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Farmland Construction
In Full Swing

Following the example of Chairman Hua and other central leading comrades who did a stint of work while inspecting the Miyun Reservoir on the outskirts of Peking on November 27, more than 600 cadres from the Ministry of Water Conservancy and Power, the First Ministry of Machine Building and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry went on November 30, December 1 and 2 to suburban Peking in separate groups with their ministers at the head. They joined the peasants in farmland capital construction and gave on-the-spot guidance.

In learning from Tachai in agriculture, rural people’s communes undertake farmland capital construction. This includes building water conservancy projects, terracing hillsides, ameliorating soil and planting trees, all aimed at expanding the acreage under cultivation and increasing per-hectare yields.

Following the convening of the Second National Conference on Learning From Tachai in Agriculture last spring, Chairman Hua, on behalf of the Party Central Committee, in August called on the rural people’s communes to concentrate their efforts on farmland capital construction in the current winter-spring period.

On the evening of December 3, the national general office in charge of farmland capital construction called a telephone conference to spur on efforts in this respect. Principal leading comrades of many provincial Party committees have taken personal charge of this work and large numbers of cadres from Party committees at various levels are on hand at the work-sites taking part in physical labour and giving guidance. The Ministry of Water Conservancy and Power has selected a rural production brigade as its base where its personnel from the minister to the rank and file go in groups to do a stint of physical labour every Friday. All this has given a fillip to the mass movement of farmland capital construction and an upsurge rarely seen in recent years has emerged throughout the country. By mid-November, the labour force engaged in the more than 600,000 projects had come to 80 million strong.

Greeting President Mobutu

Premier Hua Kuo-feng on December 6 sent a message to Mobutu Sese Seko, congratulating him on his re-election as President of the Republic of Zaire.

The message reads in part: “May the Government and people of Zaire, under Your Excellency’s leadership, achieve continuous new successes in the struggle to safeguard national independence, state sovereignty and territorial integrity and in developing the national economy and building the country, and may they continue to make contributions to the united struggle of Africa and the third
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world against hegemonism. May the friendly relations and cooperation between the Governments and peoples of China and Zaire develop further.”

Hegemonism Denounced

Speaking at a banquet in honour of the Friendship Delegation of the Japanese Chemical Industry on December 6, President of the China-Japan Friendship Association Liao Cheng-chih said: The lasting friendship between the Chinese and Japanese people is of prime importance. It should be arranged in accordance with the guidelines earnestly agreed upon between the Governments of China and Japan. Uncalled-for interference by a certain superpower cannot be tolerated.

Taking advantage of the reshuffle of the Japanese cabinet, President Liao Cheng-chih added, a northern neighbour of ours recently churned out a number of articles intensifying its naked interference in and intimidation against the Japanese Government with regard to China-Japan relations.

These clumsy acts of our northern neighbour, he went on to say, will surely arouse stronger resentment among the Japanese people. We Chinese and Japanese people firmly oppose these hegemonic acts. At the same time, I am convinced that the people and farsighted figures in Japan will allow no one to make compromises or concessions in face of these hegemonic acts.
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A Great Debate on the Educational Front
—Repudiating the gang of four's "two estimates"

How should we estimate the situation on the educational front in the 17 years from the founding of New China in 1949 to the beginning of the Cultural Revolution in 1966 and the situation regarding intellectuals? This is a major issue concerning the political line, over which our Party waged a prolonged struggle against the "gang of four."

The Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao and the revolutionary people have always maintained that, in education and in other fields, Chairman Mao's revolutionary line occupied the dominant position throughout the 17 years prior to the Cultural Revolution and that the contributions made by intellectuals in the educational field to the socialist cause and their political and ideological progress must be fully acknowledged. But the "gang of four" asserted that in those 17 years Chairman Mao's proletarian line in education "was in the main not implemented" and that "the bourgeoisie exercised its dictatorship over the proletariat" and the revisionist line held the dominant position in education. It also alleged that the majority of the teachers and of the students trained in that period were "basically bourgeois in their world outlook," that they were "bourgeois intellectuals" and belonged to the "stinking ninth category" of class enemies, coming after the eight other categories: landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, Rightists, renegades, enemy agents and capitalist-readers. This is the gang's notorious "two estimates."

Concocted by the gang in 1971, the "two estimates" seriously distorted Chairman Mao's thinking on educational revolution, enormously dampened the revolutionary enthusiasm of both the cadres and teachers, shackled their minds, and wrought havoc to our educational cause and the level of education as a whole. As a result, the modernization of agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology was retarded. The gang's crimes aroused great indignation among the people of the whole country.

In accordance with Chairman Mao's instructions, Premier Chou En-lai in 1972 set about tackling this question. The "gang of four," however, raised a hue and cry. Spearheading its attack at Premier Chou, the gang described it as an attempt at "restoration" and "regression." In 1975 Vice-Chairman Teng Hsiao-ping, acting on Chairman Mao's directives, proposed to make suitable changes in educational work. The gang again stepped forth and charged him with "changing the orientation of the educational revolution."

For a fairly long period of time, the "gang of four" attacked everyone who did not agree to the "two estimates" and accused them of "opposing" the Cultural Revolution and Mao Tsetung Thought.

The gang's criminal aim was to use the "two estimates" as an important anti-Party weapon to overthrow a large number of leading comrades both in the central and local authorities and usurp the supreme leadership of the Party and state.

Whence the "Two Estimates"

The "two estimates" were concocted with a premeditated motive. In February 1966 Chiang Ching, working hand in glove with Lin Piao, slandered that on the literary and art front "an anti-Party and anti-socialist line has held sway" since the founding of New China. In April 1967 she alleged that what was taught...
and practised in the schools and colleges in the said 17 years “was practically all their stuff [meaning the bourgeoisie’s and the landlords’—Tr.], plus the rubbish of Soviet revisionism,” and that the schools and colleges in that period “trained more intellectuals than before who were completely divorced from the workers, peasants and soldiers, from proletarian politics and from production.” It was from these allegations that the “two estimates” stemmed.

In a talk on education in Shanghai in March 1971, Chang Chun-chiao, a member of the “gang of four,” said that “the bourgeois intellectuals have exercised dictatorship over us” and that “a large number of teachers must be replaced.” “I’m fed up with these people,” he added, “but you can’t have them all shot!”

The “gang of four” dished out the “two estimates” in 1971 through Chih Chun, its hatchetman in the educational field. At that time the struggle against the Lin Piao anti-Party clique was in full swing, and Chen Po-ta was exposed as a counter-revolutionary. All this struck terror into the hearts of members of the gang for they and the Lin Piao anti-Party clique were actually jackals of the same lair. So they trotted out the “two estimates” to counter the Party Central Committee’s criticism of Chen Po-ta and efforts to implement the Party’s policies on the educational front. They vilified that the schools and colleges under the leadership of the Party were “dominated by renegades, enemy agents and capitalist-roaders” and were places where “the bourgeois elite was trained.”

The majority of the intellectuals support the socialist system. Only a small number of them have followed the feudal, capitalist and revisionist line.

Teachers should be respected as teachers. Don’t criticize them whenever they say something wrong. Is it possible to be correct all the time? It doesn’t matter if they say something incorrect, something wrong. Let people discuss it together. How is it possible to speak correctly about everything all at once? Impossible!

This was Chairman Mao’s basic assessment of the situation on the educational front and the situation regarding the intellectuals.

Obviously, it was diametrically opposed to the “estimates” made by the “gang of four” which, out of ulterior motives, kept Chairman Mao’s instructions from the people and did everything they could against these instructions till their downfall.

The Revolutionary Line Is Predominant

On July 6, 1971, Premier Chou pointed out: “Chairman Mao’s red line has illuminated the educational front too”; “the great majority of the intellectuals accept leadership by the Communist Party and work in the interest of socialism.” These instructions of Premier Chou’s were likewise opposed by the “gang of four.”

In spite of interference and sabotage by the counter-revolutionary revisionist line of Liu
Shao-chi, Lin Piao and the "gang of four," Chairman Mao's revolutionary line held the dominant position in all fields of work, education included, throughout the 28 years after the founding of New China.

During the period from the founding of the People's Republic to 1957, we transformed all the old schools and colleges and encouraged the teachers and students to take part in various political movements and remould their ideology. On this basis education developed rapidly. All these achievements were fully affirmed by Chairman Mao. He said in 1957 that only a few years after the establishment of our state, people could already see "the unprecedented flowering of the economy, culture, education and science." (Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work.)

In 1958, Chairman Mao formulated the policy that "education must serve proletarian politics and be combined with productive labour" and that it "must enable everyone who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a worker with both socialist consciousness and culture." This pointed out more clearly than ever the orientation of our revolution in education.

To sum up the experience in the educational revolution, the 60-point document on work in the institutions of higher learning and the rules and regulations concerning work in the middle and primary schools were drawn up in 1961. In his report on the work of the government delivered at the Third National People's Congress in 1964, Premier Chou pointed out: "In recent years, we have improved the work of teaching and raised the quality of education in accordance with the policy that education must serve the politics of the proletariat and must be combined with productive labour."

Just before the start of the Cultural Revolution in 1966, the number of institutions of higher learning in China was well over 400 as against some 200 in the early post-liberation days, and total enrolment in schools at various levels was more than 130 million. As to the class origin of the students, those from worker or peasant families accounted for 64.6 per cent in colleges and universities and those from exploiting-class families only 9.4 per cent. In the middle schools, students from worker or peasant families made up 77.9 per cent and those from exploiting-class families only 5.2 per cent. The educational level was steadily raised and a large number of graduates, who were both socialist-minded and professionally competent, had been trained for the state. All these achievements resulted from the implementation of Chairman Mao's line in education.

**Interference by the Revisionist Line**

Everything has two opposite aspects, so does the educational work in the 17 years before the Cultural Revolution. While Chairman Mao's line occupied the dominant position, there were interference and sabotage by Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line. In 1950, Chairman Mao criticized Liu Shao-chi for his erroneous proposition that the old educational system be "kept basically as it is." In 1956, Chairman Mao again criticized Liu Shao-chi for his error in mechanically copying the Soviet experiences.

As a small number of people followed Liu Shao-chi's line, there existed in some schools the tendency to divorce education from reality, from labour and from politics. In addition to this, the period of schooling was too long, the courses of study were too heavy and the teaching method was not suitable, while in examinations the students were treated like enemies, often taken by
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Develop socialist culture and education.

*A poster by Cheh Kung*
surprise by the teachers who deliberately tested them by asking queer questions.

