

REDNESS AND PROFICIENCYRefuting Yao Po-mao's Theory of "Complete Unity" of
Redness and Proficiency

by

Li Yu-shuo (李羽碩)

(Shanghai Wen-hui Pao, January 19, 1965)

Comrade Yao Po-mao (姚伯茂) has concocted the so-called "two types of contradictions" to justify Comrade Yang Hsien-chen's "combine two into one" theory. To prove that the contradiction "with identity as its essential feature" has "objective existence," he cites the contradiction between redness and proficiency as an example. He maintains that the contradiction between redness and proficiency belongs to the category of contradictions "with identity as their essential feature," and that they are "completely united."

Further, he says, "The struggle between two aspects of the contradiction will not result in one aspect being 'surmounted,' 'eliminated' and 'overcome' by the other but in mutual promotion and common advancement. Both aspects are eternally green and will never become 'extinct.'" This contradiction should be resolved, he says, by "integrating, uniting and connecting the two, thus 'combining two into one.'"

This type of inference is entirely wrong.

The Contradiction between Redness and Proficiency
Is Concrete and Real

Comrade Yao Po-mao talks glibly about concrete analysis of concrete contradictions. But it appears from two of his articles that, whenever he touches upon such concrete opposites as redness and proficiency, he always substitutes conceptual sophistry for concrete analysis. If we are to analyze seriously such opposites as redness and proficiency, we should begin with the social content of the contradiction between redness and proficiency.

In the socialist society, the redness we have in mind means placing proletarian politics in command, while proficiency means professional ability to serve proletarian politics. The relationship between redness and proficiency is essentially one between politics and professions. Politics is the soul and commander of professions. Therefore, one must use redness to lead proficiency forward and become both red and proficient so as to render a better service to socialist revolution and socialist construction.

Comrade Yao Po-mao artificially cuts the two apart and represents redness and proficiency as being irrelevant to each other. His intentions are clear. That is, he does not want to put politics in command of professions and does not want professions to serve politics.

In fact, professions are inseparable from politics. Professions separated from revolutionary politics are likely to serve reactionary politics. A profession that does not serve proletarian politics is bound to serve bourgeois politics. Either this or that, and there is no room for compromise.

If we examine the concrete manifestations of the contradiction between redness and proficiency and analyze problems on the basis of reality, we shall find that the contradiction between redness and proficiency finds two main expressions:

One expression is the contradiction between "red and proficient" and "proficient but not red." The Party wants us to be both red and proficient. Influenced by bourgeois ideas some intellectuals stress the importance of specialization and want

to be proficient but not red; they even think redness will hinder proficiency. Thus, "red and proficient" and "proficient but not red" will inevitably lead to a sharp struggle.

Redness and proficiency--the two aspects of a contradiction--are not parallel to each other in their relationship. Redness always occupies the leading position in the contradiction. The nature of things is mainly determined by the principal aspect of the contradiction that has acquired a dominant position. In terms of thought, this contradiction is one between proletarian thought and bourgeois thought. It will take quite a long time to determine the outcome of this struggle.

Redness is in the leading position in the contradiction between redness and proficiency. This should be affirmed but it does not mean that proficiency is unimportant. Some comrades take the view that redness means proficiency. This view, too, is one that does not meet the requirement of being both red and proficient. If one has enthusiasm for socialist revolution and construction but lacks practical, professional knowledge, redness will be nothing by a fancy. Without proficiency, what does redness command? One who is not proficient is likely to become an empty-headed statesman. Care should certainly be taken to avoid this erroneous understanding.

Whatever the case, the two are, in fact, a contradiction between the disruption of redness and proficiency and the demand for both redness and proficiency. The struggle between these contradictory opposites is absolute. The only difference lies in the nature of the contradiction. It is inconceivable that both redness and proficiency can be achieved without a serious struggle.

Another expression of the contradiction between redness and proficiency is that politics and profession together are at once adaptable and incompatible. This is because redness and proficiency cannot possibly run parallel to each other in the course of development. At one time, the development of redness is fast and that of proficiency slow. At another, the development of proficiency is fast and that of redness slow. That is to say, contradiction exists from beginning to end between redness and proficiency in the course of development. Imbalance is entirely a normal phenomenon while balance and unity of opposites is a temporary phenomenon. For this reason, they must be promptly adjusted so as to achieve a relative balance between redness and proficiency.

