistance (the N.U.F.C., R.G.N.U.C., C.P.N.L.A.F., the population and Buddhist monks) as the sole legal head of state of Cambodia and the leader of the National Resistance (the N.U.F.C.). Consequently, Norodom Sihanouk is internationally the authentic representative of independent, non-aligned and anti-imperialist Cambodia with territorial integrity.

— Finally, the Khmers of the N.U.F.C. are the only masters of the Liberated Zone where there are neither "Viet Cong" nor "north Vietnamese." The Liberated Zone is the perfect, shining symbol of independence and national sovereignty, national pride and dignity, freedom and democracy, of a national administration without corruption or other blemishes, of the happy and prosperous life of the people despite U.S. imperialism's war of aggression and the crimes of its air force.

I was able to go everywhere in complete safety. All along my way and during my stay in the Liberated Zone, every village and every unit of the C.P.N.L.A.F. undertook to protect me from any danger. The highest leaders of the N.U.F.C., R.G.N.U.C. and C.P.N.L.A.F. took good care of me and always accompanied me in affectionate fraternity. Delegations of Buddhist monks, women, peasants, combatants, etc., came to express to me the unshakable loyalty of their affection and attachment.

(Continued on p. 16.)

Peking Review, No. 15
Learning From Tachai

Powerful Force for Developing Agriculture

CHAIRMAN Mao issued the great call “In agriculture, learn from Tachai” to the whole country in 1964. Over the years this call has gone deep into the hearts of China’s several hundred million people, setting in motion a vigorous, wide-spreading movement that has rapidly propelled forward the growth of China’s socialist rural construction and agriculture.

Road to Socialist Agriculture

The struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads still remained after land reform had put an end to feudalism in China’s countryside. In the early period after the Chinese People’s Republic was established, Chairman Mao laid down the basic line in the Chinese countryside of persisting in building socialism and defeating capitalism. It called first of all for collectivization of agriculture and, on this basis, bringing about its mechanization and electrification. Guided by this line the countryside after land reform was gradually collectivized within a few years. At the same time technical transformation was also carried out by fully mobilizing the enthusiasm of the peasants and bringing into play the superiority of the collective economy.

Tachai is an outstanding representative of China’s peasants guided by Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line in building a socialist countryside out of a “poor and blank” one. The road Tachai has travelled is the road taken by China in building up a socialist agriculture.

Tachai is a production brigade of 33 households in the people’s commune of the same name in Hsiyang County, Shansi Province in north China. It is on Tiger Head Mountain in the Taihang mountain range 1,000 metres above sea-level. The people of Tachai were as poor as their land in the old society. One landlord and three rich peasant households between them owned 60 per cent of the land and the exploited and oppressed poor and lower-middle peasants, who made up 80 per cent of the population, were either landless or had little land. The 800 mu of cultivated land were a thousand fragmented pieces strewn over seven gullies, eight ridges and one slope. The deeply cut up terrain had no vegetable cover and drought alternating with sudden mountain torrents destroyed whatever crop that could be induced to grow on the poor unfertile
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soil. Per-mu grain yields averaged a mere 100 jin. People described Tachai as a place "full of bare rocky ridges and gullies without a square metre of flat land and annually cursed with calamity."

After liberation the poor and lower-middle peasants of Tachai led by the Chinese Communist Party received land and improved production. But an economy based on individual households was powerless to transform nature and overcome disasters to achieve general prosperity. What was to be done? "Get organized!" Chairman Mao pointed out, and his words found their way into the hearts of the poor and lower-middle peasants of Tachai.

The mutual-aid teams joined forces in 1953 to organize an agricultural producers' co-operative of the elementary type and that year saw a big rise in production. Grain per-mu averaged 290 jin, a foretaste of the superiority of a collective economy. Then an advanced agricultural producers' co-operative was formed and later, in 1956, it joined with neighbouring co-ops to set up the present people's commune. In the years following co-operation Tachai's peasants have worked collectively to quarry rock for building embankments on their fields, hewed fields out of the hills, planted many forests, built many water conservation works and equipped themselves with power machines. They merged the 4,700 tiny meager plots, turning them into 1,600 larger and more fertile terraced fields. From these the brigade harvested more than 1,000 jin of grain a year on each mu of land. The poor hill village was gradually changed into a new socialist village with all-round development of farming, forestry, animal husbandry and side-line occupations.

Tachai Brigade's practice is another proof that "in agriculture, the socialist road is the only road for our country." Tachai's experience is of significance to the whole Chinese countryside.

**Revolutionary Spirit**

In learning from Tachai it is most important to learn how Tachai firmly adhered to the principle of putting proletarian politics in command and putting Mao Tsetung Thought in the fore, and Tachai's revolutionary spirit of relying on its own efforts and working hard and its communist style of cherishing the state and the collective. In a word, learn to be like the Party branch of Tachai in using Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to educate the peasants. This is the fundamental experience of Tachai, the essence of the Tachai spirit.

Why was it that the people of Tachai could unswervingly keep to the socialist orientation in the struggle between the two roads?

Why was it that they could stand up to all hardships and fought hard to transform nature?

The fundamental reason was that the people of Tachai persisted in putting the study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in first place to continuously enhance their socialist consciousness.

"To bring our more than 500 million peasants through socialist transformation is a project of earth-rocking, heaven-shaking dimensions which cannot possibly be achieved in an atmosphere of calm seas and gentle breezes." (Chairman Mao: Socialist Uprising in China's Countryside.) Every socialist achievement by Tachai has resulted from arming the poor and lower-middle peasants of Tachai with Mao Tsetung Thought to struggle against nature, against the class enemy and against all erroneous tendencies.

After the people of Tachai had set up an elementary co-op in 1953 they stood firmly against the onslaught of Liu Shao-chi and his gang for cutting down the number of co-ops. Armed with Chairman Mao's
directive that "the only way to bring about collectivisation, according to Lenin, is through co-operatives," the people of Tachai saw through the intrigues of the class enemy to sabotage the co-ops and went on to consolidate and develop their collective economy. Then taking advantage of temporary difficulties the national economy met with in the early sixties, Liu Shao-chi and Co. peddled their sinister wares of san zi yi bao and "the four freedoms" in a vain effort to disintegrate the socialist collective economy and restore capitalism. The poor and lower-middle peasants of Tachai who knew by personal experience the superiority of the collective economy firmly kept in mind Chairman Mao's teaching "People's communes are fine" and thwarted the revisionist line. They worked harder to develop collective production. Each year they delivered and sold to the state 200,000 jin of grain, overfulfilling their set target by a big margin.

August 1963 saw seven full days of rain just when the crops were doing fine. That one week equalled the annual rainfall of 1962. Wind and rain wreaked havoc. Of the 200 mu of land they had worked so hard to build up over a decade 130 mu were washed away and most of the 600 mu of terraced fields were left devastated. More than 90 per cent of the crops were destroyed and 97 per cent of the houses collapsed.

What were they to do now? The Party branch led the masses in studying Chairman Mao's works. "Bad things can be turned into good things" became their ideological guideline as they fixed on a plan to make good the damage through self-reliance. They turned the relief grain, funds and materials allocated by the state over to other afflicted communes and brigades and relied on the strength of the collective economy as the masses themselves began a stubborn fight to get their brigade on its feet. They worked in the daytime to restore their fields and repaired their houses at night. That year, they reaped a bumper harvest. Reserve grain, members' food grain, and grain delivered and sold to the state were no less than those of the previous year. The houses, too, were swiftly rebuilt.

