

---

## **CHINA UPDATES: 8 items: OCTOBER 2009.**

---

### **Official: the Chinese people never allow other countries to interfere with internal affairs**

**www.chinaview.cn 2009-10-17**

BEIJING, Oct. 16 (Xinhua) -- An interview with Zhu Weiqun, vice minister of the United Front Work Department of the Communist Party of China (CPC) Central Committee, by the Focus magazine of Germany on September 22, 2009.

China Tibet Information Center's note: At the request of the German magazine Focus, Zhu Weiqun, vice minister of the United Front Work Department of the CPC Central Committee, had an interview with the magazine on September 22, on condition that the magazine would carry the main contents of the interview. On October 5, the Focus reported the interview with a few more than 400 words when translated into Chinese. The China Tibet Information Center hereby presents the main contents of the interviews.

Zhu: First I would like to welcome Ms. Dometite and your colleagues from the Focus magazine to the United Front Work Department. Please feel free during the interview, and raise what you consider to be tough questions. However, I hope you can carry the main contents of this interview on your magazine. I have seen quite a number of reporters from Western countries who had a rather bad practice -- when what I said did not match what they needed, they were not courageous enough to report it.

Focus: Thank you for your warm welcome and for this interview opportunity. We all know it is not easy to have a chance like this. You just said we can ask questions we consider to be tough. We will take your words seriously.

Every country is entitled to handle ethnic relations in accordance with its own conditions.

Focus: In China, Tibet is an autonomous region. How do you understand the concept of "autonomy?"

Zhu: The question is a theoretical and political one, and is very practical in the meantime. China is a multi-ethnic country with 56 ethnic groups. We practice an ethnic policy featuring

"equality, unity, mutual aid and harmony." In regions where ethnic minorities live in compact communities, that is, where ethnic minorities take up the majority of the local population, regional ethnic autonomy is exercised. Ethnic minorities account for a little more than eight percent of China's total population, but ethnic autonomous regions takes up about 64 percent of the country's territory.

One outstanding feature of the distribution of China's ethnic groups is that people of different ethnic groups live in a highly mixed way. For instance, in Tibet where regional ethnic autonomy is exercised, people of Moinba, Lhoba, Manchu, Hui, Qiang and Han ethnic groups live together with the Tibetans. In cities and provinces other than autonomous areas, such as Beijing and the provinces in central or eastern China, there are quite a number of people of ethnic minorities, who also enjoy the legitimate rights as citizens and favorable policies entitled to ethnic minority residents. Different countries have different ethnic distributions, as well as different histories, cultures and traditions. In this sense, different countries carry out autonomy in different ways, if they do have autonomy of certain kinds. Every country in the world is entitled to decide what system should be applied to handle its ethnic relations in accordance with its own national conditions. In other words, the word 'autonomy' has different interpretations, and incur different policies in different countries. No country should impose its own practice on others.

China's regional ethnic autonomy has been clearly defined by the Constitution and the Law on Regional Autonomy for China's Minority Nationalities. These stipulations have been earnestly implemented in practice. We will continue to perfect our regional ethnic autonomy system as our practice advances. But we will not deviate from our ethnic policies and the regional ethnic autonomy system we have worked out in accordance with our country's national conditions. What China's regional ethnic autonomy should be like, to put it more simply, is exactly what it is right now.

Focus: We would like to know what kind of rights people in Tibet enjoy, particularly their right to make decisions for the development of their own region. Can you give us an example?

Zhu: The people's congresses and governments at all levels elected by the people of all ethnic groups in Tibet have comprehensive rights to the region's economic, social and cultural development, on the premises that they follow and do not contradict the principles of the Constitution. I want to point out that China's regional ethnic autonomy is not the pure self-governance of a single ethnic group in your mind. China's regional ethnic autonomy is linked with the country's unification and the unity of the Chinese nation, without which the regional ethnic autonomy would not exist. History has proven that all ethnic groups would be subjects to bullies and invasions of the imperialist forces without ethnic unity and the country's unification. In that case, there would be no autonomy.

