



**BETRAYAL OF
PROLETARIAN
DICTATORSHIP
IS THE HEART
OF THE BOOK ON
“SELF-CULTIVATION”**

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

Quotation from Chairman
Mao Tse-tung

All revolutionary struggles in the world are aimed at seizing political power and consolidating it.

“This Year’s Election”

**BETRAYAL OF PROLETARIAN
DICTATORSHIP IS THE HEART
OF THE BOOK ON
“SELF-CULTIVATION”**

by the Editorial Departments of *Hongqi (Red Flag)*
and *Renmin Ribao (People's Daily)*

(May 8, 1967)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1967

All revolutionary struggles in the world are aimed at seizing political power and consolidating it. The desperate struggles waged by counter-revolutionaries against revolutionary forces are likewise solely for the sake of maintaining their political power.

— Mao Tse-tung

The book on the "self-cultivation" by Communists is the representative work of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road. It is a big poisonous weed opposed to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought. Its poison has spread throughout China and the world. It must be thoroughly criticized and repudiated.

What is the heart of this book?

It is the betrayal of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And this betrayal means the complete, out-and-out betrayal of Marxism-Leninism itself and of the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

Marx pointed out over a hundred years ago:

. . . And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society, nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this struggle of the classes, and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of pro-

duction; 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society. . . .¹

Lenin again emphatically pointed out fifty years ago:

It is often said and written that the main point in Marx's teachings is the class struggle; but this is not true. And from this untruth very often springs the opportunist distortion of Marxism, its falsification in such a way as to make it acceptable to the bourgeoisie. For the doctrine of the class struggle was created *not* by Marx, *but* by the bourgeoisie before Marx, and generally speaking it is *acceptable* to the bourgeoisie. Those who recognize *only* the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to be still within the boundaries of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the doctrine of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who *extends* the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. This is what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as big) bourgeois. This is the touchstone on which the *real* understanding and recognition of Marxism is to be tested.²

Like all opportunists in the history of the international communist movement, the author of the book on self-cultivation curtails and distorts the fundamentals of Marxism. Though he lards his nearly hundred-page book with certain abstract

¹"Marx to J. Weydemeyer" (March 5, 1852), *Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955, Vol. II, p. 452.

²V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965, pp. 39-40.

phrases on class struggle, he makes no mention whatsoever of the actual class struggle or of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Naturally without the dictatorship of the proletariat, his talk about class struggle is just deceitful rubbish wholly acceptable to the bourgeoisie.

The book was first published in July 1939 and reprinted many times during the War of Resistance Against Japan and the War of Liberation. None of these editions made any mention of the anti-Japanese war or the class struggle during the former period,¹ nor did they mention the War of Liberation or the class struggle during the latter period, or the question of seizing political power. This kind of book on self-cultivation could not do the least harm to Japanese imperialism, or U.S. imperialism and its lackey the Kuomintang of Chiang Kai-shek.

During the War of Resistance Against Japan, Chairman Mao pointed out that "the seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution"² and that "the development, consolidation and bolshevization of our Party have proceeded in the midst of revolutionary wars; without armed struggle the Communist Party would assuredly not be what it is today"³. Obviously, the development, consolidation and building of the Party and the ideological remoulding of Party members cannot be discussed outside the context of the revolutionary wars and the seizure of power by armed force. Yet in the very years of war when the guns were roaring and when we were struggling for political power, the top Party person in authority taking the

¹None of the editions of the book published before 1962 made mention of the War of Resistance Against Japan. In the revised 1962 edition, a passage concerning the policy on the anti-Japanese national united front was added as an illustration in the section, "The Unity of Theoretical Study and Ideological Self-Cultivation".

²Mao Tse-tung, "Problems of War and Strategy", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 219.

³Mao Tse-tung, "Introducing *The Communist*", *Selected Works*, FLP, Peking, 1965, Vol. II, p. 292.

capitalist road wanted people to forget about the fundamental task of seizing political power by armed force and indulge in self-cultivation. "Self-cultivation" of this kind can only cultivate philistines who reject revolutionary war and refuse to seize political power! The philistine products of such cultivation are no Communists, but Social-Democrats of the Second International.

