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TRUONG CHINH: "WEAKNESSES, SHORTCOMINGS AND MISTAKES" IN AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATIVES

Background

In 1954 Truong Chinh, as vice-Chairman of the Land Reform Committee, took the lead in implementing an "agrarian reform" that was to have disastrous results, culminating in a peasant revolt in Nghe An Province two years later. In October 1956, after publicly admitting "serious mistakes" and "left-wing deviationism," he relinquished both his vice-chairmanship of the Land Reform Committee and his position as First Secretary of the Lao Dong Party.

Truong Chinh's political eclipse was brief. In 1958 he was appointed one of the DRV's four vice-Premiers. In 1960 he relinquished this post and became Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Assembly, a post to which he was re-elected in 1964. Not until 6 November 1968, however, did he make a major statement on agricultural matters. On that date he delivered an address entitled "Resolutely Correct Deficiencies, Develop Good Points, and Cause the Agricultural Co-operativization Movement to Advance Stably" before a conference of cadres in Vinh Phu Province. In his speech, which was published in the party daily Nhan Dan on 29 and 30 January 1969, he reviewed the situation of agricultural cooperativization in North Viet-Nam; criticized deficiencies in the cooperativization movement in Vinh Phu Province, and recommended ways of overcoming those deficiencies.

Although the agricultural cooperativization movement in North Viet-Nam is "generally good," said Truong Chinh, it is still beset with many deficiencies and mistakes: 200,000 families (Ho) still remain outside the cooperatives; the material and technical bases of the cooperatives are still too weak; and the management of cooperative production means is not good. But the cooperatives' weakest link is management.

According to Truong Chinh, the most serious error in the management work is the "three contracts to families" system "in a number of cooperatives scattered throughout many provinces." Under this system cooperatives assign a family one or more specific tasks to do throughout a crop season or other period of time; distribute land to families, which return part of the harvest to the cooperatives; and assign land to families for their private use. This "three contracts" system involves the growing of vegetables, industrial crops, and rice, the raising of pigs and fowls, and handicraft production. Truong Chinh strongly criticizes this system which, he says, "is in reality a return to the individualistic way of working. It destroys the meaning of the agricultural cooperativization movement and makes the cooperatives a mere form."
Approximately two-thirds of the speech is devoted to a detailed criticism of the "three contracts" system as applied in Vinh Phu Province. This province, admits Truong Chinh, in 1967 met 99.5% of its quota for the compulsory sale of rice to the state, ranked third in the sale of vegetables, and was one of the few provinces to overfulfill its plan for the state purchase of pork. In Vinh Phu, however, errors regarding the "three contracts" system have been "clearer and more serious than those of other provinces." There the application of the system began in the fall of 1966, when the province issued guidelines for 1966-1967 which recommended that the "three contracts" system be implemented in order to "insure rational utilization of manpower and increase labor productivity." This, claimed the provincial party committee, "will increase labor productivity realistically... stimulate the activism of the working people... and overcome bureaucratism, escaping production, remaining isolated from the masses, corruption, and interest in personal profit on the part of some primary-level cadres." And in the spring of 1967 the province's Agricultural Department declared that if long-term assignments are made, "[the people] will seek every means to arrange their daily work, improve tools, increase working time, and fully utilize secondary manpower in the families...

Truong Chinh presents a detailed rebuttal to each of the points made by the Vinh Phu provincial committee. Although North Viet-Nam is now giving top priority to increasing agricultural production, it is clear that Truong Chinh is as much concerned with ideology as with production. "The idea that any method of production that increases the social product is acceptable," he stresses, "is not the view of the working class and the Party;" rather, "we must produce in accordance with socialist collectivization." In his view, giving land contracts to families has led to detrimental consequences: "a growing tendency to serve one's own interests, with a decrease in the cooperative members' concept of collectivity; destruction of the patriotic emulation movement in agriculture; reduction of the role of socialist collective labor; restoration and expansion of the individual way of working; and pushing the agricultural production cooperatives backward and toward disintegration."

"If this situation is not immediately stopped," warns Truong Chinh, "it will lead to the contracting out of most, if not all, cooperative-owned land to cooperative members, hence, the agricultural production cooperatives will be weakened and disintegrated." He does not, however, condemn the "three contracts" system in toto, but quotes a Central Agricultural Department report issued in December 1961, which states that the "three contracts" are to be made only to permanent (or in wartime, relatively permanent) production teams. But the production teams must not make the "three contracts" with families.

Although the three-month delay in publishing the speech and the fact that some editing was done (his fourth recommendation for correctly implementing the "three contracts" system was deleted—see p. 31) may indicate that there was considerable debate, the policy advocated by Truong Chinh has apparently become the official party line. Soon after the publication of the speech in Nhan Dan, articles regarding the implementation of the new policy appeared in the authoritative journals Hoc Tap and Tuyen Huan, and in numerous other publications.
Notes:

1. The Vietnamese term ho refers to a household, with an average of about five family members, and not to the extended family.

2. Although Truong Chinh refers to Vinh Phu's production in 1967, etc., the province actually did not come into being until February 1968, with the merger of Vinh Phuc and Phu Tho Provinces. He apparently regards Vinh Phu as an enlarged Vinh Phuc.
TRUONG CHINH SPEECH ON COOPERATIVIZATION

Hanoi Nhan Dan 29-30 January 1969

[Truong Chinh speech, "Resolutely correct shortcomings, develop the strongpoints, and lead the cooperativization movement in agriculture forward steadily," delivered at the conference of Vinh Phu Province cadres on 6 November 1968; underlines denote boldface]

[Text] Dear Comrades: The agricultural cooperativization movement in the north is generally good, but there still are some shortcomings and mistakes, particularly in regard to the "three contracts" and "three controls," for instance in the undertaking of three assignments for families, some cooperative members being permitted to use cooperative land as their own, causing corruption, waste, and so forth. In Vinh Phu, such shortcomings and mistakes were relatively serious. The party Central Committee Secretariat already has issued directives to the Vinh Phu provincial party committee to correct the situation.

Today, as you comrades are meeting here, I would like to offer a number of observations about the agricultural cooperativization movement--in the north in general, and in Vinh Phu in particular--and at the same time express some ideas to help you to overcome shortcomings, develop strongpoints, and make deserving contributions of your province to the anti-U.S. resistance for national salvation and the construction of socialism.

I--A few words about the situation of agricultural cooperativization in the north today

Since the campaign in our cooperatives to promote managerial and technical improvements, the agricultural cooperativization movement in the north has made relatively good improvements. The superiority of the collective way of life is being further developed. In general, the rural areas of the north are steadily moving on the road of socialist construction and enthusiastically fighting in the anti-U.S. resistance for national salvation.

As of the end of 1967, the north had 23,550 cooperatives, with 93.7 percent of the farmer families and 90.0 percent of the total acreage. High-level cooperatives accounted for 76.7 percent of all cooperatives and covered 88.8 percent of the cooperative members' families and 86 percent of the cooperatives' land. (The data used in the first part of this article were supplied by the General Directorate of Statistics and the Agriculture Department of the Central Committee)

The fact that the cooperatives were enlarged has created conditions for an increase in production, a stronger material and technical base, and a new labor distribution. At present, a cooperative has on the average 126 families, 74 hectares of land, and 276 workers. (Specifically, the average cooperative in the delta has 275 families, 124 hectares, and 443 workers; in the midlands, 169 families, 108
hectares, and 421 workers; in the former fourth zone, 121 families, 73 hectares, and 226 workers; in the highlands, 44 families, 39 hectares, 122 workers.)

The material and technical base of the cooperatives has begun to be strengthened. The water conservancy network has been enlarged. Thanks to water conservancy works, many cooperatives are able to carry out irrigation and drainage relatively effectively. Some cooperatives are in a position to achieve rational irrigation and drainage, speed intensive cultivation, and increase productivity. Seed-selecting establishments, fertilizer-processing houses, collective animal farms, warehouses, drying yards, fish ponds, tree nurseries, and so forth have also been developed.

With regard to means of production, in addition to the regular tools, the agricultural cooperatives are equipped with 800,000 improved 64A rakes, 500,000 improved vehicles, 80,000 insecticide sprayers, and 3,624 gasoline-engine pumps; and there are 4,616 small mechanical stations. A number of cooperatives have electric pump stations.

More and more managerial and technical cadres of the cooperatives have been trained. As to the technical cadres working right in the cooperatives, there are 15,000 intermediate-level cadres and 30,000 primary-level cadres.

After the cooperative management conference at the end of 1961 and two phases of the campaign to promote management and technology, management in the cooperatives showed progress.

In general, the cooperatives succeeded in determining production guidelines and started working according to plans. Most of them set up plans for each crop season and each year. The better ones had plans for 2 or 3 years. Many cooperatives paid attention to growing subsidiary crops, vegetables, and industrial crops; raising animals; planting trees; producing handicrafts, and so forth. In 1967, of the cooperatives' cultivated area, grain crops accounted for 89.4 percent, vegetables 4.3 percent, industrial crops 5.9 percent, and fruit trees and other types of trees 0.4 percent. The number of cooperatives raising livestock collective, raising fish, and growing trees increased every day.

While strengthening the collective economy, many cooperatives paid attention to guiding their members toward developing secondary family income-earning as a supplement to and support for the collective economic life, and at the same time helping to improve the members' standard of living.