Without struggle it is impossible to effect the transition from imbalance to balance. This struggle must be repeated many times before redness and proficiency can develop. It is necessary to elevate the content of redness and proficiency constantly in real life. So far as revolutionary intellectuals are concerned, redness and proficiency call for constant endeavor and have no limit.

The contradiction between redness and proficiency Comrade Yao Po-mao has in mind is merely a merry-go-round in conception and is incongruous with real life. May we ask: How can you exclude from such opposites as redness and proficiency the fundamental contradiction between "both red and proficiency" and "proficient but not red"?

Further, on the ground that redness and proficiency cannot eliminate each other, Comrade Yao Po-mao denies the class content of this contradiction. That is, he denies that the contradiction between redness and proficiency is essentially a struggle between two kinds of world outlook and thought of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

As we know, the class nature of redness is so clear nobody can deny it. Proficiency refers to scientific knowledge which includes social science and natural science. Social science has a very strong class nature. While natural science itself has no class nature, yet natural science workers bear a class nature for they are dominated by the thought of a particular class when conducting scientific research. There cannot be a "vacuum zone" in their ideological domain, and either proletarian thought or bourgeois thought occupies a dominant position in it. The socialist society is one in which classes and class struggle exist.

"In a class society everyone lives within the status of a particular class and every mode of thought is invariably stamped with the brand of a class." ("On Practice") Intellectuals belong to a particular class. How can it be said that their different attitudes toward the question of redness and proficiency do not represent an acute struggle for promoting proletarian thought and destroying bourgeois thought?

Thus, in denying the struggle involved in the contradiction between redness and proficiency, Comrade Yao Po-mao substitutes so-called "concrete analysis" for class analysis and does away with class struggle.

The Theory of "Complete Unity" Runs Counter to the Dialectic Identity

Comrade Yao Po-mao denies the absoluteness of struggle between redness and proficiency. Does he then refer to the identity of contradiction when he claims "redness and proficiency are completely united?" No, they are entirely two different things.

The identity of contradictions means that the two aspects of a contradiction are "interdependent" and "transform into their opposites" under given conditions. The "combination" or "transformation" of redness and proficiency mentioned by Comrade Yao Po-mao is an equivalent of "combine two into one" and is anything but a dialectic identity.

Chairman Mao says: "The two aspects of every contradiction find the presupposition of their existence each in its opposite aspect and both co-exist in an entity." ("On Contradiction")

Comrade Yao Po-mao represents the combination of redness and proficiency as a "mutual embodiment." With such a "mutual embodiment," do not the difference between redness and proficiency, contradiction and struggle, go out of existence?

The combination of redness and proficiency as we understand it presupposes recognition of contradiction. It means a combination through struggle and movement. The more they struggle against each other, the more closely they are combined. Without struggle, a combination would mean "mixing mud for plaster" and "a mixture." Without internal connections how can the combination move redness and proficiency forward? In fact, when he talks about "combination" of redness and proficiency, Comrade Yao Po-mao actually tries to "substitute proficiency for redness" in the name of "combination" and lead the intellectuals astray.

In analyzing the contradiction between redness and proficiency, Comrade Yao Po-mao denies the transformation of redness and proficiency into their opposites. In his opinion, the transformation of redness and proficiency into their opposites does not mean that "one aspect 'surmounts,' 'eliminates' and 'overcomes' the other; it means mutual promotion and common advancement." This argument is also untenable.

The transformation of redness and proficiency is concrete. Through struggle of mind those who are "proficient but not red" are awakened and aroused to cast away their erroneous idea of giving importance to proficiency to the neglect of redness and head for the correct road of both redness and proficiency. If they win in the struggle and become both red and proficient instead of being only proficient but not red, it means the contradiction is transformed. "Redness" has been excluded from the minds of those who were formerly only proficient but not red; through criticism and education they have realized that politics is the soul and commander and that they must be both red and proficient. In this way, "redness" has shifted to the leading position and become the "soul" and "commander."

Does not this mean that the positions of the contradictory aspects have undergone fundamental transformation? In this sense, the transformation of redness and proficiency is likewise one of "surmounting," "eliminating" and "overcoming" one aspect by

the other. But it is an ideological struggle for promoting proletarian and destroying bourgeois ideas. It is not "eliminating" proficiency by redness or "eliminating" redness by proficiency as Comrade Yao Po-mao sophisticates. Without destruction, there is no construction.