Self-reliance and hard work were well rewarded. By 1964 the per-mu grain yield in Tachai reached 740 jin. Members' income and public accumulation also went up. At this stage some peasants got the idea that purse-strings could be loosened somewhat, arguing that the collective was big and prosperous. The Tachai Party branch saw that this must be nipped in the bud, for it was a negation of the revolutionary spirit of hard work and plain living. Big achievements had been attained in revolution and production, but perseverance in hard work and plain living involved the all-important question of continuing the revolution or giving up revolution. At a discussion during a study session of Chairman Mao's works, the Tachai poor and lower-middle peasants said: "In closely following Chairman Mao in making revolution we must be far-sighted and aim high. Far-sighted means fighting for the realization of communism in our country and aiming high means keeping in mind the whole of mankind. We must hold on to the style of hard work and plain living even though production conditions have vastly improved. Prosperity must not whittle away the fine communist style of cherishing the state and the collective."

In the last few years, they have continued their efforts in farm capital construction in a big way, carrying out scientific farming and developing mechanization. Milling rice, wheat, threshing, weeding, crushing fodder and other work are now fully or partially mechanized and machines are being introduced to plough, transport and level the land and so on. They have succeeded in reaping a bumper harvest year after year. In 1971 grain production yielded 1,086 jin per mu and last year, despite an abnormally bad drought, per-mu yield of grain was 947 jin. Thanks to a diversified economy the brigade income in 1972 was still 10 per cent higher than that of 1971.

Bumper Harvests

"In agriculture, learn from Tachai" is the battle-cry of hundreds of millions of Chinese peasants. And what is more they are learning from Tachai and getting good results. The countryside is changing rapidly as the movement spreads and the peasants' socialist consciousness rises. The revolutionary spirit of self-reliance, hard work and plain living has become deeply rooted in the minds of the peasants. Bumper harvests have been gathered for years in succession. Known for their low yields and inadequate grain production in the past, the three provinces of Hopei, Shantung and Honan began raising enough grain for themselves in 1960, thus initially fulfilling the strategic task set by Chairman Mao, which called for "changing the situation in which grain has to be transported north from the south." China met with one of the most serious natural disasters since liberation in 1972, but her peasants brought into play the Tachai spirit and fought a stubborn and victorious battle to get a good harvest. Grain output reached 240 million tons in 1972, approximating the 1970 bumper harvest. Not easy in such a calamity-stricken year, other agricultural products showed increases over those of 1971.

In the nationwide movement to learn from Tachai the peasants have, in the spirit of "The Foolish Old Man Who Removed the Mountains," levelled hills and hacked fields out of mountains, built exten-
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sive water conservancy works, fought shifting sand and de-alkaline
ized the land and planted large areas to trees. They have done
this on an ever growing scale and the quality of the work has con-
tinually improved. Conditions of agricultural production in many
places have shown big improvement and acreage giving stable
and high yields has expanded year after year. Many areas can now
irrigate and drain their fields during drought or excessive rain-
fall.

Agronomic research has kept pace with the swift agricultural
development. The number of people engaged in mass scientific
experiments is steadily growing and in many places there are four-
tiered agronomic experimental networks embracing county, com-

tunen, production brigades and teams. As scientific farming developed many changes have occurred in the system of cultivation, improved strains are being used on a larger scale and cultivation techniques have con-
tinually improved, low yields have given way to high
yields and many more high-yield units have appeared which are continuing to get higher yields. For example, in the suburbs of Shanghai there are 25 brigades getting
more than 2,000 jin of grain per mu. The Hohengcheng
Brigade in Hopei Province, north China, by a skilful
blend of intercropping has for years had higher cotton and grain per-mu yields than targetted for high-yield-
ing regions south of the Yangtze River.

Even as it consolidated collectivization the Tachai
Brigade introduced mechanization. This has given added
impetus to mechanization throughout the Chinese
countryside. Enthusiasm to mechanize farming by self-reliance has never been higher. Local industry
serving agriculture is developing swiftly. More than
96 per cent of the counties in China today have
plants making and repairing farm machines, and many
provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions have
networks making and repairing farm machines from the
counties down to the communes and production brigades.
Many counties make their own chemical fertilizers, iron
and steel and hardware and operate their own small
hydropower stations, coal-mines and other industries.

Comparing 1971 with 1962, the number of tractors
in the Chinese countryside went up 2.7 times, power
for irrigation and drainage went up 3.2 times, 5.7 times
more chemical fertilizer and 5.5 times more pesticides
were used and rural electric consumption rose 6.5 times.

What Tachai has done is known and emulated
throughout China and the seeds of her experience dis-
seminated far and wide across the land have struck
roots and are blossoming. Communes and brigades
across the nation report doubling their grain production
in two or three years. Whole counties also have followed
Tachai's example and become advanced.

Hsiyang County's grain output doubled in three
years and tripled in five years since 1967, when it began
learning from Tachai. Yushu County in Kirin Province,
northeast China, with a population of 900,000
and 4,600,000 mu of cultivated land nearly doubled
grain output in six years to provide the state with 700
million jin of commodity grain a year. Hopei Province's
Luancheng County boosted grain production 80 per cent
in three years. Last year, its per-mu yield of wheat in one season alone was more than 500 jin, over 100
jin above the annual per-mu grain target called for
by the National Programme for Agricultural Develop-
ment. Mountainous Tuan Yao Autonomous County in
Kwangsi, south China, where the soil is nine-tenths rock
doubled grain production in five years. Huihsien County
in Honan Province, central-south China, did the same in
six years and managed to gather a rich grain harvest
last year despite extremely bad weather. The above-
mentioned is representative of developments since
China's farming sector started learning from Tachai.

Compared to the past, the present situation of Chi-
inese agriculture and its level of production is encourag-
ing. Much remains to be done, however, for them to
meet the needs of a big development of the national
economy, and agricultural growth has been uneven in
various parts of the country. Right now, the mass
movement to learn from Tachai is unfolding in depth
and in accordance with the general principle for develop-
ing the national economy of "taking agriculture as
the foundation and industry as the leading factor," to
strive for swifter and greater advance in agriculture.

Visitors from rural areas come to learn from Tachai.
A Visit to the Tungting People’s Commune (III)
— Its three-level ownership

by Our Correspondents

URING our stay in this lakeside commune, we made the rounds of a number of commune-run enterprises and went to a production brigade and one of its production teams to get some idea of the commune’s system of ownership.

Collective ownership of the rural people’s commune in its present stage in general falls into three levels—commune, production brigade and production team. Farmland, forests, water and its resources, farm tools and machinery, draught animals, small factories and mines and other means of production are shared between the commune, brigade and team. Collective ownership at the team level rather than that at the other two levels is at present the basic one. This is generally known as the “three-level system of ownership of the means of production in the people’s commune, with ownership by the production team as the basic form.”

Commune Ownership

So far as production is concerned, the commune mainly helps production teams develop agriculture, animal husbandry, forestry, side-line occupations, fisheries and other work. Usually the means of production owned by the commune are a small number of enterprises and facilities which production brigades and teams are unable to handle or which are more advantageous for the commune to run. At Tungting, these include a farm machinery repair workshop, a sapling nursery, a fish hatchery, a fruit-processing plant, several fodder-processing factories, a public service centre (making briquettes, fluffing cotton and doing other work), a workshop making reed mats, a brick and tile kiln, a construction centre, an irrigation station, a veterinary station and an environmental sanitation centre, as well as several small quarries producing granite, kaolin and sand. Most of these directly serve farm production and the peasants’ daily life, with only a few providing industrial raw materials for state-owned enterprises. They are playing no small part in consolidating and developing the rural socialist collective economy.

We went by boat to the fish hatchery. Fishery is one of the commune’s major lines of production and many production teams have their own fish ponds, covering a total of about a quarter of the area in use. Before the hatchery was set up, the various production teams had to send a total of 300 members to the upper and lower reaches of the Yangtze River to buy fry. This took them two or three months a year and cost the teams more than 200,000 yuan. With technical help from a state research institute, the commune built the hatchery in 1965. After several years of experiments, it now produces all the fry the production teams need and is able to sell a portion to other provinces. This not only saves on cost and manpower, it also ensures better breeds of fish with higher output.