In view of this, Chairman Mao in a talk during the Spring Festival of 1964 pointed out: "The policy and line in education are correct, but our methods are improper. I believe that there should be some reforms in education. Education as it is now leaves much to be desired." Later, in the course of the Cultural Revolution, Chairman Mao issued the call that education should be revolutionized. Responding to this call, more than 100 million revolutionary teachers and students took part in the revolution and thoroughly criticized the revisionist line in education.

Should one draw the conclusion that "Chairman Mao's line in education was in the main not implemented" simply because he had said that "there should be some reforms in education" and "education should be revolutionized"? Absolutely not! According to the "gang of four," if anyone so much as acknowledged that Chairman Mao's line always held the dominant position, he was denying the necessity of continuing the revolution and he was opposing the Cultural Revolution. Since Chairman Mao had criticized the work in education before the Cultural Revolution, they argued, it was a proof that Chairman Mao's line was not implemented. This is typical metaphysical view which runs counter to Chairman Mao's appraisal that "the policy and line in education are correct."

The mistakes in educational work in the first 17 years following the founding of New China, which were the direct results of the interference by Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line, constituted only the secondary, and not the principal, aspect. This is clear enough if we take into consideration the achievements in education in that period. It becomes all the more evident if we look at some facts showing in whose hands the leadership in education was.

Leading cadres at all levels in the field of education consisted mainly of two groups of people. One was those good cadres who had been tested a long time in the revolutionary wars and class struggles and who were transferred by the Party from other fields of work after liberation to strengthen the leadership in education. This was done with the concern of Chairman Mao and Premier Chou. The other was the large number of cadres who were workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals trained by the Party after liberation. Political movements since liberation, the Cultural Revolution in particular, had proved that the overwhelming majority of these two groups of people were good or fairly good cadres loyal to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. Bad elements who had sneaked into the cadres' ranks were few in number. Some comrades had followed the erroneous line, but most of them enhanced their political consciousness and corrected their mistakes after being tempered and educated in the Cultural Revolution. Small wonder that cadres in the educational field took a firm stand against the "gang of four" in the 11th two-line struggle which was the most acute and complicated in the history of our Party.

**Intellectuals Are Part of the Revolutionary Force**

Chairman Mao regarded the workers, poor and lower-middle peasants and revolutionary intellectuals all as forces that the dictatorship of the proletariat should rely on. He personally formulated the policy of uniting, educating and remoulding the intellectuals. The "gang of four," however, vilified the teachers and the students trained by our schools and colleges as "bourgeois intellectuals" and as enemies of socialism belonging to the "stinking ninth category." The gang thus completely reversed the relationship between ourselves and the enemy, turning the motive force of revolution into its target of attack.

To provide a "basis" for their fallacies, they deliberately distorted the following statement made by Chairman Mao in 1957:

"Most of our present intellectuals come from the old society and from families of non-working people. Even those who come from workers' or peasants' families are still bourgeois intellectuals, because the education they received before liberation was a bourgeois education and their world outlook is fundamentally bourgeois." *(Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work.)*

This was an analysis made by Chairman Mao with regard to the five million or so intellectuals in our country at that time. It was precisely in view of this situation that Chairman Mao stressed the need for the intellectuals to remould their world outlook and pointed out
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that the working class must build its own army of intellectuals, "including all those intellectuals from the old society who truly take a firm working-class stand after being remoulded." (Have Firm Faith in the Majority of the People.)

However, the "gang of four" applied the above-mentioned analysis of Chairman Mao's to the situation in 1971 in total disregard of its essence and the specific time, place and conditions in which it was made. Here the gang was merely substituting metaphysics for dialectics.

The number of intellectuals in our country in 1971 had increased to over 20 million and most of them had grown up in socialist New China. As to their class origin, most were from workers' or peasants' families, and the proportion of Party members and Youth League members among them had increased considerably as compared with 1957. In addition to this, the education they received in the schools and colleges was mainly Marxist. Having been tempered in the various political movements, the Cultural Revolution in particular, both the intellectuals from the old society and those trained in New China had greatly raised their political consciousness and made progress in varying degrees in remoulding their world outlook. By that time, as expected by Chairman Mao, a new contingent of working-class intellectuals had been formed, though still in its initial stage.

In the light of all this, Chairman Mao made a new appraisal of the situation regarding the intellectuals in his instructions in 1971. But the "gang of four" withheld them from the masses, and insisted on using the assessment Chairman Mao made 14 years earlier to appraise the more than 20 million intellectuals in the early 70s. This shows that the gang deliberately distorted and tampered with Mao Tsetung Thought.

In his political report to the 11th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, Chairman Hua pointed out: The great majority of China's present-day intellectuals "have made progress in varying degrees in transforming their bourgeois world outlook into the proletarian world outlook, the process of gradually acquiring and consolidating the latter." This accurate and incisive analysis by Chairman Hua is, in essence, the same as that made by Chairman Mao in 1971, and is a forceful refutation of the "gang of four's" "two estimates."

The "gang of four" also maliciously described the difference between physical and mental labour as class antagonism in an attempt to sow discord between the workers and peasants on the one hand and the intellectuals on the other and undermine their alliance.

**The Remoulding of World Outlook**

Nor was this all. The gang also used world outlook remoulding as a pretext to persecute intellectuals. Members of the gang described the remoulding of world outlook as something mysterious. They did so to serve their own purposes. When Chairman Mao spoke of the remoulding of world outlook, his aim was to help the intellectuals revolutionize their ideology so that they could play a more active role in the socialist revolution and construction.

As to what is meant by thorough remoulding of world outlook, Chairman Mao said explicitly: "To be red, they must make up their minds thoroughly to transform their bourgeois world outlook. They don't have to read a lot of books, what they must do is to get a true understanding of the following questions. What is the proletariat? What is the dictatorship of the proletariat? Why is it that the proletariat alone has great promise while the other classes are all classes in transition? Why must our country take the socialist road and not the capitalist road? Why is the leadership of the Communist Party indispensable?" (Have Firm Faith in the Majority of the People.)

Chairman Mao's teaching tells us that to transform one's bourgeois world outlook and to be a proletarian intellectual is not an unattainable goal. The fundamental question concerning world outlook is one of whom should we serve. Since the intellectuals love the Party and the motherland, support socialism and are willing to serve the workers, peasants and soldiers, they are, as Chairman Hua has stated, already in the process of gradually acquiring and consolidating the proletarian world outlook. Our task is to encourage them to continue their advance along this correct road and turn themselves into proletarian intellectuals.

China has entered a new historical period of development since the smashing of the "gang of four." Our current criticism of the "two estimates" concocted by the "gang of four" is
of tremendous significance to holding high the great banner of Chairman Mao, comprehensively and accurately understanding and applying the system of Mao Tsetung Thought, persisting in the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and carrying the revolution in education through to the end. Only when the gang's fallacies have been thoroughly exposed and criticized and a distinction has been made between right and wrong as regards the line, and only when we have summed up both the positive and negative experience of the past 28 years can we make rapid progress in the educational revolution, enable educational work to keep pace with the fast developing socialist revolution and construction and meet the requirements for building a modern country.

The Two-Road Struggle in the Economic Field During the Transition Period

by Hsueh Mu-chiao

This is the third instalment of an article by the noted economist Hsueh Mu-chiao. The first two instalments appeared in issues Nos. 49 and 50. — Ed.

The three years from the founding of the People's Republic in 1949 through 1952 was the period of recovery of China's national economy. During this period industrial and agricultural production registered an increase of 145 and 48.5 per cent respectively. By the end of 1952, production in both industry and agriculture had surpassed the highest level on record.

Planned Management of National Economy

Beginning in 1953, the nation embarked on its First Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy. In other words, we started the planned management of the national economy at a time when five different economic sectors existed side by side. How was this possible when there was capitalist economy in addition to a large amount of individual economy? The answer was because the state-owned economy held the predominant position, and by placing orders with capitalist industrial enterprises for processing and manufacturing goods or for purchasing their products, we had the main part of private industries comprising the major branches and factories under our control.

As the socialist sector accounted for a considerable proportion in wholesale trade but not in retail trade, the state which had most of the commodities at its disposal wholesaled merchandise at fixed prices to private retailers for resale also at fixed prices. The differences between wholesale prices and retail prices went to the private merchants as their earnings. In some cases, these merchants merely sold goods for the state on commission. In this way, the state also had the retailers under control.

At that time, the co-operative movement in agriculture and handicrafts had just started. It was mainly through the supply and marketing co-operatives, which handled the major farm products and part of the handicraft articles, that we succeeded in placing agriculture and handicrafts under planned management. With the price policy as the lever, these co-operatives placed agricultural and handicraft production under its guidance. For instance, when cotton was in short supply, they raised the cotton price to boost cotton production, and when there was a surplus in the supply of certain goods, the prices were reduced to bring down production. Most of the products were purchased by the state which fixed the prices. In this way, both agricultural and handicraft production was adjusted through the operation of the law of value.
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At that time private industry and commerce remained a capitalist economy in form. But, as Chairman Mao put it, “it is not an ordinary but a particular kind of capitalist economy, namely, a state-capitalist economy of a new type. It exists not chiefly to make profits for the capitalists but to meet the needs of the people and the state.” (On State Capitalism, 1953.) Here, placing orders with private firms for processing and manufacturing goods or for purchasing their products and private merchants acting as sales agents of the state were state-capitalism of a lower form, while joint state-private enterprises were state capitalism of an advanced form. Why was it that the main purpose of state-capitalist industrial enterprises was not to make profits but to meet the needs of the people and the state?

Subjectively, a capitalist always goes after profit. How can we expect him to do anything without profit? Objectively, however, he had to carry out production strictly in accordance with the contracts he had signed with the state, with clear stipulations regarding what to produce, the amount to be produced and the time of delivery. This not only enabled the capitalists to make some profit but was of great benefit to the state and the people. By placing orders with the private enterprises for processing and manufacturing goods or for purchasing their products, all private factories had ties only with the state and no direct links with the market, thereby severing all connections between the capitalists and the market. So at that time, both the law of surplus value* and the law of the planned and proportionate growth of the national economy became applicable to state-capitalist industry.

Beginning in 1953 the supply of food grain and cotton (raw material for the textile industry) fell short of demand as a result of the rapid development of the national economy. What with the development of urban industry, the tremendous increase in the number of workers and staff members in the cities and a higher purchasing power, the supply of grain, cotton piece goods and many other commodities lagged behind demand. Although the state was in control of most of the peasants’ marketable grain and cotton through the supply and marketing co-operatives, a portion of them still found its way to the rural fairs where speculative merchants could freely buy them at high prices.