With regard to labor management, in general, the cooperatives paid attention to stabilizing and consolidating the production teams. In many places, attention was paid to fully utilizing the manpower working for the cooperatives. As to the number of collective work days, on the average a working person worked 254 days in 1967, as against 103 in 1960. More manpower was put in the various sectors and occupations all the time, and was mainly directed toward building the material and technical base of the cooperatives and achieving intensive cultivation.
Many cooperatives successfully applied the system of three contracts (volume-of-production contract, production-cost contract, and labor-point contract) made with the production teams, which--depending on the nature of each job--contracted the work to groups. In collective labor, the group divided up specific tasks among individual cooperative members. Some cooperatives succeeded in assigning groups simple tasks like growing sesbania. Many production teams utilized strong and weak manpower in a rational way. Because of the labor cooperation system and the system of responsibility for labor, many cooperatives made remarkable achievements in teaching the socialist working people labor skills, a sense of organization and discipline, and a spirit of collective ownership toward the cooperatives' common tasks and property.

In 1960, the value of production output by a working person was 149 dong; it increased to 280 dong in 1967.

Because of progressive management, production was assured, although in the last few years agriculture lost a lot of manpower, mostly strong and young working people.

Financial management gradually improved. Corruption, exploitation, and cooperative debts decreased. In regard to distribution, the cooperatives made a lot of effort to fulfill their duty toward the state, as well as raising capital accumulation for the cooperative, expanding the collective welfare, and guaranteeing their members' standard of living.

Life in the rural areas has undergone many changes. The system of exploitation of man by man in rural areas has been abolished. The farmers' material and cultural living standards have clearly improved. According to incomplete statistics, the average per-capita monthly income of farmers was 11.47 dong in 1961, which increased to 15.27 dong in 1967. Cooperative members built more houses and bought more goods. Collective welfare, educational, public health, and sanitation establishments developed quite well. The farmers' cultural level was raised most obviously.

The cooperativization movement in agriculture has showed a lot of progress in recent years. The superiority of the cooperatives was expressed in many ways:

Cooperative production gradually abolished the one-crop situation and subsistence character of our agriculture in the past; the cooperatives opened additional production sectors and gradually went into intensive cultivation; more and more farm products were made; and production was better planned every day.

The capital and fixed assets of our cooperatives increased every day; their material and technical base gradually, enlarged; their technical level became better and better; the ranks of technical cadres and workers in agriculture became more and more numerous.

The labor and living conditions of the farmers cooperative members were improved little by little; the collective welfare establishments gradually developed; the countryside took on a new appearance; the farmers became more and more attached to their cooperatives.
With the cooperativization movement in agriculture, along with socialist indus-
trialization, conditions are being created gradually to turn our divided, poor, and
back-ward agriculture into a centralized agriculture that moves gradually toward
modernization.

The collectivized farmers are emulating hard to achieve three goals—5 tons
of rice, 1 worker, and two pigs per hectare of cultivated land—and this emulation is
expanding increasingly.

In the course of agricultural cooperativization, a new class—the class of collec-
tivized farmers—has been created; the worker-farmer alliance has been further
consolidated; political and moral unanimity in the society of the north has been
strengthened one step further.

Because of the above strong points, in spite of the fierce war, the cooperatives
still guarantee production labor and the standard of living of all its members, main-
taining agricultural production under any circumstances, properly fulfilling their duty
toward the state, and serving combat well. This proves the superiority of socialism
in general, and of the agricultural cooperativization movement in particular, of the
north.

The victories our agricultural cooperatives have scored are mainly due to our
party's correct line, policies, and guidelines in agriculture.

The party Central Committee solved in time the problem of enlarging the scale
of the cooperatives; linked cooperativization with water conservancy; correctly formu-
lated the requirements of the campaign to improve management and technology in the
cooperatives in order to consolidate and perfect the new production relation, speed up
increased agricultural production, and assure that agriculture serve as the base for
industrial development.

Such victories also prove that our farmers were very revolutionary and deter-
mined to follow the party and President Ho, build themselves a new life, and make
an active contribution to the anti-U.S. resistance for national salvation.

In short, the agricultural cooperativization movement in the north today leans
more toward strength than weakness. But, while moving forward, it also has weak-
nesses, shortcomings, and mistakes that we should see in order to try to overcome:

a—Although the effort to bring farmers into cooperatives has been virtually
completed, nearly 200,000 families still remain outside of the cooperatives, including
nearly 70,000 families which have few workers or consist of old people.

The agricultural cooperativization movement is not developing uniformly. In
many Catholic areas, the number of farm families that have joined cooperatives is
still low. The scale of the cooperatives is, in general, unstable because the effort
to unify them has dragged on and has waxed and waned again and again. Still there
are many small cooperatives: 26.4 percent of the delta cooperatives and 42.5 percent
of the midland cooperatives have less than 80 hectares of land; the highland coopera-
tives are even smaller.
There still is a big variation in the level of the cooperatives. Besides the cooperatives that are striving to improve, the weak and deficient cooperatives still account for a large percentage. According to an analysis of 62 cooperatives involved in the experimental democratic campaign in Thanh Hoa and Hai Hung provinces and rural Hanoi, the number of good, average, and deficient cooperatives accounted for 24.1, 48.5, and 27.4 percent, respectively.

b--Though the material and technical base of the cooperatives has begun to gain strength it is generally still too weak and incapable of satisfying the requirements of intensive cultivation, increased productivity, and all-round agricultural development. The water conservancy systems are still few and far from perfect. There still is a big shortage of draft power, tools, and fertilizers. The material and technical base of animal husbandry is still too little.

The guidelines for building the material base and for purchasing technical equipment are still not correct, and do not promote the realization of the guidelines for production, intensive cultivation, and the increase of labor productivity. Although a lot of labor and capital has been expended, the effects on production are still small. Management and utilization of improved tools are still poor, and such tools are either lost or broken in large numbers. The effectiveness of the scientific and technical teams is still limited.

c--In many places, the management of cooperative production means is far from good. The cooperatives' land is not yet tightly managed. Specifically, cooperative members are allowed to occupy collectively-owned land to develop it for themselves, turn it into living areas, or dig ponds for fish-raising; or divert collectively-owned land for private use, for enjoyment, celebrations and so forth. The highland cooperatives have so far failed to determine the relationship between the state and themselves in regard to management of hill and forest land. There still is a lot of waste in the utilization of land. The practice of giving or ceding land among cooperatives, or between the latter and state organs, still occurs frequently.

Maintenance of draft animals, seeds, and tools is far from good. Some major means of production are not yet collectivized, or are bought by the cooperatives for resale to benefit the personal use of cooperative members' (for instance, improved vehicles, and 64A improved rakes), which creates irrational differences in income and distribution, and at the same time violates the party and state policy dealing with collectivization of means of production.

d--Management of the cooperatives is still the weakest link. As the scale of the cooperatives has been increased and the principal means of production have been collectivized, improvement of management, along with technical improvement and ideological education, is most important.

Not only does it solve the relations among cooperative members and between the latter and the management, but it also constitutes the determining factor in increasing the ability of collective labor to increase production. Only when management is good can we apply advanced science and technology and develop the great potential of the collectivity in production.
Because agricultural production cooperatives are a socialist collective economic organization, their management must be modeled after the socialist formula. Although in recent times management in the cooperatives has made some progress, such aspects as management of production, of labor, of financial affairs, and of distribution are still weak and even show shortcomings and mistakes. In many cooperatives, lack of democracy in financial matters, lack of clarity in bookkeeping, corruption, and waste are quite common. Distribution is not just and rational; it does not provide an incentive to labor. However, at present, the most serious mistakes in cooperative management are the "three contracts with families", which are found in a number of cooperatives in many provinces.

The "three contracts with families" mainly deal with the growing of subsidiary crops, industrial crops, and vegetables and the raising of pigs and domestic fowl; in some places they also deal with rice.

They have many forms:

(1) The cooperatives contract land out to production teams, which assign a certain area to a family on the basis of the number of its workers and then assign one or several jobs in a crop season, or during a relatively long time. This method is called contracting work to families.

(2) The cooperatives contract with families for a volume of production: They distribute land to families, which at the time of harvest must surrender a part of the harvest to the cooperative, according to the principle that the cooperatives "distribute land and collect rent."

(3) The cooperatives assign land to families outright: The cooperative members get all they can cultivate without having to pay anything to the cooperative, and so on.

The contracts with families gradually led to such situations as these:

As long as everybody works, the cooperatives cannot manage labor, nor can they utilize manpower rationally. The collective emulation movement and the movement to improve technology gradually declined.

Families that have more working people, and stronger ones, get more income; families with few workers or families with husbands and sons who have gone to war or to labor projects have poor income, which creates bad consequences in many ways.

As the cooperatives cannot have tight management of agricultural products, stability of prices and management of markets are badly affected.

Training of the collectivized working people in labor skill and in working conscientiously and with a sense of organization and discipline is also on the decline.

The role of the production team leaders is greatly limited because, under the family contracts, the cooperative members themselves direct the work of their own families, so the team leaders cannot control the work of each individual. Moreover,
the cadres of production teams themselves will be busy doing the work that the teams have assigned their families, and thus the collective work is neglected.

With the "three contracts with families" policy, the cooperative members' tendency to private ownership develops while their collectivity-mindedness is decreased.

In short, the "three contracts with families" are in reality a return to the individualistic way of working. It destroys the meaning of the agricultural cooperativization movement, and makes the cooperatives a mere form. Not only is it wrong in terms of managerial method, but it is also against the party and state line on agricultural cooperativization.

The above-mentioned mistake exists and develops because of the following reasons:

The concept of many cadres and cooperative members about the struggle between two roads is deviant and confused: After the great majority of farm workers joined the cooperatives, they were eager to believe that the struggle had been virtually and successfully completed and failed to see its long-term and complicated nature.

The revolution in production relations and the problem of consolidating and perfecting the new production relations were not given, in the last few years, the proper importance. Although cooperative management is very important, new, and complicated, after the completion of the second phase of the campaign for managerial and technical improvement in the agricultural production cooperatives, management was not put under tight guidance any more.