The fruit-processing factory is a big help to the production teams which used to worry about fruit rotting if it was not shipped out in time. In 1971, for instance, three days and nights of heavy rainfall held up the loquat shipments. The factory processed them into syrup, thus saving the teams any loss. Although the teams involved did their best to ship out last year’s bumper harvest of arbutus in time, they were still left with 25,000 kilogrammes on their hands. The problem was again solved by this factory which processed them.

Starting virtually from scratch in several small rooms, the factory had no funds in its early days. It at first processed fruit sent in by production teams and paid them after selling its products. Thus it gradually accumulated funds to expand workshops and buy more equipment. With an annual processing capacity of 750,000 kilogrammes of fruit, the factory has accumulated 270,000 yuan for the commune since it started.

The greater portion of the profits from commune-run enterprises goes into expanding reproduction. The fruit-processing factory was the only industry in 1958. It was later joined by the fish hatchery and farm machinery repair workshop before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution began. With funds accumulated by these three enterprises, the commune now runs enterprises and facilities with 500 workers doing 15 kinds of work. These enterprises and facilities are an in-
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Research work at the Tungling hatchery.

dispensable part of the three-level ownership of the commune economy.

Ownership by Production Brigade

We went to the Chenkuang Brigade, one of 30 under the commune. It consists of eight production teams formed by and large within the confines of former villages and has a population of 1,263.

The accountant accompanied us on visits to the brigade's fodder-processing factory, farm tools factory and boat repair yard which are on a smaller scale than the commune-run enterprises. Brigade-run enterprises and undertakings, he explained, are those which are beyond the capability of production teams or are more advantageous for the brigades to run. These together with a tractor and a pump are for the teams' use.

The function of the production brigade is, under commune leadership, to take care of its teams' production and administrative work. Among other things, it helps them work out production plans; guides, examines and supervises the teams' production, distribution and financial work; helps them improve management; builds and runs brigade-wide water conservancy and other farm capital construction projects; and organizes necessary co-operation between them.

Comrade Han Chang-nan, brigade Party secretary and revolutionary committee chairman, greeted us warmly. He told us he had just been at the No. 4 team which obtained another 430 kilograms of rice by re-threshing stalks which had already been through the thrresher. The purpose of such an on-the-spot meeting was to educate cadres of other teams who neglected the idea of re-threshing as output promised to be good without it. After seeing for themselves the advantages of re-threshing, they all pledged to do the same. This is one instance of how the brigade leadership leads farm production.

In addition, the brigade is also in charge of other work, such as civil affairs, militia, public security, culture and education and public health. Whatever it does, it puts stress on political-ideological work and helps the teams implement the Party's policies and principles. When the commune asked the Chenkuang Brigade to plant 30 mu of watermelons in 1972, the plans submitted by the production teams, however, all but doubled the assigned figure. They obviously saw greater profits in watermelons. But this would in turn necessitate using some cropland. Getting the wind up, the brigade called a meeting of team cadres to study the Party's policy of "taking grain as the key link and ensuring an all-round development." (This means that the people's commune, while keeping a tight grasp on grain production, should develop agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, sideline occupations and fishery in a rational way, and handle well the relation between grain production and that of cotton, edible oil and other industrial crops.) After arriving at a correct understanding, they reasonably reduced their planned watermelon acreage.

Han Chang-nan said: "This is how we exercise leadership over the production teams. We use typical examples to induce the cadres to study the Party's policies and principles and help them do their work well, instead of issuing orders arbitrarily."

Ownership at Production Team Level

Ownership at the production team level is basic at the present stage of development. All land within their confines, collectively owned forests (except those run by the state), water and its resources and other major means of production belong to the teams. Draught animals, farm implements, small machinery and the labour force are at the teams' disposal and both the commune and production brigade cannot deploy them without compensation.

At present, commune members have their share of small plots for private use and go in for some domestic sideline occupations. Their incomes, bank savings, houses and other means of livelihood are privately owned and protected by the state.

The production team is the basic accounting unit in the commune. In other words, it organizes production and distribution and carries out independent accounting, being solely responsible for its own profits or losses. As conditions gradually ripen, the current basic ownership at the production team level will switch to that at the production brigade level and then the commune level. And collective ownership of the commune will finally pass over to socialist state ownership. Needless to say, this calls for a considerably long process of gradual development.

Peking Review, No. 15
Superpowers’ Maritime Hegemony Opposed

Opened on March 5, the first U.N. Sea-Bed Committee session of 1973 concluded on the afternoon of April 6. The session was held to make further preparations for the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea.

In the course of this month-long session, representatives from the small and medium-sized countries voiced their opposition to the superpowers’ maritime hegemony and their determination to defend the sovereignty and interests of their countries. The Chinese representatives expressed firm support for the just stand and reasonable proposals of these countries.

Speaking at the March 27 meeting of Sub-Committee I of the U.N. Sea-Bed Committee discussing questions on the international machinery in the international sea-bed area, Chinese Representative Hsia Pu stressed that the superpowers absolutely should not be allowed to exercise exclusive control over the international machinery and that the principles of equality among big and small nations, rational geographical representation and rotation of offices by election should be applied. At the March 29 meeting of Sub-Committee II, Chinese Representative Shen Wei-liang made a speech on the four Geneva conventions on the law of the sea. Chuang Yen, Chief Representative of the Chinese Delegation, spoke on April 5 at the Sub-Committee III meeting, refuting the Soviet Representative Malik’s absurd assertions on the questions of territorial sea and exclusive economic zones. In Sub-Committee III debates on marine scientific research, the Chinese representative pointed out that in carrying out the research, the sovereignty of all countries should be respected and that the superpowers’ monopoly of such research should be broken.

Following are excerpts from Chinese Representative Shen Wei-liang’s speech and the summary of the speech by Chief Representative of the Chinese Delegation Chuang Yen at Sub-Committee II of the U.N. Sea-Bed Committee. — Ed.

Shen Wei-liang’s Speech:

Support for a New Convention
On the Law of Sea

In 1958 when the First Conference on the Law of the Sea was held, many Asian and African countries had not yet won independence. Asian, African and Latin American countries made up only about half of the 80-odd countries then participating in the conference. And owing to manipulation by the imperialist powers, their many reasonable propositions were not adopted. Thus, the four Geneva conventions have completely failed to reflect truly the reasonable demands of the numerous developing countries. In the decade and more since then, profound changes have taken place in the world situation. All countries, big or small, should be equal. International affairs should be settled by all countries through consultations on an equal footing. Opinions of the third world should be fully respected. The representatives of many countries have now pointed out that the four conventions do not meet the needs of our epoch and should be rewritten. This is well-founded. This just demand was reflected in the list of subjects and issues relating to the law of the sea approved last year by the Sea-Bed Committee, which covered various topics relating to the maritime law to be discussed at the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea. However, the superpowers are doing their utmost to maintain the four Geneva conventions. As everyone is aware, one of the superpowers demanded the inclusion in the list of an item entitled: “measures which must be taken to ensure the universal participation of states in . . . the Geneva conventions of 1958.” This attempt failed only because of the strong opposition of many countries.

What is the real purpose of the superpowers in defending so obstinately the outmoded four Geneva conventions? The answer can be found by a mere glance at the main provisions of the four conventions.

The Convention on the Territorial Sea and The Contiguous Zone

With their unbridled ambition to carve up and dominate the seas and oceans, the superpowers are trying hard to narrow down the territorial seas of other
coastal states. At the 1938 Conference on the Law of the Sea, the head of the delegation of a superpower attempted to impose upon other countries the three-nautical-mile breadth of the territorial sea as a so-called principle of international law. But after the conference he publicly admitted that he was opposed to a broader territorial sea not “simply” from consideration of international law, but “for compelling military and commercial reasons.” Because, if a broader territorial sea was agreed on, the operations of the air and naval forces of his country would be “seriously impeded.” The other superpower opposed the three-nautical-mile rule, being at the time nominally for “safeguarding the sovereignty of all states.” But as its own territorial sea was 12 nautical miles, it tried to confine those of all other countries to the same breadth. Though they held two propositions, the purpose was the same, that is, to contend for the domination of the seas and oceans. Thanks to the unflinching struggle of some small and medium-sized countries, the 1938 conference did not make explicit provisions on the breadth of the territorial sea. But the convention on the territorial sea and the contiguous zone stipulates in paragraph 2 of article 24 that “the contiguous zone may not extend beyond 12 miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.” It is this paragraph that the superpowers are attempting to use as a so-called “legal basis” for opposing the developing countries in their struggle to defend their territorial sea rights.