It is obvious that without destroying bourgeois thought proletarian thought cannot be promoted. Can it be said that bourgeois thought may be allowed to "co-exist forever" with proletarian thought and remain "eternally green"?

Another ground on which Comrade Yao Po-mao denies transformation of redness and proficiency into their opposites is that redness and proficiency "promote each other and advance together."

"Mutual promotion and common advancement" is a reflection of the struggle between redness and proficiency. Promotion and advancement contain a factor of transformation, but they do not amount to transformation. To realize transformation, definite conditions have to be fulfilled, the most important one being struggle; otherwise, no transformation can be achieved.

The so-called "mutual promotion" signifies that only through "promotion" can one "press forward." A person who made no movement before this also goes forward after he has been urged, criticized and subjected to struggle. For this reason, every day, every month and every year we must urge those who are not willing to go forward to embark upon the red and proficient road.

The so-called "common advancement" is aimed at enabling those, whose proletarian awareness is not at a high level, to realize--through criticism, education and their own struggle of minds--that "proficiency but no redness" is a blind alley, that they carry responsibilities on their shoulders today and that at no time can they separate themselves from politics--either proletarian politics or bourgeois politics. In this way, their class awareness will be raised gradually. Thus, "common advancement" must also go through struggle.

Yao Po-mao's "mutual promotion and common advancement" is based on his theory of "complete unity." Here he denies the struggle of opposites. His "promotion" and "advancement" are either abstruse speculations or idle talk to deceive others.

Another ground on which Comrade Yao Po-mao denies the transformation of redness and proficiency is "connection and transformation are identical." To prove this, he quotes Lenin's words, "Everything is connected by transitions" and "Connection means transition."

It should be pointed out that here Comrade Yao Po-mao quotes the words out of context. The original text is: "Everything is vermittelt = mediated, bound into One, connected by transitions." The second sentence is: "Concerning the exposition on connection and transition (connection means transition)....." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 38, p. 103, 192)

What Lenin means here is that connection is the medium of transition and that if they do not exist in the same entity, there will be no internal connection, nor transition.

Now Yao Po-mao deliberately omits "is mediated, bound into One" from the first quotation. In doing so, he cancels by the stroke of a pen the importance of the sentence: connection is the medium of transition. In the second quotation he cites only the words of emphasis written by Lenin in brackets and, regardless of the context, uses the words to serve his purpose. What he does is actually a dishonest twist of classic works.

It must be pointed out that these words of Lenin's precisely make the total import of identity clear: mutual connection and mutual transformation. First, he makes a distinction between connection and transformation by way of explaining that

connection is distinct from transformation. Then he explains the close relationship between dialectic connection and transformation. From the dialectical point of view, the relationship between connection and transformation should be like this: there is transformation within connection while connection is maintained through transformation. Here the crux of the matter still lies in mutual transformation. The reason is that the contradictory aspects not only depend on each other but, more important still, transform themselves into their opposites.

Comrade Yao Po-mao claims that connection and transformation are one and the same thing. This means that he substitutes connection for transformation. And the connection he has in mind is the "indivisibility" of two profiles of a contradiction and a connection without struggle. Does not the "transformation" he has in mind become idle talk?

Lenin says: "What distinguishes the dialectical transition from the undialectical transition? The leap. The contradiction. The interruption of gradualness. The unity (identity) of Being and not-Being." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. 38, p. 314) Since Comrade Yao Po-mao denies the struggle between redness and proficiency and denies the qualitative change between the two, then the "transformation" he has in mind can only be undialectical transformation.

It is the task of revolutionaries to effect the transformation, to bring about transformation of things and to achieve the objective of revolution. Comrade Yao Po-mao denies the transformation of redness and proficiency into their opposites and preaches a non-revolutionary "theory." We are, of course, against his theory.

Comrade Yao Po-mao says: "Redness and proficiency are completely united." Since they are "completely united" it would mean that the relativity of identity is denied and unconditional "identity" is preached. In other words, the unity is made absolute and the absoluteness of the struggle of opposites is excluded. This shows that the "complete unity" expounded by Comrade Yao Po-mao is an out-and-out "combine two into one" theory.

