

RED FLAG: TENG TWISTED MAO'S 1964 DIRECTIVE

Peking Domestic Service in Mandarin 2315 GMT 25 Aug 76 OW

[Article by Fang Hai: "An Example of Attempts to Tamper with Marxism"--published in RED FLAG No 8, 1976]

[Text] Waving red flags to oppose the red flag, outwardly supporting Marxism but inwardly tampering with and emasculating its revolutionary soul, is an old trick used by the revisionists to oppose Marxism. An example of this is the tampering with Chairman Mao's directive that management itself is a matter of socialist education by chieftains of the revisionist line in the party like Teng Hsiao-ping and his ilk.

The important directive issued by the great leader Chairman Mao in 1964 on the socialist education movement has penetratingly analyzed the changes in class relations with the deepening of the socialist revolution, summed up scientifically the characteristics of class struggle during the historical stage of socialism and pointed out clearly that there exists a bureaucrat class in the party. Chairman Mao pointed out: "The bureaucrat class on the one hand and the working class together with the poor and lower-middle peasants on the other are two classes sharply antagonistic to each other." They "have turned, or are turning into bourgeois elements sucking the blood of the workers," and "these people are the target of the struggle, the target of the revolution."

The bureaucrat class mentioned by Chairman Mao refers to those in power in the party taking the capitalist road, namely, the bourgeoisie in the party. This directive and subsequent instructions in regard to this subject put forth by Chairman Mao represent an important development in Marxist-Leninist theory on class struggle and on the dictatorship of the proletariat; they have ideologically armed the whole party and the people of the whole country and become a powerful ideological weapon for combating and preventing revisionism and persisting in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the light of Chairman Mao's directive as a whole, management itself is a matter of socialist education. This means that management itself is also a part of class struggle. The key question of management is: Which class has control of leadership over socialist enterprises, what line is to be implemented, who is to be relied on, who is to be united with, who is to be attacked, and the interest of which class is to be served? Chairman Mao's directive deals with the socialist education movement in the urban and rural areas. This movement represents a tit-for-tat class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie both within and outside the party who are attacking us. The focal point of this movement is to struggle against those in power in the party taking the capitalist road. Liu Shao-chi and company, including Teng Hsiao-ping, opposed putting the emphasis of the movement on struggle against those in the party taking the capitalist road. They did their utmost to distort the class nature of this movement and protect the bourgeoisie in the party. This directive of Chairman Mao aims precisely at their revisionist line. It is crystal clear that the socialist education mentioned here refers to class struggle, particularly the struggle against the capitalist roaders.

However, for a long period of time, Liu Shao-chi, Lin Biao and Teng Hsiao-ping had been opposing Chairman Mao's directive. They did their best to conceal the principal aspects of Chairman Mao's directive and resorted to every trick to emasculate its revolutionary soul.

They completely ignored the fact that the bureaucrat class on the one hand and the working class together with the poor and lower-middle peasants on the other are two classes sharply antagonistic to each other; they ignored that those in power in the party taking the capitalist road are the key target of the socialist revolution. Instead, they wrote off the class feature that management itself is a matter of socialist education by taking sentences out of context, by brazen distortion and by twisting its meaning in application. To put it purely and simply, they distorted Chairman Mao's directive as a way to strengthen management.

How is management to be strengthened? Putting revisionist stuff into practice would mean nothing other than introducing a few "laws of the monarch" and letting the capitalist roaders exercise control, restriction and repression over the working class. This runs diametrically counter to Chairman Mao's directive.

In class society, enterprise management is invariably of a class nature. The key to success of socialist enterprise management is to put the power of leadership firmly in the hands of the Marxists and the worker masses, to unswervingly implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, to criticize the revisionist line and to turn the socialist enterprises into staunch bastion for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. The struggle between the two lines on the question of enterprise management fully indicates that the correctness or incorrectness of the line decides everything. Under the guidance of the correct line, the new socialist relations between people will be consolidated and developed, and the proletarian power of leadership over the enterprise will be consolidated on a continuing basis. If the incorrect line dominates somewhere, the bourgeois rights in the relations between people will be intensified and expanded, and the leaders of the enterprise will become bourgeois elements sucking the blood of the workers. Accordingly, such an enterprise will change its color.

Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao, Teng Hsiao-ping and the like distorted and tampered with Chairman Mao's directive because the directive exposed their essence as a bureaucrat class. Didn't Teng Hsiao-ping rampantly clamor that "reliance on the workers, peasants and soldiers is relative?" Didn't he attack our criticism of "control, restriction and repression" as putting unwarranted labels on them? In essence, the intention was to continue to use the power in their hands to deprive the workers of the power to manage enterprises, to exercise the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the worker masses by means of revisionist regulations and rules or to corrupt people's minds with such things as "putting bonuses in command" and "material incentives" so that the worker masses will once again become slaves of capital.

Chairman Mao further points out in this directive: "If the managerial staff do not join the workers on the shop floor, work, study and live with them and modestly learn one or more skills from them, then they will find themselves locked in acute class struggle with the working class all their lives and in the end are bound to be overthrown as bourgeois by the working class. If they don't learn any technical skills and remain outsiders for a long time, they won't be able to do management well either. Those in the dark are in no position to light the way for others." Teng Hsiao-ping, the arch unrepentant capitalist roader in the party, distorted this important directive of Chairman Mao's as something purely concerning the learning of technical skills. In "Some Problems in Accelerating Industrial Development," also known as the "20-Article Regulations," concocted under his aegis, the first half of this directive of Chairman

Mao's is entirely deleted, and all that is retained is "If they don't learn any technical skills and remain outsiders for a long time, they won't be able to do management well either." Here the words "work, study and live with them" are missing, the sharp struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie has disappeared, and the subject has reverted to pure management. With regard to management, attention is given solely to learning technical skills so as to avoid remaining outsiders. Is this not a flagrant alteration?

