

LU TING-YI

EDUCATION MUST BE
COMBINED WITH
PRODUCTIVE LABOUR

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS PEKING

EDUCATION MUST BE COMBINED
WITH PRODUCTIVE LABOUR

Lu Ting-yi

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1958

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This booklet was written by Lu Ting-yi, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, on the basis of the conclusion drawn at a conference of educational work convened by the Central Committee of the Party.

Notes, wherever necessary, are available at the back of the text.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

EDUCATION in our country has developed very rapidly since early this year. Figures compiled by the State Statistical Bureau up to the end of June, as yet incomplete, report 1,240 counties with universal primary school education, 68,000 middle schools¹ run by the people themselves, more than 400 institutions of higher learning newly established by the local authorities, approximately 90 million or more people attending literacy courses, and 444 counties in which illiteracy has been wiped out in the main. The victory in the rectification campaign and the struggle against the bourgeois rightists has given rise to the great leap forward in the industry and agriculture of our country. The leap forward, in turn, has precipitated an upsurge in the technical and cultural revolutions. The great advance in education is one of the signs of the high tide of the cultural revolution.

Two measures adopted at the end of last year and early this year pushed forward the advance in education. One was the application in all schools of the principle of combining work with study. The other was the establishment of agricultural middle schools. The practice of working while studying begins to combine the ordinary schooling with productive labour. It breaks the age-old tradition in the schools of looking down on physical labour, changes the atmosphere in the schools and has a very good influence on the social atmosphere. The agricultural middle schools are vocational (technical) schools set up by the people themselves, on a part-work

and part-study basis. Schools of this kind meet the pupils' desire to continue their studies and also prepare agricultural technicians. They are comparatively simple to set up and meet the practical needs of today. Without state financing, they still lighten the economic burden on students' families. Therefore, from the moment they were encouraged, they have been springing up like bamboo shoots, numbering tens of thousands in a few months. With primary school graduates freed from worry about lack of opportunity for further study, the number of primary schools run by the people themselves has also increased greatly and primary school education has rapidly become universal in many provinces, autonomous regions and cities. To meet the growing needs of production, adult education has also developed, the literacy campaign is in full swing and all sorts of spare-time general and technical schools have sprung up in great numbers. This high tide of the cultural revolution has spread from the countryside to the cities, where another stream is evident—the establishment of factories by schools and the setting up of schools by factories.

Now this combination of schooling and productive labour has given rise to the campaign to reform school curricula and the efforts to change school systems, as well as to change the composition of the teaching staffs, etc. Our educational work is like a hundred flowers in bloom, like "ten thousand horses galloping ahead." Education is now breaking the bounds of exclusive control by the experts and of doctrinairism to become the work of the whole Communist Party and the people as a whole, to become socialist education suited to the situation in our country. This transformation has been taking place under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Such absurdities as "more, faster, better and more economical results cannot obtain in education," "laymen cannot lead experts," "Communist Party committees do not understand education," "the masses do not understand education," etc. are being smashed to smithereens.

Our state is a proletarian dictatorship, a socialist state. Our education is not bourgeois but socialist education. Socialist education is inconceivable without Communist Party leadership. Socialist education is one of the powerful weapons for transforming the old and building the new society. The purpose of the socialist revolution and socialist construction is to do away with all exploiting classes and all systems of exploitation including their remnants and to bring into being a communist society in which the principle "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs" is carried out, and the difference between town and country and between mental and manual labour eliminated. This is precisely the purpose of socialist education. Such education can be led only by the political party of the working class, the Communist Party; the bourgeoisie is not qualified to lead education of this type. Only under the leadership of the Communist Party can educational work assume the new countenance that we see it has today.

During the past few years, prolonged debates on educational policy have taken place. Many theoretical and practical problems were settled at the conferences on educational work convened by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in April and June of this year.

The educational policy of the Chinese Communist Party has always been that education should serve the politics of the working class and be combined with productive

labour; and to apply this policy, education must be led by the Communist Party. This is the direct opposite of the educational policy of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois education is led by bourgeois politicians; it serves the politics of the bourgeoisie, that is, it serves the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; it is incompatible with proletarian dictatorship. Under the socialist system, the bourgeoisie dare not advocate directly and openly that education should be led by bourgeois politicians and be a weapon against the proletarian dictatorship; it can only put forward the hypocritical, deceptive propositions that "education should be led by experts" and "education for education's sake," with the aim of preventing education from serving the proletarian dictatorship. In our socialist country, therefore, the educational policy advocated by the bourgeoisie is embodied in the propositions "education for education's sake," "mental and manual work are separate" and "education should be led by experts."