I can give you one example on the autonomy rights issue. For instance, some people are very curious about the percentage which Tibetan officials take up in the region's government. The Dalai Lama said the Tibetans had lost their political positions in Tibet. I can tell you that is a lie. In Tibet, more than 70 percent of government officials at the regional level are Tibetans. The figure is more than 90 percent at or below county levels in the region.

---

**Items**

---

**The New York Times**

**October 19, 2009**

**Uneasy Engagement**

**At Book Fair, a Subplot About Chinese Rights**

**By STEVEN ERLANGER and JONATHAN ANSFIELD**

FRANKFURT — As China extends its economic reach, it has also increased efforts to promote its culture, or “soft power,” to counter Western influence and improve its image in the wider world.

Yet if Chinese goods are accepted everywhere, its arts and literature, embattled at home after decades of censorship and state control, are proving harder for the government to export.

After years of delicate preparations, China was the “honored guest” this past week at the Frankfurt Book Fair, the largest and most influential book trade event, based on the number of publishers represented. But what Beijing hoped would be a celebration of its cultural achievements turned into a tug of war between control and free speech, as much a showcase for Chinese dissidents as the state’s approved writers.

Mao Zedong said that power flowed from the “wielders of the pen,” not only from the gun. But the chairman would not be amused to find books like “Mao: The Unknown Story,” an indictment of his rule that is banned in China, displayed alongside the official Chinese exhibit at this year’s fair, which ended Sunday.

When the German organizers and diplomats urged the Chinese to allow a prominent storyteller and musician, Liao Yiwu, to come to Frankfurt, the authorities refused to lift his

overseas travel ban, and told him to stop talking about it.

A symposium preceding the book fair titled “China and the World — Perceptions and Realities,” became a major confrontation. Fair organizers withdrew invitations to two dissident writers the Chinese wanted to exclude, Dai Qing and Bei Ling, but welcomed them at the last minute after criticism by journalists and politicians. When the writers made statements, the Chinese delegation walked out, only to return after an abject apology by the fair’s director, Jürgen Boos.

“We did not come to be instructed about democracy,” declared Mei Zhaorong, China’s former ambassador to Germany.

Unlike the exquisitely choreographed ceremonies during the Beijing Olympics, the fair presented a messier and more ambiguous portrait of China on the rise — a country still deeply uncomfortable with its own discordant voices, yet eager to become more competitive with the West in the realm of ideas.

China controlled its own massive display of books, artwork and authors at the fair, including even books from Taiwan, to underline its assertion of “One China.” But it could not censor the 2,500 books about China displayed by others. And while Beijing had many consultations with the German government and arguments with the fair organizers, it ultimately did not push to prevent dissidents and critics — even representatives of the Dalai Lama — from attending the event.

The book fair is not the Beijing Olympics and “cannot be controlled,” said Mr. Boos. He apologized for mishandling the symposium, but said: “It is the beginning of a cultural dialogue. And dialogue is not easy.”

Still, Chinese officials did not attend dissident events, “which were full of people who already agreed with the dissidents,” said the German novelist Tanja Kinkel. “They were preaching to the choir,” she said.

The Chinese themselves were annoyed. With SpiegelOnline headlining its coverage “China, the Unwelcome Guest,” several official Chinese delegates told colleagues that Europe’s politicians and news media were strongly biased.

Li Pengyi, a delegation member and vice president of China Publishing Group Corporation, said happily that China had sold nearly 900 copyrights here. But he complained about the coverage.

“We don’t feel we’ve been hospitably treated,” he said. “China sent more than 2,000 people

to Frankfurt. And now this barrage of criticism.”

Zhao Haiyun, spokesman for China’s General Administration of Press and Publication, said that instead of focusing on literature, the media had focused on human rights and censorship. “The German media are very biased,” he said.

Even so, the Chinese did not pull out. The Beijing leadership sent Xi Jinping, China’s vice president and heir apparent to President Hu Jintao, a measure of the political weight they attached to the event.

Michael Naumann, a former German culture minister and now publisher and editor of Die Zeit, a prominent weekly newspaper, said German organizers misjudged the complications of honoring China in a year laden with controversy, including the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the 20th anniversary of the crushed Tiananmen Square democracy movement and the 60th anniversary of Chinese Communist Party rule.