In regard to the formula of socialist management of the collective economy, there are certain wrong views that have not yet been subjected to criticism: that production can be done in any way, provided the social product increases; that only through contracts with families is it possible to fully utilize secondary manpower to avoid the situation of people arriving late and going home early, to make cooperative members act positively, and with a high sense of individual responsibility; that contracts with families serve as an incentive by offering material advantages, and so forth.

When the prevailing labor condition is manual work, we first cooperativize agriculture, then mechanize it. This situation makes cadres and cooperative members fail to see the importance of labor cooperation.

On the other hand, cooperative management itself, particularly management of labor, faces difficulties created by the war. Our cadres' knowledge of collective economic management is still low; as the attitude and views of the township and cooperative cadres are not really firm, they are easily influenced by the small producers' free disorderly thinking. Those cadres praise the "convenience" without recognizing the serious mistake in "contracts with families."

Because of the requirements of supporting the front and the shortcomings in the cooperative cadres' management, the ranks of the latter are not stable. Many experienced cadres have been transferred to other work; and the leadership of the local party committees over the cooperatives has definitely been weakened.
The central organizations concerned have been slow to help the party Central Committee assume ideological, policy, and organizational leadership over the agricultural cooperativization movement. After the mistakes were uncovered, because of a failure to recognize the seriousness of the mistakes, they did not suggest in time the appropriate measures to stop and correct them effectively.

II—About the Situation of Agricultural Cooperativization in Vinh Phu Province:

Dear comrades: After two phases of the movement to improve management and technology, the agricultural cooperativization movement in Vinh Phu Province has developed and consolidated further.

For all practical purposes the agricultural production cooperatives in the province have moved from the low to the high level. At present, the province has 1,111 cooperatives covering 98.6 percent of the farm families in the province. On the average, each cooperative manages 116 hectares of land, 202 families with 434 workers, and 98 draft animals.

The scope of cooperative enterprises has been enlarged. Fifty-one percent of all cooperatives raise pigs on a collective basis; 18 percent raise cattle or buffaloes; 84 percent raise fish; 21 percent raise ducks; and 26 percent raise chickens collectively.

The level of cooperative management has made a lot of progress: 81 percent of all cooperatives have annual plans; 98 percent have plans for each crop season.

Many specialized cells or teams were formed and have operated quite well, such as pig-raising cells, fish-raising cells, palm leaf-collecting cells, tea-picking cells, lacquer-exploiting cells, tree-planting cells or teams, and so on.

In 1965, the number of cooperatives that obtained more than 5 tons of rice per hectare of two-crop land was 131 (or 9.4 percent), but in 1967 it increased to 248 (21.4 percent).

The number of "deficient" cooperatives is decreasing; the "average" and "good" ones increased in number.

The material and technical base of the agricultural production cooperatives, generally speaking, has strengthened gradually. The districts and townships of the province are able to make locally plows, harrows, and simple tools for agricultural production. The quantity of improved tools has increased each year. Fifty-five percent of the cooperatives are equipped with small machinery.

Attention has been paid to training cooperative cadres. The provincial school for cooperative management is still maintained. In 1967, it trained 14,719 cadres; in the first 6 months of 1968, it trained 2,560 cooperative management cadres. On the average, each cooperative has one medium-level technical cadre and three primary-level technical cadres.

Under the leadership of the party committee, the collectivized farmers of Vinh Phu are striving to attain the triple goal--5 tons of rice, one worker, and two pigs per hectare of cultivated land.
Agricultural production of the province has gradually been concentrated in individual areas. One area consisting of 160 townships cultivates tea. Kim Anh District has nearly 1,000 hectares of tobacco. Camellia growing is concentrated in 77 townships. Sugarcane is concentrated around the Viet Tri sugar refinery. Raising of cattle and buffaloes takes place mainly in Thanh Son, Thanh Thuy, Doan Hung, and Yen Lap Districts.

Under wartime conditions, production in Vinh Phu faces many difficulties; the party leadership echelons mobilized the masses to boost production and practice thrift in order to fulfill their obligations towards the state and guarantee the people's standard of living. In 1967, the province met 99.5 percent of its plan for compulsory deliveries of paddy to the state; in regard to compulsory deliveries of leafy vegetables, Vinh Phu also ranked third behind Hanoi and Ha Tay. It overfulfilled its plan by 14 percent in regard to tobacco purchased by the state. The volume of pork sold to the state exceeded the plan by 31.5 percent (Vinh Phu was one of the 14 units that overfulfilled their plans for the state purchase of pork).

The provincial party committee has been paying attention to consolidating the cooperatives and increasing agricultural production. However, in the nine months since the merging of the two provinces to form Vinh Phu, because the committee was very busy and failed to take proper action on the key matter, it neglected cooperative management. Therefore, besides its strongpoints, which definitely predominate, the agricultural coopertivization movement of Vinh Phu has shown some regrettable shortcomings and mistakes, particularly in the field of cooperative management.

Indeed, in regard to the management of agricultural production cooperatives, there are a lot of matters that need to be discussed. But this time, I only offer you some ideas about the three contracts and about the management of means of production, particularly the management of cooperative land in Vinh Phu in the last three years (1966-1968). Corruption and waste in the cooperatives are still a current problem, but have been dealt with in the phases of the campaign to improve management and technology. I shall refer to them only briefly.

In resolution No 68-NQ/TU of the former Vinh Phuc Province, dated 10 September 1966, the party committee referred generally to the problem of cooperative management, but the main part of the resolution was aimed at solving problems related to organization, utilization, and distribution of labor in agricultural production. The committee considered them as the basic factors in agricultural production capable of promoting the production of grains, foods, industrial crops, and animal-raising. After analyzing carefully the general labor situation in the province, in the section dealing with the guidelines, tasks, and measures for agricultural labor management in the 2 years 1966-1967, the resolution states: "2. Resolutely carry out, fully, correctly, and properly the three-contract system (contracting work to groups, to workers, and to families) insuring rational utilization of manpower and increasing labor productivity...."

"Proper execution of the three contracts--from contracts with groups to contracts with each worker, and with each family (for each factor in cultivation and for the entire crop)--can solve the problem of increasing labor productivity realistically, will stimulate the activism of the working people, will speed and heighten the productivity of each person, each group, and the cooperative collectivity, and hence prevent such phenomena as
dependence and reliance on others, laziness, liberalism, and acting at one's convenience; will thus permit tight labor management and good labor discipline through conscientiousness; will save manpower, with full utilization of secondary manpower and idle labor in the families, and with the regular working people being able to find time to relax and study. At the same time, it will overcome bureaucratism, escaping production, remaining isolated from the masses, corruption, and interest in personal profit on the part of some primary-level cadres.

"Learn from the experience of the Hoa Loan, Van Quan, and Tien Huong cooperatives, which have done well with the three contracts, group contracts, and so forth and quickly disseminate this experience as widely as possible." (After the merging of Vinh Phuc and Phu Tho Provinces, the provincial party committee made copies of the above resolution to send to districts of the former Phu Tho Province, along with an official letter containing guidelines for its implementation.)

The plan of the Agriculture Department of former Vinh Phuc Province, No 116-BHTXsx/ng, dated 14 April 1967, on guidance for the three-contract program, contains the following:

"In addition to proper execution of the three-contract system, we can contract for production of certain specific crops (tobacco, potatoes, cucumbers, vegetables, and so forth), and certain handicraft occupations (weaving, hat-making, and so forth) with families and with workers."

The plan of the Agriculture Department of former Vinh Phuc Province, dated 15 April 1967, on guidance for contracting work out to workers, families, and groups in agricultural production cooperatives, contains the following sections which pointed to the usefulness of making contracts with workers and with families:

"1. Satisfy the requirement of fully utilizing labor capacity. All the workers who are required to work for the collective shall be assigned tasks by the collective according to each individual's ability, including all cadres; all people who do not consider themselves subject to the cooperatives' management; transient labor; people shirking assignments or choosy about their work, doing the easy jobs and dropping the difficult ones; lazy people who depend on the hard-working ones, and so on. There must be an end to the state of mobilization in which people are called one by one, work is assigned every day, and people can work or stay home at their desire.

"2. Give long-term assignments to allow the workers to arrange their own work in accordance with sunny and rainy days, rather than being passive as in the past. On this basis, they will seek every means to arrange their daily work, improve tools, increase working time, and fully utilize secondary manpower in the families and get high wages, and avoid criticism by doing their work well. This way, the requirement for increased labor productivity will be satisfied.

"3. Only by assigning work this way can specific technical norms be assigned for each job, each element, and each piece of land to those who do the actual work. Avoid untrustworthiness and irresponsibility, for once a job has been clearly assigned, it is up to the individual whether it is done well or badly; he cannot put the blame on anybody else. Thus it is appropriate to encourage only those who do their work properly; those who are careless or deceptive or lazy are to be educated. This way you heighten the
sense of ownership of each working person toward his cooperative and introduce science and technology to the masses and to production in a widespread, practical, and realistic way, thus guaranteeing achievement of all the prescribed technical standards.

"4. Only by achieving this element properly can the cooperatives and production teams calculate the labor balance in each period, crop, and year so as to draft plans more accurately and know whether there is an excess or shortage of manpower at any given time. If there is an excess of manpower, they can arrange some work to use it up; during the busy crop season, they can solve such problems by making some improvements in the tools, by spreading out the crops in the year, or by stimulating labor in some way to meet the crop schedules.

"5. Assigning work for long periods of time is a measure to organize distribution of labor rationally. On this basis, specialization of labor in production will be gradually achieved.

"6. If production team cadres do not have to arrange the work, assign work, and calculate work points each and every day, they will have time to get more deeply into production management, plan methods of doing work, stay in the ricefields, control production and techniques, and so forth.