Education is, first and foremost, the transmission and acquisition of knowledge. But what is knowledge? What is the purpose of transmitting and acquiring knowledge? We Communists interpret these questions differently from the bourgeoisie. Most bourgeois pedagogues hold that only book knowledge is knowledge and that practical experience cannot be regarded as knowledge. They therefore take the view that education means reading books; the more a man reads the more knowledge he has and those possessing book knowledge are of a higher order. As for productive labour, particularly manual labour and manual workers, they think all this is humiliating and leading one to nowhere. There are other bourgeois pedagogues who maintain that education is life and vice versa. They do not understand life as

the practice of class struggle and struggle for production, nor do they stress the importance of theory. So in the end they write off education in effect. These two sets of bourgeois views, though they appear to be diametrically opposed to each other, stem from the same root. They imply that there is no class differentiation among human beings and that pedagogy is a branch of learning that stands above classes.

We Communists view the question differently. We believe that pedagogy is a branch of social sciences. All the social sciences must be guided by politics, and education is no exception. People require education to wage the class struggle and the struggle for production. We believe there are only two kinds of knowledge in the world. One is knowledge of the class struggle. The class struggle is the struggle between groups of men of different economic status and this has already existed for several thousand years. In the present period of transition in our country, there is still class struggle. In the future, when classes no longer exist, even though there will be no class struggle, there will still be contradictions among the people; therefore, for ten thousand years to come there will still be poisonous weeds, that is, there will be struggle between truth and falsehood, between the advanced and the backward, between those who promote and those who impede the development of the productive forces.

The other kind of knowledge is the knowledge of the struggle for production, that is, the knowledge men gain in their struggle against nature. Philosophy is the summing up and generalization of the two kinds of knowledge. The importance of philosophy consists in the fact that the philosophy of dialectical materialism provides

men with a correct way of thinking. The essential distinction between men lies not in differences of "disposition" or personality, but, first of all, in their different class standpoints and, in addition, their ways of thinking. Class standpoints and ways of thinking are interrelated and at the same time are distinct from each other. Errors often emanate from two sources — class origin and the way of thinking. To avoid making great errors or to commit fewer errors, people must study politics and philosophy.

We Communists also maintain that there are two kinds of one-sided, fragmentary knowledge. One is book knowledge completely divorced from practical activity. Comrade Mao Tse-tung says: "What sort of knowledge is the bookish information of the students? Granted that their information is entirely true knowledge, it is still not knowledge acquired through their own personal experience but only a matter of theories written down by their forefathers to sum up the experiences of the struggle for production and of the struggle between classes. It is entirely necessary that they should inherit this kind of knowledge, but it must be understood that in a certain sense such knowledge is to them still something one-sided, something which has been verified by others but not yet by themselves. The most important thing is that they should be well versed in applying such knowledge in life and practice. Therefore, I should advise those who have only bookish knowledge but little or no practical experience that they should be aware of their own shortcomings and be modest."

Experience without theory, which is usually perceptual or partial, is also a kind of one-sided, fragmentary knowledge. Comrade Mao Tse-tung says: "Those com-

rades who are engaged in practical work will also come to grief if they misuse their experience. True, these comrades are often rich in experience which is certainly valuable, but it would be a great danger if they should rest content with such experience. They ought to realize that their knowledge is usually perceptual and partial, and that they lack rational and comprehensive knowledge; in other words, they are not equipped with theory, and their knowledge is thus comparatively incomplete. Without comparatively complete knowledge it is impossible to do revolutionary work well." What is then comparatively complete knowledge? Comrade Mao Tse-tung says: "There is only one kind of true theory in the world, the theory that is drawn from objective reality and then in turn verified by it; nothing else can be called theory in our sense." "All comparatively complete knowledge is acquired through two stages, first the stage of perceptual knowledge and secondly the stage of rational knowledge, the latter being the development of the former to a higher plane." "There are two kinds of incomplete knowledge: one is knowledge already contained in books and the other is knowledge which is usually perceptual and partial, and both are one-sided. Only through an integration of the two can excellent and comparatively complete knowledge emerge." ("Rectify the Party's Style in Work," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. IV)

The purpose of education is to enable students to acquire comparatively complete knowledge and not one-sided, incomplete knowledge. It follows that teachers are required to have comparatively complete knowledge.

Our educational workers always say that "education is the people's business." This is good, because in our

country this is true. But as the experience of the past nine years shows, there are two different interpretations of this phrase. The bourgeois pedagogues maintain that the masses of the people are entitled to receive education; but as to running education, that is only for the experts, not for the masses of the people. Their slogans are: "the professors must run the schools"; "laymen cannot lead experts"; "the Party does not understand education"; "the masses do not understand education"; "students must not criticize teachers"; etc.

These myths advanced by the bourgeois pedagogues were even accepted as true by some of our comrades, who forgot that our Party on hundreds and thousands of occasions had been called "laymen," yet, as it ultimately turned out, proved in fact rather more expert than any experts.

Some of our comrades advocated this sort of proposition: (1) only the state may run schools and (2) only one kind of school — general, full-time schools — may be set up. Past experience shows that the bourgeois pedagogues are keenly interested in this proposition because it ties the hands of the masses and does not permit them to set up schools. The bourgeois pedagogues know that if education were run along these lines, our country would find it very difficult to institute universal primary and secondary education and have no hope at all of instituting universal higher education, because the state has no way of carrying the huge burden of expenditures involved without heavy damage to production.