With a view to placing these farm products within the orbit of planned economy, we introduced the system of planned purchase and marketing of grain and cotton by the state. The peasants were required to sell to the state all their surplus grain after delivering public grain (agricultural tax in kind) and deducting that portion which they kept for their own consumption and for seeds and fodder. The same applied to cotton. Aside from what the peasants kept for their own use, they should sell all the surplus cotton to the state. The planned purchase and marketing witnessed another fierce struggle between the two classes and the two roads. Its enforcement was another move to sever the links between the bourgeoisie and the peasants, and as a result, the former was further isolated.

The Erroneous Line of Liu Shao-chi
And Po I-po

Class struggle in society is bound to be reflected in our Party. Liu Shao-chi put forward a counter-revolutionary revisionist line. In 1949 he started clamouring about “consolidating the new-democratic social order” and “letting the capitalist economy go on developing for another few decades.” He eulogized the bourgeoisie for “its merits in exploitation” and advocated the “four freedoms” in the countryside, that is, freedom to hire labour, engage in private enterprises, practise usury and buy or sell land. His aim was to develop the rich peasant economy. In short, he was opposed to the socialist transformation of individual farming, individual handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. Chairman Mao sternly criticized this reactionary bourgeois line pursued by Liu Shao-chi.

In 1953, the Party Central Committee made public the general line for the period of transition, which was to bring about step by step socialist industrialization of the country and the
socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce. Why was it proclaimed in 1953? Because after the land reform was completed in the previous year, after the peasants had come over to the side of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance had been established everywhere in the country, we could go a step further in transforming capitalist industry and commerce and the individual economy. But Liu Shao-chi (then Vice-Chairman of the Central People's Government) and Po I-po (then Vice-Chairman of the Financial and Economic Committee under the State Administration Council) made unprincipled concessions to the bourgeoisie. Their mistakes found expression mainly in taxation and commerce.

They came out with a new tax system entailing "equality between public and private enterprises." Under the original state taxation law, a 3 per cent business tax was levied on sales in wholesale trade and all private firms had to pay this tax when wholesale transactions were involved. But in the case of transfer of goods between wholesale centres in state-owned commerce, it was not considered sales and therefore these centres did not have to pay any tax. When the tax system was revised in 1953, Po I-po proposed to collect the business tax in wholesale trade from the factory. This raised the ex-factory price. Both the state-owned and private wholesalers indirectly paid the business tax when they bought goods from the factory, while the private wholesale merchants no longer needed to pay any business tax for their sales.

At first glance, this new tax system was fair enough because both state-owned commercial undertakings and the private merchants paid the same amount of tax. In actual fact, state-owned commerce suffered because a new tax was levied on it. Moreover, a private merchant was free to decide what goods he wanted to sell and where to sell them; in other words, he could choose to deal in goods from which he could make profits. State-owned commerce, however, had to shoulder the task of ensuring supply and stabilizing prices, and was obliged to deal in all kinds of goods. So the new tax system increased the burden of state-owned commerce which was thus handicapped in its competition with the private merchants. What was more, it was to the disadvantage of state-owned commerce in controlling the market.

Liu Shao-chi and Po I-po also committed serious mistakes with regard to commercial policy. In order to control the market, we must bring private industry, commerce and agriculture as well as their products under our control. We must follow this policy, and this meant that state-owned commerce must have big and well-stocked warehouses. When the First Five-Year Plan began in 1953, we drew up a plan that was over-ambitious due to lack of experience. Po I-po prepared a very big budget which could not be carried out, resulting in huge deficits. What was to be done? He told the state-owned commercial departments to "disgorge," that is, to reduce the amount of goods in stock and put them on sale. These departments were thus forced to put an enormous amount of goods in the hands of private merchants. As a result, the control of the market once again fell partially into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

It was in this situation that a national conference on financial and economic work was convened in the summer of 1953 under the personal guidance of Premier Chou En-lai at which these mistakes were criticized. Chairman Mao addressed the conference and criticized these "bourgeois ideas, which are favourable to capitalism and harmful to socialism." (Combat Bourgeois Ideas in the Party, 1953.)

The erroneous line pursued by Liu Shao-chi and Po I-po again brought tension to the market in 1953. The struggle between the proletariat and private industry and commerce had its twists and turns. In 1949, speculative capitalists attacked the proletariat, and 1950 saw the proletariat launching a counter-offensive to defeat the capitalists. In 1951, the capitalists launched another attack against the proletariat. By unfolding the struggle against the "three evils" and the "five evils" in 1952, the proletariat counterattacked the capitalists who were on their last legs, and it was the People's Government which revived them once again. The capitalists spoke of those years as "that unforgettable 1951 and unbearable 1952." To them, 1953 was another unforgettable year, their "golden age." But from 1954 they began to go downhill.

(To be continued.)
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Criticism and Self-Criticism in Newspapers

Newspapers have recently published many letters in the special column "Letters From Readers." Some criticized shortcomings and mistakes in various fields of work and undesirable social phenomena, others made suggestions for improvement or commended good deeds. This way of running newspapers has been a fine tradition of our Party, which is greatly welcomed by the readers.

On October 30, Renmin Ribao carried several letters about an episode in its column "Letters From Readers," of which two were from a reader, one complaining about the quality of a transistor radio he had bought and criticizing its producer for its overbearing attitude, and the other written six weeks later praising the producer for accepting his criticism, which he described as the Party's fine style of work being restored.

What happened was this. In March this year, Yang Chih-hsin, a resident of Shanghai, bought a transistor radio, but its quality was so poor that before long he had to take it to the seller, the Shanghai Electric Appliances Store, for repair. When the store failed to fix it, he sent the radio to the producer, the Peking Radio Factory, in early August.

On August 29, Yang got a reply from the factory. Instead of telling him whether the radio could be repaired or not, the letter said: "A radio is put together with components and parts produced by dozens of factories. We only turn out radios; as for repairs there are repair shops. In all likelihood, you would have to wait for some time. . . ." The letter requested Yang to send in some money for repairs and postage fees.

That same day, Yang sent his first letter to the editorial department of Renmin Ribao recounting what had happened and expressing strong dissatisfaction with the factory's reply. In this letter, he wrote: "It grieves me to tell you all this. I sincerely hope that the departments concerned will pay due attention to the quality of radios and take proper measures to improve their products."

After receiving this letter, Renmin Ribao forwarded it to the radio factory and sent correspondents to look into the matter. After investigations, they reported: "The products of this factory used to rank among the nation's best. But quality has declined lately because the leadership there has become self-complacent and slapdash in management."

At first the factory turned down Yang's criticism. Later with the help of leading organs, the factory's Party committee called several meetings to examine its work and trace the cause of the decline in quality to its members' way of thinking and style of work. It also examined its erroneous attitude towards Yang Chih-hsin and Renmin Ribao. Then it decided to put the matter before the workers and staff and called on them to voice criticisms of the Party committee, while at the same time it took effective measures to improve technical management and quality. The radio returned by Yang as well as his letter were put on display in the factory to draw the attention of all the workers and staff.

On October 11, Yang wrote his second letter to Renmin Ribao, in which he said: "I'm writing this letter to express my thanks to you. This morning, a leading comrade of the Peking Radio Factory who had made a special trip to Shanghai visited me at my home. After listening to my complaints, he made a self-criticism and gave me a new radio for the one I had bought. I'm very glad to see that the Party's fine style of work is now back with us."

Renmin Ribao published the two letters from Yang Chih-hsin together with the letter of the Peking Radio Factory rejecting Yang's criticism as well as the investigation report and a brief comment.
Visiting a P.L.A. Division (III)

The Tradition of Democracy

by Our Correspondents Chou Nan-hsing and Lo Fu

Once in the barracks of the People's Liberation Army, people find it hard to distinguish who are officers and who are soldiers — everybody wears an army uniform with red badges on the collar and a cap with a red five-pointed star insignia. This was the case in the division we visited. We saw that cadres at the company and lower levels occupied the same living quarters as the rank-and-file soldiers and ate in the common mess-hall; they took part in study, military training and recreational activities like everyone else. Leading cadres at higher levels or cadres from leading organs often go to work in the companies to help out. Some high-ranking officers also go to the companies, acting as cadres at the grass roots or as ordinary soldiers so as to better understand the situation there.

Every night we saw company cadres going on rounds, according to a system formulated during the war years, to see if the soldiers were well covered and sleeping well or if the guards on sentry-duty were cold. On a rainy day, they would make a point of seeing that the soldier on duty wore a rain coat.

Unity Between Officers and Men

Through our contacts with cadres at division and regimental levels, we came to know that they, like ordinary fighters, came from among the labouring people. They had learnt fighting and commanding in wartime. Though they differed in rank, their relations with the fighters were based on revolutionary comradeship and not on status.

Comrade Chang Chiang, secretary of the division Party committee and the division's political commissar, said that unity between officers and men has always been one of the characteristics of the people's army founded by Chairman Mao. He described many incidents exemplifying the long tradition among cadres of caring for the soldiers. Thirty years ago, when he was serving as orderly to one of the veteran commanders, he fell ill while on the march. He had boils all over his body, and under the difficult war conditions, there were not enough medical workers. In the daytime when they were marching, the commander lent him his horse to ride, and in the evening, personally cleaned, medicated and dressed the sores. Gradually as Comrade Chang recovered, he absorbed the tradition of showing concern for the ordinary soldiers.

Later in 1949, he became a company political instructor of the division. Once during a battle while pursuing Kuomintang troops in southwest China's Szechuan Province, one of the soldiers fell ill and fainted. Recalling the concern shown him by the commander years before, Comrade Chang told the deputy political instructor to take care of the soldier while he himself led the company in continuing the fight.

Carrying the patient on his back, the deputy political instructor trudged 10 kilometres along a winding mountain path to get to the army field hospital. On coming to, the soldier, moved to tears, said: "I'll fight to the end for the revolution!" In ensuing battles, the soldier displayed outstanding courage and died a martyr in the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea.
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In peacetime, the People's Liberation Army keeps up the tradition of unity between officers and men. At the division, we heard many stories reflecting their solidarity, respect for each other and mutual help.

On the march, cadres often shouldered guns and field packs for weak fighters. If a soldier's family met with difficulties, the cadres would talk things over with him, try to put his mind at ease and at the same time take necessary measures to help him overcome difficulties. Some cadres even sent some of their own savings to a soldier's family when they heard that it had met with economic difficulties. Once a company political instructor bought a special medicine produced in Kwangtung for his wife, who had fallen ill. But hearing that the mother of one of the soldiers had the same disease, he sent the medicine to the soldier's mother instead, because this kind of medicine was not easy to obtain at that time. Then he did his best to procure another dose for his wife.