"7. If the cooperative members do not have to meet every evening, they will have time to relax and take care of their health, as well as have other activities and study. In work distribution, giving assignments to workers, checking the work" (According to an explanation by the Vinh Phu Agriculture Department, "checking the work" takes place after the cooperative members' families have finished work in the field. Assigned by the team, the cadre in charge of the team comes to inspect and compare it with the norms set by the cooperative or the production team. He will either score points for the cooperative member or ask him to redo the work) "and calculating work points and merits, the important thing is to apply democracy in the management of production labor; namely, good people are encouraged and stimulated promptly, while lazy people are frequently criticized and educated by the collective. This will heighten the cooperative members' concept of collective ownership. After each crop season, each year, the electing of 'excellent' and 'advanced' workers will be accurate."

The above is a summary of the "wonderful feat" of the provincial Agriculture Department. Let us consider it seriously to see what effects it has created at the primary level.

Just after the two provinces had been merged, the provincial party committee, which had not yet found time to discuss agricultural cooperative management, still relied on the old resolution of Vinh Phuc, that is, to set up experiments in several cooperatives from which to draw experience for overall guidance. Thon Thuong cooperative of Tuan Chinh township, in Vinh Tuong district, was chosen for one of the provincial experiments. The cooperatives in Dai Dong also have been used since 1966 by a member of the provincial standing committee for an experiment in the letting of contracts for products to families. Recently, Dong Xuan cooperative of Xuan Hoa township, in Lao Thach district, also was recommended by the Vinh Phuc provincial party committee to all local areas in the province as a place for them to come to visit and study.
As a result, a number of districts, townships, and cooperatives developed many forms of the three contracts with families "in crop growing and animal raising." Many cooperatives made the three contracts with their members' families, under the guise of contracts with workers, under the pretexts of going into labor specialization, fully utilizing the manpower in the members' families, increasing productivity in cultivation, getting more products, and so forth. Here are some typical forms of the three contracts in the province:

a--In crop farming

(1) Contracting with families to do one or more production jobs for a period of time

The Dong Xuan cooperative of Xuan Hoa township, in Lap Thach district, distributed land to families and assigned them one or more production jobs over a long period of time, with instructions to go onto other jobs after having completed the first ones. But it did not assign them work for the entire crop season. For instance, the production team assigned each family 3 sao of land for soil-preparation or transplanting. The soil-preparation package consisted of plowing, harrowing, making embankments around the rice-field, scraping corners, and so forth. The transplanting package consisted of pulling seedlings from the ricefields, transporting them, and transplanting.

After a field trip to study the experience of Dong Xuan cooperative, the cooperatives of Lap Thach and Binh Xuyen districts also developed this form of contract with families of their members.

(2) Assignment to families of various jobs for the entire crop season, over the long term

The Thon Thuong cooperative of Tuan Chinh township, in Vinh Tuong district, prior to 1967, had been making the three contracts with production teams in accordance with the instructions of the Central Agriculture Department; that is, the cooperative made the three contracts with production teams, which made contracts with groups, which assigned work to workers to do collectively. In 1967, after the plowing and harrowing had been completed, the production teams assigned everything--from transplanting, caring for the ricefields, weeding, fertilizing, and watering to harvesting--to workers, actually to families, for them to do in a given area, which varied according to the working capacity of each cooperative member's family. This is called contracting of various jobs, for the entire crop season, and for the long term.

(3) Contracting with families or workers for volume of production

Contracting for volume of production of rice is widespread among the cooperatives of Binh Xuyen district. For instance, the Yen Lo cooperative of Dao Duc township, with a total of 381 families, in the 1967 10th-month rice crop season transplanted 300 mau and let contracts for 153 mau to 232 families. The families that took contracts took the good and close-by ricefields and had the right to get their shares of hay on a priority basis, The remaining area, consisting of odds and ends, was worked by production teams. The persons accepting contracts were paid 13 work units per sao, and if their output increased, for every 5kg they would be given one work unit as a bonus; for each decrease of 3kg under the levels assigned, one work unit would be subtracted as a fine. Production tools and draft animals were also given to the families accepting contracts.
Cooperatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Dai Dong Township, in Vinh Tuong district, made volume-of-production contracts with families for the cultivation of subsidiary food crops and industrial crops such as sweet potatoes, taro, cucumbers, beans, peanuts, and so forth.

Cooperative 3 of Dai Dong township, in Vinh Tuong district, has 198 families and a total cultivated area of 284 mau. It assigned contracts to families for the cultivation of all subsidiary food crops and industrial crops on 37.4 mau or 14 percent of its total cultivated area. The number of families that accepted contracts was 193; only five refused because they were single people unable to do the work. Thus 96 percent of all the families accepted contracts. On the average, each family received 1 sao, 14 thuoc (not including the 5 percent of land given to the cooperative members upon their joining the cooperative).

That cooperative deserves the top prize for redistributing land, for going against the cooperativization movement.

(4) Contracting land to families outright

Cooperatives take collectively owned land and assign it to their members gratis for private cultivation.

The Tan Lap cooperative in Lap Thach district distributed to each worker 5 thuoc of land for cultivation of sweet potatoes. It set the volume of production and suggested a balanced-ration project to its members' families beforehand. At the time of harvest, the cooperative did not know whether the output was large or small. (According to a report of the secretary of the township party committee, the township had 423 families with 2,161 persons, who got 5 'thuoc of land each, or a total of 72 mau)

The party committee of Van Don township, in Doan Hung district, advocated that the families use the land for "self-production and self-consumption." The Kim Thanh cooperative let its members cultivate the land for personal use, including both the land used as living area and crop land, which accounted for as much as 20 percent of the total area it possessed.

b--In animal husbandry

(1) Contracting with families for raising pigs

The Tan Lap cooperative of Lap Thach district assigned contracts to families for raising 524 suckling pigs. For each pig, it assigned 10 thuoc of two-crop rice land, yielding 59.2 kg of 5th-month rice and 80.7 kg of 10th-month rice per sao annually.

The pay for livestock raising was 40 work units. The breeding cost was 30 dong per pig. Each year, it collected 40 kg of meat. The share of meat surrendered to the cooperative was 400 kg. In 1967, 74 families accepted contracts; in 1968, 230 families. The arable area assigned to its members for raising pigs was 41 mau, or 11.9 percent of its total arable area. Meanwhile, only 8 mau were assigned to collective animal-raising.

The Tan Lap cooperative of Lap Thach district contracted with a number of families to raise pigs. For every 10 pigs, it gave the family concerned 6 sao of rice land and paid for wages and breeding stock. This form of contracting was also adopted by the Dong Xuan
cooperative of Xuan Hoa township in Lap Thach district and by the Van Quan cooperative of Yen Lang district. For instance, Van Quan cooperative had 10 production teams, and six of these teams contracted with a number of families to raise 10 to 20 pigs.

Mrs. N. of team 3 was assigned by the team to raise 20 pigs, and it assigned her 6 thuoc of rice land per pig; the cooperative gave her breeding stock and paid her 26 work units per pig; the quantity of meat to be surrendered to it was 45 kg. Members' families are allowed to use the fertilizer; if there is any surplus they sell it to the production team.

In Yen Lo cooperative of Binh Xuyen district, assignment of pigs on contract to its members' families comes first, assignment to its livestock teams is secondary. Specifically, 353 of the 471 pigs, or 79 percent were assigned to members on contract, while the teams got only 118 pigs.

(2) Contracting with families for raising poultry

The Son Duong cooperative of Lam Thao district contracted out the raising of geese to families at the rate of two geese and one gander per family; it gave 140 kg of unhusked rice and would get 50 young geese. The Dong Phu cooperative of Van Don township, in Doan Hung district, contracted with members the raising of chickens. It gave them 3 sao of land, paid 70 work units, and collected 50 kg of chicken.

Generally speaking, we find that the "three contracts with families" have existed in many cooperatives--both deficient and advanced ones--and in both crop farming and animal husbandry. In some places, land, work points, seed, and capital are assigned to families, which have to surrender fixed quantities of products. In other places, people talk about "three contracts," but actually it is a case of unconditional assignment of land to cooperative members for individual production and individual consumption. The cooperative loses land and taxes to its members without getting anything back. In still other places, contracts are made for each job, for all the crop season, and for the long term as indicated by the resolution of the provincial party committee and guidance plan of the provincial agriculture department.

Many townships and cooperatives went one step farther than their province. Where they unconditionally assigned some land owned by the collective to cooperative members for private use they in fact carried out a redistribution of land in the form of the "three contracts with families." In some places they even gave all the improved tools owned by the cooperatives to their members' families outright in the form of sales on credit by installments. For instance, the Yen Lo cooperative of Binh Xuyen district sold all its improved vehicles and improved 64A rakes to members. When it had a quantity of lime to be transported, because of lack of transportation equipment of its own, it asked some members to transport it for hire to the cooperative. The members replied that transporting lime would quickly ruin their vehicles and therefore asked for higher fees. The Van Quan cooperative of Yen Lang district bought 126 improved vehicles, assigned 28 to its production teams to manage, and sold the remaining 98 to members on credit, for 120 dong each payable in 3 years. The Dong Xuan cooperative of Xuan Hoa township, in Lap Thach district, also sold improved vehicles to its members, just like Van Quan cooperative. This form is relatively common among all cooperatives in the province.
The tendency to let contracts to families is growing. As it stands now, in only a short time, the agricultural production cooperatives in the province will be gradually weakened. Outwardly, they are socialist collective enterprises, but in reality they are individual enterprises.

To sum up, what does the above situation tell?

a--By contracting land owned by the cooperatives out to families, in some cooperatives a redistribution of land to cooperative members is taking place.

b--Through volume-of-production contracts with families, some cooperatives have turned themselves into "landlords and collectors of rent" toward their members.

c--In many cooperatives, individual production is overpowering collective production.

d--In many local areas, the party line on, and the principle of agricultural cooperativization are being seriously violated.