We Communists do not agree with the bourgeois pedagogues. We think that it is for the socialist revolution and socialist construction that the masses of the people need education. As the masses of the people are

able to conduct revolution and construction, they are, of course, capable not only of receiving education but also of running education. In running education, it is necessary to rely on a corps of specialists, for without a powerful specialized corps things will not go well, and at present, this corps of specialists still needs to be greatly strengthened by transferring cadres and establishing teachers' training schools. But the corps of specialists in education must integrate with the masses, and reliance on the masses in running education is the more important. Only by linking the specialized educational workers with the masses, adhering to the mass line of "from the masses and back to the masses," and carrying out the policy of setting up schools by the whole people under the leadership of the Party, is it possible, in fact certain, for our country's educational work to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results. And only by fully applying the policy of setting up schools by the whole people under the leadership of the Party is it possible to do all-round planning, duly considering and coordinating all aspects, so that not only does the educational work grow, but grows in a way that helps, and does not impede the development of production.

Our educational workers always say, too, that "educational work must receive leadership from the Party." This is undoubtedly correct. Socialist education must be led by the Communist Party and educational work in the socialist People's Republic of China must be led by the Communist Party of China. But there are also different interpretations of what leadership is and what kind of leadership is needed. What the bourgeois pedagogues call "Party leadership" is "Party leadership in political matters and our leadership in vocational mat-

ters." On questions unrelated to education they may listen to the Party; but if the Party has something to say about educational principles, policies, systems, methods and so on, they regard it as unacceptable. In words they want Party leadership, but in practice they do not want it; on minor questions they may listen to the Party, but on major questions they want to have their own way in defiance of the Party. Some of our comrades in the Party who work in the educational field put themselves up as experts in relation to Party committees and fail to respect their leadership. This is an expression of bourgeois influence in our Party.

In the past few years, the "theory" that the principal laws governing educational work are to be drawn from the study of the history of education, was spread widely in educational circles in our country. From this it would follow that to run socialist education it is just necessary to study the history of education, while recognizing Party leadership in the abstract; as for specific Party leadership, this is not needed.

Study of the history of education, provided it proceeds from the viewpoint of Marxist historical materialism, is indeed useful and helps towards an understanding of the laws which governed education for thousands of years in the era of class society. However, it must be understood that the laws governing education in the history of class society are not the same as the laws governing socialist education, much less the laws governing socialist education in China. For the past thousands of years, education was in the hands of the slave-owners, the landlord class and the bourgeoisie. The principal laws to be derived from this history are those governing exploiting-class education. They are certainly a far cry from the

laws of socialist education. Mistakes would be inevitable if these laws were copied as the laws of socialist education.

What the facts show is that the so-called theory that "the principal laws governing educational work are to be drawn from the study of the history of education" is in reality a pretence by which the study of the history of education is used to keep bourgeois educational ideas, policies, systems, methods and so on intact under the socialist system and to palm these off as socialist.

In China's history of education there is one aspect which is of the people. There was the Confucian idea that "in the matter of instruction, no distinction should be made between men of all sorts and conditions"; Mencius' idea that "the people are more important than the king"; the idea of Hsun Tzu that "man will overcome nature"; Chu Yuan's criticism of the vices of royalty; Szema Chien's eulogy of resistance to evil; the ancient materialism of Wang Chung, Fan Chen, Liu Tsung-yuan, Chang Tsai and Wang Fu-chih; the democratic literature of Kuan Han-ching, Shih Nai-an, Wu Cheng-en and Tsao Hsueh-chin² and the democratic revolution of Sun Yat-sen. The conditions in which these people lived varied. Many of them did not write specifically on education. But what has just been referred to could not but have its impact on the education of the people. All this must be mentioned in talking about the history of Chinese education.

But taking the major aspects, education over the past thousands of years was certainly an instrument in the hands of the exploiting classes, while socialist education is an instrument in the hands of the working class. This change, from an instrument of the exploiting classes to

an instrument of the working class, is a qualitative leap in education and a great revolution in education itself. To study the history of education without seeing this qualitative leap is to depart from dialectics; it is metaphysical. We advocate the study of the history of education but we oppose the view that the principal laws of socialist education can be found through such study because it would lead us to right deviationist mistakes.

Moreover, even the laws of socialist education, though they are of the same character in different countries, differ in their specific features. Doctrinaire mistakes would be made if the specific features of one's own country are not studied. What are the specific features of our country? First, ours is a socialist country; second, it has a huge population and covers a vast area; third, its economy and culture are backward; fourth, it is led by the Communist Party and its industry and agriculture are leaping forward rapidly; and fifth and most important, our country has carried out a serious rectification campaign and anti-rightist struggle, the people are encouraged to air their views, contend, debate to the fullest extent and publicize their views in *tatsepao*.³ We must define our educational principles, policies, systems, methods and so on in accordance with these characteristics of our own, combining the universal truths of Marxism with the specific conditions of our country.

