

V

CRITICIZE TENG AND BEAT BACK THE RIGHT DEVIATIONIST WIND

Introduction

The Campaign to Criticize Teng Hsiao-ping and beat back the right deviationist wind was the major trial of strength between the revisionist and revolutionary headquarters within the Chinese Communist Party in the last years of Mao's life. The Right had done all it could to obstruct the dictatorship of the proletariat campaign; it even formulated its own program in opposition to Mao, which was embodied in the "three poisonous weeds"—documents on industrial management, science and technology, and a "General Program" (Appendices 1-3). Teng, Hua, Li Hsien-nien and others were intimately involved in drafting them.

The Right organized a series of conferences in mid-1975 to push their line in practically all major areas, circulated the weeds, made another major offensive at a "Learn from Tachai Conference," and attacked the educational reforms. It was an all-out assault. Towards the end of the year, Mao had initiated a debate on the educational front to defend the innovations of the Cultural Revolution, and as the new year arrived, he directly attacked Teng Hsiao-ping and his eclectic and revisionist formulations of putting the development of the economy, stability and unity, and class struggle on the same level.

In early April, during the mourning period for Chou En-lai, the Right staged the largest counter-revolutionary demonstration since liberation. Chou was idolized and Mao slandered. During the early part of 1976 Mao had issued a series of directives on the evolution and nature of capitalist-roaders within the Party, which represent a major contribution to the body of Marxist-Leninist theory, and at the same time he called for public exposure and ferreting out of these forces. Mao presided over the removal of Teng.

The readings focus on the Left's response to the increasingly bold

attacks from the Right which took a leap with the Tien An Men incident. The line pushed by Teng and the whole Right in science and technology, industry, education, culture, etc. was subjected to scathing criticism in articles that appeared in the Chinese media and which were studied widely. For example the article on "A New Type of Social Relations in a Socialist Enterprise" describes important reforms in the management system which were implemented by workers in a Shanghai factory in the course of criticizing this line. Changes like this have been attacked by the Right, at that time and now, as "anarchy." Today, one-man management, rules and the authority of specialists are championed.

Chang Chun-chiao's talks give some sense of how the struggle was actually unfolding during this period, and the final article indicates that the Left was stressing that even if this battle were lost, the struggle of the masses would ultimately triumph.

TEXT 25

TWO POEMS

Mao Tsetung



CHINGKANGSHAN REVISITED

—to the tune of *Shui Tiao Keh Tou*
May 1965

*I have long aspired to reach for the clouds,
Again I come from afar
To climb Chingkangshan, our old haunt.
Past scenes are transformed,
Orioles sing, swallows swirl,
Streams purl everywhere
And the road mounts skyward.
Once Huangyangchieh is passed
No other perilous place calls for a glance.*

*Wind and thunder are stirring,
Flags and banners are flying
Wherever men live.
Thirty-eight years are fled
With a mere snap of the fingers.
We can clasp the moon in the Ninth Heaven
And seize turtles deep down in the Five Seas:
We'll return amid triumphant song and laughter.
Nothing is hard in this world
If you dare to scale the heights.*

Peking Review #1, January 2, 1976. (Originally written in May and Autumn 1965.)

TWO BIRDS: A DIALOGUE

—to the tune of *Nien Nu Chiao*
Autumn 1965

*The roc wings fanwise,
Soaring ninety thousand li
And rousing a raging cyclone.
The blue sky on his back, he looks down
To survey man's world with its towns and cities.
Gunfire licks the heavens,
Shells pit the earth.
A sparrow in his bush is scared stiff.
"This is one hell of a mess!
O I want to flit and fly away."*

*"Where, may I ask?"
The sparrow replies,
"To a jewelled palace in elfland's hills.
Don't you know a triple pact was signed
Under the bright autumn moon two years ago?
There'll be plenty to eat,
Potatoes piping hot
With beef thrown in."*
"Stop your windy nonsense!
Look you, the world is being turned upside down."*

*This refers to "goulash."—P.R. Ed.

TEXT 26

REVERSING CORRECT VERDICTS GOES AGAINST THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, a great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is triumphantly developing throughout the country.