Another important question concerning the territorial sea is the right of passage through the territorial sea. Article 14 of the afore-mentioned convention provides in general terms that ships of all states shall enjoy the right of innocent passage through territorial seas. That is to say, it may be interpreted that foreign military ships enjoy the same right. This is obviously unacceptable to many countries. As is well known, legislations of many countries expressly provide that prior approval or notice is imperative for foreign military ships to pass through their territorial seas. This is a matter within the sovereignty of a coastal state— a point even admitted by the draft convention originally put forward by the International Law Commission. However, the above-mentioned article in the convention has actually written off at one stroke this lawful right of the coastal states. Besides, article 16 of the convention stipulates that there shall be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits which are used for international navigation. This blatantly deprives coastal states with such straits of the right to exercise sovereignty over their own territorial seas. Consequently, foreign warships and submarines can intrude unimpededly into the straits within the territorial sea limits of coastal states in disregard of their security. Is it not crystal clear whose interests these unjustifiable provisions serve?

The Convention on the High Seas

A small number of maritime powers have long dominated the seas and oceans and run amuck by utilizing the so-called “freedom of the high seas.” The convention on the high seas further stipulates explicitly the so-called “four freedoms” of the high seas (that is, so-called freedom of passage, freedom of fishing, freedom of laying and maintenance of submarine cables or pipelines at sea-bed and freedom of flying over high seas — Ed.).

During the First Conference on the Law of the Sea held in 1938, the representative of the United States disclosed that the Soviet Union had dispatched to all parts of the world nearly a hundred mammoth “factory ships,” which were capable of undertaking the whole process of fishery production on the sea, and that consequently, “many countries, such as Iceland, the new states of Africa and Asia and the west coast countries of South America became alarmed.” In turn, the Soviet representative accused the United States of carrying out naval and air manoeuvres near the coasts of other countries in the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea by taking advantage of the “freedom of the high seas” and thus posing a serious threat to those coastal states. This shows that the so-called “four freedoms” in effect allow the superpowers to enjoy hegemony while bringing disasters to the small and weak countries. Some coastal countries have had bitter experience in this respect.

At present, activities of the superpowers on the seas and oceans have greatly increased as compared with 1938. It can thus be seen that the “four freedoms” of the high seas are, in essence, freedoms of superpower aggression, threat and plunder against other countries, particularly the developing countries, and freedoms of superpower hegemony and power politics. Should such “freedoms” be permitted to continue today in the 1970s?

The Convention on Fishing and Conservation Of the Living Resources of the High Seas

Article 7 of the convention requires that measures taken by coastal states for the conservation of fishery resources “do not discriminate in form or in fact against foreign fishermen.” This, in reality, serves to provide legal justification for the superpowers to plunder the fishery resources of other countries. At present, the one or two superpowers, relying on their maritime superiority, are dispatching large numbers of fishing fleets to wantonly intrude into the off-shore areas of other countries and plunder their fishery resources on a large scale. The above-mentioned provision serves no other purpose than to leave the door wide open to such acts of their piracy. This has been fully proved by the fact that in the last decade the annual catch of the Soviet Union from distant water fishing constitutes over three-fourths of its total output.

The Convention on the Continental Shelf

Three out of the only seven articles forming the operative part of the convention are designed to uphold “the freedom of the high seas.” For instance, article
3 stipulates that the rights of a coastal state over the continental shelf do not affect the legal status of the superjacent waters as high seas, or that of the air space above those waters. Article 4 includes a specific clause against impediment to the laying and maintenance of submarine cables or pipelines on the continental shelf. Under article 5, there are many more specific provisions: Paragraph 1 stipulates that exploitation of the continental shelf must not interfere with navigation, fishing, the conservation of resources and scientific research. Paragraph 6 says that installations or devices for exploitation must not interfere with international navigation. Paragraph 3 stipulates that a coastal state shall not normally withhold its consent to the request of “purely scientific research” into the continental shelf, etc. In a word, no one is allowed to prejudice or affect the so-called “four freedoms” of the superpowers.

It is worth noting that the Soviet representative stated at the conference that “if no kind of scientific research into the continental shelf could be undertaken without the consent of the coastal state, much valuable purely scientific work would be stopped.” But later the Soviet Government promulgated its own legislation which prohibits surveying or any other activities on its continental shelf unless there is agreement or special permission. This double standard fully reveals the true features of a maritime overlord.

It is not difficult to see from the above analysis that the outmoded four Geneva conventions on the law of the sea are fundamentally in the interests of the superpowers in pursuing maritime hegemony and not to the advantage of the large numbers of developing countries in their just struggle to defend their sovereignty and national economic interests. If the four Geneva conventions should be taken as the basis in the forthcoming new conference on the law of the sea, it would in effect mean forcing all other countries to accept the maritime overlord position of the superpowers and submit to their orders and manipulation. This is absolutely unacceptable to us. Therefore, the Chinese Delegation firmly supports the opinion of the delegations of many small and medium-sized countries that at the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea a new and comprehensive convention should be worked out to replace the four Geneva conventions. We are deeply convinced that this will be in the interests of the people of all countries.

**Chuang Yen’s Speech:**

**Soviet Revisionist Representative’s Absurd Assertions Refuted**

**CHUANG Yen**, Chief Representative of the Chinese Delegation, pointed out in his speech: “The Soviet representative alleged that the breadth of the territorial sea of one hundred countries including China had not exceeded 12 nautical miles and that, therefore, the Soviet Union was not imposing its views on others by proposing 12 nautical miles as the maximum limit for the territorial sea of all countries. It must be pointed out that the essence of the matter is who should determine the limit of the territorial sea of a country, and not the question of how many countries have set 12 nautical miles as the limit of their territorial seas. The Chinese Delegation has always held that all coastal countries are entitled to determine reasonably the limits of their territorial seas according to their specific natural conditions, taking into account the needs of their security and national economic development. The People’s Republic of China declared in 1956 the limit of her territorial sea to be 12 nautical miles. But we have never been opposed to the territorial sea of other countries exceeding 12 nautical miles. Many other countries have adopted such a reasonable stand. Now what is the position of the Soviet Union? Having set 12 nautical miles as the limit of its territorial sea, it insists on not allowing the territorial sea of other countries to exceed 12 nautical miles; otherwise, it will arbitrarily charge others with so-called ‘violation of international law’ and so on and so forth. In fact it is insisting on imposing its own will on others. Is this not the tyrants’ way?”

**Real Purpose of Opposing Establishment Of Exclusive Economic Zones**

He added that the Soviet representative has done his utmost to oppose the reasonable demand of the developing countries for the delimitation of exclusive economic zones, asserting that this would not necessarily be favourable to the developing countries, and even alleging with ulterior purpose that in Africa it would only be in the interest of South Africa. These absurd assertions were immediately and effectively refuted by many representatives. It is entirely legitimate for the developing countries to demand a reasonable delimitation of exclusive economic zones in order to resist the superpowers’ plunder of their coastal fishery resources and to protect their national economic interests. But strangely enough, a self-styled “protector” of the interests of the developing countries has gone so far as to desperately oppose this just and reasonable demand. What really is the reason for all this? It can be seen from an abundance of information that the Soviet Union has gone to an appalling extent in plundering fishery resources in the seas of Latin America and Africa and the Arabian Sea.