It is clear, therefore, that the so-called theory that "the principal laws governing educational work are to be drawn from the study of the history of education" is a most pernicious "theory" which divorces education from reality and leads it to right deviationist and doctrinaire mistakes. Not to proceed from the objective realities of one's own country is subjective, anti-Marxist thinking.

If we err in our way of thinking, we cannot find out the major laws governing the development of things. If we do not proceed from reality and if we go against the universal truths of Marxism, we will surely make mistakes, either right deviationist or doctrinaire mistakes, or both. This is the important lesson we should draw from the educational work of our country.

We are Marxists and so we maintain that it is necessary to proceed from objective reality. Therefore we must first study our own conditions seriously and take to it with enthusiasm. We also study the experiences of our fraternal countries seriously, and we study history seriously, but our purpose is not to copy or transplant but to understand history, understand historical materialism in the field of education, so as to have examples for study with the aid of which we can do our work satisfactorily in accordance with our own conditions. Whatever work we do, we must rely closely on the leadership of the Party because it is none but the Communist Party that understands our conditions best and knows Marxism best. The Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the working class; it must and can give leadership in everything. From the Central Committee down to the basic organizations, the Communist Party is the organized, disciplined vanguard of the working class. We have relied on this vanguard for victory in the revolutionary war and for success in the socialist revolution on the economic, political and ideological fronts and we must rely on it for victory in the technical and cultural revolutions. Our educational workers should accept Party leadership not only in politics but also in the sphere of educational ideas, policy and work. Only in this way will it be possible to keep

up with the times and avoid mistakes or make fewer mistakes.

In the final analysis, the debate on education that has been going on in recent years boils down to the question of "what is all-round development." Marxists believe in "producing fully developed human beings" and in achieving this through education. It is well that our educationists often talk about all-round development. Yet there are differences of principle in the interpretation of "all-round development." Judging by our country's experience in education in the past nine years, although the bourgeois pedagogues do not directly and openly oppose all-round development and even appear to "support the principle actively," yet they interpret it one-sidedly as meaning education through learning of extensive book knowledge. They do not hold with students studying politics and participating in productive labour. In fact they vulgarize the idea of all-round development and equate it with the bourgeois educational line which rears "know-alls."

We Communists interpret all-round development in an entirely different way. The essence of all-round development is that the students should acquire comparatively broader knowledge, become versatile people capable of "going over in sequence from one branch of production to another, depending on the requirements of society or their own inclinations." (F. Engels: *Principles of Communism*) We maintain that workers should be versatile in industrial production and peasants should be versatile in agricultural production; moreover that workers should at the same time be peasants and peasants should be workers. We maintain that civilians should take up military service and retired military men go back

to production. We maintain that cadres should participate in physical labour and productive workers in administration. All these propositions are already being put into practice gradually. Measures such as these which involve both the division of labour and change of work conform to the needs of society. They are more reasonable than the division of labour under the capitalist system. They not only increase production but enable the state to carry out reasonable readjustment of the productive forces when this becomes socially necessary, without causing social upheaval.

Our leap forward in industry and agriculture is already giving rise to the problem of the partial transfer of producers to other branches of production when what they are making grows in output to the point where it meets the current maximum demands of the people and there is even a surplus. Without such transfer there would be failure to meet the demands of the people, to develop the productive forces of society continuously and raise the people's living standards continuously. Our educational and other relevant spheres of work must prepare the ground for such transfers. Education should enable the students to acquire broad knowledge. But how broad depends on concrete objective and subjective conditions. In the future, when communist society is fully consolidated, developed and mature, men will be trained in many kinds of work and be able to undertake many professions while specializing in selected fields. This is what we aim at. We must march to this goal.

In our country's present conditions, we can train people to do many kinds of work, but cannot yet train "people to be capable of undertaking any profession." The essence of all-round development is also that the knowl-

edge imparted to the students must be not one-sided and fragmentary, but comparatively complete knowledge. This requires that education should serve politics and be combined with productive labour. Speaking of his ideal of education in the future, Karl Marx referred to "an education that will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings." (*Capital*, Vol. I) That is, he urged that students acquire comparatively complete knowledge and be able to engage not only in mental labour but manual labour as well. Book knowledge alone, however broad, is still partial and incomplete. People with extensive book knowledge alone and without experience of practical work are only what the bourgeoisie calls "know-alls." They are not what we regard as people of all-round development. Physical development is necessary in childhood and this development must be sound. In addition, a communist spirit and style and collective heroism should be inculcated in childhood. This is the moral education of our day. Both are linked with the development of intellectual education. Both are related to manual work and therefore the principle of combining education with labour is unshakable.

In brief, the all-round development we stand for is this: students should be enabled to acquire comparatively complete, broader knowledge, grow up physically fit and acquire communist morals. In his *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "Our educational policy must enable everyone who gets an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a cultured, so-

cialist-minded worker." This is our educational principle of all-round development. "A cultured, socialist-minded worker" is a man who is both politically conscious and educated. He is able to undertake both mental and manual work. He is what we regard as developed in an all-round way, both politically and professionally qualified. He is a worker-intellectual and an intellectual-worker.