Now let us examine the reasons serving as basis for the "three contracts with families" policy, as it was indicated in the guidance plan of the provincial agriculture department, to see if they are right or wrong.

Is it correct to say that "contracting with workers and families means full utilization of working capacity, as all the working people having the duty to work collectively?"

The general guideline for full and rational utilization of labor in agriculture is to develop ceaselessly the superiority of socialist labor cooperation. First of all, it involves fully utilizing the producing power of land by means of intensive cultivation, increased productivity, expansion of cultivated area (reclamation, full utilization of alluvial land and river-bank land), increase of cultivated area multi-cropping, improving depleted soil, creation of additional occupations in the cooperatives, and overall agricultural development. The cooperatives will consequently have more products and goods and the members more jobs; work days will increase and their value will go up; members' income, the accumulation of the cooperatives, and compulsory deliveries to the state will all show good results. Only in that way will the full utilization of the cooperative members' and their families' working capacity be correct and significant.

As to letting contracts to producer families for individual work in the manner of small producers is very wrong. Regarding the collectively-owned land being contracted out to members' families to till on a personal basis, whether the members of such families put much or little labor into the work, the quality, productivity, and output of the cooperative members' labor are not high. The leader of team 6 of Thon Thuong cooperative, Tuan Chinh Township, Vinh Tuong district, said: "Mrs H and Mrs C each have 2 or 3 children, when they weed the field contracted to them, the mothers do the outer part and the children the inner part of the ricefields, working hard through the morning and afternoon. Although they remind their children
to do a good job, they still are unable to get rid of all the weeds. Both families work very hard, arriving early and leaving late." The cooperative members already devote considerable time to working on the 5 percent of the land assigned to the families; in addition to that, they spend time and energy working in the fields contracted to them. It is hard for the cooperative management or production team to ask members to do work for the general interest. Therefore, saying that contracting to families means fully utilizing the working capacity of the collective is incorrect.

Moreover, in the ricefields contracted by the cooperatives to families, part of the products produced by the cooperative members is to be given to the cooperative; part is for their own consumption, and another part they sell in the market. This also depletes labor, and it cannot be accounted for in full. Under such conditions, how can working capacity be fully utilized for the collective?

In regard to the peasant masses, we cannot force them to join the cooperatives or use administrative measures to compel them to give up the individual working, but we must educate and persuade them, bring them into organizations, and combat their own free, disorderly spirit. We cannot concede, nor follow them while they go back to the individual system of work. The "three contracts with families" are a sign of rightist thinking in the field of management of agricultural cooperatives.

Is it correct to say that "giving long-term assignments to workers (actually, to members' families) allows them to arrange their own work in accordance with sunny and rainy days, without being passive as in the past? On this basis, they will seek every means to arrange for improving tools, increasing working time, and fully utilizing secondary manpower in the family to get high wages; they will do the work carefully to avoid criticism. This way, the requirement for increased labor productivity will be satisfied. ...." Is this correct?

In order to raise labor productivity in agriculture, we must strengthen the material and technical base of the cooperatives; develop water conservancy, improve technology, and advance gradually toward mechanization of each aspect of farming, while at the same time educating the cooperative members to constantly heighten their level of political, cultural, and technical consciousness so as to emulate for more successful production; and train and improve the economic management and technical cadres in the cooperatives, thus bettering management and utilization of labor in agriculture. Thus, only by concentrating the workers in specific organizations, educating them, encouraging them to emulate, and developing their collective intelligence to improve technology, use of improved tools, and so forth can we increase labor productivity.

On the other hand, by contracting land to members' families for individual cultivation, we shall certainly halt technical improvement in agriculture and even make it regress. Events have shown that in most places where contracts are let to families, no cooperative member ever made an improved tool by himself. Hoa Loan cooperative in the past threshed rice by machine, but since it began making contracts with families, these threshing machines have been left unused and its members instead used a stool to beat the rice ears. From mechanization and electrification, people would go back to primitive times!
The belief that by contracting with families they would "work carefully to avoid being criticized" is also wrong. We must make the cooperative members fully understand the concept of collective ownership, and recognize the fact that working well for the collective is also to their own advantage. If we give contracts to families, the parents in the latter will be working with their children; in this case, who works carefully, who emulates whom, who struggles with anyone else? Who does the technical supervision? Who criticizes? Who corrects? If contracts with families are used to stimulate material interest, then the effectiveness of such a stimulant cannot be guaranteed, and an overdose will be toxic and very dangerous. Since the cooperative members do not have good and correct concepts or improved tools, they cannot obtain higher and higher labor productivity.

Is it correct to say that "only through contracts with workers or families in this way can specific technical norms for each job, each aspect, and each piece of land be assigned directly to those who do the actual work...and science and technology be brought to the masses and to production in a widespread, practical, and realistic way, thus guaranteeing achievement of the prescribed technical norms?"

When contracts have been let to families, can such tasks as transplanting in straight rows guided by pieces of strings, weeding by means of the 64A improved rakes, and fertilizing be achieved according to exact specifications at the right time? Through contracts with families we can fully utilize the secondary manpower in the families, but children having no production experience and who have not yet studied technology, as well as old women, are very limited from the point of view of improving technology. Actually, in the Thon Thuong cooperative, no family that accepted a contract was able to work in accordance with the technical norms set by the cooperative. Therefore, the claim that contracts with families "bring science and technology to the masses and to production in a widespread manner" is unfounded.

Only by means of collective work can we have the right conditions to guide the members toward working according to new agricultural techniques, helping and showing one another, and making gradual progress a step at a time. Only when the science and technology cells guide, assist, and educate the working masses and heighten their knowledge of science and technology can we guarantee achievement of the technical norms that have been set.

Is it correct to say that "only by properly achieving this aspect (i.e., contracting with workers or families) can the cooperatives and production teams calculate the balance of manpower in each period, crop, and year so as to draft production plans more accurately...and meet the schedules"?

In the case of contracts with families, all the able cooperative members work, but they do the cooperative's work only after finishing their own, or they try to sandwich in the cooperative's work. Working capacity in a family is likely to change, especially during the wartime. Working capacity in groups is relatively more stable. Let us take a concrete example: Mrs. C of team 6 in Thon Thuong cooperative has three children; while her elder children still were at home, she accepted more than 1 mau; but now her two older children are away, and she has had a lot of difficulty with regard to manpower. Thus we find that with family contracts, if there is a serious shortage of labor, they will be bogged down in the season.
Conversely, with collective working it is possible to send reinforcements to the shortage areas and generate mutual assistance; hence, it is easier to guarantee work on schedule. Production teams are usually divided into many labor groups. In case someone in a group is absent for any reason, the group will take care of this, arrange for mutual aid, ask each group member to produce a little more, and thus still achieve the task.

The groups are an appropriate form for our present agricultural production conditions. Groups have the effects of encouraging emulation between individuals and between groups for proper achievement of the work assigned by the collective. They implement mutual assistance between the strong and the weak members, between the old and the young, and progress is achieved through criticism, observation, and help.

Is it correct to say that "long-term contracts with families are a measure for organizing rational work distribution, and that on this basis, specialization of labor in production will be gradually achieved?"

Socialist labor cooperation creates many possibilities of organizing labor with the highest effectiveness. Therefore, ever since agricultural production cooperatives were set up, the problem of specialization of labor has become a clear guideline for labor organization. Each worker works regularly, or most of the time, in a specific sector. Gradually, the production teams begin to specialize. In addition to raising the workers' technical level, the production teams improve their tools so as to move gradually from manual work to semimechanization and mechanization. Therefore, it is necessary to stabilize labor organization and labor specialization.

At present in our agricultural production cooperatives, many sectors and occupations have been formed; even in a single sector, the trend is to move toward a clear division of labor. For instance, in animal husbandry, the Van Quan cooperative has specialized cells raising different kinds of domestic animals and fowls; certain cells take care of sows and suckling pigs; other cells process feed; and so forth. Labor specialization creates favorable conditions for raising the technical level, for going more deeply into one's sector or occupation, for accumulating experience to raise labor productivity. Therefore, it is necessary to create conditions favorable for boldly advancing certain agricultural production activities toward specialization—for instance, plowing and harrowing, water conservancy, growing of duckweed, seed selection, animal husbandry, transportation, and so forth.

It is necessary to have correct production guidelines and build the material and technical base of agriculture; to raise the cooperative members' cultural, scientific, and technical level; and to adopt the systems, policies, and regulations that guarantee for each production activity full achievement of standards. More particularly, it is necessary to strengthen ideological work, heighten the cooperative members' spirit of collective ownership, build up their enthusiasm for the interests of the collective, and heighten their concept and love for their sector and occupation.

Only by relying on teams and groups can we successfully achieve these tasks.
As long as contracts are made with families for long periods of time and for multiple activities, we cannot have specialization of labor in agricultural production. As each family has only a few people and yet must do many different tasks, how can it organize specialized cells or groups?

It is correct to say that "the three contracts with families allow the production team cadres to be less busy; that if they do not have to arrange the work, assign the work, and evaluate the work every day, they will have time to get more deeply into production management, devise working methods, stay close to the ricefields, control production and techniques, etc; when there are contracts with workers or families, the cooperative members do not have to meet every evening, so they have time to relax, and take care of their health, living conditions, and studies?" Is this correct?

When there are contracts with families, the families of the cadres also accept some land, and the cadres work both in the fields assigned by the collective and on their families' own land. How can the cadres find time to get more deeply into production management, stay in the ricefields, and control production and techniques? In this case, if they want to supervise the quality of the cooperative members' work, the production teams must have as many cadres as they have families in order to keep close watch over every piece of land and every member. Consequently, the team cadres must rely on the collective's groups to be able to control the ricefields, production, and techniques and to make timely on-the-spot corrections.