"Combine Two into One" Cannot Resolve the Contradiction between Redness and Proficiency

Comrade Yao Po-mao takes the view that the contradiction between redness and proficiency should be resolved by "combining, uniting and connecting the two, by 'combining two into one.'"

In our opinion, "combine two into one" cannot resolve the contradiction between redness and proficiency--it can only mean a theory of reconciling contradictions.

Let's look at history and reality and see whether there is "complete unity" or full struggle between redness and proficiency. History is the best witness and facts speak louder than words.

To realize redness and proficiency is a historical process of struggle. Controversy over the question of redness and proficiency arose on several occasions in the past 15 years since liberation. After liberation, the Party required the intellectuals to study both politics and professions. Some people openly disagreed with it and proclaimed: "Having mastered mathematics, physics and chemistry one can travel all over the world without fear." This viewpoint--becoming proficient and not red and depending on ability for a living--was criticized by us as soon as it was presented.

In 1957, bourgeois rightists again advanced their absurd theory of "becoming proficient first and red second." Set against the Party's "be both red and proficient" watchword, this absurd theory was taken as one of the features of their attacks on the Party. The anti-rightist struggle beat off the frantic attacks by the rightists and

awoke many people in the middle, who began to realize that "be proficient first and red second" was a plot and a trick.

However, the bourgeois idea of "becoming only proficient and not red" did not come to an end and still manifested itself stubbornly in new forms when opportunities were presented. A few years ago; some people advanced a harmful theory that "one will become red after he has become proficient;" they tried to enter the blind alley-- "proficient but not red"--which had been subjected to criticism on many occasions.

Moreover, these theories always appeared alternatively to deceive those whose class awareness was not high.

Facts have proved time and again that destruction of the bourgeois ideas over the question of redness and proficiency is a repetitious process and can by no means be completed with several rounds of struggle.

From the above review of the process of struggle over the question of redness and proficiency, it is clear that in realizing redness and proficiency it is essential to criticize various shades of the erroneous idea of "becoming proficient but not red"--and that this involves complicated struggles. Whether it is reflected in society or in individuals, the struggle is exceptionally sharp, bearing on the question of who triumphs over whom.

Further, it should be realized that this struggle is by no means one that can win eternal ease through one supreme effort--it will go backward and forward. It went backward and forward in the past; it goes backward and forward today. It may be taken for granted that it will go backward and forward in the future.

The class struggle has its ups and downs during the transition period, and the controversy over the question of redness and proficiency will go on. Though the forms of struggle may be different, yet the fundamental question remains the same: Be both red and proficient or be proficient but not red?

How can Comrade Yao Po-mao, who glibly advocates "concrete analysis of concrete problems," disregard historical facts?

Some instances in real life can likewise confirm that this struggle is acute. We want to "promote the proletarian and destroy the bourgeois" but those imbued with strong bourgeois ideas will always have their backs to a hill and fight stubbornly. Through their social connections and family relations they are doing everything in their power to disseminate their politico-ideological influence and preach bourgeois individualism.

They advocate: "Depend on ability for a living" and "one who has ability cannot be beaten by others." They say, those whose family origin is not good can only "win fame" professionally. Others say: "A policy of brinkmanship must be adopted politically but a policy of strength must be adopted professionally." They say: "Pass hard tests professionally, pass muster politically and lead a good life." There are those who have no ambition and only want to acquire "some skills," find a good job and make ends meet.

If we do not guard against these bourgeois ideas and let them influence us, every harm will be done so far as transformation of the intellectuals is concerned. This shows that only by arming ourselves with Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung and by combating the erroneous tendencies can we insure that our forces will go ahead along the red and proficient road.

Contradictions are exposed for the purpose of resolving them in a better way. Since the "combine two into one" road is impassable, there is only one way out: correct resolution of the contradiction between redness and proficiency.

The contradiction between redness and proficiency is a non-antagonistic contradiction among the people. To resolve this contradiction, we can only adopt the

formula--"unity-criticism-unity,"--that is, "proceeding from a desire for unity we should resolve the contradiction through criticism or struggle so as to achieve new unity on a new basis." ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People")

The criticism referred to here implies struggle. Only by resolving the contradiction through criticism or struggle can real unity be achieved. And unity is precisely a result of struggle.