In return, fighters also cherish and respect cadres. Not long ago, when a commander was away leading his battalion on a training expedition, his wife fell ill. Comrades at home took turns looking after her as they would a member of their own family. Here, members of the division are really putting into practice Chairman Mao's teaching that "our cadres must show concern for every soldier, and all people in the revolutionary ranks must care for each other, must love and help each other." (Serve the People, 1944.)

Caring for each other conforms to making strict demands on each other. We often heard people say that cadres must first be pace-setters, meaning that everything the cadres ask the soldiers to do, they must themselves do well first. Under such circumstances, cadres set strict demands on the ideology, training, study, work and everyday life of the soldiers. Both simple rough methods and an accommodating attitude towards the soldiers should be opposed.

**Political Democracy**

An important reason why unity between officers and men can be realized within the People's Liberation Army is the tradition of democracy fostered by Chairman Mao. At the time of the founding of the P.L.A., Chairman Mao pointed out: "Apart from the role played by the Party, the reason why the Red Army has been able to carry on in spite of such poor material conditions and such frequent engagements is its practice of democracy. The officers do not beat the men; officers and men receive equal treatment; soldiers are free to hold meetings and to speak out; trivial formalities have been done away with; and the accounts are open for all to inspect..." (The Struggle in the Chingkang Mountains, 1928.)

During the long revolutionary wars, this thinking of Chairman Mao has been constantly enriched, and has developed into a whole system of political, economic and military democracy.

When the Red Army was founded in 1927, some cadres, influenced by traditional concepts, used old methods of command and they beat or cursed the soldiers. Chairman Mao personally set up soldiers' committees in the Red Army, the earliest organizational form for practising democracy. Summing up the Red Army's ex-
experience in carrying out the system of democracy, Chairman Mao in 1929 directed the Red Army to ensure democracy under centralized guidance. (On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party.) By stressing the importance of a system of democracy on one hand and opposing ultrademocracy on the other, Chairman Mao laid the basis of our army's system of democracy.

A leading comrade of the division's political department told us about implementing "democracy in the three main fields." He said: Every company has a revolutionary soldiers' committee which is a mass organization of all the armymen under the leadership of the Party branch. Its basic task is to carry out democracy in political, economic and military fields. Its major duties are to propagate the Party's line, principles and policies and carry out orders and instructions from the higher levels; safeguard the armymen's democratic rights and collect and communicate the soldiers' opinions towards the leading cadres; help the company's leadership run the kitchen and dining room well as do a good job in farm work and side-occupations, supervise expenditures and check on accounts; develop cultural, recreational and sports activities in the company. The committee, elected by all the armymen in the company, has from 5 to 15 members, with cadres making up one-fifth. It serves for a year.

Fighters can criticize each other's shortcomings and make self-criticism, criticize the leadership or put forward suggestions to it at squad meetings as well as in the revolutionary soldiers' committees, the comrade continued. Every month, company leaders report to the company on its work and solicit the soldiers' opinions. There are also meetings discussing the work of the Party branch and the Party members' deeds. Cadres and soldiers often have heart-to-heart talks during which they exchange opinions.

Does it mean a loss in prestige for the cadres and therefore a weakening of army discipline if cadres are criticized by soldiers? The leading comrade assured us: "From our experience, it is just the other way around. When cadres modestly accept the soldiers' criticisms and correct their shortcomings and mistakes, the soldiers show more respect for them and carry out orders more strictly. In this way, relations between officers and men are much closer and they achieve a high degree of political unity."

**Economic Democracy**

While we were talking, a clarion sounded the call for lunch. We went to the dining room to have our mid-day meal with the soldiers. Inside, it was clean and bright; each table, set with rice, two dishes and a soup, seated eight. Soldiers and company cadres ate together in a

*Summing up experiences gained in training.*
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friendly atmosphere. Posted on the wall of the dining room was the previous month's detailed account of mess expenditures. Open accounts for all to inspect, and soldier representatives taking part in mess arrangements are important factors in maintaining economic democracy.

In the old-type army, soldiers were not only suppressed politically but were also exploited economically. Officers deducting sums from the soldiers' wages was a common practice. At the very beginning when our army was founded, Chairman Mao put forward the principle of economic democracy. He stressed that the livelihood of the soldiers should be improved as much as conditions allow.

During the meal we heard some more interesting details about the dining room. For instance, every year there are a few holidays; usually commanders and fighters enjoy a good dinner together in celebration. But how is the menu decided? Only after listening to the soldiers' opinions. Fighters coming from minority nationalities have their own national holidays also. On the basis of other soldiers' suggestions, the mess cooks prepared particularly good dishes for the few minority soldiers to express their greetings to them. Though it seemed a trivial thing, it expressed the comradely warmth of the revolutionary ranks and made these new recruits very happy.

Military Democracy

The P.L.A.'s experience demonstrates that a revolutionary army can practise not only political and economic democracy, but also military democracy. The young Red Army in the past could quickly train a large number of outstanding commanders from among peasant soldiers as well as from among cadres who had had no training in a military academy. One of the important reasons why it could do this was its practice of military democracy.

During the war years, the P.L.A. enforced democratic methods both in drill and fighting. As for training, they carried out a method in which officers taught soldiers, soldiers taught officers and soldiers taught each other. In this way, everyone had a chance to learn the strong points of other people and to overcome his own weaknesses. After every drill, a democratic meeting would be held in which officers and soldiers together went over the training, and discussed how to do better the next time.

In past campaigns, so long as conditions permitted, cadres and fighters would be mobilized to discuss the proposed plan of battle and to surmount any problems in military techniques and tactics. When fighting ceased, the soldiers would be organized to pass judgment on their performance as to bravery, adeptness in the use of military techniques and tactics, the discipline, and the officers' skill and wisdom in commanding. In this way, they summarized the experiences gained in battle.

This tradition has been well kept in peacetime. For example, not long ago, a unit of the division prepared for a march on a rainy day. The leadership asked them to make sure they could cook a meal within an hour somewhere along the way. On such a wet day, where could they find dry firewood out-of-doors? Through discussion, the fighters found a way. Each one took along a piece of dry wood, tucking it into his field pack. One piece was a trifle for each soldier to add to his load, but added together, there was enough to start a fire to cook a meal.

How was it that P.L.A. hand grenades could defeat enemy tanks and our wooden boats beat back enemy warships? How were enemy reinforced concrete blockhouses blown up by the P.L.A. without cannon? Courage and wisdom did it, and military democracy was an effective method of triggering the wisdom of the masses.

Chairman Mao in 1948 pointed out in The Democratic Movement in the Army: "The policy for political work in our army units is fully to arouse the rank and file, the commanders and all working personnel in order to achieve three major objectives through a democratic movement under centralized leadership, namely, a high degree of political unity, better living conditions, and better military technique and tactics." This division, and the whole People's Liberation Army as well, is firmly continuing to implement this teaching of Chairman Mao.
The Significance of the Theory of Three Worlds

— Excerpts of an article by Kazimierz Mijal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party

Some time ago, Kazimierz Mijal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party, wrote the article “Long Live Mao Tsetung Thought.” Chairman Mao, the article points out, integrated the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution and thus defended and enriched Marxism-Leninism. His analysis of present-day international relationships and his theory of the differentiation of the three worlds derived from such an analysis expounded by means of the classical Marxist-Leninist method the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world. Chairman Mao’s analysis, the writer adds, is helpful to the proletariat of all countries and the Marxist-Leninist Parties in working out the political line for their own revolution.

Below we publish excerpts from parts three, five and six of the article, which is in seven parts. — Ed.

The World Socialist System

The world after the Russian October Revolution was divided into two systems — the capitalist and the socialist. The socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union came into being as many countries took the road of building socialism at the end of World War II. With the passing of Stalin and the usurpation of power of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the modern revisionists, the Soviet Union became a social-imperialist power and the existence of the socialist camp came to an end.

The disintegration of the socialist camp does not mean that socialism as a world system no longer exists. These are two separate things.

The banner of the Great October Revolution discarded by the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist clique has been kept afloat by the great Chinese revolution, which enriches and preserves intact the treasure house and honour of the October Revolution and is forging ahead along the road of the October Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is exerting an ever greater influence on the progress of mankind.

Since our country came under military occupation the people of Poland have become familiar with a spate of slanders put about by the Brezhnev revisionist clique that Mao Tsetung’s great China “betrays” Marxist-Leninist principles. However, the Polish and the international proletariat know that these are lies concocted by the renegades to Marxism-Leninism and the fascist enemies of socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

China is a socialist country and also a developing country belonging to the third world. The third world countries are with China. The world socialist system and the international proletariat constitute the unprecedentedly powerful mainstay of the world revolutionary forces and rallying round them are the revolu-
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tionary forces of all peoples who in their struggle to win independence, political sovereignty and economic independence for all countries and nations and to oppose imperialist wars are bringing into being a worldwide democratic united front to fight against imperialism, colonialism and the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

While defending the fruits of the Chinese revolution and socialist construction and protecting China's dictatorship of the proletariat from the grave menace of Russian social-imperialism, Mao Tsetung safeguarded the world socialist system against the real threat and possible extinction at the hands of the forces of international imperialism.

**Fundamental Contradictions in The Present-Day World**

Mao Tsetung's analysis of the structure of the capitalist world and his differentiation of the mutually opposed three worlds on the basis of the analysis greatly facilitate the proletariat of all countries and all genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties in deciding their own revolutionary political line.

The fundamental contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is all-pervasive in the capitalist world. Wherever capital is active and the contradiction exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, there is struggle between the two classes. This is the A B C of Marxism.

Fundamental contradictions exist between imperialist countries and between monopoly groups and are sharpening all the time. Of these contradictions, the major one is between the United States and the Soviet Union. Thus, the two superpowers naturally form the first world. The contradictions among the developed countries excluding the United States and the Soviet Union, though in themselves important, are nevertheless secondary in significance and so they make up a separate group—the second world. However important the contradictions between the first world of superpowers and the second world of developed countries may be, their significance pales beside the major contradiction between the United States and the Soviet Union. The two superpowers are pushing imperialist, colonialist and hegemonist policies, hoping to gain world domination by bringing under their control not only the third world countries but the developed second world countries as well.