It is correct to prevent the cadres from avoiding production, and to reduce bureaucratism. However, in order to reach that goal, the cooperatives must teach their cadres the concept of labor and formulate a system of cadre participation in production.

In some cooperatives where contracts have been made with families, the members must work still harder in order to work the land contracted to them by the production teams as well as their families' own land, and do their secondary work, etc. Many people arrive at work early and leave the field late, and also work during the noon time without resting. Where subsidiary food crops and vegetables are grown, the people work even harder. If they take their products to the market to sell at free prices they will receive more money; this increases the small producers' tendency to work for their own interests. Many greedy people work very hard, rapidly, affecting their health.

Like any other complicated activity, cooperative management is always running up against confusion and difficulties. The problem that matters really is that we must persistently struggle, work and study, review experiences, and improve both our work and our methods. With regard to meetings, it is necessary to have a good, fast, and efficient way of holding them. To do this, meetings must be prepared beforehand and held at the exact time scheduled. We must formulate technical standards and production regulations for each group and each worker to know and follow so as to avoid needless discussions. Do not make contracts with families to work on an individual basis just to avoid problems. Saving yourself work that way would be a passive, regressive, nonrevolutionary attitude.
Is it correct to say that the purpose of contracting with families is "to implement democracy in the management of production labor"? Is it true that individual work by each family means implementation of democracy in labor management, while collective working is nondemocratic? With family contracts, who manages whom? Do the cooperative members' families manage themselves, or do the team leaders, or does the cooperative management board manage them? The heads of families manage and assign the work in their families, while the cooperative management and team leaders are gradually losing their managerial rights. The cooperative members' concept of collective ownership in production management is gradually disappearing. Outside of the time devoted to working for the collectivity, the cooperative members are free to do work of their own. The cooperatives' management of production and labor becomes more and more difficult as the members' confused thinking and tendency to serve their own interests increase.

In short, the views that I have just analyzed and judged are actually the views of small producers, not of the worker class and the party.

Moreover, the idea that "any method of production that increases the social product is acceptable" is not the view of the working class and the party. Indeed, in the agriculture of the north today there are only two production formulas: collective production and individual production. The former moves toward socialism and creates a sufficient and happy life for our farmers. The latter creates an economy of small goods production. This economy, every day and every hour, gives rise to capitalism, and, if it grows, will make the living of our working farmers insecure. This is the main reason why we have to continue to reform production relations in agriculture. In agricultural production, we cannot adopt any way we like, but we must rather produce the way the socialist collective formula dictates--i.e., everybody able to work must work; he receives according to his labor; he gets more if he works more, and less if he works less, and nothing if he does not work.

Production must be aimed at increasing the social product more and more and making it more and more sufficient and plentiful. But the important thing is, who gets these products? Under the socialist system, the products created by the workers certainly must not be given to the parasitic people, as happens in the society where there exists the exploitation of man by man, but rather they must be distributed to the working people (manual and intellectual labor) in accordance with the contribution of each of them to the building of the new society.

In the rural areas of the north today, virtually all major means of production such as land, draft animals, and farm implements have already been collectivized; production relations have changed. Now the "three contracts with families," expanding the formula of individual, creates big contradictions in our socialist agriculture. Although the principal means of production belong to the collective they are assigned to cooperative members' families for their use; their labor is not subject to the cooperatives' management; the cooperatives also are unable to manage their products, which filter out to the free market. Distribution in the cooperatives is not rational. Compulsory deliveries to the state are not guaranteed. On the basis of individual working, such matters as technical improvement and collective emulation
for productivity increase and overfulfillment of the state plan decline. Implementation of the guidelines and tasks of the state plan is also hard to guarantee. In such a confused state of agriculture, the rules of socialist development are upset.

You comrades should go to the farms to see for yourselves; where the "three contracts with families" are in force, there is a loss of solidarity among the cooperative members. The families that receive fields on contracts fight with one another to get good, nearby ricefields, abandon the poor, faraway ricefields, and fight over production tools and draft power. Irrational harvest and distribution create excessive discrepancies in income among the various farmers; particularly those families that have fewer workers, older and sick people, or husbands and sons being away with the army or doing corvee labor have many disadvantages.

In addition, giving contracts to families leads cooperative members to return to the old system of work exchange, for when any family that accepts an amount of land has a shortage of manpower, or its workers are in poor health, it must ask some of the others to swap work so as to meet the schedule. There are even isolated cases of hiring labor! This is the main reason why, right here in Vinh Phu, many cooperative members are confused and puzzled. Some people say: "formerly the party said we should contribute land to the cooperatives for collective working and mutual assistance, but now they are distributing the land for personal working. We don't understand it at all!"

Giving contracts to families has unintentionally replaced the socialist collective production formula with the individual production formula with regard to the land contracted out by the cooperatives. It had bad effects on the thinking of the base-level cadres and the farmer masses. The following considerations should attract our attention:

A township cadre said: "If I do not contract for the assigned land, my wife and children will keep complaining. I intend to resign from the party committee to have time to work the land I contracted for from the cooperative." And a cooperative member said: "This time the cooperative is making us rich. If we don't seize the opportunity and sign the contract, we'll regret it." If this situation is not immediately stopped, it will lead to the contracting out of most, if not all, cooperative-possessed land to cooperative members' families, hence, the agricultural production cooperatives will be weakened and disintegrated.

In short, giving land contracts to families has led to these detrimental consequences: a growing tendency to serve one's own interests, with a decrease in the cooperative members' concept of collectivity; destruction of the patriotic emulative movement in the cooperatives; restriction and regression of the technical revolution in agriculture; reduction of the role of socialist collectivized labor, restoration and expansion of the individual way of working; and pushing the agricultural production cooperative backward and toward disintegration. Let me ask you, comrades and cooperative members of Vinh Phu, to quickly stop this wrong and dangerous practice of contracting out to families.
This does not mean that from now on the contracting of work to cooperative members' families will be completely abandoned in the agricultural production cooperatives. Depending on the nature of each job, the groups can divide it among individual workers, and even to members' families if it is a simple job that requires only a few people working in a given period of time—-they can try to do it during the noon break and in the evening—and if it will not interfere with the mobilization of the collective's manpower. For instance, bamboo weaving, transporting of bricks, tending of silkworms, and so forth. The important thing is not to assign land and other means of production belonging to the collective, such as draft animals, plows, and harrows, improved vehicles, to members' families for personal work.

With regard to the shortcomings and mistakes in the cooperative management of means of production, let me tell you the following facts that deserve our attention:

1. About management of land.

In Vinh Phu, the land owned by the cooperatives is generally under collective management, but many cooperatives have violated the cooperatives' rules regarding land management under various forms:

a.--Some cadre and cooperative members have occupied the cooperatives' collectively-owned land to build houses, turn into gardens, dig ponds for fish-raising, etc. Part of the 5 percent of land that was assigned to cooperative members for cultivation of fodder crops for use in collective livestock raising has also been occupied by some cooperative members to establish their own farms, or for the use of their own families. In past years, because of the U.S. imperialists' bombings and strafings, some cooperative members were temporarily evacuated to new places, where they used collectively-owned land to build houses and gardens, and have occupied it continuously up to the present. In Lap Thach District, they took 300 hectares of the cooperatives' land to dig ponds. In Yen Lac District about 200 hectares of the cooperatives' land were used for building of houses.

b.--A number of agencies, organizations, and military units, from district to central levels, which were evacuated to Lap Thach, Tam Duong, and other districts, also used the cooperatives' land to build "capital construction," but instead of using it all, they let the rest grow wild, wasting hundreds of hectares.

c.--In many places, a number of cooperatives members occupied cooperative-owned or state-owned hill land to turn into their own property.

2. About management of draft animals.

Since they have been assigning land and contracting work and many activities to families, some agricultural production cooperatives in Binh Xuyen District let their members use the cooperative-owned draft animals not only for the contract land but also for their families' land. As a result, these draft animals, because of over-work and lack of feed, grew weak or died.
3. About management of production means.

Because they had contracted land to families, many cooperatives also assigned all their plows, harrows, and improved 64A rakes to the families that had signed contracts (as the cooperatives did not have enough tools to distribute to them, these families exchanged work among themselves.)

Regarding improved vehicles and transport bicycles, in the past they were under centralized management, but because so many of them were being broken, many cooperatives have transferred them to their members in various ways. For instance, they got loans from the bank to buy such vehicles and resold them to their members on credit; buyers were allowed to pay in installments (Van Quan, Dong Xuan, and other cooperatives).

While management of those vehicles and other production equipment by many cooperatives was not yet carefully organized, while there was still a lack of definite rules about their maintenance, and while the cooperative members had not been as properly educated in regard to spirit of collective ownership and sense of responsibility as at present, management by individual families of their own improved vehicles was actually better than management by the collective. However, we should not base on this temporary situation the conclusion that the collectivized labor system is inferior to the individualistic labor system. The question raised at this time is whether we should actively reorganize and improve the collective management of improved vehicles, as well as other production implements of the cooperatives. We absolutely must not dissolve collective management.

One thing we should pay attention to is that the members' families that accept contracts, once having improved vehicles at their disposal, use them not only for their own land and for the contract land, but also for hauling for hire for the collective or for individuals. Therefore, although the vehicles are maintained quite well, their life expectancy is reduced.

We should consider whether it is right or wrong for the cooperatives to get loans from the state bank to buy improved vehicles to resell to their members, and we should come to a definite conclusion. In my opinion, it is wrong for them to do so, for it means that the state is investing in the development of the individual economy. We must fully understand this principle; the state provides improved vehicles and other improved farm implements in order to benefit the collective economy, strengthen the material and technical base of the cooperatives, and maintain collective labor management. Naturally, we must guide the family economy of the cooperative members to expand in the right direction, maintaining its role of supplementing the collective economy, instead of trampling over the latter. (We do not prevent cooperative members' families from buying their own transport equipment, but only when the state has enough improved vehicles to satisfy the collective needs of the cooperatives can we sell some of these vehicles to cooperative members.)