We insist on the educational principle of all-round development. We consider that the only method to train human beings in all-round development is to educate them to serve working-class politics and combine education with productive labour. We say the only method, because there is no other way to achieve this aim. Bourgeois pedagogues do not agree. They consider the only method to train people to have what they call "all-round development" is to read books and learn by rote. They are absolutely against students learning politics and, in particular, students becoming labourers. According to our educational principle of all-round development, we can and must rely on the masses to run education. According to the bourgeois educational principle of so-called "all-round development," they can rely only on experts to run education; they cannot rely on the masses. According to our educational principle of all-round development, education must be under the leadership of the Communist Party. According to the bourgeois educational principle of so-called "all-round development," education can only be led by the experts; it does not need the leadership of the Communist Party as the Communist Party is "a layman." From this we see that different interpretations of all-round development lead to different and even opposite conclusions. That is why we say that the debate

on education in recent years ultimately boils down to the question of "what is all-round development." This is essentially a struggle between proletarian and bourgeois educational ideas.

If we followed our bourgeois pedagogues' attitude towards knowledge, towards education as the business of the people, towards leadership by the Communist Party and towards all-round development, our educational work would be dragged back to the old bourgeois road. Precisely because of this, it is necessary to give a clear explanation of our communist interpretation of these questions.

Great achievements have been made in our educational work, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, in the past nine years since the founding of the People's Republic of China. These are — the recovery of the right to run education, a right formerly usurped by the imperialists; the satisfactory taking over of the schools all over the country; the abolition of the fascist system of school management practised by the Kuomintang reactionary clique, the abolition of its fascist education and domination of the students by its special agents; the setting up of a socialist educational system; and the wiping out, in the main, of the counter-revolutionaries and other bad elements hidden in educational circles. In addition, courses in Marxism-Leninism have been opened in the schools; ideological remoulding has been conducted among the teachers and students; the universities and departments have been reorganized and teaching systems reformed; and struggles have been waged against the bourgeois rightists. The number of students in institutions of higher learning, middle schools and primary schools has in all cases increased several

fold; big advances have been made in the campaign against illiteracy and in spare-time cultural and technical education; the policy of working while studying has begun to be applied in all schools; organizations of the Chinese Communist Party have been established among the educational workers; and large numbers of people have been trained as cadres for socialist construction.

But the struggle between working-class and bourgeois ideas proceeds continuously on the educational front. This is in the nature of a struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads. Bourgeois thinking has hampered the development of education. When the bourgeois rightists made their ferocious attacks, they even attempted to use the students as a stepping stone for the restoration of capitalism. This was at one time the dream of Chang Po-chun, Lo Lung-chi, Tseng Chao-lun, Chien Wei-chang and others of their ilk. Our victory in the anti-rightist struggle and the great leap forward in industry and agriculture have turned bad things to good account and enabled people to understand better the danger and baneful consequences of bourgeois thinking in educational work. The work in the past nine years has given us experience and enabled us to explain our Party's policy of educational work more clearly and systematically.

The chief mistake or defect in our educational work has been the divorce of education from productive labour. The policy of combining education with productive labour was put forward by our Party early in 1934. Comrade Mao Tse-tung already then said: "What is the general policy for the Soviet⁴ culture and education? It is to educate the broad masses of the toiling people in the spirit of communism, to make culture and education

serve the revolutionary war and the class struggle, to combine education with labour and to enable the broad masses of the Chinese people to enjoy civilization and happiness." In 1954 when the period of economic rehabilitation was over and the First Five-Year Plan already in operation, the Central Committee of the Party raised the question of adding productive labour to the curricula of the schools. But the proposal encountered obstruction and was not carried through at that time. The Central Committee of the Party repeatedly stressed its policy that education must be combined with productive labour — at the national conference on propaganda work in March 1957, in the editorial of *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) on April 8 of the same year and at the Nanning meeting in January 1958. It is only now that this policy of the Party has been carried out on a nation-wide scale. Education must serve politics, must be combined with productive labour and must be led by the Party — these three things are interrelated. Education divorced from productive labour is bound to lead, to a degree, to the neglect of politics and of Party leadership in educational work, thus divorcing education from the realities of our country and eventually causing right deviationist and doctrinaire mistakes.

The combination of education with productive labour is required by our country's socialist revolution and socialist construction, by the great goal of building a communist society and by the need to develop our education with greater, faster, better and more economical results.

The aim of our socialist revolution is to wipe out all exploiting classes, all systems of exploitation, including their remnants. Basic victory has now been won in the socialist revolution on the economic front. On the political

and ideological fronts, too, the socialist revolution has achieved decisive victory. As the Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China has pointed out in its resolution, our task is "to actively carry out the technical and cultural revolutions while continuing with the socialist revolution on the economic, political and ideological fronts."