Sharpening fundamental contradictions exist between the biggest imperialist countries that make up the first world and the colonial, semi-colonial and newly liberated countries and dependent countries that constitute the third world. As the biggest imperialist countries, the two superpowers are the biggest enemies of the third world countries. But while striving to put the third world under their control, they at the same time curb the expansion and influence of the developed second world countries and make them increasingly dependent. To all third world countries and mankind as a whole, the two superpowers pose the greatest danger. But in specific conditions there may be differences. Sometimes it may be this superpower and sometimes the other which is the direct and chief enemy of a certain third world country.

In the present situation when contradictions are developing in the capitalist world as a whole, it cannot be said that any third world country will inevitably be ruled by or become an appendage of a certain superpower with which it establishes bilateral state relations, political relations, economic relations or cultural relations on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence while struggling for liberation or after getting rid of the other superpower's influence. The danger exists, but it may not become a reality.

Today, those developed second world countries without colonies are continuing to struggle to maintain and expand their spheres of influence and traditional markets, particularly in regard to the third world countries, in order to import cheap raw materials and labour power and export to them capital, industrial products and services. These developed second world countries do not make up a close-knit political bloc for certain fundamental economic contradictions divide them. Furthermore, the serious class struggles in these countries are growing more acute and complex with each passing day.
Externally, these countries are fighting on two fronts. They have to preserve and expand their own influence in the third world countries and at the same time oppose the two superpowers that are more blatant than ever in interfering with their domestic affairs and are scheming to shift on to them the burdens of a growing economic crisis and the losses resulting from a general capitalist crisis.

In their struggle to oppose the main danger the two superpowers pose to their interests, to oppose the outbreak of a new imperialist world war and to consolidate their sovereignty and political and economic independence, the third world countries can and should make use of the differences among the developed second world countries, the contradictions between the first and second worlds and the ever growing and sharpening contradictions between the two superpowers.

The fundamental contradiction between the world capitalist system and the world socialist system is not a contradiction within capitalism itself but an extremely important and sharp contradiction between capitalism as a whole and the countries building socialism. The revisionist leaders of the Soviet Communist Party describe this type of contradiction as the major contradiction in the present-day world which rises above all internal capitalist contradictions. This, however, is incorrect.

Today, all countries have established definite and necessary economic, political and cultural relations with one another. Such relations exist between socialist and capitalist countries, including relations with imperialist countries based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. But the necessary concessions made within this scope to achieve understanding and co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit do not provide any reason for the working class of the developed capitalist countries to suspend and weaken the class struggle, or for the people of the third world countries to suspend or weaken the people's revolutionary struggle. When the revisionist leading clique of the Soviet Communist Party compromised and co-operated with the bourgeoisie at the price of stamping out the class struggle and the people's revolutionary struggle as it wished, the leadership of the Communist Party of China most resolutely drew a distinction with this Right opportunist trend.

"At no time must one rely on one imperialist power against another or preserve oneself in front of another imperialist power." Who could possibly be the object of such warning? The trouble with the bourgeois agents in the communist movement is not a matter of "reliance," they actually serve the bourgeoisie. All Marxist-Leninist Parties have pointed out that such warning is wrong. The Marxist-Leninist Parties yet to gain power will never "rely on" the domestic bourgeoisie, nor will they seek any understanding or compromise with the superpowers. But that's precisely what was done by the old social-democratic parties and is done by the modern revisionists, for both are bourgeois workers' parties. From the foregoing, we can come to the conclusion that such warning probably has the socialist and capitalist countries in mind, warning their governments not to reach any understanding or compromise with either superpower, because only thus can people understand the implication of the term "reliance." But this assertion is equally incorrect.

We are well aware of how Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung were resolved in rejecting such closed-door slogans as "To hell with all agreements and compromises!" Marx and Engels pointed out that "where it is a matter of a struggle against the existing Government, we ally ourselves even with our enemies." (Stein, 1849.) Lenin made use of even the most reactionary forces in Russia and the international arena to win victory for the revolution. Stalin also made use of some troops of the reactionary emigre Polish Government against Hitlerite Germany. Likewise, during the War of Resistance Against Japan, Mao Tsetung also made use of the reactionary Kuomintang forces with which he had fallen out. The use of reactionary imperialist forces to oppose the main enemy is diametrically different from putting reliance on the reactionary imperialist forces. Even during the second imperialist war when the Soviet Union was up against such heavy odds, it joined the alliance against Hitler. This, however, cannot be interpreted as Soviet "reliance" on the United States and Britain.
For the international proletariat, to determine who is the most dangerous enemy of revolution and socialism at the present stage by no means undermines the basic tasks raised in the light of Marxism-Leninism and the fundamental principles of class struggle, nor does it fall into abstract discussions of whether the United States and the Soviet Union constitute the "same" danger. The concrete analysis of concrete conditions is the revolutionary soul of Marxism while the critics of the theory of the three worlds totally disregard this fact. They excessively play up their loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist teachings and proletarian internationalism. They quote Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, but when they analyse a problem, they totally disregard the crux of the matter. As a result, no matter what their intention is and at times even contrary to their will, they are defending the position of Russian social-imperialism objectively.

Asia, Africa and Latin America are the main area of the storms of the world revolution which deals imperialism direct blows. This is how things stand. After World War II, no revolutionary storms took place in Europe, North America and Oceania. There were strikes and even general strikes but they were only economically motivated. There were students' demonstrations, and there were even revolutionary workers' demonstrations in France in 1968 and violent blood-shedding revolutionary struggles in Poland in 1970 and 1976 waged by the proletariat against the revisionist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. While these led to changes of the ruling circles, the foundation of the rule of capital and the bourgeoisie was not undermined. Even in the case of the fascist Portuguese government, its collapse was due to the defeat in the imperialist war it waged against its African colonies. Therefore, to be able to adopt a revolutionary and objective attitude in assessing the revolutionary storms in the world (these were seriously dealt with by Mao Tsetung and the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party) and to be able to take a sincere approach to the world's revolutionary events in which our brothers and the oppressed and:exploited people of various countries shed their blood, we should throw away the bourgeois frame of mind of regarding Europe as the centre and the "theory" of looking at the Asian, African and Latin American people from the position of an "elite nation." This "theory" advanced with the worst of motives by Russian social-imperialism in dealing with these nations has been criticized and repudiated, as it should, by the leadership of the C.P.C. Central Committee.

According to the warning by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Communist Party, it seems that to emphasize the great significance of the revolutionary storms in the third world countries means disregarding the role of the socialist system and the working class in the developed capitalist countries. This is utterly groundless slander.

The revolutionary struggle of the third world countries will not hamper but encourage the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries to embark on the road of revolutionary storm with greater tempo.

In making an analysis of economic relations, Marx, Engels and Lenin affirmed the differentiation of the naturally shaped capitalist world, as it was divided into "two worlds" — the industrial world and the agricultural world, city and countryside, the oppressed nations and the oppressor nations. Does the prescription written by the critics of the theory of the three worlds mean that the founders of Marxism had "forgotten" the class struggle or deviated from the Marxist teachings? It should be noted that in each of the two worlds there simultaneously exist the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the exploited and exploiters as well as the oppressed and the oppressors.

At the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, the world was divided into three types of countries: the highly developed capitalist countries, the middling developed capitalist countries and the colonial countries. Stalin upheld this differentiation. Was the world not divided into three parts in the way it was divided into "three worlds"? Just so. This, however, did not in the least deviate from the principle of class analysis, nor did it depart from Marxism-Leninism. The purpose of doing so was to help the working class of every country and its Party formulate its political line in

(Continued on p. 25.)
Soviet-U.S. Nuclear Talks: An Analysis

Much as Moscow and Washington try to generate optimism about the progress of their SALT II talks, in the final analysis conclusion of an agreement will only drive both sides to step up their nuclear arms race.

Much arm-twisting is going on between the Soviet Union and the United States as they carry on their SALT II talks. Not long ago, Brezhnev smugly said that the Soviet-U.S. nuclear talks were progressing "well." "Real progress" was the expression U.S. President Carter used to describe the talks. The press in both countries came out with statement after statement that "both sides have made major concessions," that the "deadlock" has been broken, that "the two countries are on the way to reaching agreement," etc. A Soviet-U.S. joint communique boasted that a Soviet-U.S. nuclear agreement is of "particular importance" to "further measures aimed at the effective prevention of nuclear war and the limitation of armaments, thereby contributing to progress towards all real disarmament." People cannot but ask: What "particular importance" is there in a Soviet-U.S. nuclear agreement? Does such an agreement contribute to "progress towards all real disarmament" or is it the start of a new round in the nuclear arms race?

U.S. Loses as Moscow Gains

The deal on a Soviet-U.S. nuclear agreement is not yet clinched, but something about its content has been disclosed and the media in Western countries are already busy with comments.

Certain people in the United States said that the new agreement would for the "first time" in thirty years bring "parity" in the number of strategic weapons and that the ceiling on the total number of strategic delivery vehicles for each side would be less than the 1974 stipulation (2,400 for each side). Some reports said that it would be one-tenth less than the 1974 figure. However, it is reported that in the new accord the United States would insist on limiting the Soviet heavy missiles not to 150 as it did before but to 308. Since the United States has not got such heavy land-based missiles as those possessed by the Soviet Union, an equal number of missiles for both sides would mean Soviet preservation of its enormous might in land-based missiles. "The Russians," people pointed out, "have in reality given up nothing by reducing the aggregate number of their strategic delivery vehicles." It is clear who is to benefit from such an agreement.

The Soviet Backfire bomber and the U.S. cruise missile have long been bones of contention in the Soviet-U.S. nuclear talks. In drawing up the new agreement, reports say, the Soviet Backfire bomber will not be included in the limited aggregate number provided the Soviet Union agrees not to deploy such bombers against the United States or to increase their production. Some people commented that this was like handing over anties to the Soviet Union in the nuclear gamble. Others held that the Soviets' word is doubtful in times of peace and worthless in times of war. As for the cruise missile, which is a potential "deterrent" in the U.S. nuclear armoury, the new agreement will set limits on its range—air-launched cruise missiles not to exceed 1,500 miles and those land- or sea-launched ones not to exceed 350 miles. U.S. public-opinion pointed out that to place such extremely rigid restrictions on the cruise missile makes it worthless even to carry on research on this promising weapon. No wonder some U.S. opinion circles believe that the United States "loses far more than it gains."

Nuclear Contention Behind "Limitation"

A review of the history of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear weapons points up the well-known fact that the signing of SALT I agreements has not put an end to the nuclear armament race between the two super-
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powers, especially since the aim of the Soviet Union has always been to gain nuclear supremacy by frenziedly developing nuclear weapons behind the smokescreen of agreements.