Our great leader Chairman Mao recently pointed out: **“Reversing correct verdicts goes against the will of the people.”** Chairman Mao’s words have fully expressed the strong desire of the revolutionary people to combat restoration and retrogression and to persevere in continuing the revolution and exposed the reactionary nature of the unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party who goes against the trend of history. They are an inspiration to the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country to take a still more active part in the struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts.

This struggle was provoked by the bourgeoisie. The Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts was stirred up around last summer. Those doing this opposed taking class struggle as the key link, tampered with the Party’s basic line, negated the proletarian revolution in education and in literature and art and the socialist revolution in the field of science and technology; they negated the three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young, the new socialist things on various fronts and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and they tried to reverse the correct appraisal of the Cultural Revolution and settle accounts with it. They had theory and a programme to guide their organized activities in reversing correct verdicts. They directed their spearhead at our great leader Chairman Mao, at his revolutionary line and at the masses of revolutionary people. If this Right deviationist wind is not rebuffed and beaten back, would it not be tantamount to tolerating the spread of revisionism unchecked and the restoration of capitalism?

The mass revolutionary debate that started in Tsinghua University has dealt this Right deviationist wind a head-on blow; this has won the hearts of the people as well as enthusiastic support and acclaim from the people of all nationalities in the country. The revolutionary masses and revolutionary cadres have earnestly studied the experience of

Peking Review #11, March 12, 1976. (Translation of *Renmin Ribao* [People’s Daily] Editorial, March 10, 1976.)

Tsinghua University and, under the leadership of the Party, criticized "taking the three directives as the key link," thereby completely isolating the capitalist-roaders in the Party who stirred up the Right deviationist wind. Facts prove that the workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals, that is, the people who account for over 95 per cent of the total population, want revolution and support socialism. They do not want to be oppressed by bigwigs who practice revisionism. Their basic desire is to take the socialist road, and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution represents their fundamental interests. They want to consolidate and expand the fruits of victory of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, restrict bourgeois right and advance the socialist revolution. To practice revisionism and reverse the correct appraisal of the Great Cultural Revolution will never be approved by the masses of the people.

Chairman Mao recently pointed out: **"With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the co-operative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road."** This incisive Marxist-Leninist analysis by Chairman Mao has summed up the historical experience of China's socialist revolution over the past 20 years and more, and it has defended and developed Marxism-Leninism. It is a powerful ideological weapon for us in combating and preventing revisionism and a powerful ideological weapon for us in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Chairman Mao clearly indicates here that the capitalist-roaders are precisely the bourgeoisie in the Party during the period of socialist revolution. From the co-operative movement to the criticism of bourgeois right, every step forward in the socialist revolution has met with resistance from the bourgeoisie in the Party. Since in socialist society, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle and there still are the soil and the conditions engendering capitalism and the bourgeoisie, capitalist-roaders or new representatives of the bourgeoisie will inevitably appear in the Party, and the phenomenon that "the capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road" will continue to exist for a long time. The person who stirred up the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is precisely the capitalist-roader who followed Liu Shao-chi in practising revisionism and opposed all the socialist revolutionary movements before the Cultural Revolution and who was criticized in the Cultural Revolution but has refused to mend his ways. In words, he stated "I'll never reverse the verdict," but once he took up

work again, he relapsed into error and continued to take the capitalist road. Persons like him have never been Marxists but are bourgeois democrats with their ideology, as Chairman Mao pointed out, remaining at the stage of the democratic revolution. Like Sung Chiang in the novel *Water Margin* who, though having joined the ranks of the peasant insurgents, still represents the landlord class, the capitalist-roaders are "Communists" in name but actually representatives of the old and new bourgeoisie within and outside the Party. We must bear in mind that throughout the historical period of socialism, the principal contradiction is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the main danger is revisionism, and the target of the revolution is the bourgeoisie, mainly those in power in the Party taking the capitalist road.