When a revised edition of the book on self-cultivation was printed in August 1949, and when it was republished with many additions and deletions in August 1962, it dished up the same old stuff. Though revised and republished on these dates, the book not only says nothing about the socialist revolution or the class struggle in socialist society, but remains completely silent about the dictatorship of the proletariat. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road blatantly sets himself up in opposition to a series of great works by Chairman Mao, such as the **"Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China"**, **"On the People's Democratic Dictatorship"** and **"On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People"**. In flagrant opposition to Mao Tse-tung's thought, he wants people to forget about the socialist revolution, the class struggle in socialist society and the dictatorship of the proletariat and engage in self-cultivation. "Self-cultivation" of this kind can only cultivate a Bukharin type of person who goes in for capitalism instead of socialism or a person of the Khrushchov type who rejects the dictatorship of the proletariat and works to restore capitalism!

Though twice revised and reprinted many times, the book on self-cultivation does not mention the seizure of power by armed force or the dictatorship of the proletariat. Is this an accidental oversight? By no means.

The book discusses the question of the state. A Marxist cannot possibly discuss this question without mentioning the class nature of the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Yet it is precisely the dictatorship of the proletariat that the

book on self-cultivation throws out while it talks about the question of the state in the abstract in the manner of the hireling scholars of the bourgeoisie.

The author says that "the proletariat is able to build up a strictly organized and disciplined party and state apparatus to wage an irreconcilable struggle against all forms of corruption, bureaucracy and degeneration and ceaselessly weed out of the Party and the state organs those elements that have become corrupt, bureaucratic and degenerate in their work, . . . thereby preserving the purity of the Party and the state apparatus". We may ask: How can the proletariat build up its own state apparatus? Is it possible without a violent revolution, without smashing the old state machine? It is precisely this fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism that the book has discarded. It would seem, according to the author, that so long as Communists apply themselves energetically to self-cultivation, a Utopia will descend from the skies. What he has been dreaming of is really nothing but a bourgeois state.

In the 1962 edition of the book the words "set up a centralized and at the same time democratic state apparatus" are added to the above-quoted passage. This deliberate addition indicates the way the author sees the nature of our state. However, neither here nor elsewhere in the book does he make any mention at all of exercising dictatorship over the class enemy. **Chairman Mao says that our proletarian state exercises dictatorship over the class enemy and "what applies among the people is democratic centralism"**.¹ By simply describing our state as "centralized and at the same time democratic", with no dictatorship over the enemy, what is the author doing if not opposing the dictatorship of the proletariat, preaching the Khrushchov theory of "the state of the whole people" and advocating bourgeois dictatorship?

The book describes at some length "the cause of communism" as "the greatest and most arduous undertaking in human

¹ Mao Tse-tung, *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, FLP, Peking, 1966, p. 5.

history". A Marxist would find it imperative to mention here that communism can only be realized by going through the dictatorship of the proletariat. But the author does not say a word about the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"What is our communist cause? How should Party members advance it?" The author replies:

In that world there will be no exploiters and oppressors, no landlords and capitalists, no imperialists and fascists, nor will there be any oppressed and exploited people, nor any of the darkness, ignorance and backwardness, and so on. In such a society all humanity will consist of unselfish, intelligent, highly cultured and skilled communist workers; mutual assistance and affection will prevail among men and there will be no such irrationalities as mutual suspicion and deception, mutual injury, mutual slaughter and war. It will of course be the best, the most beautiful and the most advanced society in human history.

The author adds:

We Communists should be men of the boldest vision and revolutionary determination. Every Party member should gladly and solemnly resolve to shoulder the task of realizing communism, a task greater and more arduous than any in human history.

After these and similar priest-like invocations and blessings, the author draws the conclusion: "This is my understanding of the cause of communism." In the answer he gives and elaborates in high-flown phraseology, the one thing he excludes is precisely the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is how he understands the communist cause, and that is what he advocates for achieving it!

This sort of description of communist society is nothing new but has existed from ancient times. In China, there are such descriptions in the passage about "great harmony" in the chapter entitled "Li Yun" in the *Book of Rites* [edited by Tai

Sheng, a scholar of the Western Han Dynasty — 206 B.C.-24 A.D.], in *The Journey to the Land of Peach Blossoms* by Tao Chien [poet of the Eastern Tsin Dynasty — 317-420] and in the *Book of Great Harmony* by Kang Yu-wei [leader of the 1898 Reform Movement]. Abroad there are a great number of works by French and British Utopian socialists containing the same stuff.