The cultural revolution is to enable all 600 million Chinese people, except for those who are incapable, to do productive work and to study. This means to make the masses of our workers and peasants intellectuals as well and our intellectuals labourers too. Only when the masses of the workers and peasants and the intellectuals alike develop along the line of making up what they lack, is it possible to change thoroughly the irrational legacy of the old society and eradicate the backwardness of each, i.e., eliminate the cultural deficiency of the masses of workers and peasants and eliminate the bourgeois thinking of the intellectuals. This is, therefore, a very far-reaching revolution which demands that education must serve working-class politics, that it be combined with productive labour.

Marx said: "An early combination of productive labour with education is one of the most potent means for the transformation of present-day society." (Karl Marx: *Critique of the Gotha Programme*) It is impossible to carry through the cultural revolution without combining education with productive labour. Cultural revolution is beneficial to the country, to the masses of workers and peasants as well as the intellectuals. Only those who stick to the bourgeois standpoint do not want such a revolution. The bourgeois policy of education for education's

sake, and divorcing mental from physical labour, is incompatible with the socialist revolution.

Our socialist construction demands the utmost effort and consistent pressing ahead; it demands building the country industriously and thriftily; it also demands technique and culture and the training of large numbers of socialist-minded and professionally proficient technicians in conformity with the principle of achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results. These needs of socialist construction also demand the combination of education with productive labour. Lenin said: "It is impossible to visualize the ideal of future society without combining the training and education of the young generation with productive labour. Neither training and education without productive labour, nor productive labour without parallel training and education could have been raised to the height demanded by present-day technique and the state of scientific knowledge" (*Pearls of Narodniks' Hare-brained Schemes*). The policy of combining education with productive labour will certainly raise the quality of education. This holds true for intellectual and for moral and physical education. The educational policy of divorcing mental and manual labour cannot meet the needs of socialist construction.

The future communist society will be one of "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs," a society in which the differences between town and country and between mental and manual labour are eliminated. Our big leap forward in industry and agriculture has made the attainment of communism no longer a far distant prospect. One hundred and ten years ago Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto formulated ten measures to establish a communist society, which

"will be pretty generally applicable . . . in the most advanced countries." Of these, the first eight have already been carried out in China, through the adoption of methods suitable to the actual conditions of our country; and the last two, namely "the combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; the gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country" and "the combination of education with industrial production," are beginning to be carried out.

It is clear to everyone that because of the application, in the course of industrial development, of the policy "to develop industry and agriculture simultaneously while giving priority to heavy industry; and, with centralized leadership, over-all planning, proper division of labour and co-ordination to develop national and local industries, and large, small and medium-sized enterprises simultaneously," industry has appeared in the rural areas and, with it, the phenomenon of workers who are simultaneously peasants and peasants who are simultaneously workers. This phenomenon has the embryo of communist society.

Because the principle of combining education with productive labour is beginning to go into operation, with schools setting up their own factories and farms, and factories and agricultural co-operatives establishing their own schools on a large scale, the phenomenon of students who are at the same time workers and peasants and of workers and peasants who are students at the same time is beginning to appear. This, too, has the embryo of communist society. It can be imagined that when China enters into communism, our basic social organizations will be many communist communes. With few exceptions, each basic unit will have workers, peasants, traders,

students and militia. In the field of education, each basic unit will have its own primary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning; at the same time everybody will have the time to acquire education as both labourer and intellectual. In *The Housing Question* Engels anticipated this situation when he said: "And it is precisely this industrial revolution which has raised the productive power of human labour to such a high level that — for the first time in the history of humanity — the possibility exists, given a rational division of labour among all, of producing not only enough for the plentiful consumption of all members of society and for an abundant reserve fund, but also of leaving each individual sufficient leisure so that what is really worth preserving in historically inherited culture — science, art, forms of intercourse — may not only be preserved but converted from a monopoly of the ruling class into the common property of the whole of society, and may be further developed." To attain this prospect, our educational work must not go in the direction of divorcing mental and manual labour but in the direction of combining mental with manual labour and education with productive labour.

To the bourgeois educationalists it seems impossible to get greater, faster, better and more economical results in education. But the tremendous growth in educational work since the beginning of this year has proved that the application of the mass line in educational work can make it develop with greater, faster, better and more economical results. The combination of education with labour, making education an activity that is warmly welcomed by the workers and peasants, is an important way of arousing mass initiative in the setting up of schools.

The principles of running schools by applying the mass line under Communist Party leadership are: First, to combine unity with diversity. The purpose of the training is unified, that is, to train socialist-minded, educated workers; but the schools can be run by the central or local authorities, factories and mines, enterprises and agricultural co-operatives, and the forms the schools can take are varied. They may be full-time, or part-work part-study, or spare-time schools; they may collect fees or be free of charge. As production grows further and working hours can be shortened, the present spare-time schools will be similar to part-work part-study schools. When production develops considerably and public accumulation rises greatly, the schools that now charge fees will similarly become free.