For the greater part of the 1960s, the United States enjoyed a threefold edge over the Soviet Union in the number of strategic missiles. But in subsequent years, the Soviet Union took advantage of the U.S. impasse in its war of aggression against Viet Nam and especially the ballyhoo of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear weapons that started in the winter of 1969 to redouble its efforts to expand nuclear armaments. By the end of the second quarter of 1972, the Soviet Union had increased its missiles from 1,211 to well over 2,000, thus turning the tide. The five-year-term interim agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms concluded in Moscow in May 1972 by the Kremlin and Washington proclaims that both sides will not possess more nuclear weapons than they already have. In essence, this confirms the Soviet missile supremacy in the form of an agreement. The Soviet Union was thus given a free hand to concentrate on improving the quality of its nuclear weapons.

Following their meeting at Haishenwei (Vladivostok) in November 1974, the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States announced a verbal agreement, good for a period of ten years, to limit the number of strategic offensive arms and set for each side a ceiling of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles, with MIRVs (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles) not exceeding 1,320. To all intents and purposes, the accord is a green light for a new round of nuclear arms race because it allows both sides to considerably expand the number of MIRVs, improve the quality of strategic missiles, increase the throw-weight of missiles, and research on and manufacture mobile strategic missiles without restriction. Taking advantage of this accord, the Soviet Union lost no time to research on, manufacture and develop its multiple warhead missiles, heavy ICBMs, mobile missiles and Backfire bombers. In a space of a few years, it has developed four new types of ICBMs and a submarine-launched ballistic missile with a range of 4,000 miles and made a breakthrough in the technique of MIRVs. While trying to retain its numerical superiority, the Soviet Union endeavours to catch up with and surpass its adversary in the making of multiple warheads. The United States, on its part, is doing its utmost to maintain its qualitative superiority and slow down the rapid speed at which its rival is catching up in the quality of strategic arms. Thus the progress of negotiations, Moscow admitted, has lagged behind the pace of the emergence of new weapons; in a word, the planners at the drawing board have outwitted the diplomats.

Arms Race Continues

It is thus clear that the Soviet-U.S. nuclear arms talks and the agreements reached over the last eight years do not mean a move towards “disarmament” nor “consideration given to each other” and “equal security for both sides.” They mean launching round after round of nuclear arms race behind the veil of “limitation.” This proves to the hilt that negotiations are nothing but a form of struggle by which each side tries to restrict the other's expansion and build up its own strength. The results of the nuclear arms race outside the conference room tend to back up each against the other in the negotiations. The Soviet Union and the United States use negotiations and agreements as a means to cover up their newly started arms race which in turn gives rise to new rounds of negotiations. This repeats itself in an endless cycle with arms expansion going on and on. If there is any difference between the two superpowers, it is that the Soviet Union has shown greater skill in using negotiations and agreements to benefit itself.

Some Americans are of the opinion that if there had been no agreement on nuclear arms limitation, the Soviet Union would have become more unbridled in its arms expansion and the danger of a nuclear war would have become greater. They are labouring under the illusion that agreements can be used to induce the Soviets to make corresponding concessions. They even maintain that an agreement, however undesirable, is better than none, believing that an agreement can bind the other side hand and foot and preserve what they call a “balance of nuclear power.” This psychology furnishes the Soviet Union with favourable openings.

History has proved time and again that the imperialist powers bent on attaining world
hegemony invariably resort to the trick of sham disarmament. On the eve of World War II when Hitler was sabre-rattling, the German representative held forth vociferously about “disarmament” and “balance of armament” at the World Disarmament Conference held under the auspices of the League of Nations. This conference which dragged on for three years provided a smokescreen for imperialist arms expansion and war preparations. As one comment went at the time, the disarmament conference discussed the kind of guns to be used to kill people. Today, 40 years after that conference, people again hear this warning: “Often arms control agreements [between the Soviet Union and the United States] are nothing less than agreements to arms.” That is a thought-provoking warning!

— by Chang Hua

“Joint Investment Projects” — A New Soviet Gimmick to Plunder East European Countries

BY: “international division of labour,” “planned co-ordination” and “multilateral integration,” Soviet social-imperialism controls the economic lifelines of its “fraternal countries” in what it calls the “socialist community.” The range of control extends to raw materials, marketing, price in foreign trade, production plans, fund for capital construction and even labour force. The so-called “joint investment projects” undertaken inside the Moscow-dominated Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (C.M.E.A.) are a glaring example of how the Soviet Union controls and plunders these countries.

“Joint Investment Projects” — What Are They?

Handicapped by natural conditions, the member states of C.M.E.A., East European countries in particular, are comparatively short of energy and other natural resources. Taking advantage of this situation, Moscow has needled these countries into furnishing the Soviet Union with capital, equipment and labour force to exploit mines and build factories in exchange for Soviet supply of fuel and raw materials. This goes by the seemingly harmless term “joint investment projects.”

The “co-ordination plan for the 1976-80 multilateral integration measures” adopted at the C.M.E.A. 29th session in 1975 under Soviet coercion and cajolery is a new form used by the Soviet Union to control and plunder the East European countries through “joint investment projects.” The “plan” stipulates that within five years, the Soviet Union and other C.M.E.A. member states will jointly build ten “integrated” projects, eight of which to be sited in the Soviet Union. These eight projects alone require 8,000 million rubles, and the Kremlin demands that the East European countries put up half the cost. For instance, the German Democratic Republic is required to provide 8,000 million marks (1,700 million rubles), Bulgaria, more than 600 million rubles.

The 2,800-kilometre natural gas pipeline between Orenburg in the Urals and the western border is one of the biggest projects. The Soviet Union undertakes to explore and design prospective routes while the East European countries are charged with laying pipes along the whole line and building 22 pumping stations, each country to build one section within a prescribed time limit. Other projects include the Ustilimsk Paper Pulp Combine and the Kiembaevsk Asbestos Combine. To complete the eight projects, the East European countries have to supply on a massive scale metal structures, vehicles, cement, cables, steel pipes, consumer goods, as well as labourers and technicians. To build the gas pipeline, they must send as stipulated 25,000 people to the Soviet Union. But in fact only 15,000 went because of a host of contradictions.

As they carry on plunder abroad, the colonialists, old and new alike, always resort
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to inventing "theories" to defend their ugly deeds. Soviet "social-imperialism" is no exception.

In order to control and plunder other C.M.E.A. member states, Moscow has spread various fallacies, one being what it calls "no profit is attainable." The new tsars once gave the East European member states to understand that fuel and raw material costs much higher investment than other industrial branches, whereas the return is slower. The production of fuel and raw materials, so they say, yields no profit. The Soviet Union is the main supplier of fuel and raw materials to the East European countries. The problem of increased investment caused by rising exports, they assert, should be tackled by increasing the loans and technical aid of the countries concerned, the fact is that Moscow exports fuel and raw materials not only to the East European countries but also to the West and in recent years, these exports to the West have increased far faster than the amount shipped to the East European countries.

To expand armaments and prepare for war in its bid for world hegemony, the Soviet Union must import as much as it can in the way of technical know-how and equipment from the West but it has little to offer in the way of exports for exchange. Shoddy Soviet machinery and equipment attract few customers in Western markets. Consequently, apart from contracting Western loans on a big scale, increased exports of fuel and raw materials are an important way to gain foreign exchange. Moscow's demand that the East European countries bankroll the exploitation of Soviet natural resources is aimed at getting something out of its trade with the West. To say that it has nothing to attain is only a pretext to cover up its actual looting.

What is called "sharp increases in the cost of exploitation" is another fallacy spread by the Soviet Union. According to the men in the Kremlin, the new bases of fuel and other raw materials are located in remote areas and the conditions as regards weather, exploitation and transport are worse than before. Since cost has sharply risen, the countries concerned therefore should make good the difference between estimated and actual cost. But in point of fact, it is the creeping depletion of resources in the western parts of the country and particularly strategic considerations that have caused the Soviet Union to build a number of new fuel and other raw material bases in remote areas in the north and east. For example, these newly built bases are designed to produce all the planned increases in oil and natural gas, more than 80 per cent of copper and aluminium and over 50 per cent of pulp listed in the current five-year plan. Obviously, the building of these bases is meant to meet Moscow's own needs and the extra burdens are shifted on to its "fraternal countries." Such behaviour is worse than what the old colonialists were capable of.

Growing Centrifugal Trend

The multifarious "joint investment projects" which Moscow has crammed down the throats of its East European C.M.E.A. partners thus imposes a heavy burden on these countries that are short of funds and manpower. It is only natural that they resent the Soviet pressure.

In addition to undertaking "economic integration" projects, Czechoslovakia, for instance, is obliged to lay within the country a section of the gas pipeline to carry Soviet natural gas to West European countries. This alone will cost Czechoslovakia 20,000.2 million Korunas (amounting to 2,700.5 million rubles), or 16 per cent of its capital construction's investments planned for 1975. To undertake a number of capital construction projects for the Soviet Union, the Czechoslovak Government has been forced to slash 24 domestic capital construction items. At the 30th C.M.E.A. session in 1976, the Czechoslovak delegation asked for a new form of co-operation which does not require direct investments in exchange for raw materials. It also proposed that investment must be apportioned in consideration of the economic strength of the countries concerned. The Hungarian press also voiced its complaints: If larger parts of our imports depend on investment, our economy will grow at a smaller rate, even decline. East European countries complained that the Soviet Union had perfidiously scrapped agreements and repeatedly jacked up export prices of fuel and other raw materials, thus bringing them new difficulties. At the 31st C.M.E.A. session this year, they particularly resented the arbitrary way the Soviet Union...
behaved in the matter of the fuel supplies. As a result, the long-term co-operation plan for five items, including supplies of fuel and other raw materials, which Moscow tried to railroad through the meeting, was shelved. The session came to naught.

Since East European countries have suffered enough from importing Soviet fuel and other raw materials, they have to find other alternatives. They now put the stress on exploiting domestic resources, increasing the proportion of domestic resources in home consumption and making greater investments in the departments charged with producing fuel and other raw materials. Time and again they emphasize the need to save fuel, work out rational economy measures and energetically expand economic and trade relations with the West and the third world countries so as to seek new sources of fuel and other raw materials.