The watchword, "be both red and proficient," proposed by the Party is a correct policy for uniting the intellectuals. If, in the course of carrying out this policy, we do not conduct the necessary criticism and struggle against the erroneous ideas opposed to the requirement of redness and proficiency, but "combine two into one," invariably come to terms with them, yield room to them and remain indifferent, then it will be impossible to achieve unity.

In dealing with the intellectuals, the Party always insists on "achieving unity through struggle." That is why many intellectuals are constantly able to make greater progress on the red and proficient road. Conversely, if we give up struggle, some people will be allowed to go astray and become "only proficient but not red." Are the past lessons in this connection not great enough for us to learn?

Comrade Yao Po-mao believes that to use "combine two into one" to resolve the contradiction between redness and proficiency--a contradiction whose "essential feature is identity"--is not a theory of reconciling contradiction. This is indeed a strange talk and fantastic theory.

Since Comrade Yao Po-mao's "two types of contradictions" are subjectively concocted and the premise is wrong, this sophistry will of course not help him. All contradictions (including the contradiction between redness and proficiency) are irreconcilable. Contradictions are only different in nature and are by no means distinct from one another in terms of non-reconciliation. The struggle for resolving contradictions is a driving force behind things.

Over the question of redness and proficiency, Comrade Yao Po-mao denies contradiction, denies the struggle of opposites and denies "mutual transformation" of the two aspects of a contradiction. What is it if not a real theory of reconciling contradiction?

A Wrong Theoretical Basis Created for "Proficiency Without Redness"

Comrade Yao Po-mao's theory that redness and proficiency are "completely united" is none other than a reflection, in the question of redness and proficiency, of the acute class struggle in the ideological domain.

During the socialist period, it involves a fundamental change for the intellectuals to use the proletarian world outlook for transforming their bourgeois one. But not everybody is able to do so.

Some with their minds full of the bourgeois world outlook have not completely shifted to the side of the proletariat in taking their stand and examining things and dare not look at the question in the face. They are in favor of new things but are unwilling to part with old things. Sometimes they want to make progress politically but dare not look squarely at their ideological remolding. They want to keep pace with the trend of development but mark time.

It is at this juncture that Yao Po-mao comes forward with his theory of "complete unity" of redness and proficiency--a sugar-coated poison that caters to the needs of certain intellectuals who are afraid of ideological remolding. This not only lures the intellectuals away from politics but also creates a so-called theoretical basis for their inability to remold their minds consciously.

According to Comrade Yao Po-mao's logic, redness and proficiency are "completely united" and may be "combined into one." If so, are not ideological and political work and the struggle to "promote proletarian and destroy bourgeois ideas" entirely unnecessary? Is it redundant for intellectuals to integrate themselves with workers and peasants? Is it redundant to steel oneself in the stormy class struggle?

Yao Po-mao's theory of "complete unity" of redness and proficiency virtually creates a 'theoretical basis' and a legal basis for those who want to be "only proficient and not red." As the theory of "proficiency without redness" is so odious that its open presentation will certainly be opposed by the people, Yao Po-mao has exerted a lot of effort to embellish it skilfully. His allegations that "the two should be combined," "redness and proficiency promote each other," and "connection and transformation are essentially one and the same thing," etc., are, bluntly speaking, nothing but an attempt to blur the dividing line between right and wrong, between "redness and proficiency" and "proficiency without redness." It is an attempt to dissuade people from smashing the kingdom of bourgeois thought in the depth of the soul of certain persons, from conducting a struggle for "promoting proletarian and destroying bourgeois ideas," and from upholding proletarian politics.

If a struggle for "promoting proletarian and destroying bourgeois ideas" is not wanted, it does not mean there is no struggle. If proletarian politics is not wanted, it does not mean politics is not wanted. Yet Comrade Yao Po-mao dares not make this point openly. He evades the issue and equivocates. His aim is to "unite" [the two thoughts] only proficiency, and no redness, then to go further and eventually exclude 'redness and proficiency' altogether. Are not Comrade Yao Po-mao's intentions quite clear?

"Both redness and proficiency" and "only proficiency but no redness" are fundamentally two different roads. The former is a proletarian road and the latter a bourgeois blind alley. The former will train proletarian fighters who become one with the working people. The latter will train spiritual nobility who ride on the backs of the people.