Second, to combine the spreading of education widely with the raising of educational levels. The level of education must be raised on the basis of popularization and popularization must be so guided as to raise the level of education. Some of the full-time, the part-work part-study and the spare-time schools undertake the task of raising educational levels at the same time as education is being spread extensively through part-work part-study and spare-time courses. Since the schools that popularize education are part-work part-study or spare-time schools, they can meet the whole or the greater part of their expenditures themselves, and can find teachers locally in accordance with the principle that "every capable person can teach." They can develop gradually by perfecting their curricula, equipment and teaching staff with aid from the government. In schools where courses in labour are lacking, the stress should be on introducing them and in schools where the deficiency is in the basic courses

the stress should be on introducing these, so that both kinds of schools go forward to fill in what they lack and apply the principle of combining theory with practice more effectively.

Third, to combine over-all planning with decentralization, to bring into play the initiative of both the various central government departments and the local authorities and the masses so as to develop education with greater, faster, better and more economical results. In planning educational work, the central and the local authorities, guided by the Party committees, can develop education as fast as possible and enable this development to benefit, not hamper, the growth of production.

Fourth, to apply the mass line in the political, administrative, pedagogic and research work in the schools. In all such work, it is necessary, guided by the Party committees, to adopt the method of open and free airing of views, and *tatsepao* and the method of the "three combinations" (for instance, in working out teaching plans and programmes, the method can be adopted of combining the efforts of the teachers and the students under the leadership of the Party committee and in teaching, the method of inviting people with practical experience to give lectures, in co-ordination with the teachers in special fields, under the leadership of the Party committee, and so on), and to establish democratic relations of equality — changing the old irrational relations — between the leadership and the rank and file and between the teachers and the students. Experience shows that remarkable achievements have been made where these methods have been adopted.

A struggle has to be waged before the combination of education with labour is effected, and this struggle will

be a protracted one. Why? Because this is a revolution upsetting old traditions in educational work that have persisted for thousands of years. The principle of divorcing mental from manual labour has dominated educational work for thousands of years. All the exploiting classes in history have adhered firmly to this principle. More than two thousand years ago, Confucius took a stand against combining education with productive labour. He condemned Fan Chih⁵ who "requested to be taught husbandry" and "requested to be taught gardening" as a "small man." Mencius opposed Hsu Hsing,⁶ saying: "Those who labour with their minds govern others; those who labour with their strength are governed by others. Those who are governed by others support them; those who govern others are supported by them. This is a principle universally recognized." On this point, bourgeois pedagogues are in full accord with Confucius and Mencius. Originally, education was linked with productive labour, but was separated in class society; now the link will be reforged.

Fourier and Owen, the Utopian socialists of the eighteenth century, were the first to put forward the idea of combining education with productive labour. Marx, Engels and Lenin all endorsed this idea. In Volume I of *Capital* Marx expressed the view that a part-work part-study system of schooling was more suitable for children than full-time study. In "The Directives to the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council on Some Questions" he suggested: "In a reasonable social order every child must become a productive worker starting at the age of nine."

He maintained that children from the age of nine to twelve should do two hours' work every day in a work-

shop or at home, children from thirteen to fifteen years of age four hours and from sixteen to seventeen years of age six hours. He believed that "the combination of remunerative productive labour, mental education, physical exercise and polytechnical training elevates the working class considerably above the level of the higher and middle classes." Marx once foretold that "there can be no doubt that when the working class comes into power, as inevitably it must, technical instruction, both theoretical and practical, will take its proper place in the working-class schools." (*Capital*, Volume I) Only in a socialist country led by the working class and the Communist Party can the principle of combining education with productive labour be carried into effect and play a great role in revolution and construction. Marx's prophecy will come true in our country.

We must realize that to carry the combination of education with productive labour into effect means a fight with the old traditions that have persisted for thousands of years. Without the communist style of toppling down the old idols, burying doctrinairism, and daring to think, speak and do, without the creative spirit of combining the universal truths of Marxism with the concrete realities of our country, we cannot succeed. Today, in our educational work, vigorous efforts are being made to pull down the out-dated and set up the new. Bourgeois and doctrinaire ideas are being broken down and new, Marxist educational theories, systems and methods, curricula and school systems suited to our country are being created. This educational revolution has solid economic foundations. The Marxist doctrine of historical materialism teaches that the superstructure must conform to the economic base. The political system is superstructure,

the concentrated expression of economic life. Education comes into the category of ideology and is also superstructure; it serves politics. Class society which has existed for thousands of years has had ownership by slave-owners, landlords or capitalists as its economic base. The political systems that conform to these types of ownership are the dictatorships of the slave-owners, the landlords and the bourgeoisie. The types of education that serve these dictatorships are those of the slave-owners, the landlords and the bourgeoisie. These types of education differ from each other, but all have this in common that education is divorced from productive labour, mental from manual labour, and manual labour and manual labourers are despised. The divorce of mental from manual labour is needed by all the exploiting classes, including the bourgeoisie.

Our society has socialist ownership as its economic base. The political system suited to socialist ownership is proletarian dictatorship. Our education serves the proletarian dictatorship. Therefore, contrary to the old traditions that persisted for thousands of years, it must apply the principle of combining education with productive labour so as to eliminate the difference between mental and manual labour; and this also means wiping out the survivals of all the systems of exploitation that have existed in history, so that humanity may enter into communist society.