The land cooperatives' draft animals, plows and harrows, improved vehicles, etc. are the principal means of production of the collective; if collective management is not good, we must reorganize it, instead of assigning or reselling to the cooperative members.
The draft bylaws of the high-level agricultural production cooperatives state: "Cooperative properties must be managed and utilized in order to develop the collective economy, raise the living standard of the cooperative members, and fulfill the duty of the cooperatives toward the state." At the same time, the bylaws also stressed the need to "fight waste, corruption, and the abuse of loss of cooperative property."

The cooperatives should, therefore, properly organize good management of collective property and not assign such property to their members' families just to get rid of it because there were some difficulties, nor distribute draft animals, plows and harrows, improved vehicles, and land to families; for what would the cooperatives, in this case, have left? Management of means of production still faces many difficulties and complications. The members who do not maintain the cooperatives' means of production very well, must be taught to protect public property and we must spell out in clear terms the management of such means of production (organizing if necessary, specialized groups or cells to be in charge of them). We must absolutely not, because of difficulties, violate the system of socialist ownership and the cooperatives' bylaws.

Now let me talk briefly about the problem of corruption and waste in the cooperatives in Vinh Phu.

Corruption and waste of money and rice of the cooperatives in the province also are quite common and quite serious in some places.

Although, after two phases of the campaign to improve management and technology, the province has been able to solve a number of cases, corruption still remains, just like weeds that grow again and again.

The reason behind corruption and waste are that some cadres and party members do not set good examples, have very poor sense of responsibility and spirit of collective ownership, abuse power and violate party and state policies and regulations whenever they have a high-ranking position and some authority, use public funds very freely, and fail to observe democracy in financial matters and accuracy in book-keeping. The cooperatives' concept of property protection has been very poor.

When the masses speak, the cadres do not listen; they even hold prejudices against them, revile them, and accuse them of one crime or another.

For instance, they charge them with objecting to the cooperatives, resisting implementation of party and government policies, and put unfavorable recommendations in the files of those people's children when they apply for school or a job. Therefore, the mass of cooperative members have to keep their mouths shut; and those who dare to resist because they cannot take any more, have to struggle all by themselves.

The province must have permanent measures to resolve the problem of corruption and waste; a combination of education with punishment; and considering education as the main factor to prevent, restrain, and eventually eliminate that evil. Only then can there be true unity in the cooperatives and a rapid increase in production; only then will the masses enthusiastically emulate in production and associate themselves more closely with the collective.
Deviations and mistakes in the three-contract program as well as in the management of means of production in the cooperatives of Vinh Phu Province, date back to 1966 (even earlier in the case of corruption and waste). At present, such mistakes are increasing and their nature is very serious because they are not only connected with the working methods, but also with attitudes and views. We must try to analyze them carefully and seek the real reasons, if corrective measures are to be effective.

What are the reasons for the above shortcomings and mistakes, particularly in the "three contracts with families" program?

1. After the land reform, the policy of our party was "resolutely bring the farmers in the north along the road of agricultural cooperativization to socialism." The way we carry on cooperativization of agriculture is to try to educate the farmers about the road to development of the countryside following the land reform, that is, the road of agricultural cooperativization the one that leads our farmers to socialism. Only by taking this road can our farmers have true happiness. And if they take the road of individually working for their livelihood, the countryside will certainly be divided deeply among the rich and the poor, the system of exploitation of man by man will be reborn, and the working farmers will be starving again.

There can be two ways to move to socialism in agriculture. In one, since the land reform, when the farmers received land, draft animals, and farm implements, our party educates them to take the road of agricultural cooperativization; it contributes land, draft animals, and major farm implements to the cooperatives for achieving collectivized labor and distribution according to their labor; through collectivized labor and on the basis of gradual socialist industrialization, technology is improved, labor productivity is increased, agriculture is gradually mechanized and socialist agriculture is built and developed. In the other, agricultural mechanization is achieved first: we produce plows, harrows, threshing machines, water pumps, etc. for agriculture; farmers, seeing the advantages of machinery, will join the cooperatives so as to work collectively and to get to use machinery. We have chosen the first way because we are well aware that our country, being a backward agricultural country, does not need to go through the phase of capitalist development before it can move on to socialism; moreover, in our country, agricultural cooperativization must help to speed the process of socialist industrialization, and, conversely, socialist industrialization creates favorable conditions for consolidation and development of agricultural production cooperatives.

Like other provinces in the north, Vinh Phu has educated and persuaded its farmers to take the road of agricultural cooperativization at once, without waiting for agricultural mechanization. However, after the farmers had already joined the agricultural production cooperatives, the cadres neglected their political and ideological education, or educated them only superficially. For a long period of time, they failed to understand fully the spirit of absolute struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads, between the collective and individualistic labor formulas in the countryside. The cadres and farmers understood the problem of agricultural cooperativization only superficially and in oversimplified terms. The thinking of some people is still unreformed; they still miss the individual way of working.
2. In the party leadership echelons, a number of comrades have deviant or erroneous views about the three-contract program. Other comrades who resist and criticize, are not firmly resolved to defend the truth, and to some extent compromise with one another in an unprincipled way. Therefore, such deviant and wrong views still spread in a legitimate way, through talks at conferences, lectures in the party's schools in the province, visits to farms, dissemination of experience, etc.

When they reach the masses, those wrong views fit well with the selfish thinking of the small producers. Consequently, those two ways of thinking meet and grow very quickly to bring the cadres and masses away from the party line without their knowing it.

3. While the U.S. aggressors wage aggressive war in the south and a war of destruction in the north, all our party and people concentrate our minds and forces on defeating them. A large part of our agricultural manpower has been mobilized for combat and combat support. The organization and utilization of manpower in agriculture face difficulties. The local leaders tried to solve the situation, but because they did not fully understand the principle and policies of the party regarding socialist management of agriculture and agricultural production cooperatives, while applying it on the local situations, they deviated to the individual production formula, transferring some means of production of the cooperatives to members' families and gradually restoring the individualistic way of working.

4. In the process of development from work exchange to cooperatives and from low-level cooperatives to high-level ones, cooperative management was very new and complicated, particularly in regard to the "three-management, three-contract" movement. As the movement developed, local cadres, and especially the provincial cadres, were bureaucratic and superficial and failed to stay close to the farms to inspect, study, review the situation, draw experience, listen to the masses' opinions gather and publicize useful experiences, and at the same time discover mistakes and shortcomings for timely correction; they also failed to see the true nature of the errors in contracting land out to families, as well as in loosening the cooperatives' management of means of production. Therefore, the errors and deviations at the base-level continued to grow quietly and ate into section after section of the collective economy without the high-ranking cadres', because of their subjective attitude, knowing anything about it.

5. The provincial party committee and agriculture department consulted the Central Committee on a few other matters, but they did not ask for a directive; hence, a little error became a big one. On the other hand, after having discovered errors in the Vinh Phu agricultural cooperativization movement, the special assistants to the Central Committee did not recognize the seriousness of those mistakes, nor did they suggest to the Central Committee any measures to correct them; so they continued to grow.

We must clearly recognize the nature and reasons for the above shortcomings and errors so as to try to correct them and move forward.
Dear comrades,

The above errors are not peculiar to Vinh Phu, but other provinces also perpetrated them. If we take Vinh Phu first to analyze and criticize, and recommend corrections, it is because Vinh Phu's errors are clearer and more serious than those of other provinces.

Recently, the comrades of the Vinh Phu Standing Committee received direct instructions from the party Central Committee Secretariat. The Vinh Phu party committee met to review the situation and immediately recognized the deviations and errors and expressed its determination to correct them. This we are happy about.

I believe that, with the revolutionary tradition of the two former provinces that we merged, Vinh Phu will surely strengthen unity, develop its strong points, correct its shortcomings, move forward steadily, and fulfill the tasks assigned by the Central Committee.

In order to correct properly the shortcomings and errors perpetrated, while waiting for the instructions in writing of the party Central Committee Secretariat in regard to this problem, let me repeat here for your benefit some principles of the "three-contract" policy contained in the final report on phase I of the movement for improving cooperative management and technology of the Central Agriculture Department in December 1961.

The section dealing with "Specific Problems in Cooperative Management" (under the heading Labor Management) in that report explains relatively clearly the three contracts in the cooperatives as follows:

"After having set labor norms and classified the work to determine the criteria for computing wages, the cooperatives must assign work to the teams. There are many ways to give assignments: assignment of separate jobs, and 'three contracts.' Assignment of single jobs is to assign the quality and quantity of work to be done in a day or in a short time. This can be assigned to groups or individual cooperative members, depending on the nature of each job. 'Three contracts' consists of assigning the volume of production, work points, and production costs in the course of a crop season or an entire year. Under present conditions, 'three contracts' is a rational and strict labor system of responsibility for labor; 'three contracts' are made only with permanent production teams." (Under wartime conditions, with the number of agricultural workers changing constantly, we can also make "three contracts" with relatively permanent production teams).

To make "three contracts" properly, we must observe the following points:

1. Three prerequisites for "three contracts."

Draft accurate production plans; determine the exact amount of manpower available; classify the work and determine the technical norms; divide the assignment
among permanent production teams, which must have enough hard-core cadres to assume leadership.

2. Methods of implementing "three contracts."

The "three contracts" must conform to the overall production plan of the co-operatives, which has been approved by all members at their congress.