Chuang Yen stated, “Numerous facts have shown that the Soviet Union is an avaricious plunderer of the fishery resources of the world. Here, we would like to mention in passing that the fact that the Soviet Union delimited in 1956 a ‘controlled fishing zone’ has been confirmed in the speech of Mr. Malik.

“You could willfully delimit a controlled zone up to 48 degrees north and 170 degrees 25 minutes east as far as 400 nautical miles away from your coast for the purpose of protecting your coastal fishing, whereas you have arbitrarily opposed the demand of the developing
countries for a reasonable delimitation of exclusive economic zones in their coastal areas. We would like to ask: What kind of logic is this? It is thus not difficult to understand that in stubbornly opposing the establishment of exclusive economic zones the real purpose of the Soviet Union is simply to maintain its fishing hegemony on the seas.”

**Acts of Piracy Cannot Be Denied**

Refuting the Soviet representative’s malicious attacks that China was “over-ambitious,” Chuang Yen said: “It is clear for all to see in the present world who are the superpowers, who are lording it over others, who have established huge military bases and stationed troops on the territories of other countries, and who are carrying out intervention, subversion, aggression, intimidation and plunder everywhere! As regards, for instance, the situation on the seas and oceans, it is the warships and nuclear submarines of the superpowers that have been plying the oceans; it is the fishing fleets of the superpowers that have frequently intruded into the coastal areas of other countries for unbridled plunder of their resources. Such acts of piracy cannot be denied.”

Referring to the fact that in his speech the Soviet representative peddled the proposal for the so-called non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, Chuang Yen noted, “Back at the 27th Session of the General Assembly, the Chinese Delegation pointed out that this proposal of the Soviet Government was a sheer hoax designed to cover up its arms drive and war preparation, aggression and expansion and to further strengthen its position of nuclear monopoly. It was only natural for the Chinese Delegation to firmly oppose such a proposal. Is it not easy to see through the intention of the superpower which, running amuck and lording it over others everywhere in the world, has the temerity to preach ‘the gospel of peace’ at the United Nations forum?”

“The speech of the Soviet representative once again shows that the current international struggle with regard to the right over the seas and oceans is in essence a struggle between aggression and anti-aggression, plunder and anti-plunder, hegemony and anti-hegemony. In defence of their national economic interests and state sovereignty, the large number of developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are now getting united to wage unremitting struggles against the maritime hegemony of the superpowers. This is the trend of our time, which no one can hold back,” he emphasized.

Chuang Yen reaffirmed that the Chinese Government and people will unwaveringly adhere to their just principled stand, firmly stand together with the developing countries and all countries that uphold justice, and work jointly for the establishment of a new law of the sea which will meet the needs of the present era.

(Continued from p. 6.)

A grand meeting was organized in the Koulen Mountain in my honour and to celebrate together the third anniversary of the founding of the N.U.F.C. and C.P.N.L.A.F. Ten thousand compatriots attended the meeting, including civilians and militarymen, the laity and the ecclesiastic, the young and the old, men and women, peasants and townspeople. Especially the heroes Khieu Samphan, Hou Youn, Hu Nim, Son Sen, Saloth Sar, etc., and Madame Hou Youn and Madame Khieu Ponary, etc., participated in the meeting.

All this undoubtedly constitutes a great, new historic victory won by our N.U.F.C., that is to say, by the Khmer people in their sacred struggle for national salvation and for total liberation of the country.

From now on, the whole world should be convinced that the N.U.F.C. is very strong and that the U.S. imperialists will never be able to defeat it, whatever they may try. Our enemies should also be convinced that their propaganda of lies will no longer be able to deceive the world with regard to the reality of the Khmer National Resistance, that they will never be able to divide or disunite the patriotic Khmers whose union from now on is more complete and indestructible than ever. This union is more powerful than the U.S. Air Force; even the U.S. atomic bombs will not be able to destroy this sacred union.

U.S. imperialism could prolong for a while the existence of the traitorous Lon Nolite regime in Phnom Penh by spending tons of dollars and by carrying out numerous air raids against the Khmer Resistance. It will not be able to prevent the N.U.F.C. and C.P.N.L.A.F. from liberating Phnom Penh sooner or later, and thereby liberating all Cambodia.

The success of the N.U.F.C., R.G.N.U.C. and C.P.N.L.A.F. in all aspects and in all fields will enlarge in the days, months and years to come. This is the death sentence on the dirty “republic” of Phnom Penh and on the neo-colonialist system which U.S. imperialism has been trying to establish in our Cambodia.

I am very firmly convinced that in the not distant future, our heroic C.P.N.L.A.F., with the help of the valiant people in Phnom Penh, will succeed in liberating our capital and establish there the R.G.N.U.C.—the only legal and legitimate government of Cambodia and the Khmer people.
What Kind of “Fraternal Co-operation” Is This?

The Soviet revisionists’ “economic co-operation” — they call it “internationalism” — with some members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance is really national egoism.

In a statement made in Czechoslovakia not long ago, the Counsellor of the Soviet Embassy in Prague, Semyonov, demanded that Czechoslovakia open its “home market” to Soviet machinery and equipment and coordinate its industrial “projects” with “Soviet needs.” Appearing in the Czechoslovak press, Semyonov’s statement is a great help to people in getting a deeper understanding of so-called “fraternal co-operation” in economic relations between Soviet revisionist social-imperialism and some East European members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (C.M.E.A.).

The Soviet revisionist leading clique always has regarded some C.M.E.A. East European member countries as markets for its machinery and equipment. For many years, it has dumped most of its exported machinery and equipment on to these countries. In view of the needs of their economic development, these countries, far from being content with this unenviable position, began in recent years to develop gradual economic ties with member countries of the West European Common Market and other countries, and imported some needed machinery and equipment from them. According to official Czechoslovak figures, the share of the Common Market countries in the total volume of Czechoslovakia’s foreign trade rose from a little over 7 per cent in 1965 to 11 per cent in 1971, while trade with the Soviet Union dropped from 37 per cent to 33 per cent in the same period. This is greatly worrying the Soviet revisionist leading clique which has always considered countries such as Czechoslovakia as its exclusive preserve.

Soviet Counsellor Semyonov in his statement charged that “some factories and enterprises” in Czechoslovakia were “often buying products from the West” and “only exploring the possibility of importing machines and equipment from capitalist countries,” while showing little interest in importing them from the Soviet Union. Taking advantage of the fact that Czechoslovakia depends on the Soviet Union for most of its fuel and raw material supplies, he threatened: “We hope our partners in the socialist countries are able to understand that if their home market is not open to Soviet machines and equipment, it would not be possible for the Soviet Union to further develop economic ties, for our potentiality to supply fuel and raw materials is limited.”

It is necessary to point out that in order to get Soviet raw materials and fuel, Czechoslovakia provided the Soviet Union from 1960 to 1970 with credits and investments totalling some 2,000 million rubles to exploit iron ore, petroleum, non-ferrous metals and to lay an international natural gas pipe line to Western Europe. In his statement, Semyonov moreover asked Czechoslovakia to grant more credit to “help” the Soviet Union develop the fuel and raw material industries. For many years, the Soviet revisionist leading clique has glibly advertised that its economic relations with Czechoslovakia and other member countries of the C.M.E.A. are “internationalist” and “fraternal relations of socialist co-operation” “on the basis of equality and mutual support.” But the bare fact contained in Semyonov’s statement is that the Soviet revisionists hold that Czechoslovakia only has the obligation to “support” the Soviet Union but no right to take sovereign action to meet its own needs. They want others to “help” them develop fuel and raw material industries and then use fuel and raw material supplies as a “trump card” in their hands to control others, forcing others to open wide their “home market” to Soviet machinery and equipment. Who can find in this practice any trace of “internationalism” and “fraternal co-operation”? As to the “import” of machinery and equipment “from the West,” the Soviet revisionist leading clique’s zeal for it is well known to all. According to official Soviet data, the volume of imports from 11 Western countries increased by more than 61 per cent in the period from 1964 to 1971 and most of the imported goods are machinery and equipment. They import large quantities of machinery and equipment from the West, while blaming others for doing the same. As the saying goes, the magistrates were allowed to burn down houses, while
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the common people were forbidden even to light lamps. Here again, who can see any trace of "equality"?