The principle of combining education with productive labour is needed by the working class and all other working people. This principle, which conforms to the people's desires, will certainly prevail. On the other hand, the principle of divorcing mental from manual labour, since it does not conform to the socialist economic base and

the people's requirements, will sooner or later be discarded by the people even though it has a tradition of thousands of years. With politics in command, with leadership by the Communist Party, and the rallying of the entire Party and all educational workers who can be rallied to fight against bourgeois educational policy and for the application of the Party's educational policy, we can so carry through our cultural revolution that all of our 600 million people are able to do productive work and all are able to study, changing them into new men who are both labourers and intellectuals.

NOTES

¹In China the primary schools cover the first six years of schooling. Middle schools account for the years after primary school, up to college.

²Confucius (551-479 B.C.), great philosopher and educationalist of ancient China.

Mencius (c. 390-305 B.C.), famous philosopher of the Warring States period and a follower of Confucius. In his book *Meng Tzu*, a collection of his sayings preserved by his disciples, he said: "The people are most important; next comes the government; the king is the least important."

Hsun Tzu (c. 340-245 B.C.), a materialist thinker of the Warring States period. In the chapter "On Heaven" in his book *Hsun Tzu* he expounded the theory that man will overcome Heaven.

Chu Yuan (c. 340-278), a great patriotic poet and statesman of the Warring States period. In his poetical work *Li Sao* he severely criticized the rulers of his state because they listened to the words of treacherous ministers and persecuted the loyal ones.

Szema Chien (c. 145-90 B.C.), a great historian, outstanding thinker and literary writer of the Han dynasty. In his work *Shih Chi (Historical Records)* he paid tribute to the heroic leaders of peasants in their revolt against tyrants, and exposed the vices and crimes of the rulers of different historical periods.

Wang Chung (27-107), a materialist and atheist of the Eastern Han dynasty. He wrote a book called *Lun Heng (Impartial Discussion)* in which he attacked the various kinds of religious doctrines and superstitions spread by the feudal rulers. He carried materialism and atheism to a further stage of development.

Fan Chen (c. 450-515), famous materialist of the Southern and Northern Dynasties. He wrote the book *Shen Mieh Lun (Extinction of Spirit)* in which he expounded the doctrine of atheism.

He explained the relation between spirit and matter from the materialist standpoint of view, holding that spirit is a function of matter. He mercilessly attacked Buddhism to which the feudal rulers were greatly devoted.

Liu Tsung-yuan (773-819), a famous literary writer and materialist of the Tang dynasty. In his writings he attacked theism, religion, and superstitions. In an essay on feudalism he held that emperors do not rule by the Mandate of Heaven.

Chang Tsai (1020-1077), philosopher of the Sung dynasty. In his book *Cheng Meng (Right Teaching for Youth)* he explained his view of Nature from the materialist standpoint, sometimes with a dialectical approach in its crude form.

Wang Fu-chih (1619-1692), materialist thinker and patriot of the period between the Ming and Ching dynasties. In his commentaries on *Yi Ching (Book of Change)* and *Shu Ching (Book of History)* he held the theory that practice comes before knowledge.

Kuan Han-ching (c. 1227-1297), playwright of the Yuan dynasty. He was the author of *Midsummer Snow*, *Butterfly Dream*, and other plays.

Shih Nai-an (1296-1370), great literary writer of the Yuan dynasty. He was the author of *Shui Hu (Water Margin)*.

Wu Cheng-en (c. 1500-1582), literary writer of the Ming dynasty and author of *Hsi Yu Chi (Pilgrimage to the West)*.

Tsao Hsueh-chin (c. 1722-1763), great literary writer of the Ching dynasty and author of *Hung Lou Meng (Dream of the Red Chamber)*.

³ Opinions and criticisms written out in bold Chinese characters on large sheets of paper and posted for everybody to see.

⁴ This refers to the Soviet areas in China which existed at that time under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party.

⁵ Fan Chih, disciple of Confucius. The *Analects* record a conversation between Fan Chih and Confucius. Fan said that he wanted to learn farming; Confucius said that he was not so good a teacher as the peasant. Fan Chih said that he wanted to learn how to plant vegetables; Confucius said that he was not so good a teacher as the kitchen-garden keeper. After Fan Chih had left

Confucius told his other disciples that Fan was a man with no great ambition. This conversation shows that Confucius had a contempt for productive labour and that he was against the combination of education with production.

⁶ Hsu Hsing, a thinker of the Warring States period. He held the theory that all men, be they kings or common people, should till the land and weave cloth themselves. Mencius did not agree with Hsu Hsing. He held that those who work with their brain govern while those who engage in manual labour are governed. Those who are governed must support those who govern. From this we can see that Mencius was against the combination of brain work and manual labour.

教育必須与生产劳动相結合
陆定一著

*

外文出版社出版（北京）
1953年10月第一版
编号：（英）7050—8