The bourgeoisie will always do everything in its power to guide the intellectuals to the dangerous road which leads to proficiency but not redness, whereas the proletariat will always guide the intellectuals to the road which leads to both redness and proficiency. This being so, the struggle between the two thoughts and two roads over the question of redness and proficiency is inevitable and a protracted one.

It may definitely be said that as long as the effect of bourgeois thought exists, this struggle will exist. What Yao Po-mao advocates is precisely intended to set "only proficiency but no redness" against the correct direction of both redness and proficiency.

It would be very dangerous to follow the road conceived by Comrade Yao Po-mao. "Combining two into one"--that is, combining "both redness and proficiency" with "only proficiency but no redness"--will have only one result: "only proficiency but no redness" will prevail over "both redness and proficiency." If so, the younger generation we bring up will certainly become new bourgeois intellectuals. Going in this direction, revolutionary specialists will degenerate into dependents of the bourgeoisie. What is it, if not a "life-and-death" struggle, if things are allowed to take their own course? Does Comrade Yao Po-mao flatly deny that the contradiction between redness and proficiency is not a "life-and-death" struggle? Have you ever thought about the serious, evil consequences that will follow your "theory"?

Without destruction, there will be no construction; there will be no controlled flow if the river is not dammed. In order to let intellectuals take the road that leads to both redness and proficiency, we must struggle not only against the wrong road that leads only to proficiency but not redness, but also against all wrong theories that pave the way for "only proficiency but no redness."

Without struggle, there can be no progress; without struggle there will be no advancement. Viewed from this angle our controversy with Comrade Yao Po-mao over the question of redness and proficiency will acquire a deeper significance. We are convinced that as a result of this controversy the overwhelming majority of our comrades will be able to see through Comrade Yao Pao-mao's trick and realize that his "complete unity" theory is a very harmful one that meets the needs of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

SINKIANG

Spring Festival Message from Sinkiang Production- Construction Corps

(Shanghai Chieh-fang Jih-pao, February 1, 1965)

On the eve of the Spring Festival, the headquarters and political department of the Sinkiang Production-Construction Corps wrote to the CCP Shanghai Municipal Committee and Shanghai People's Council, offering warm greetings and sending best regards to the municipal Party and government leadership, to all people of the municipality and to the parents and teachers of the youths taking part in frontier construction.

The letter refers to the progress made by the youths from Shanghai in thought, labor and work, saying they are growing up fast as a shock force for the construction of Sinkiang.

The letter introduces the great achievements made by the Sinkiang Production-Construction Corps over the past year. Total production of grain increased by 16 per cent compared with 1963; per-mow output topped the peak level in the history of land reclamation; total production of cotton increased by more than 60 per cent compared with 1963. Greater headway was also made in economic construction in other fields.

The letter points out that these achievements were scored with the energetic aid of the whole nation and were the crystallization of the common labor performed by the whole body of workers of the Corps and the youths taking part in the construction of Sinkiang. The youths from Shanghai taking part in the construction of Sinkiang achieved a great success in the great work of building and defending the frontier.

Shanghai sent large numbers of outstanding educated youths to Sinkiang in recent years to take part in the socialist construction of Sinkiang. Under the care of Party organizations and veteran fighters, they are growing up fast and in healthy ways as a shock force for the construction of Sinkiang. Large numbers of advanced elements have emerged from their ranks.

Of the Shanghai youths assigned to the first agricultural division of the Corps in 1963 and 1964, more than 10 thousand were rated five-good workers or good production hands. More than a thousand of these five-good workers and good production hands were promoted to basic-level cadres.

On the eve of the National Day last year, many outstanding youths from Shanghai joined the Chinese Communist Party and the Young Communist League.

For example, Comrade Ying Fen, who came to the frontier region in August 1963, not only got used to the labor life and became strong physically but also acquired many skills of agricultural production in a little more than one year. On many occasions, he won the titles of "five-good worker," "good production hand" and "model YCL member." Highly respected by new and old workers he joined the Chinese Communist Party in October last year.

Comrade Hsiung Han-ying, who has joined the Party, is now deputy commander of the 3rd company, 1st battalion, Shengli No. 9-Farm of the Corps. Over the past year and more, she strenuously studied Chairman Mao's writings, took an active part in farm activities and underwent hard training to acquire basic skills. The 20 mow of paddy rice cultivated by her last year yielded more than 500 cattles each.