In his statement, Semyonov demanded that Czechoslovakia, in repaying past Soviet credits, should "pay more attention to the goods which must be up to the value of the credit." He said: "We shall never take the products which you fail to sell on other markets and the commodities must be first class. "Part of them," he said, "must be made of imported materials or under foreign licences." He also showed dissatisfaction with the lack of "varieties of goods produced and supplied to the Soviet Union by Czechoslovakia." He even asked that Czechoslovak industrial enterprises, while planning their "items of production," "make a better study of the Soviet market, its needs, and the prospects of the development of the Soviet economy," so as to "make these items co-ordinate with Soviet potentialities." For example, in accordance with the formulas of the "international division of labour" and "specialization" pushed forward by the Soviet revisionists in the C.M.E.A., Czechoslovakia used to provide the Soviet Union with most and even all its annual exports of trunk-line electric locomotives and trolley-buses. Today, as demanded by Semyonov, the enterprises producing these two items will have to switch to other "new items" to meet the Soviet Union's changed needs. Why? According to Semyonov, it is because the Soviet Union "has already completed its plan for the electrification of railways" and trolley-buses no longer fit in with the "principle of the development of urban communications" in the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Soviet "demand for Czechoslovak locomotives is diminishing" and it "would be impossible to increase the Soviet purchases" of Czechoslovak trolley-buses. While forcing "fraternal countries" to accept, against their will, the commodities the Soviet Union cannot sell in Western markets, the Soviet revisionists demand that the goods from them must be of "first class" quality, even made of materials "imported from the West." Czechoslovak enterprises which had to be "specialized" in producing some items yesterday, are asked today to switch to other items according to altered Soviet needs. What is this if not an open attempt to make others submit to the economic interests of the Soviet revisionists and run here and there under the latter's baton?

To sum up, it is "economic co-operation" in name but economic control in reality, "internationalism" in name but national egotism in reality. Such "fraternal co-operation" is ridiculous.

(A commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent.)

Mediterranean Hegemony Bid: A Soviet Revisionist Obsession

Soviet revisionism is strongly opposed to discussion of the Mediterranean security problems at the European security conference. The Soviet revisionist social-imperialists have thus let the cat out of the bag — theirs is a case of "sham relaxation and real expansion."

As often as not, the Soviet Government has declared that it stands for "turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and friendly co-operation," that it is its intention to "strengthen security in the Mediterranean as a whole," and "stabilize the situation in this region," and so on and so forth. Are the Soviet revisionists really concerned about peace and security in the Mediterranean? One recent event has disclosed this as nothing but more claptrap from them.

At the current Helsinki preparatory talks for a conference on European security and co-operation, quite a few countries, especially some Mediterranean ones, suggested that any European security and co-operation discussion should not sidestep the question of eliminating tension in the Mediterranean area and that it should cover the question of security in the Mediterranean. This suggestion, however, was opposed by the superpowers. The Soviet revisionists, who have always claimed to be "faithful friends" and "equal partners" of the people of the Mediterranean countries, this time did not even take the trouble to don their mask of "socialism." They alleged that this "has gone beyond" the framework of European security and co-operation, and "created difficulty" for the meeting. With these as pretexts, they opposed bringing up the Mediterranean question at the meeting.

The Mediterranean Sea being contiguous to Europe, some European countries are also Mediterranean countries. This is common geographical knowledge. Just as it has been emphasized repeatedly by these countries,
European security and security in the Mediterranean “are interdependent” and the Mediterranean area is of “particularly great significance for the security of Europe as a whole.” The Soviet revisionists themselves, too, have admitted this countless times. For example, the Soviet Government in its statement of February 15, 1972 said that the grave situation in the Mediterranean area “runs counter to the interests of peace and relaxation of tension in Europe” and that such a situation would “push again developments on the European continent towards aggravation.” But when many European countries now want to discuss the question of security in the Mediterranean area, the Soviet revisionists actually about-face and utter nonsense about this question going beyond the framework of “European security and co-operation.” Why? Can there be European security and co-operation without security in the Mediterranean?

The cause is not far to find: they have ulterior motives.

The Mediterranean has always been a bone of contention for the imperialists and colonialists. For a time after World War II, U.S. imperialism became the Mediterranean overlord. The social-imperialists have long cast a covetous eye on it as an important strategic area in their contention with the U.S. imperialists for maritime supremacy and for the Middle East, Europe and Africa. Soviet revisionist warships held manoeuvres in the Mediterranean in 1964. In the summer of 1967 when Israel launched an aggressive war against the Arab countries, Soviet revisionists took the opportunity to send large numbers of warships into the Mediterranean and set up a permanent task force there. They have got hold of naval and air bases in the eastern part of the Mediterranean area to form a network of military bases in the region. They are stepping up expansion into the western part of the area in an effort to form a pincer encirclement around Europe together with their Baltic fleet and the northern fleet. They are seeking political prerogatives in the Mediterranean countries and are even engaged in subversive plots against the governments of these countries so as to get them in their grip. A Soviet revisionist naval chief smugly said: “Our century-old dream has now become a reality!”

In early 1967 when Soviet revisionism was still in an inferior position in the Mediterranean, Brezhnev assumed the pose of opposing the entry of foreign fleets there. He took the United States to task. “The question is,” he asked, “what grounds are there, 20 years after the end of the Second World War, for the U.S. Sixth Fleet to cruise in the Mediterranean, to use military bases, ports and fuelling stations in a number of Mediterranean countries?” Now it is Brezhnev’s turn to answer the same question once put forward by the Soviet Union. But it is apparent that Brezhnev and his cronies have long since cast what they said to the winds. At a time when the Soviet revisionists are riding roughshod over the Mediterranean in the wake of U.S. imperialism, they speak of the “proud presence of the Soviet fleet” in the Mediterranean being “naturally reasonable.”

It is precisely this “pride” of Soviet revisionism to contend with U.S. imperialism for hegemony that made it turn down the demands of the Mediterranean countries and many other medium-sized and small countries in Europe to discuss the question of security in the Mediterranean at the conference on European security and co-operation. This is at the bottom of the Soviet revisionist apprehension over and opposition to this proposal. It is not difficult here to tell what kind of stuff the “European security and co-operation” trumpeted by the Soviet revisionists is and what they have in mind when they try so hard to advocate holding the conference on European security and co-operation.

Soviet revisionism has thus once again fully revealed its hypocrisy—the hypocrisy of “sham relaxation and real expansion,” this time on the Mediterranean question. Made with tongue in cheek, its statement is self-contradictory. It wants to carry out aggression and expansion and be an angel of peace as well. It talks glibly about European security but opposes the discussion of the question of the security in the Mediterranean which is inseparable from European security. It waxes eloquent about relaxation of tension but makes a lame apology for its expansion in the Mediterranean. At one time it asserted that the entry of Soviet warships into the Mediterranean was for “the protection of the fraternal peace-loving people in the Arab world,” then on another occasion it declared that it was “going there for the need of the security interest” of the Soviet Union. Sometimes it claimed it “does not consider” any sea-going navigation by the warships of the big powers as “desirable” but the next moment it clamoured that Soviet warships would sail into “every area of the world oceans.” As to the strange statement about the Soviet Union also being a Mediterranean power, this is utterly despicable. Social-imperialism, being “socialism in words, imperialism in deeds,” has the kind of deceit which undisguised old-line imperialism does not have. But on the Mediterranean question, however hard they may try to cover up and dodge about, the Soviet revisionists can neither hoodwink the people of the world nor avoid being condemned by them.