“I think the people who run the book fair were kind of naïve when they invited the Chinese,” he said. “But opening this enormous window of the book fair to Chinese writers, whether they are censored or not, will give them a way to sniff out the open forum of intellectual debate.”

Since 2004, China has pursued what it calls its “going out” policy on the cultural front, trying to square its economic influence and new status as a global power, while trying to defuse criticism on issues like Tibet, Taiwan and human rights.

There have been yearlong cultural exchanges with many countries; the opening of hundreds of language teaching centers known as Confucius Institutes; new foreign-language services from official media like Xinhua and CCTV; and new interest in foreign platforms like the Kennedy Center and the Europalia festival in Brussels.

There have been other furors. When China was featured at the 2004 Paris Book Fair, officials initially persuaded the French not to invite the Nobel literature laureate Gao Xingjian, a French citizen whose books are banned in China.

But Frankfurt, with its 7,300 publishers and 300,000 visitors, was a much riskier venture.

Jing Bartz has been the fair’s chief representative in Beijing since 2003 and negotiated strenuously with Chinese publication officials. “China has really wanted to use this platform to promote Chinese culture,” she said. “On the other side, they are worried because they can’t use Chinese rules to do it.”

What helped persuade China was the cultural trade gap. At the 2005 Beijing book fair, the Chinese were shocked that German publishers sold 600 copyrighted works to China while the Chinese sold just one to Germany, Mrs. Bartz said.

Chinese officials worried particularly that the Dalai Lama might attend, or that books would be displayed from adversaries like the banned movement Falun Gong.

The breakthrough came in 2006, said Mrs. Bartz, when Shi Zongyuan, then head of the General Administration of Press and Publication, told organizers: “We just have to make it very clear what is our guest of honor program, and what are the other events.”

China invested \$15 million and managed nearly every detail of its exhibition. There was much argument over what translations to finance. The 20 new German-published volumes China financed include works by major writers, like Jiang Rong’s “Wolf Totem,” Yu Hua’s “Brothers,” and Xu Zechen’s “Running Through Zhongguancun.”

Mr. Xu’s hit, about a migrant hawking pirated DVDs and fake IDs in the capital, was unexpected. But of some 100 newly translated titles that China promoted, most are banal introductions to China from state publishers.

“The government has not put on such a concentrated, large-scale event before to promote Chinese literature, so I think it’s a good opportunity,” said Mr. Xu, 31. “Because of the government’s involvement, there are inevitably going to be these ideological problems. But we just have to be responsible to ourselves.”

Since the uproar over the symposium last month, said Mr. Boos and Mrs. Bartz, China has appeared more relaxed. Officials eventually gave up protesting the attendance of those like the Uighur independence advocate Rebiya Kadeer; the Dalai Lama’s envoy, Kelsang Gyaltsen; Ms. Dai, Mr. Bei or Mr. Gao.

“They tried to learn,” Mrs. Bartz said. But she confirmed that while the Chinese were “very satisfied with the business results” of the fair, “they don’t really feel they were welcomed as guests here.” The word went down from the top, she said, not to react to demonstrations or provocations from protesters or journalists.

Back in China, however, the fair has not brought any noticeable easing of restrictions.

Mr. Liao, the writer and musician, was imprisoned from 1990 to 1994 after he wrote a poem about the Tiananmen massacre. Despite an invitation here — he hoped to promote his book about China’s downtrodden, known in English as “The Corpse Walker” — the police would not lift a ban on his going overseas.

In a telephone interview, Mr. Liao said it was not a complete loss for him or other underground writers, given the publicity. “Only by going through these incidents, it seems, can we become known to the outside world,” he said.

\* Steven Erlanger reported from Frankfurt, and Jonathan Ansfield from Beijing.

---

**The Times**

**October 13, 2009**

### **China tightens grip on Africa with \$4.4bn lifeline for Guinea junta**

While the rest of the world recoiled in horror at recent events in Guinea, where at least 150 pro-democracy supporters were killed and dozens of women publicly raped by government soldiers, China has sensed an opportunity to steal another march on Western competitors in Africa.