The struggle initiated and led by Chairman Mao to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts concerns the future and destiny of our Party and state. After every great historical social change, there inevitably are persons like Confucius who came out and tried to turn things back and restore the old order. Such persons are bound to appear in great revolutions such as the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The current struggle between reversing correct verdicts and opposing the reversal, between restoring the old order and combating restoration, is a continuation and deepening of the struggle between Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and the counter-revolutionary revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao, and a continuation and deepening of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Such struggles will go on in the future, and we must be sober-minded about this.

The struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts is being carried out under the leadership of the Party committees at various levels. Do not establish ties and do not organize fighting groups. It is essential to conscientiously study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, study Chairman Mao's theses on classes, class contradictions and class struggle since the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and his important instructions on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and on the counter-attack on the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts, and get a clear understanding of the character, target, tasks and prospects of the socialist revolution. Leading cadres should stand in the van of the movement and take the lead in study, exposure and criticism and in the counter-attack against the Right deviationist wind. It is necessary to have faith in the masses, rely on the masses and boldly arouse the masses, and firmly grasp the main orientation of struggle: unite, and focus the criticism on the revisionist line

of that capitalist-roader who refuses to mend his ways. The revolutionary masses and revolutionary cadres must bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings "**help more people by educating them and narrow the target of attack**" and "**learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones and cure the sickness to save the patient.**" With regard to the small number of leading cadres who have carried out the erroneous line, it is essential to help them change their class stand and encourage them to correct their mistakes. We should adhere to the principle "**grasp revolution, promote production and other work and preparedness against war,**" do a better job in all work including industrial and agricultural production, be vigilant against class enemies trying to make trouble and against those trying to sabotage production to undermine revolution. It is necessary to continue, through the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts, to promote stability and unity and consolidate and develop the great achievements of the Great Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius.

Under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, let us take class struggle as the key link and carry the struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts through to the end!

COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY POLITICAL INCIDENT AT TIEN AN MEN SQUARE

Early April, a handful of class enemies, under the guise of commemorating the late Premier Chou during the Ching Ming Festival, engineered an organized, premeditated and planned counter-revolutionary political incident at Tien An Men Square in the capital. They flagrantly made reactionary speeches, posted reactionary poems and slogans, distributed reactionary leaflets and agitated for the setting up of counter-revolutionary organizations. By means of insinuation and overt counter-revolutionary language, they brazenly clamoured that "the era of Chin Shih Huang is gone." Openly hoisting the ensign of supporting Teng Hsiao-ping, they frenziedly directed their spearhead at our great leader Chairman Mao, attempted to split the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, tried to change the general orientation of the current struggle to criticize Teng Hsiao-ping and counterattack the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, and engaged in counter-revolutionary activities.

The counter-revolutionary activities culminated on April 5. At about 8 a.m., a loudspeaker car of the municipal Public Security Bureau was overturned, the body of the car and its loudspeakers smashed. After 9 a.m., more than 10,000 people gathered in front of the Great Hall of the People. At its maximum the crowd at Tien An Men Square numbered about 100,000 people. Except for a handful of bad elements who were bent on creating disturbances, the majority of the people were passers-by who came over to see what was happening. Some of the people were around the Monument to the People's Heroes; the majority were concentrated on the west side of the square near the eastern entrance to the Great Hall of the People. A dozen young people were surrounded and beaten up by some bad elements, receiving cuts and bruises on their heads with blood trickling down their swollen faces. The hooligans shouted: "Beat them to death! Beat them to death!" An army guard who tried to stop the hooligans by persuasion had his insignia pulled off, uniform torn and his face beaten to bleed. The bad elements exclaimed: "Who can put this situation under control? Nobody in the Central Committee can. Should he come today he would

Peking Review #15, April 9, 1976. (Translation of *Renmin Ribao* [People's Daily] reports by worker-peasant-soldier correspondents and staff correspondents.)

not be able to return!" Their counter-revolutionary arrogance was unbridled to the extreme. The masses were infuriated and many of them said: "Ever since liberation, Tien An Men Square has always been the place where our great leader Chairman Mao reviews parades of the revolutionary masses. We'll absolutely not tolerate such counter-revolutionary acts happening here!" Several hundred worker-militiamen who went up the flight of steps leading to the Great Hall of the People to stand guard were broken up into several sections by the hooligans. The latter repeatedly shouted reactionary slogans and savagely beat up anyone in the crowd who opposed them. Some of those who got beaten up were dragged to the monument and forced to kneel down and "confess their crimes."