The facts are clear. The so-called "joint investment projects" advertised by the Soviet Union are nothing but a gimmick. Many invest and only one reaps the profit. Moscow's acts of ruthless bullying, oppression and plunder cannot but evoke strong resentment from the East European C.M.E.A. countries and accelerate a centrifugal trend away from the Soviet Union. The tighter the Soviet control and exploitation of these countries, the fiercer their struggle against the Soviet attempts will be, and the more Soviet social-imperialism will be exposed.

(Continued from p. 20.)

accordance with the nature of the revolution and the revolutionary tasks confronted by each of the three types of countries.

Like the teachings by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin in previous historical periods, Mao Tsetung's analysis of the present-day world and his differentiation of the three worlds based on this analysis are helpful to the proletariat of all countries and their revolutionary parties in working out their political line so as to unite all forces of the world revolution.

The Main Area of Storms of World Revolution

Delivering the Political Report on behalf of the C.P.C. Central Committee at the 1973 C.P.C. Tenth National Congress presided over by Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai said: "The third world has strengthened its unity in the struggle against hegemonism and power politics of the superpowers and is playing an ever more significant role in international affairs." The term "third world" has been used in scientific literature and political essays for more than two decades. As early as 1970, it was written into political dictionaries while some people seemed ignorant of this and went so far as to raise this question "what is the third world?" Every worker, however, could very easily answer: "This refers to the poorest, the most oppressed and exploited people of the Asian, African and Latin American countries."

Where there are starvation, enslavement, oppression and exploitation, there are rebellions and revolutionary storms. The third world is the source of superprofits and economic strength for international monopoly capital, U.S. imperialism and Russian social-imperialism in particular. At the same time, it is also the weakest link in the chain of politics and the key area of imperialism, colonialism as well as hegemonism of the two superpowers.

In the developed capitalist countries and in the imperialist citadels with modern industry, there are concentrated the strongest immediate and potential forces of the working class. At an opportune moment when objective and subjective conditions for socialist revolution are mature, the working class will fulfil its historical mission of burying capitalism in the cradle of capitalism and the heartland of imperialism. But at present though class struggles are going on and even turning sharper lately, these countries are still not the "main area of the storms of the world revolution." We believe that the great day of large-scale battle will come sooner or later in Western Europe, Eastern Europe and North America. At present, however, "nobody can deny that the main area of the storms of the world revolution lies in the broad regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America."
**Friendship Notes**

**Visitor From Iceland**

Recently, a blind man from Iceland visited the site of the National Institute of the Peasant Movement founded by Chairman Mao in 1926 in Kwangchow. He listened carefully to what the guide was saying and, when shown the room Chairman Mao had once lived in, ran his hands lightly and lovingly over the bed, desk, chair and bookshelves. He was the 25-year-old Mr. Arthor Helgason, President of the Iceland-China Society for Culture.

Mr. Helgason lost his sight in an unsuccessful eye operation when he was a boy. Despite this handicap, he has, in the past ten years, worked tirelessly to enhance understanding and friendship between the people of Iceland and China. In 1966, he heard over the radio an Icelandic journalist speak about his three visits to China. He was moved when the speaker described the revolutionary optimism and the indomitable spirit of the Chinese people. Later, he heard some revolutionary Chinese music and was inspired by its vigour and militancy. Then he began listening to the English transmission from Radio Peking and reading Chinese publications with the help of friends. As his interest in China grew, so did his friendship for this country.

In recent years, he has done much work arranging Chinese music for presentation over Icelandic radio, and has spoken over the air many times about Chinese music and given recitals in person. He has also lectured on and written articles about the political, economic, cultural and educational achievements of New China as well as about China's stand in international affairs. In March this year he was elected President of the Iceland-China Society for Culture.

During their visit to China, Mr. Helgason and other members of the Delegation of the Iceland-China Society for Culture visited factories, rural communes, schools and hospitals to get a first-hand understanding of the way the Chinese people live and work. He taped most of his meetings with Chinese people. Returning to the hotel after a whole day's visit, he would neglect rest to discuss with the delegation members what they had seen and heard.

Mr. Helgason and his party were met by Chinese Vice-Premier Wang Chen in Peking's Great Hall of the People. He presented the Vice-Premier with a copy of *Long March—Chairman Mao's Poems*, an Icelandic translation he had revised and written a foreword to. "I'm honoured to have the opportunity to present this book to a veteran revolutionary of China who took part in the Long March," he said. Vice-Premier Wang Chen was very pleased to receive this precious gift symbolic of the friendship between the two peoples, and, opening the flyleaf, asked Mr. Helgason and the other Icelandic friends for their autographs.

**Dry Dock in Malta**

Work on a 300,000-ton dry dock, started in 1974 by workers and technicians of Malta and China, has now entered the stage of pouring concrete.

The first stage of this major engineering task involved the removal of half a mountain and the excavation of a basin about ten metres below sea level through solid rock. Giant excavators ate into the mountain and a continuous line of dumpers took the stone away. An estimated one million cubic metres of rock were removed within one year.

Throughout the construction site, Maltese and Chinese workers could be seen working side by side in close harmony. Chinese worker Wang Chi-ming who headed a team of 20 Maltese workers doing reinforced concrete work jumped at any heavy job although his Maltese colleagues ever solicitous of his health tried their best to stop him.

A workshop of the construction site, in addition to doing repairs and maintenance work, processed construction materials and did a host of other jobs. But with workers of both countries pooling efforts, the shop's monthly tasks were fulfilled or overfulfilled. Li Hsueh-yi who led a group of 50 or so young Maltese straight out of school found them eager and diligent. He thought out many ways of overcoming the language barrier and these youngsters picked up technical skills from him very rapidly.
The Chinese excavator operator Lu Chun, known as “Little Tiger” for his difficulty-defying spirit, was injured while taking over a hazardous job from his Maltese friends. Visiting him in the hospital, Prime Minister Mintoff said: “You’re a hero. You were injured while doing a job for our country. The Maltese people should learn from you. And we’ll do our best to cure the injury in your leg.” The local people also called to see him bringing fresh flowers and presents after they read of the accident in the newspapers.

**Sao Tome and Principe Grows Rice**

This year saw Sao Tome and Principe growing rice for the first time in its history. Two crops were produced one after the other, with their respective per-hectare yields reaching 5 and 8.5 tons. This gave great joy to this African island country in its second year of independence.

The rich soil and abundant rainfall provide excellent conditions for grain production, but in the five centuries of Portuguese colonialist rule, the land was given over entirely to growing cocoa and coffee for export so that the people were compelled to rely entirely on imports for their grain and clothing. The Government of the Democratic Republic has decided to put an end to this irrational situation.

In May last year, a Chinese agro-technical team was invited to the Diogo Nunes State Farm in the suburbs of the town of Sao Tome, the capital, to experiment with growing rice there together with local agro-technicians.

The first step was to build rice-fields. This was a tough and trying time. There was a shortage of agricultural machinery and the only bulldozer was engaged in pushing over old palm trees. The rocks were manually removed. Because more labour was needed, local inhabitants and students were called to lend a hand. Prime Minister M. Trovoada’s 70-year-old mother also came to help.

The whole country took a keen interest in this project. President M. Pinto da Costa himself came to inspect the farm on three occasions. People working on the project outdid themselves to ensure success. “We will do anything to get rice to grow,” said Ableno, who is in charge of the machine shop. He and his colleagues quickly and skilfully processed parts of machines and farm tools so that there would be no holdups. When a brake pulley for a tractor was needed during the busy days of transplanting, he got his fellow workers together and had the pulley made within three days.

Technicians and agro-workers of the farm and their Chinese colleagues have become fast friends. “We are determined to learn everything about rice growing from our Chinese friends before they leave for home,” the farm personnel declared.

**“Xue Hai”**

The oceangoing ship Xue Hai, built by the “May 3” Shipyard of Yugoslavia for China, was handed over to China at a November 18 ceremony at Rijeka.

The 213-metre-long ship with a payload of 45,000 tons is a sister ship of the Mei Hai commissioned two and a half months earlier. The “May 3” Shipyard workers see the two vessels as a symbol of the friendship between the two countries.

**Australian Fauna (Specimens) Exhibition**

A three-week Australian Fauna (Specimens) Exhibition was held recently at the Museum of Natural History in Peking. About 80,000 people visited it.

The exhibition was sponsored by the Australian Government in accordance with the agreement on cultural exchanges between China and Australia. On display were specimens of more than 30 kinds of fauna, including reptiles, birds (lyre and satin bowerbirds), marsupials and monotremes (platypus). The specimens were well mounted and gave a vivid ecological study of Australian fauna. Films shown at the exhibition acquainted visitors with the habitats of the animals indigenous to Australia.

Dr. Peter Stanbury, noted Australian zoologist and curator of the Macleay Museum of the University of Sydney who came to China for the exhibition held talks with his Chinese colleagues.

**CORRECTION:** The last sentence of the first item under *Newly Off the Press* on page 31 of our issue No. 47 should read: “It also includes... in the handwriting of this veteran revolutionary written on March 6, 1976, when he was 90 years old.”
MOZAMBIQUE

Rhodesian Invaders Resisted

Rhodesian racist troops have stepped up their inroads into Mozambique since late November. This development deserves close attention.

On November 23, Rhodesian invaders launched a large-scale attack on the Zimbabwean refugee camp northeast of Chi-asso City. In the attack, enemy bombers dropped napalm and fragmentation bombs and airborne paratroops. According to incomplete statistics, 85 refugees were killed, including 55 children and 21 women, and more than 500 wounded and a number of others missing.

On November 26 when the Rhodesian troops, with air support, invaded a border area of Tete Province, Mozambican armed forces beat them back. The next day, the Rhodesian troops attacked the border town of Espungera, Manica Province, they were countered by Mozambican forces.

Since Mozambique instituted total sanctions against the Rhodesian racist regime on March 3, 1976, the Smith regime has stepped up activities encroaching upon Mozambique's sovereignty. Rhodesian troops carried out 143 acts of invasion in one year ending last March. During the period from May 1976 to May 1977, 1,432 Mozambican civilians were killed, 527 wounded and many schools, hospitals, shops and factories were ruined.

Statements denouncing the Rhodesian racists for their new crimes have been issued by Mugabe, Joint Leader of the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front; Nkomo, President of the Zimbabwe African People's Union; the O.A.U. Liberation Committee and a number of African and Asian countries. The Sudanese Government has decided to send Mozambique 1,000 tons of sorghum to support that country in resisting Rhodesian racist aggression.

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA)

Sham Independence for Bophuthatswana

Following Transkei's "independence" last year, Bophuthatswana, a second "homeland for the black people" thought up by the South African racist regime, was granted "independence" on December 6.