China is preparing to throw the junta in Guinea a lifeline in the form of a multibillion-pound oil and mineral deal, financed largely by soft loans. Such policies have already served China well with rogue and discredited regimes from Angola to Sudan. The move comes as the European Union, spurred on by France, the former colonial power, and the African Union are considering sanctions against Guinea if its young military leader, Captain Moussa Dadis Camara, continues to renege on a deal to stand down in favour of free elections.

The massacre occurred after 50,000 demonstrators took to the streets when Captain Camara — who seized power in December after the death of the long-time dictator Lansana Conte — announced that he would stand in the poll. Thousands stayed at home yesterday and riot police patrolled empty streets as the opposition called two days of mourning for the dead.

Beijing, meanwhile, was reported to be close to agreeing a deal, financed by its China International Fund, of about £4.4 billion covering a range of projects. Guinea, the world’s largest exporter of bauxite, also has huge deposits of uranium, iron ore, diamonds and a host of other minerals. It is also believed to have significant off-shore oil reserves.

China’s policy of not linking trade, aid and investment to political reform or human rights issues has paid huge dividends so far. In less than a decade it has created a footprint across the entire continent and secured a willing provider of much needed raw materials to power its economic growth.

There is now barely a country on the continent that does not have a sizeable Chinese presence. Copper-rich Zambia and the Congolese province of Katanga now boast the fastest-growing Chinatowns in the world. Sudan, for years out of bounds to Western companies because of its links to terrorism, now pumps 600,000 barrels of oil a day from its Red Sea port into Chinese ships. In return it received weapons that it used against rebellious black Africans in Darfur.

In Angola the Chinese have built roads, de-mined rural areas, upgraded ports and rehabilitated railways. In the Ethiopian and Kenyan capitals of Addis Ababa and Nairobi they are heavily involved in new construction projects.

At the weekend President Kagame of Rwanda, whose Government has frequently been accused of supporting atrocities in neighbouring Congo, praised Chinese investment for helping Africa to develop. "The Chinese bring what Africa needs: investment and money for governments and companies," he told the German Handelsblatt newspaper in an interview. "I would prefer the Western world to invest in Africa rather than hand out development aid."

Annual trade between China and Africa is now put at £62 billion, more than four times the £15 billion that it reached in 2004. China has also written off billions of dollars of bad African debt and used its "war chest" of foreign currency reserves to cement new alliances and finance cut-rate loans and commercial lines of credit.

There is only one condition: any money provided must be used to pay Chinese companies and buy Chinese goods that flood the continent's bustling street markets. Stalls now overflow with cheap plastic sandals, underwear, artificial flowers and cut-price motorbikes and tools.

Ordinary Africans are far less enthusiastic than the governing elites. Rights activists accuse the Chinese of cutting corners, exploiting corrupt local officials and ignoring health, safety and environmental concerns.

A recent report by the Oxford-based group Rights and Accountability in Development highlighted that 90 per cent of the output of Congo's mineral-rich Katanga province now went to China. However, it said, Congolese workers accused them of flouting local laws, poor pay, atrocious safety records and no welfare or social development policies.

For years Guinea has been one of the most sinister regimes in West Africa. In recent years it has become a conduit for drug smuggling from Latin America to Western Europe, much of it believed to be organised by the young army officers now so reluctant to give up power.

---

**Story from BBC NEWS:**

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/africa/8301826.stm>

**Published: 2009/10/11 20:54:22 GMT**

## **China praised for African links**

Rwandan President Paul Kagame has praised the way China does business in Africa, criticising the West for basing relations with the continent on aid.

Huge Chinese investment in African companies and infrastructure is helping Africa develop, Mr Kagame said.

Annual trade between China and Africa is now worth more than \$100bn (£63bn).

Chinese companies are active across Africa, but have been criticised by some in the West, who accuse Beijing of failing to promote good governance.

Chinese firms, many of them state-owned, regularly bid for major construction projects at costs which Western firms cannot match.