The volume-of-production contract covers quantity, specifications, and quality. With the exception of rice, corn, and so forth, which can be assigned in terms of kilograms and quintals, the secondary crops like tomatoes, vegetables, melons, etc. are assigned both in kilograms and quintals and also in terms of conversion into money to guarantee quality and reduce difficulties arising from spoilage. If value is reckoned in terms of money, consider the market prices at the time of selling, and make a fair adjustment.

The production-cost contract covers such items as fertilizer and seeds, which are obligatory in nature, and must be carried out by the teams exactly in accordance with the plan and cannot be foregone. If any team deliberately omits or reduces those items, not only will it be prevented from using the leftover, but it will be fined as well.

As to work points, after the cooperatives have given assignments to the teams, the latter can, according to the manpower available and the overall work point-computation standard adopted by the cooperatives, make adjustments or get supplementary manpower to suit their own production conditions. The teams can keep for themselves the number of work points thus saved.

In addition to the work points actually assigned to the teams, the cooperatives must keep in reserve an additional number of work points and announce it to all cooperative members, in case of unexpected natural calamities that require additional work, such as fighting drought, fighting floods, catching insects, etc. These work points will be kept by the cooperatives, which, in case of necessity, when they see that more work must be assigned to the teams, will then assign them to the teams setting new manpower levels and point-computation standards on the basis of the actual situation, or on the basis of local customs and experience.

3. Leadership over implementation of "three contracts."

After giving the assignments to the teams, the management board must attach importance to leadership of the implementation of the teams' plans, oppose unconditional contracts, and seek to guarantee full execution of technical requirements and specifications and adherence to schedules. If necessary, it must readjust the specifications in the contracts to meet the schedules. On the other hand, it must strengthen ideological and political education for the cooperative members, fight localism and self-interest, and prevent corruption in the collective.

The production teams, after having accepted contracts from the cooperatives, must have specific production plans for each piece of land (what to grow, how many times to plow and harrow, how much harvest to expect, etc.) and give specific work
assignments to each worker so that they would have the responsibility for taking care of the field, prompt discovery of insect damage and water shortage, etc., but they must not make the "three contracts" with families. The production teams must only, on the basis of the levels set by the cooperative, assign individual jobs to temporary labor cells or individuals for periods of 5-10 days each.

[Paper omits point 4]

5. Some other cases deserving our attention in the implementation of the "three contracts."

The "three contracts" for other occupations are also modeled after the "three contracts" in agriculture. But attention must be paid to the following points:

In addition to contracting for volume of production, we must also assign the gross value of the products. For the productive occupations that face many difficulties, with products that depend a lot on natural conditions and weather, we must allow for considerable depreciation in the volume-of-production contract (for instance, in the raising of ducklings).

As to the occupations that are suitable for production in individual families or groups, such as bamboo weaving, raising of silkworms, etc., the "three contracts" can be given to families or groups so they can take advantage of their leisure time to do extra work.

You comrades must carefully consider the report of the Central Agriculture Department, some excerpts of which I have just given you, and at the same time review the "three contracts" experience of the agricultural production cooperatives and the experiences that have arisen specifically from our resistance to the U.S. for national salvation so as to apply it accurately.

Here-under I offer you some ideas to help you comrades to make specific corrections:

1. The provincial party committee must give instructions to the cooperatives in the province to stop immediately all forms of "three contracts with families" as I mentioned above, at the same time preventing individual cooperative members and farmers from occupying state and cooperative land or other means of production of the cooperatives to use as their own property.

The land that has been contracted out to any family, before correction of the mistake, can be temporarily worked by those families so as to maintain the total cultivated area and productivity of the cooperatives. Pending the correction in accordance with the general decision of the provincial party committee, absolutely do not stir things up in an abrupt, hurried way, which could harm production.

2. The party leadership echelons, from provincial to primary levels, must seriously review the shortcomings and mistakes mentioned in this report and discuss realistic plans to correct them. Through this review, make the cadres and party
members fully understand the spirit of absolute struggle between the two roads and apply this spirit to the implementation of the party's policy of socialist management toward agricultural production and the cooperatives. Clearly recognize the principle of collective management and the collective labor system, for the purpose of properly utilizing the cooperatives' organized resources and labor to develop production, raise labor productivity, raise the members' standard of living, and fulfill the obligations toward the state.

After such a review in the party as I described above, organize sessions for members of agricultural production cooperatives to discuss the common regulations of the high-level cooperatives with which to build their own cooperatives' bylaws; at the same time, discuss the document of the Central Agriculture Department on the "three managements" and "three contracts"; heighten the concept of collective ownership and the ideological and political level of the cadres and cooperative members, thus making them clearly recognize the principle of socialist management in the agricultural production cooperatives. On this basis, observe and criticize the shortcomings and mistakes in the cooperatives in relation to cooperative management, and discuss ways to correct them.

3. The current requirement for correcting mistakes in the cooperatives is: if there are mistakes, be determined to correct them, and correct them everywhere; on the basis of good ideological correction, and corrections in concept, organization, and utilization and management of labor, consolidate the party chapters still a step further, strengthen unity in the party organization and in the cooperatives, develop the spirit of collective ownership of the masses of cooperative members, make them more enthusiastic and encourage them to develop production and raise more plants and animals; make sure the cultivated area and productivity of cultivated crops are not decreased and the herd of pigs is increased rather than reduced in number.

4. The current guidelines for correcting mistakes are:

a.--Both correct well and produce well; thus, the correction of mistakes must be linked with crop seasons (right now; during the winter-spring production season);

b.--Truly follow the mass line; start the masses thinking, make them see clearly what is right and what is wrong, discuss with them, rely on them to make good corrections;

c.--Be firm and careful; carry on your work step by step according to plans, exerting leadership; choose some townships to make corrections first, then draw experience to apply to other townships; avoid being too scattered and too superficial.

The Central Agriculture Department must coordinate with the Vinh Phu party committee to correct mistakes in a number of important places, to uncover any ideological, policy, and organizational problems that can be suggested to the Central Committee for timely solution, and at the same time to draw from experiences that would be helpful for the Central Committee in guiding the correcting of similar mistakes in other provinces.
5. When reviewing and correcting mistakes, avoid the following deviations:

a. Refusing to correct mistakes, from fear of responsibility or of loss of prestige, or correcting mistakes in a secret, hasty way to be rid of them; failing to get the masses thinking; not knowing how to take advantage of the current correction of mistakes to educate cadres, party members, and the mass of cooperative members to consolidate their socialist attitudes and help them to improve their ideology and level of cooperative management.

b. Correcting one mistake and jumping to another mistake, for instance: (1) Knowing that giving contracts to families is wrong, but when following the Central Committee's correct "three contracts" program, fearing difficulties or trouble; therefore, land is left idle, production stops, or the families that have signed contracts are left in a state of confusion to the point that production is destroyed; [or] (2) when the cooperatives and production teams do not have enough stables and pens, feeds, and cadres, they still take the pigs back from the raisers and, because there is no place to raise them, sell or kill the pigs in an irresponsible manner—hence, the herd of pigs will be reduced in number; or the cooperatives temporarily leave the pigs with members' families who may be too lazy to take care of them, or leave them for long periods; thus the pigs get sick, lose weight, and die; or while abandoning contracting with families to raise pigs, the cooperatives fail to encourage their members to raise pigs on a family basis, and hence the herds of pigs raised by both the collective and families decrease in numbers quickly.

c. In the ranks of cadres, staff members, and the masses, people argue back and forth and debate at length on how "you are wrong and I am right"; hence, bad elements find a good opportunity to interfere to create loss of unity in the party and cooperatives.

6. Make a final review of the cooperatives' experience with the "three managements" and "three contracts," compiling the useful experience of Vinh Linh Province in these matters to disseminate among all the cooperatives in the province. The process of correcting the mistakes in the "three contracts with families" and in management of production means of the cooperatives is also that of reviewing experience and compiling experiences in management of agricultural production cooperatives in the province.

7. To correct the shortcomings and mistakes in management of cooperative land, the Central Agriculture Department must investigate and consider the problem and suggest solutions to the Central Committee, particularly in the cases of members occupying collectively-owned land to use as their own property. In the process of correcting "three managements" and "three contracts" mistakes in key places, the party committee of Vinh Phu should make any specific suggestions it might have directly to the Central Committee.

As to the cooperatives' fight against corruption and waste, it should be carried on just as it was after the phases of the movement for improving management and technology in the agricultural production cooperatives; there is nothing new in this regard.
The thing we should pay attention to is the need to educate cadres and cooperative members constantly in regard to the socialist concept of cooperative property, while at the same time strengthening supervision to avoid repetition of the offenses.

8. In order to ensure strengthening of cooperative management, avoid serious shortcomings and mistakes, and ceaselessly move the cooperatives ahead, the important problem is to have cadres who have strong attitudes, good qualities, high working ability, and a high cultural, scientific, and technical level. Therefore, the provincial party committee must investigate and compile statistics on the crops of managerial and technical cadres directly or indirectly serving the agricultural production cooperatives, have definite policies and plans for the training, improvement, and effective utilization of cadres, and at the same time stabilize and strengthen that body of cadres.

Dear comrades,

The agricultural cooperativization movement of the north in general, and of Vinh Phu in particular, has both rights and wrongs. What is important is that we recognize the achievements as the important thing, at the same time seeing all the shortcomings and mistakes in order to correct them resolutely; and as we correct them well, we can develop the strong points and move forward steadily.

We have the party headed by President Ho to give us very clear-sighted leadership. Our people are very revolutionary and have absolute confidence in the party and President Ho. Our cadres are, in general, good. Therefore we will surely correct our errors properly. Then we will further consolidate and expand the cooperatives, expand agriculture, consolidate the worker-farmer alliance, contribute to consolidating the revolutionary base for the entire country, speed the building of socialism in the north and speed the anti-U.S. resistance for national salvation toward final victory.

I wish you comrades good health and success.