In socialist society, there still exist classes, class contradictions and class struggle, and the most essential relations between people are still class relations. The leaders of socialist enterprises and those who are led by them, the managerial staff and the worker masses are all masters of the country and the enterprises. The only difference lies in the jobs they are doing, while there is no discrimination as to who are high and honorable and who are low and humble. However, due to the existence of bourgeois rights, there are still different grades. Under these circumstances, it is possible for some people to turn the power in their hands into their privilege and become overlords riding roughshod over the people--the bureaucrat class--instead of servants of the people.

Chairman Mao has put forward that the cadres and managerial staff should work, study and live with the worker masses and learn one or more skills from them. This is precisely for the purpose of overcoming bureaucuracy, preventing revisionism, forging close ties between the cadres and the masses and correctly handling the contradictions among the people so as to insure that there will be no change in the color of our enterprises. The managerial staff can do their work well only when they put themselves in the position of ordinary workers, stand on an equal footing with the masses, consciously restrict bourgeois rights, identify themselves with the workers in ideology and in feeling, modestly learn from the masses and see to it that they are always doing physical labor and always thinking of the masses in their minds. If they fail to do this, but hold themselves aloft, divorce themselves from the masses or even bully, repress and exploit the workers, then they will find themselves locked in acute class struggle with the working class and, in the end, will be overthrown as bourgeois by the working class.

Should the cadres and the managerial staff learn technical skills? Of course, they should. Chairman Mao has consistently stressed that it is necessary to have our cadres master politics and vocational work and to make them both Red and expert. As for the relationship between politics and vocational work, however, politics is the commander. Only by perseveringly putting politics in command, working, studying and living with the masses and learning skills from them can the cadres serve the people. If they pay no attention to putting politics in command and to working, studying and living with the masses, but merely give heed to learning technical skills, they are casting aside the main spirit of this directive.

As a matter of fact, Teng Hsiao-ping was not genuinely concerned about learning technical skills by the cadres. His real aim was to oppose the cadres standing on an equal footing with the workers and working, studying and living with them; to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie in the party; to intensify and expand bourgeois rights; and to exploit and repress the workers. At the same time, he wanted to deceive our cadres and make them give up proletarian politics and take the road to become specialists without a socialist conscience. He wanted to train a lot of aristocratic overlords who are divorced from the masses and who hold themselves aloft and to cultivate the class basis for them to push the revisionist line.

It is by no means accidental that the inner-party capitalist roaders like Teng Hsiao-ping distorted Chairman Mao's important directive. They did this to meet their counter-revolutionary political requirement of subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat and restoring capitalism. In the meantime, this just exposed their feeble nature in carrying out their perverted action. Chairman Mao's important directive pointed out that the bourgeoisie in the party is the major target of our socialist revolution, and this hit the vital point of the capitalist roaders like Teng Hsiao-ping. Therefore, they conceived a bitter class hatred for Chairman Mao's directive. However, because of the unique might of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, they could do nothing but adopt a revisionist trick to emasculate its revolutionary contents, to eliminate its revolutionary keenness, to forget, obliterate or distort the revolutionary aspect and spirit of this theory, and to give first place to those things acceptable or likely to be acceptable to the bourgeoisie and sing the praises of them.

Nonetheless, how can alteration cover up the brilliancy of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought? The true revisionist feature of the capitalist roaders like Teng Hsiao-ping has once again been revealed by Chairman Mao's brilliant, important directive. Last year, when vigorously stirring up the right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, didn't Teng Hsiao-ping prate profusely that someone split Chairman Mao's viewpoint? This directive of Chairman Mao's has now been published in full. Comparing it with the materials drastically edited in a revisionist way in the "Regulations" and "Outline Report" carefully concocted by Teng Hsiao-ping to distort and split Chairman Mao's instructions provides an iron-clad fact to prove that it was none other than the revisionists like Teng Hsiao-ping who viciously split Chairman Mao's viewpoint.

#### WORKERS PARTICIPATE IN SCIENTIFIC WORK

Peking NCNA in English 1236 GMT 27 Aug 76 OW

[Text] Shanghai, August 26, 1976 (HSINHUA)--Scientific and technical exchange stations have been set up in 142 cities in China since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution began in 1966. This new form for conducting mass scientific experimental activities was created by the Chinese working class.

Taking part in the activities at these stations are 1,200 scientific and technical teams with a total of 54,000 people as backbone members, including workers, cadres and technical personnel. Workers make up 70 percent of the total membership. This contingent of amateurs takes the lead in carrying out mass scientific and technical activities in the cities. Cutting across the various trades, the stations organize technical innovation activists from different factories and enterprises according to their specialities and the tasks being undertaken. Apart from exchanging advanced techniques, they also work in coordination to solve key problems in production, train backbone technicians and popularize scientific knowledge by translating it into plain language and lively forms.

Before the Cultural Revolution, due to the influence of Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line, the organization of scientific and technical institutions and of scientific and technical exchange was left to a few experts. The revisionist line was repudiated during the Cultural Revolution by the masses and since then the workers have become the main force in the field of scientific and technical exchange.