Bophuthatswana in northwest South Africa has an aggregate area of 38,000 square kilometres comprising six enclaves in three provinces. Most of its 1.2 million population are Tswanas.

The so-called "homelands" are, in fact, former "native reserves." Of the more than 26 million people in South Africa, whites number only 4.32 million but own the cities, industrial centres, mineral resources and fertile lands. The 18.6 million or so black people are confined to barren tracts of land euphemistically called "homelands" or "reserves" adding up to only about 13 per cent of the total area of South Africa. This policy of setting up "homelands" is the continuation and development of the notorious policy of apartheid and racial discrimination.
Though granted "independence," Bophuthatswana is still under the domination of the racist regime. Through "treaties" and "agreements," the Vorster regime has control of Bophuthatswana's defence, economy, foreign and domestic affairs. Half the members of the Bophuthatswana's Assembly are appointed by the regime. Officials in Bophuthatswana are trained and appointed by the South African authorities and 80 per cent of its budget is financed by Pretoria.

Bophuthatswana's pseudo-independence is strongly opposed by the Azanian people, the Tswanas included. Most Tswanas boycotted the August "pre-independence election" and last year students set fire to the building of the "legislative assembly" and openly declared their opposition to so-called "independence."

Before and after the proclamation of "independence," nationalist organizations in South Africa, the Organization of African Unity, and governments of some African countries denounced the Vorster regime for the Bophuthatswana "independence" farce it staged.

FAO

Speedy Development of Food Production

The 19th Conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) held in Rome from November 12 to December 1 was attended by representatives of more than 120 member states and some international organizations.

How to speed up food production in third world countries was one of the main topics of the conference. Food production in these countries has gone up annually since the last conference. According to FAO figures, the total amount of food produced in the third world countries exceeded 728 million tons last year, a 13 per cent increase over 1974 and a further rise is expected this year. This has contributed positively to raising the degree of self-sufficiency in food of those countries, reducing their dependence on the superpowers for food supply and enhancing their struggle against the superpowers using food as a means to exploit and control them.

The representatives of Korea, Mexico and other third world countries said that their countries would continue to give full play to the spirit of self-reliance and hard struggle, and stressed that priority must be given to food production and efforts must be made to attain self-sufficiency in food, so as to "feed ourselves by our own efforts."

At the November 17 plenary session of the 19th conference, Chinese Delegation Leader Hsiao Peng stressed that "now as ever, the speedy development of food production in the third world remains our pressing task. Although the world food situation has somewhat improved recently, one must never forget what happened during the food shortage after the 1972 worldwide crop failure. At that time one superpower snatched up food supplies right and left, and the other superpower took advantage of the situation to make huge profits, all this caused untold sufferings to food-deficient countries in the third world. It is therefore essential for the third world countries to make unremitting efforts to increase food production and continuously raise the rate of self-sufficiency in food. With food in hand, everything else will be easier to do."

BERMUDA

Against Execution of Political Prisoners

Even in Bermuda, a playground of the rich in the West, there is no tranquillity.

In early December, crowds of black youth have been demonstrating for days in protest against the execution of two black political prisoners by the colonial authorities.

People in Bermuda repeatedly demanded clemency for the two black political prisoners, but the colonial authorities excecuted them on December 2.

This immediately provoked protest demonstrations by angry crowds. Although local troops and police were called out to suppress the protesters, a curfew was imposed and arrests were made, the wave of protest continued unabated and troops had to be rushed in from Britain on December 4.

Bermuda is an island with a population of 55,000 in the Atlantic and lies about 1,000 kilometres southeast of the United States. It was proclaimed a British colony in 1684 and, since 1968, has had "internal self-government" with Britain still controlling its foreign affairs, defence and internal security.
ON THE HOME FRONT

Kweichow's New Production Successes

SOUTHWEST China's Kweichow, one of the provinces seriously sabotaged by the "gang of four," has completed its 1977 plan for gross industrial output 50 days ahead of schedule. It also gathered in a bumper harvest this year.

Its industrial production hit an all time high this year. The gross industrial output exceeded the peak year of 1975 by 8.2 per cent. At the same time, the quality of products showed improvement, production costs went down and profits increased.

Some projects whose building had started many years ago were completed this year. And construction of a number of big water conservancy works and chemical plants is proceeding at a faster pace.

The Kweiyang Iron and Steel Plant and the Kweichow Cement Plant suffered serious interference and sabotage when the "gang of four" were running riot. The former failed to fulfil its production plans in the last few years. This year it completed its annual plan for output value three months ahead of schedule and began operating at a profit, instead of a deficit.

Thé latter's cement output in August, September and October almost equalled what the plant produced in the first seven months of 1977.

The province's 1977 grain output went up by 15 per cent over 1976; this is 9.2 per cent higher than the peak year of 1973. Statistics from departments concerned show that 87 counties and cities of the province have brought about an increase in grain output. In some of the counties, per-hectare grain output exceeded six tons. Output of main industrial crops such as tobacco, tea and peanut also reached an all time high this year.

Long March Sketches Republished

RECENTLY a collection of 24 sketches has been republished depicting the famous Long March of the 30s. They record the life and struggle of the Red Army men who participated in this heroic expedition as well as scenes and people's misfortunes they encountered along the way.

The first is a drawing of the old hero Lin Po-chu. After the founding of the People's Republic of China he became Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, a post which he held until he passed away in 1960. Another pictures fighters forcing the old Luting Bridge, made of chains. There are also sketches depicting the soldiers' encampment on the marshy grasslands, their indomitable spirit in crossing the snow-clad mountains and their joyful
descending. One shows a detachment of Red Army guerrillas of Yi nationality.

The collection is noteworthy not only because it helps people understand the arduous nature of the revolution as well as gain new enthusiasm for it, but also because of the interesting story behind its appearance and republication.

In 1938, under the dark rule of the Kuomintang government in Shanghai, Ah Ying (Chien Hsing-tsun, 1900-77, one of the leaders in our Party’s literary and art movement in Shanghai in the 30s) opened a bookstore and edited a monthly to promote progressive cultural work.

One day someone handed him a bundle of sketches which was sent by a Long March fighter from the northwest and had passed through the hands of several people. The name of the artist did not appear. Greatly moved by the drawings and happy to receive them, Ah Ying had 2,000 sets of good prints made for circulation in Shanghai and the anti-Japanese base areas in south China. He had no opportunity to reprint them because shortly afterwards his bookstore was searched by the reactionary government authorities and some of the staff were arrested.

In 1958, during the big leap forward in New China, the book of sketches was discovered by a reader browsing in the Peking Library. Adopting his suggestion, the People’s Fine Arts Publishing House reprinted the drawings which contain important historical documentation in the form of art.

After five years, in 1962, the collection was brought out again. Now we know who drew the sketches — it was Huang Chen, a young Red Army man in charge of propaganda at the time of the Long March. He is now one of China’s seasoned diplomats.

Another fighter who also took part in the Long March was so impressed by the sketches that he composed a lyric to each one to express his deep feelings.

A Deputy Commander

WANG Yu-cheng was originally deputy commander of the Luan military subarea in east China’s Anhwei Province (one of the military subareas of the provincial military area). As he grew older he began to suffer from heart disease and high blood pressure. Towards the end of 1969 the Party organization of the military subarea decided that he should be relieved from active duty and given a leave of convalescence.

A veteran fighter who had joined the army in 1938, he did not look forward to such a prospect. He thought: I’m a
Communist Party member, and that means I must continue to work hard and devote my whole life to the communist cause. Though I'm not a deputy commander in active service, still I can go on working for the revolution. Therefore he obtained permission to live in a certain production team in Luan County where he had once stayed for a period.

Wang Yu-cheng took part in the team's collective labour as an ordinary member and won the respect of the team leaders and the peasants. The team was backward in production at that time. "Why is that?" he wondered. As part of a careful investigation, he visited and chatted with all leaders and members to find the reason.

He discovered a few backward persons spreading all sorts of fallacies such as: "To eat, rely on the collective, but to earn money, rely on your own efforts." "If you go in for farm production instead of trading, where will you get the money to buy good clothes for your daughter when she gets married?" This induced some members to go in for buying and selling instead of farm production. This was the basic reason why the collective did not thrive.

Wang reported this situation to the team leaders and together with them did some ideological work among the members. They helped some members of poor and lower-middle peasant origin understand gradually that devoting their main efforts to trade instead of collective production would encourage capitalist tendencies, and only make the few rich but the majority poor again. Only by increasing collective production and firmly taking the socialist road is it possible for the team to bring about a big change for the better and for every member to get more income.

Wang Yu-cheng, together with the team's cadres, discussed overall plans for transforming the hills and harnessing the rivers on a large scale. After surveying the hilly land and farmland they drew up plans for building reservoirs and for levelling the terrain.

Under the leadership of the Party branch of the production brigade, he joined the commune members in building reservoirs and levelling large tracts of land. Through arduous efforts during four winter-spring periods, they built five small reservoirs and levelled off more than 30 hillocks, expanding their cultivated area considerably.

Since 1971, the team has acquired a new look. Per-hectare grain output has increased steadily, the collective built up its accumulation and the commune members' standard of living improved. The team has begun buying machines to replace manual labour.

By 1972 the team could no longer be considered backward. Some persons tried to persuade Wang Yu-cheng to have a good rest. But he had other ideas. Just like smashing enemy strongholds one by one during wartime, he displayed the revolutionary spirit of continuous fighting and went to work in another backward production team.

**Briefs**

- China fulfilled its 1977 salt production plan 110 days ahead of schedule. With the growth of industrial and agricultural production, more and more salt is being used. The workers have made great efforts to increase salt output so as to meet the needs of our socialist construction and the people's daily life as well. By the end of the third quarter this year, six areas (including Tientsin and Shantung) turning out sea salt and four places (including Chinghai) producing lake salt had fulfilled their annual plans.

- By October 25 north China's Shihchiachuang city had completed its 1977 plans for gross industrial output and for the production of printed and dyed cloth, rolled steel, motor vehicles, chemical fertilizer, sowing machines and 14 other major products. Compared with the corresponding 1976 period, its gross industrial output went up by 15.1 per cent, hitting an all-time high for the same period, and its revenue rose by 16.2 per cent. The city's industrial output value accounts for a large proportion of Hopei Province's total.

- Situated at 4,040 metres above sea level, the Gyantse County Experimental Farm in the Tibet Autonomous Region gathered in an average of 836.5 kilogrammes of winter wheat per mu (one-fifteenth of a hectare) on its 1.32 mu experimental plot. This has set a record of wheat output in the high-altitude and cold areas.