In addition, Beijing also operates a policy of non-interference in domestic affairs.

That has allowed China to do business in areas of Africa, such as Sudan, where Western firms are constrained by human rights concerns.

### **Old problems**

Speaking to a German newspaper, Mr Kagame - seen in the West as one of Africa's more dynamic leaders - was as critical of the West as he was generous in praise of China.

"I would prefer the Western world to invest in Africa rather than handing out development aid"

Paul Kagame, Rwandan president

"The Chinese bring what Africa needs: investment and money for governments and companies," he told business newspaper Handelsblatt.

"China is investing in infrastructure and building roads," he said, adding that European and

American involvement "has not brought Africa forward".

"Western firms have to a large extent polluted Africa and they are still doing it," Mr Kagame said.

Although Rwanda received substantial international aid in the wake of the 1994 genocide, which left more than 800,000 dead, Mr Kagame told Handelsblatt that relations based more on trade than aid were now the most useful to Africa.

"I would prefer the Western world to invest in Africa rather than handing out development aid," he said.

"There is a need for help - but it should be implemented in such a way as to enable trade and build up companies."

The Rwandan leader also said that high trade tariffs prevented African producers from gaining equitable access to global markets.

"It would help Africa much more if industrialised countries allowed us the same trade rights as they give to each other," Mr Kagame said.

---

## **China dissidents top Nobel Peace Prize speculation**

**By DOUG MELLGREN and IAN MacDOUGALL Associated Press Writers**

**© 2009 The Associated Press**

**Oct. 7, 2009, 12:41AM**

OSLO — Chinese dissidents are leading the odds of winning the Nobel Peace Prize this year, the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre and the 60th since the establishment of the People's Republic of China.

Speculation on the chances of Chinese dissidents for the peace prize, announced this year on Friday, has been a yearly ritual. But this time there's a stronger current of expectation surrounding critics of China's long-standing communist regime.

Emerging superpower China remains deeply sensitive about criticism of its bloody 1989 crackdown on pro-democracy protesters at Tiananmen Square. And awarding dissidents would be a major poke-in-the-eye in the year the communist regime celebrates its diamond jubilee.

The Nobel Peace Prize committee is famous for making grand symbolic gestures aimed at influencing the world agenda, as in 1989 when, in the wake of the Tiananmen massacre, the prize went to the Dalai Lama, the exiled Tibetan spiritual leader.

U.S. President Barack Obama is thought to have been nominated but it's unclear on what grounds.

Nobel watchers say he could be a contender for next year's prize, following his lofty call for global nuclear disarmament at the United Nations last month, which came after the nomination deadline for the 2009 prize.

Other possible contenders include human rights activists from Colombia, Jordan, Russia, Afghanistan and Vietnam.

Despite the strong buzz surrounding Chinese dissidents, the Nobel committee said the race wasn't over.

"We have not come to a final conclusion," the committee's nonvoting secretary Geir Lundestad told The Associated Press late last week. "We will meet again and decide."

In his 1895 will, award founder Alfred Nobel stipulated that the peace prize should go "to the person who shall have done the most or the best work for fraternity between the nations and the abolition or reduction of standing armies and the formation and spreading of peace congresses."

Unlike the other Nobel Prizes, which are awarded by Swedish institutions, he said the peace prize should be given out by a five-member committee elected by the Norwegian Parliament. Sweden and Norway were united under the same crown at the time of Nobel's death.

The committee has taken a wide interpretation of Nobel's guidelines, expanding the prize beyond peace mediation to include efforts to combat poverty, disease and climate change. Some experts believe the committee will turn to human rights this year, because it hasn't picked a human rights activist since tapping Iranian lawyer Shirin Ebadi for the prize in 2003.

"Twenty years since Tiananmen Square? Maybe a Chinese?" said Dan Smith, of the London-based International Alert peace group.

Possible candidates could be Hu Jia, a human rights activist and an outspoken critic of the Chinese government, who was sentenced last year to a three-and-a-half-year prison term

for "inciting subversion of state power." Another could be Wei Jingsheng, who spent 17 years in Chinese prisons for urging reforms of China's communist system. He now lives in the United States.