Now the question of Mediterranean security has been brought up as the order of the day in the common struggle of the people of all countries in the Mediterranean area. “The Mediterranean is the Mediterranean of the countries along its coasts.” “Free the Mediterranean from the contention of the two atomic superpowers.” “Warships of the United States and the Soviet Union all go home.” These are voices of justice and reasonable demands. They point to the reliable way to peace and security in the Mediterranean. It can be definitely said that with the struggle against hegemony waged by the peoples of the Mediterranean area and the rest of the world surging ahead continuously, the scheme of the two overlords, the Soviet Union and the United States, to contend for the Mediterranean is bound to be frustrated and the “peace” and “friendship” disguise put on by social-imperialism is sure to be ripped to shreds.

(A commentary by Hsinhua Correspondent.)
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Mexican Hospitality. "This is your home" is the traditional way Mexican people greet their visitors. A Chinese idiom expressing a similar sentiment is "Visitors came as if they were returning home." The two are synonymous for hospitality. Not back in China long, the Shenyang Acrobatic Troupe was greeted everywhere during its visit to Mexico by its hosts with this typical Mexican greeting. The warm hospitality of the Government and people truly made the troupe's members feel at home.

President and Senora Luis Echeverria twice received the troupe in their home. At the reception at the President's official Los Pinos residence on the last day of February, Senora Echeverria's first words to the troupe were 'This is your home.'

It had already been announced then that the President and his wife would be going to visit China and Mexico-China friendship and the forthcoming presidential visit to China was the main topic during the reception. The day the President returned from an inspection tour of the city of Torreon in the north, he had attended the troupe's performance together with his family and most members of his cabinet. The President said: "We regard the Shenyang Acrobatic Troupe as a goodwill and friendship mission." "You present the 'Flowers of Friendship' here in your programme, we are going to China with flowers of friendship,' too."

Story of Two Bats. Before taking part in the competitions at the 32nd World Table Tennis Championships in Sarajevo, the well-known Yugoslav player Dragutin Surbek was pleasantly surprised to get two new bats. They were given to him by the head coach of the Chinese Table Tennis Team Hsu Yin-sheng who had brought them from Peking. Arriving in Sarajevo on March 26, the Chinese players were in the same hotel as the Yugoslav players. The following evening Hsu Yin-sheng called on Yugoslav coach Osmanagic and Surbek and presented the bats to the latter.

The story began in autumn 1971 when Surbek was in China and visited a factory in Peking making table tennis bats. He liked the bats made there and since then he and a number of his team-mates have switched to using bats made by the factory. Meeting Hsu Yin-sheng at the 1972 Scandinavian International Table Tennis Championships, Surbek told Hsu about this. Hsu passed the word to the factory and two new bats were made.

Red Cross Donation. The Red Cross Society of China has donated 100,000 yuan RMB to the Operation Help Department of the Prime Ministry of Afghanistan as relief aid to the Afghan people in drought- and flood-stricken areas.

Co-operation. The minutes of talks between China and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen on building a road between Mahfud and Mukalla were signed in Aden on March 24. The projected 330-kilometre-long road will run through the Third, Fourth and Fifth Provinces and will be joined to the Ain-Mahfud Road in the Third Province which technicians and workers of China and the Democratic Yemen are now constructing.

- The minutes of the talks between China and Nepal on the construction of the Kathmandu-Bhaktapur trolleybus service by the two countries were signed on March 26 in Kathmandu.
- The 1973-74 scientific co-operation plan between the Chinese Academy of Sciences and its Romanian counterpart was signed in Bucharest on March 31.
- A protocol on China sending a medical team to work in Mali was signed in Bamako on April 4.

Academic Exchanges. Since its arrival in Peking at the end of March, the Delegation of the Research Institute of Arts of Japan's Kyoto University, with Professor Kenji Kawano as its leader, Professor Kenji Shimada its deputy leader and Professor Kiyoshi Inoue its secretary-general, have given lectures and attended seminars as well as discussed future friendly academic exchanges with responsible members of Peking University.

- Visiting China as guests of the Chinese Academy of Sciences last month were Dr. Francis Leslie Rose, Fellow of the Royal Society of Britain and Senior Research Fellow on Pharmaceuticals, Professor of Chemical Physics of the University of Manchester Geoffrey Allen and Professor Ralph Louis Wain, Fellow of the Royal Society of Britain and Professor of Agricultural Chemistry at the University of London.
- An 11-member Chinese scientific and technical delegation left for a visit to Japan on March 26.
- A 16-member Chinese medical delegation left China on April 6 to attend the Second International Symposium on Cancer Detection and Prevention in Bologna, Italy.

Exhibitions. The Kongsberg Technical Seminar and Exhibition, the first Norwegian exhibition held in China, closed in Peking on March 23.

- A Chinese painting exhibition opened in Bucharest on March 23.

Sports. Premier Chou En-lai and Vice-Chairman of the Military Commission Yeh Chien-yen on the evening of April 8 watched an exhibition by Japanese sumo wrestlers at the Peking Workers' Gymnasium.

Sumo is a type of Japanese wrestling. That evening's performance was warmly greeted by 15,000 spectators and was shown on the Peking Television Station.

The 117-member Japanese Sumo Troupe headed by Yoshihide Musanokawa arrived in Peking on April 3.

- The President of the National Olympic Committee of the Federal Republic of Germany Willi Daume arrived in Peking on March 30 for a visit to China.
ROMANIA — SUDAN

Opposing Imperialist Dictation

Gaafer Mohamed Nimeri, President of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, and his wife paid an official visit to Romania from April 2 to 6.

The Romanian-Sudan joint communique issued on April 7 in Bucharest highlights the growing role and influence of the forces of peace, democracy and progress in the contemporary world and points out the necessity of persevering action to strengthen the unity of the anti-imperialist front. The communique considers this as an essential factor for the triumph of the struggle against the imperialist policy of domination and dietation and interference in the internal affairs of other states, and for ensuring the peoples’ right to decide independently on their path of economic and social development.

The communique emphasizes the role and contribution to be made by small and medium-sized countries to the establishment of a climate of peace and security in the world and to the development of relations of friendship and co-operation among all nations.

The communique says: “It is necessary to establish new inter-state relations based on observance and strict operation of the universally valid principles among nations. These principles are: national independence and sovereignty, equal rights and mutual advantage, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, resorting to neither force nor threat of force, territorial integrity and the inviolability of frontiers, and the settlement of disputed inter-state issues by exclusively peaceful means.”

“Ensuring the observance in international relations of every people’s sacred right to decide its own destiny and to freely choose its path of development without any interference from the outside.”

The communique says: “The two sides reasserted the militant solidarity of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the Democratic Republic of the Sudan with the struggle of the peoples of Africa and of other regions of the world for defending and consolidating their economic and social independence, and for the attainment of their vital aspirations.”

SOUTH AFRICA

African Workers Strike

African workers’ strikes against racial discrimination and for higher wages are developing in South Africa.

Following a one-week work stoppage by 700 African workers of the Alusaf Aluminium Smelting Plant at Richards Bay in northern Natal, 800 African construction workers at a port complex project in the same bay downed tools on April 2 to demand higher pay. The police of the racist authorities used tear-gas and batons to suppress the workers, but they persisted in their strike in defiance of brute force.

About 1,000 African clothing workers walked out for higher wages on April 2 in Johannesburg, the largest industrial centre in South Africa. At Alberton in the suburbs of Johannesburg, 250 African workers of the Ferrovoron Engineering Foundry went on strike the same day.

Badly shaken by the strikes of tens of thousands of African workers in the first quarter of this year, the racist authorities served up on April 4 a phoney draft bill to increase African representation in industry. Superficially, the bill provides that the number of representatives of African workers in the works committee shall be increased, but the “representatives” are actually hand-picked by the racist authorities and simply do not speak for the African workers’ interests. This bill has enraged African workers and touched off more strikes. The day it was published, several hundred workers in three clothing factories in the Johannesburg area walked out. One leader of the South African Trade Union Council condemned the authorities for their reactionary bill.