In the opinion of the author, communist society is a bed of roses, without any darkness or contradiction; all is well, without the existence of opposites. Society will thereby cease to develop. Not only will society never change qualitatively but it seems it will never change quantitatively either. Social development will then come to an end, and society will forever remain the same. Here the author discards a fundamental Marxist law — that the development of all things, all human society, is pushed forward by the struggle of opposites, by contradiction. What the author is doing here is preaching metaphysics and discarding the great theory of dialectical and historical materialism.

Marx said:

Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.¹

Lenin said:

. . . forward development, i.e., towards Communism, proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and cannot do otherwise, for the resistance of the capitalist exploiters cannot be broken by anyone else or in any other way.²

¹ Karl Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", *Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, FLPH, Moscow, 1955, Vol. II, pp. 32-33.

² V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, FLP, Peking, 1965, p. 105.

In his book on self-cultivation, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road emphatically points out that, following the political victory of the proletariat, "it will still be necessary to undergo a prolonged period of socialist transformation and only so will the gradual transition to communist society be possible". Anyone with a particle of Marxism would have inevitably mentioned the dictatorship of the proletariat at this point. But there is still not a word about it! Obviously, his "prolonged period of . . . transformation" is not a period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and his road of "gradual transition to communist society" is not the road of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is crystal clear that the author of this book has his own complete ideological system, which is to "advance the communist cause" without the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is out-and-out betrayal of scientific communism, of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought. It is revisionism, pure and simple.

Far from mentioning the dictatorship of the proletariat himself, the author has even cut out the term from two passages quoted from Lenin.

This is what Lenin wrote:

. . . the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased *tenfold* by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie, but also in the *force of habit*, in the strength of *small production*. For, unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in the world, and small production *engenders* capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale. For all these reasons **the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential**,¹ and victory over the bourgeoisie is impossible without a long, stubborn and desperate war of life

¹ Boldface emphasis ours. — Ed.

and death, a war demanding perseverance, discipline, firmness, indomitableness and unity of will.¹

But the various editions of the book on self-cultivation, including the revised 1962 edition, quote this passage as follows:

. . . the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased *tenfold* by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie, but also in the *force of habit*, in the strength of *small production*. For, unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in the world, and small production *engenders* capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale. For all these reasons . . . victory over the bourgeoisie is impossible without a long, stubborn and desperate war of life and death, a war demanding perseverance, discipline, firmness, indomitableness and unity of will.

Thus the author flagrantly deletes the words "**the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential**" from the middle of this passage. Is this an accidental oversight? Clearly, in the eyes of this top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not necessary.

In the other passage, what Lenin wrote is this:

The abolition of classes means not only driving out the landlords and capitalists — that we accomplished with comparative ease — it also means *abolishing the small commodity producers*, and they *cannot be driven out*, or crushed; we *must live in harmony* with them; they can (and must) be remoulded and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organizational work. They encircle the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which per-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, FLP, Peking, 1965, pp. 5-6.

meates and corrupts the proletariat and causes constant relapses among the proletariat into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternate moods of exaltation and dejection. The strictest centralization and discipline are required within the political party of the proletariat in order to counteract this, in order that the *organizational* role of the proletariat (and that is its *principal* role) may be exercised correctly, successfully, victoriously. **The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle — bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative — against the forces and traditions of the old society.**¹ The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force. **Without an iron party tempered in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in the given class, without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a struggle successfully.**² It is a thousand times easier to vanquish the centralized big bourgeoisie than to “vanquish” the millions and millions of small owners; yet they, by their ordinary, everyday, imperceptible, elusive, demoralizing activity, achieve the *very* results which the bourgeoisie need and which tend to *restore* the bourgeoisie.³

But the various editions of the book on self-cultivation, including the revised 1962 edition, quote this passage as follows:

The abolition of classes means not only driving out the landlords and capitalists — that we accomplished with comparative ease — it also means *abolishing the small commodity producers*, and they *cannot be driven out*, or crushed; we *must live in harmony* with them; they can (and must) be remoulded and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organizational work. They encircle the proletariat