Chinese dissidents also topped speculation in 2008, when the 10 million kronor (\$1.4 million) award went to Finland's ex-president Martti Ahtisaari for decades of work as a peace mediator. That year, Chinese officials reacted angrily to the mere suggestion that a critic of its regime might win the prize.

The Nobel committee, however, has tended to ignore such pressure. Twenty years ago, it brushed aside Beijing's threats of diplomatic reprisals and awarded the prize to the Dalai Lama. This year also marks 50 years since China seized full control of Tibet.

Both Hu and Wei are among the favorites according to Irish bookmaker PaddyPower, which also gives low odds to Obama.

Obama embraced the goal of a nuclear-free world in an agenda-setting speech in April and renewed that commitment as the 15-nation U.N. Security Council last month unanimously approved an ambitious strategy to stop the proliferation of atomic weapons.

"In many ways we have a strong candidate for next year, Obama and other world leaders" who backed the U.N. resolution, said Jan Egeland, director of Oslo's Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. "But too late for this year."

Egeland was one of the key architects of the Oslo accords, a much-lauded series of negotiations between Israel and Palestine that came in 1993. Parties on both sides shared the peace prize the following year.

Kristian Berg Harpviken, the director of the Peace Research Institute, Oslo, said his top guess was Piedad Cordoba, a senator and leader of Colombians for Peace, an organization whose aim is to facilitate peace negotiations between the government and the country's leftist FARC guerrillas.

Harpviken, who stressed that the institute has no inside information, also mentioned Prince Ghazi bin Muhammad, a philosophy professor in Jordan who advocates interfaith dialogue in a region shot through with sectarian violence, and Afghan human rights activist Sima Samar. She currently leads the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission and serves as the U.N. special envoy to Darfur.

As always, the prize committee has remained tightlipped about who's been nominated, saying only that a record 205 groups and individuals were put forward by the nomination

deadline. The list of each year's nominees is kept sealed for half a century.

Those with nomination rights include members of national governments; university professors in history, political science, philosophy, law and theology; and former peace prize laureates.

The names of some candidates are known because those making the nomination have announced their pick.

Egeland, for example, said he nominated Denis Mukwege, a physician in the war-torn Democratic Republic of the Congo who opened a clinic to help rape victims.

"He is working for the people in the biggest war," he said. "Sometimes the committee has to address the biggest wars."

---

## **South China Morning Post**

### **One-child policy gives birth to a selfish generation**

**Fiona Tam**

**Oct 08, 2009**

Thirty years after the mainland began forbidding some families from having more than one child, in order to solve a dizzying population crisis, the country's psychiatrists say the result has been a self-centred generation that, having grown up without siblings has never learned to share.

Now, as the children from one-child families enter child-bearing age themselves, mainland authorities have decided to intervene to prevent similar problems occurring.

In Beijing and Guangzhou, health authorities are co-operating with counselling centres for adolescents and mental hospitals to launch special schemes to help thousands of "little emperors".

Families living in most Chinese cities are now barred from having more than one child each unless neither parent has a sibling. With aunts, uncles and cousins pruned from family trees, the attention and expectations of two parents and four grandparents all bear down on a single child.

To psychiatrists, the policy has produced a generation of self-centred loners, prone to exaggerated feelings of superiority and also liable to have trouble building close relationships.

And without intervention, these character traits are likely to be passed on to the next generation.

Dr Cui Yonghua, a psychiatrist at Beijing Anding Hospital, said young patients' records from the past 15 years suggested there were irremediable character defects among the new no-sibling generation.

He has joined a charitable family education programme, sponsored by Renmin University, which helps parents and children in one-child families.

"The situation is worrying," Cui said. "A whole generation born after 1978 has developed a large number of mental and behavioural problems because they were spoiled by their parents and grandparents, and this has significantly affected population quality.

"Beijing health authorities have noticed this problem since 1993, and we did a large-scale survey across the country between 1993 and '99. But intervention programmes for the generation of one-child families weren't started until last year."

Cui and his colleagues give free lectures at Beijing primary schools every week, teaching skills in communication and emotional control to parents and children.