At 11:05 a.m., many people surged towards the Museum of Chinese History on the east side of Tien An Men Square. In front of the museum, a woman comrade who came forward to dissuade them was immediately manhandled. At this moment, a bunch of bad elements besieged a People's Liberation Army barracks by the clock tower in the south-east corner of the square. They crushed the door, broke into the building and occupied it. A few bad elements, sporting a crew cut, took turns to incite the people, shouting themselves hoarse through a transistor megaphone. Towards noon, some of the trouble-makers proclaimed the inauguration of what they called "committee of the people of the capital for commemorating the Premier." A bad element wearing spectacles had the impudence to announce that the Public Security Bureau must give a reply in ten minutes. He threatened that if their demands were not met, they would smash the public security department.

At 12:30, the P.L.A. fighters on guard duty at Tien An Men Square marched in formation towards their barracks to guard it. The bad elements who were making disturbances shouted in instigation: "The people's army should stand on the side of the people!" and "Those befuddled by others are innocent!" Later, they overturned a Shanghai sedan car and set it on fire. The firemen and P.L.A. guards who came to the rescue were blocked, and a fire-engine was wrecked. These bad elements said that putting out the fire meant "suppressing the mass movement." Several members of the fire-brigade were beaten to bleed.

At 12:45, a detachment of people's police came as reinforcement. But they too were taunted and stopped. The caps of several policemen were snatched by the rioters and thrown to the air. Some even threw knives and daggers at the people's police. Several policemen were surrounded and beaten up.

In the afternoon, the sabotage activities of this handful of counter-revolutionaries became still more frenzied. They burnt up four motor vehicles bringing water and food to the worker-militiamen on duty or belong-

ing to the public security department. Around 5 o'clock in the afternoon, this gang of bad elements again broke into that barracks, abducted and beat up the sentries, smashed the windows and doors on the ground floor and looted everything in the rooms. Radios, quilts, bed sheets, clothing and books were all thrown into the fire by this gang of counter-revolutionaries. They also burnt and smashed dozens of bicycles of the Peking worker-militiamen. Black smoke rose to the sky amid a hubbub of counter-revolutionary clamors. Nearly all the window panes in the barracks were smashed. Then they set the barracks on fire.

The revolutionary masses showed their utmost hatred for this counter-revolutionary political incident. Yet the handful of bad elements said glibly: "It manifests the strength of the masses." They went so far as to claim brazenly that "the situation has now got out of hand and it would be of no use even if a regiment or an army was called in," and so on and so forth, showing their unbridled reactionary arrogance.

See how these counter-revolutionaries use extremely decadent and reactionary language and the trick of insinuation to viciously attack and slander our great leader Chairman Mao and other leading comrades on the Party Central Committee:

"Devils howl as we pour out our grief, we weep but the wolves laugh. We spill our blood in memory of the hero; raising our brows, we unsheathe our swords. China is no longer the China of yore, and the people are no longer wrapped in sheer ignorance: gone for good is Chin Shih Huang's feudal society. We believe in Marxism-Leninism, to hell with those scholars who emasculate Marxism-Leninism! What we want is genuine Marxism-Leninism. For the sake of genuine Marxism-Leninism, we fear not shedding our blood and laying down our lives; the day modernization in four fields is realized, we will come back to offer libations and sacrifices."

The clamours of these counter-revolutionaries about combating "Chin Shih Huang" and demanding "genuine Marxism-Leninism" were out-and-out counter-revolutionary agitation in the same vein as the language used in Lin Piao's plan for a counter-revolutionary coup d'état, *Outline of Project "571."* By directing their spearhead at our great leader Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, and lauding Teng Hsiao-ping's counter-revolutionary revisionist line, these counter-revolutionaries further laid bare their criminal aim to practise revisionism and restore capitalism in China.