UNITED STATES

Protest Against Soaring Food Prices

Housewives all over the United States demonstrated on April 1 in protest over soaring food prices, meat prices in particular.

U.S. housewives protest against soaring meat prices.
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A week-long meat boycott starting the same day saw consumer action throughout the country demanding lower meat prices. According to press reports, many families and a number of schools and establishments had meatless meals that day. Some meat packing firms had to suspend or cut production.

Food and other consumer prices, especially meat, have recently been soaring. The U.S. consumer price index in February rose 0.8 per cent—the biggest monthly rise in 22 years—with the price of meat shooting up 5.4 per cent. In Washington food markets, prime beef was costing at its highest point $2.29 dollars a pound and pork chops about $1.40 dollars a pound. This aroused strong dissatisfaction among the people. U.S. News & World Report in an article in its April 2 issue said: “Anger and despair over rising prices—especially food prices—are running higher in this country than at any time since the days just after World War II.”

On March 29, U.S. President Nixon imposed a ceiling on the price of beef, pork and lamb. Many consumers, according to press reports, considered this measure quite insufficient, since prices are thus merely limited to the highest level in the previous 30 days, while consumers are demanding lower meat prices.

SOVIET UNION

Stepped-Up Emigration to Israel

The Soviet revisionist leading group has recently expedited the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel by stopping its levy of exit fees on them.

This was disclosed by Soviet special agent Victor Louis, disguised as a newsman, in a dispatch in the Israeli paper Yediot Aharonot on March 21. Louis has long been recognized as a secret envoy of the Kremlin whom Soviet official circles often send on special missions to engage in clandestine activities everywhere.

Louis said in his dispatch that the Soviet Union “has decided to unofficially end the imposition of the education tax on emigrating Jews” and that “the tax paid so far would be returned to relatives of the emigrants remaining in the Soviet Union.” He also revealed that his story was based on an interview with a Soviet official in charge of the specific work.

A UPI dispatch, datelined Moscow, March 21, said the above-mentioned information was confirmed by official Soviet organs. An AP dispatch from Moscow the same day said that Soviet “passport officials even allowed an American newsman to sit in on their talks with some of the Jews and watch the granting of waivers.”

Disclosures by various circles show that the recent Soviet revisionist move resulted from a behind-the-scenes bargain with U.S. imperialism on the trade question between the two countries. Louis pointed out in his dispatch that the Soviet “decision was a result of pressure from the U.S. Senate, which threatened to deny the Soviet Union most favoured nation trade status unless the tax was cancelled.” AP reported that at a recent meeting on this subject with 15 American Congressmen in Washington, V. Alkimov, Soviet Vice-Minister of Foreign Trade, while seeking “support for the trade bill” indicated time and again that the Soviet Union “may ease barriers against emigration.” U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers said in a recent statement that “quiet diplomacy” between the Soviet Union and the United States “has increased the number of Jews allowed to leave Russia, from a total of a few hundred in 1970 to about 3,000 a month now.”

The Soviet revisionists’ practice of using Soviet Jews’ emigration to Israel as a chip in their behind-the-scenes bargaining with U.S. imperialism drew immediate applause from the Israeli authorities. Israeli minister of immigrant absorption Nathan Peled declared on March 24 that it was “a positive development” on the part of the Soviet Union to stop the collection of exit fees from Soviet Jews emigrating to Israel.

The Soviet move has aroused strong resentment and opposition in the Arab world. Sayed Nofal, Assistant Secretary-General of the Council of the League of Arab States, said on March 24: “Any immigration to Israel is in fact a consolidation of Israeli aggression against the Arabs.” Mahmoud Khalidi, Director of the Office of the Palestine Liberation Organization in Damascus, pointed out in a statement to the press: “There is no difference between the Soviet emigration to Israel and the U.S. supply of munitions and economic aid to Israel.” The Algerian paper El Moujahid said in an article on March 24, “If people favour emigration to territories conquered by force, they contribute to the designs of the Zionist leaders to perpetuate their definitive presence on these territories.”

(Continued from p. 3.)

the start of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and discussed the task of carrying out education in ideological and political line. It passed a resolution calling on the city’s Youth League organizations at all levels to turn the Communist Youth League into a school for young people to study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, and strive to train the younger generation to become successors to the cause of the proletarian revolution.

Leading comrades of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Chang Chun-chiao, Chi Teng-kuei and Wang Hung-wen met all the delegates at the close of the congress and extended warm congratulations to it. Comrade Wu Teh, First Secretary of the Peking Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of China, spoke at the congress, urging young people to seriously study the experience obtained in the struggles between the two lines in the Party over the last 50-odd years and to put strict demands on themselves in line with the requirements for successors to the cause of the proletarian revolution.
Education in a Minority Area

GUIDED by the Party's policy of equality for all nationalities in China, education is striding ahead in the Li and Miao Autonomous Chou on Hainan Island, Kwangtung Province.

This autonomous chou, located in the central and southern parts of the island, is inhabited by more than a million people of Li, Miao, Hui and Han nationality. In the past these people could not dream of schooling, cruelly exploited and oppressed as they were by Kuomintang reactionaries and the local landlords. After liberation, all nationalities were emancipated politically and economically. The Party and the People's Government allocated large sums of money for the building of schools, and education made rapid headway. There are now 1,598 primary schools (one in every brigade) and 218 middle schools (one in every commune), where before liberation there were only three primary schools in the whole chou. Not a few commune members have sons and daughters attending university. To meet the needs of socialist construction, the counties have set up schools for training teachers, public health, and industrial and agricultural technique as well as training classes for minority cadres.

Spare-time education for the people is actively promoted. Industrial, mining and other enterprises as well as villages have their own evening schools for literacy, politics and science. Many adults first learnt to read and write in these evening classes.

The chou now has some 10,000 teachers. Since the beginning of the Great Cultural Revolution, Party organizations at all levels in the chou have paid great attention to enhancing the political consciousness of its teachers as well as to improving teaching methods. Each year their ranks are strengthened by graduates from the normal schools of eight counties and of Tungshih, capital of the chou.

The primary stress in education is on fostering proletarian ideology and teaching the students socialist culture. A number of schools provide students with an opportunity to learn something about industrial and agricultural production in small factories and farms which they operate, and also military affairs. This prepares them to become workers with both socialist consciousness and culture.

Grape County

TURFAN County in Sinkiang sent 18.9 million jin of its famous seedless white grapes to the market last year. This is 6.5 times the output at the time of liberation in 1949. Vineyard acreage is now 18,000 mu, 3.6 times that of 1949.

Viticulture goes back 15 centuries in this renowned grape county whose produce are big, sweet and juicy. By the time of liberation, however, neglect and cruel exploitation of the labourers by the Kuomintang reactionaries and landlords had reduced acreage to 6,600 mu of weed-choked land.

Production in the county was swiftly rehabilitated and expanded after liberation. Besides producing more grain than it can consume, the county has added a number of new vineyards to the old ones which were also put back on their feet.

One new vineyard which has sprung up on a former stretch of wilderness is the Hungluho Horticultural Farm. Its builders — commune members of Uighur nationality and educated youth who have settled there — transformed the pebbly land with fertile soil carried from a ravine 50 kilometres away, often on their backs. After several years of hard effort, they turned 3,000 mu into a green valley growing high-quality grapes.

Experimental groups made up of veteran grape-growers, cadres and agro-technicians are working to raise quality and quantity. The head of one such production team group is Abulamanlik, a seasoned vineyard tender who had been a landlord's hired hand for 30 years in the old society. Experimental plots under his care have averaged yields of 6,000 jin per mu. The group's experience has been popularized throughout the county so that more and better Turfan grapes are available to consumers.

A mobile primary school on Sinkiang's Altai grasslands which moves with the herdsmen from pasture to pasture.
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