In Guangzhou, a three-month programme at camps for adolescents to cure the little emperor syndrome, plus family education for parents, costs 27,000 yuan (HK\$30,700) per child. Organisers said the number of applications was overwhelming.

Psychological counsellor Yang Yufeng, of the Baiyun Mental Research Institute, said more than 4,000 children had joined the camp, but he estimated that accounted for only 10 per cent of demand.

The camp is part of an adolescent mental health programme launched by Guangzhou's Communist Youth League.

At the camp, adolescents with behavioural problems, almost all from one-child families, receive military training, psychological counselling, lessons in controlling emotions and legal classes, from 6am to 8pm.

Their parents are also required to take family education and communication programmes at

the camp every Sunday.

Yang said the youngest child to join the camp was an eight-year-old boy reared by a young couple, both of whom were from one-child families.

"We have seen so many parents with character defects who were born after the one-child policy began, and many of these parents have a big influence on their children's mental health," he said.

"Parents' mistakes account for more than 70 per cent of children's mental and behavioural problems."

A mother from Fujian province said she had ridden a bus for 11 hours to send her teenage son to the camp after he was expelled from secondary school because of behavioural problems.

"The money is worth it if the tutors can keep my only son from prison," she said. "I don't expect him to receive tertiary education. I'm satisfied as long as he can earn a livelihood with his hands."

Hong Kong toy factory owner Chai Kwong-wah, who has operated production lines in Shenzhen for 17 years, said today's young workers were much pickier.

"We have faced a chronic labour shortage because very few young people are willing to work in traditional manufacturing industries," Chai said.

"Many have complained to me that the jobs are low-paying and hard work, and some have even asked for air conditioning in their dormitories, something which I had never heard before from previous workers.

"They spend most of their salaries buying clothes and new mobile phones rather than sending it back to help their struggling parents."

But Yuan Zishan , a 21-year-old university graduate from Shenzhen and an only child, said: "To me, life isn't about fulfilling your parents' or society's expectations. It's your life, and you should pursue your own happiness."

---

## **After 60 years in power, Communist regime still fears protesters**

Ahead of 1 October celebrations, Chinese authorities arrested anyone who wanted to protest, whether in favour of human rights or against murders. For experts, suppressing all forms of dissent is a sign the regime is incapable of understanding and leading the population.

Beijing (AsiaNews/Agencies) – The lavish celebrations for the 60th anniversary of the People's Republic of China covered up a long series of recurrent abuses that included arbitrary arrests as well as threats and violent actions against human rights and pro-democracy activists. As powerful as mainland China might appear to be, it is still very much afraid of such people to the extent that it is prepared to violate every one of their rights to silence them, at least for a while.

Liu Chunbao from Yingkou City (Liaoning Province) is one of them. On 12 September, he was stopped en route to Beijing to submit a petition, beaten and forcibly sent home. He is currently held at a retirement home in Yingkou, under the watchful eye of eight guards.

Bi Caizhen from Xiaoyi (Shanxi) was also seized after she travelled to Beijing on 23 September to complain about corruption at Shaanxi's Liuwan Coal Mine and the murder of her husband, which she believes was carried out by thugs hired by management at the mine. She too was forcibly sent home where she is under close surveillance. According to the Chinese Human Rights Defenders organisation, friends and family have been unable to contact her.

Last Sunday night, Zhu Yingdi, who came to Beijing from Hangzhou to submit a petition, was seized by police. She was not formally charged but held at a guesthouse near Yongdingmen in the capital and prevented from contacting anyone. After that, she was forcibly brought back to Hangzhou and is now being held at a house in neighbouring Anji County.

According to Zhu's husband, Mr Dai, the couple's home in Hangzhou had been guarded around the clock by five men since 15 September; however, she managed to escape on the night of 1 October in order to present a petition against the forced demolition of their home many years ago, and to complain about local officials' repeated threats against her to keep quiet.

Things were slightly better for Shaanxi Ma Xiaoming, whom police took on “tourist” tour of Shaanxi, Guangdong and Fujian, from 7 September until 5 October in order to prevent him from having any contact with foreign or Hong Kong journalists.