^{1,2} Boldface emphasis ours. — *Ed.*

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat and causes constant relapses among the proletariat into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternate moods of exaltation and dejection. The strictest centralization and discipline are required within the political party of the proletariat in order to counteract this, in order that the *organizational* role of the proletariat (and that is its *principal* role) may be exercised correctly, successfully, victoriously. . . . The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force. . . . It is a thousand times easier to vanquish the centralized big bourgeoisie than to “vanquish” the millions and millions of small owners; yet they, by their ordinary, everyday, imperceptible, elusive, demoralizing activity, achieve the *very* results which the bourgeoisie need and which tend to *restore* the bourgeoisie.

Here the author flagrantly deletes “**the dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle — bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative — against the forces and traditions of the old society**”, and he even cuts out the statement about the leadership given by the Communist Party. Is this another accidental oversight?

Why are the lines on the dictatorship of the proletariat again left out in the revised 1962 edition of the book? There can only be one explanation, namely, that the author opposes our state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and wants to change the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

This amply proves that this top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road is a sworn enemy of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is absolutely intolerable to him. Wherever he sees the term he strikes it out.

Thus the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road shamelessly emasculates the very soul of Marxism-Leninism.

For this man, who has betrayed the dictatorship of the proletariat, to talk about “be the best pupils of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin” is really the greatest insult to Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

The revised 1962 edition of the book on self-cultivation changes “be the best pupils of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin” into “be worthy pupils of Marx and Lenin”. It deletes all of the following three passages originally quoted from Chapter Four of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*:

Men carry on a struggle against nature and utilize nature for the production of material values not in isolation from each other, not as separate individuals, but in common, in groups, in societies. Production, therefore, is at all times and under all conditions *social* production. In the production of material values men enter into mutual relations of one kind or another within production, into relations of production of one kind or another. . . .¹

The first feature of production is that it never stays at one point for a long time and is always in a state of change and development, and that, furthermore, changes in the mode of production inevitably call forth changes in the whole social system, social ideas, political views and political institutions — they call forth a reconstruction of the whole social and political order. . . .²

[The dialectical method considers] invincible only that which is arising and developing.³

¹ *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*, FLPH, Moscow, 1951, pp. 188-89.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 189-90.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

Obviously, in 1962 when he deleted Stalin's name and all the passages he originally quoted from Chapter Four of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*, the author of the book on self-cultivation had no other purpose in mind than to conform to the needs of the Soviet revisionist clique to oppose Stalin, that is also to oppose Leninism.

And in order to delete the name of Stalin, he made Engels a co-victim by deleting his name too.

In none of its many reprints and revised editions does the book anywhere call on people to be good pupils of Chairman Mao. Nowhere does it so much as mention Mao Tse-tung's thought. This is another illustration of the fact that the author is a bogus Marxist but a genuine revisionist, because in our times to depart from Mao Tse-tung's thought means to depart from the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, just as when Marxism developed to the stage of Leninism, to depart from Leninism meant to depart from the fundamentals of Marxism.

Chairman Mao teaches us: “All revolutionary struggles in the world are aimed at seizing political power and consolidating it.”¹

In opposition to this, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road does not want the proletariat and the Communists to seize power and consolidate it; he reduces everything in the world to “self-cultivation”.

“Self-cultivation is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing” — this is the formula of the book, a-hundred-per-cent revisionist formula, similar to that of the old-time renegade Bernstein's: “The movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing.”

Is it true that the ultimate aim is nothing? Of course not! Like that old-time renegade Bernstein, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road harbours sinister ulterior

¹ Mao Tse-tung, “This Year's Election”, *Red China*, September 6, 1933.

aims. He seeks to demoralize the ranks of the proletariat by inducing people to become revisionist through self-cultivation; the more they engage in such cultivation, the farther they will slide down the road of revisionism. Before nationwide victory was won, he opposed the proletarian seizure of political power; and since the winning of nationwide victory, he has been opposing the dictatorship of the proletariat in a vain attempt to practise and restore capitalism. This is just the purpose of the reactionary formula: "Self-cultivation is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing."

《修养》的要害是背叛无产阶级专政

*

外文出版社出版(北京)
1967年第一版
编号: (英)3050-1671
00015
3-E-836P