For many analysts, a country’s strength is not only measured by its military might or its technological prowess, but by its capacity to unite the population around a common goal. Beijing prefers instead to prevent people from protesting, even if it is against murder.

---

## **The Wall Street Journal**

### **Sixty Years of Chinese Communism**

**The Party is increasingly out of step with the dynamic people it governs.**

**By GORDON G. CHANG**

There are, it is sometimes said, "a million truths in China." As the Communist Party celebrates the 60th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic today, there are only three worth keeping in mind.

First, the Chinese state will try to project strength. There will be fearsome weapons and 200,000 soldiers and performers in a grand procession in the center of Beijing, meant to convince onlookers of the power of the communist superstate. Do not be impressed. If communists do one thing well, it is staging spectacles. Destitute North Korea, for instance, is even better than China in putting on perfectly synchronized parades and mass gatherings. The National Day march says little about the effectiveness, resilience or vigor of China's one-party political system.

Second, the Chinese state, for all its apparent might, is deeply insecure. The theme of the celebration is "The Motherland and I, Marching Together." But so great is the regime's worry about possible unrest or disruption in protest of its rule that the laobaixing—ordinary Chinese—will not be walking in Beijing's parade. There will be no cheering crowds lining the route along Chang'an Avenue. Citizens will be kept away by a six-province security perimeter and more than a million police and "volunteers" enforcing the tightest security in the country's history. The government has booked all the hotel rooms overlooking the route to prevent anyone from seeing the parade up close. Nearby residents have been ordered not to look out their windows or invite guests.

That leads to a third point: The Communist Party is becoming increasingly divorced from its subjects. Sixty years ago, the Chinese people supported Mao Zedong as he swept Chiang

Kai-shek's Kuomintang from power. Mao rarely feared the populace he ruled, even unleashing the masses in the Cultural Revolution to do away with political foes. His successor Deng Xiaoping used the same tactic, albeit on a smaller scale, by initially allowing the Democracy Wall movement to proceed.

Mao and Deng, for all their faults, were sure of themselves. Their successors, however, are men of lesser talents—and are certainly far less confident in their rule. Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao have institutionalized the Communist Party and thereby prevented the excesses of their two predecessors, but they have done so at great cost to the vitality of their organization. In their zeal to weed out charismatic figures—to ensure, for instance, that there will be no Chinese Gorbachev—they have purged men and women of great imagination and capability from the party leadership's ranks. What is left are thousands of colorless cadres standing behind the faceless Mr. Hu.

The Chinese people, however, are a different story. While Beijing officials are holed up in their offices planning gargantuan parades, the country's citizens are making, in the words of journalist Hannah Beech, a "kinetic dash into the future." Remaking their country at breakneck speed, they are outracing everyone else. If there are at least a million truths in China, it is because the Chinese are changing fast, perhaps faster than any other group in the world today.

If there is any cause for optimism about China, this is it. Decades of government-sponsored economic development and social engineering have made people aware, assertive and, unlike their leaders, confident. By now, this process of social change has acquired its own momentum and the party can no longer stop it. Instead, it has responded by becoming more repressive in the political realm, especially since 2002, with crackdowns on everyone from newspaper editors to the writers of karaoke songs.

As the late Samuel Huntington noted, instability occurs under many conditions, but especially when political institutions do not keep up with the social forces unleashed by economic change. When I went to my dad's hometown, dusty Rugao in Jiangsu province, last summer, no one wanted to talk about the Olympics, which were seen as "the government's games." Instead, almost everyone asked how American democracy worked and who would win the presidential election.

The Communist Party has not sensed or responded to people's widespread desire to have more say in their government. So do not be surprised that last month's party plenum, despite the expectations of the global China-watching community, produced no political reforms of any significance. The country's ruling organization can put on large-scale displays of goose-stepping soldiers, but it cannot keep up with the Chinese people, who are, in a very real sense, the ones on the march.

\* Mr. Chang is the author of "The Coming Collapse of China" (Random House, 2001).

---

—