In the past few days these elements not only wrote reactionary poems but put up reactionary posters. They lauded Teng Hsiao-ping and attempted to nominate him to play the role of Nagy, the chieftain of the counter-revolutionary incident in Hungary. They raved that "with Teng Hsiao-ping in charge of the work of the Central Committee, the

struggle has won decisive victory” “to the great satisfaction of the people throughout the country.” They uttered vile slanders, saying that “the recent so-called anti-Right deviationist struggle is the act of a handful of careerists to reverse verdicts.” They openly opposed the great struggle initiated and led by Chairman Mao to repulse the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts; their counter-revolutionary arrogance was inflated to the utmost.

However, the time when these counter-revolutionary elements ran rampant coincided with the day of their downfall. Going against the will of the people, they were extremely isolated. As these bad elements were making disturbances, perpetrating acts of violence and sabotage, many revolutionary people courageously stepped forward to denounce their counter-revolutionary acts and struggled against them. The Peking worker-militia, people’s police and army guards on duty at the square and the revolutionary people present at the time worked in close co-operation, and fought bravely in defence of Chairman Mao, the Party Central Committee, Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line and the great capital of our socialist motherland.

When the handful of bad elements again set fire to the barracks at 5 p.m., the army guards put out the fire at the risk of their own lives. To safeguard the Great Hall of the People, more than 100 Peking worker-militiamen were injured, a dozen of them seriously wounded. Six army guards were abducted and many wounded. Risking dangers, the people’s police persevered in fighting. Although the barracks was besieged and fire was engulfing the first floor, leading comrades of the Peking worker-militia command post persevered in the struggle on the second floor. At this critical moment, the switchboard operator calmly reported the news to leading departments concerned.

At 6:30 p.m., after Comrade Wu Teh’s speech was broadcast, most of the onlookers and the masses who had been taken in quickly dispersed. But a handful of counter-revolutionaries continued their desperate resistance and again posted some reactionary poems around the Monument to the People’s Heroes. Three hours later, on receiving an order from the Peking Municipal Revolutionary Committee, tens of thousands of worker-militiamen, in co-ordination with the people’s police and P.L.A. guards, took resolute measures and enforced proletarian dictatorship. In high morale, the heroic Peking militiamen valiantly filed into Tien An Men Square and mounted powerful counterattacks. They encircled those bad elements who were still creating disturbances and committing crimes in the vicinity of the Monument to the People’s Heroes. They detained the active criminals and major suspects for examination. In the face of powerful proletarian dictatorship, the handful of rampant rioters could not withstand even a single

blow. They squatted down, trembling like stray dogs. Some hurriedly handed over their daggers, knives and notebooks on which they had copied the reactionary poems. Several criminals who pulled out their daggers in a vain attempt to put up a last-ditch fight were duly punished. The revolutionary masses and people of the whole city heartily supported and acclaimed the revolutionary action of the Peking worker-militia, the people's police and the P.L.A. guards.

TEXT 28

COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION OF C.P.C. CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON APPOINTING COMRADE HUA KUO-FENG FIRST VICE-CHAIRMAN OF C.P.C. CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND PREMIER OF STATE COUNCIL

On the proposal of our great leader Chairman Mao, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China unanimously agrees to appoint Comrade Hua Kuo-feng First Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China.

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

April 7, 1976

RESOLUTION OF C.P.C. CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON DISMISSING TENG HSIAO-PING FROM ALL POSTS BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE PARTY

Having discussed the counter-revolutionary incident which took place at Tien An Men Square and Teng Hsiao-ping's latest behavior, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China holds that the nature of the Teng Hsiao-ping problem has turned into one of antagonistic contradiction. On the proposal of our great leader Chairman Mao, the Political Bureau unanimously agrees to dismiss Teng Hsiao-ping from all posts both inside and outside the Party while allowing him to keep his Party membership so as to see how he will behave in the future.

**The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China**

April 7, 1976

Peking Review #15, April 9, 1976.

TEXT 29

FIRMLY KEEP TO THE GENERAL ORIENTATION OF THE STRUGGLE

Personally initiated and led by our great leader Chairman Mao, the struggle to repulse the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts is victoriously developing throughout the country, and the situation is excellent.

Assiduously studying Chairman Mao's important instructions and using great debate, mass criticism and big-character posters as their weapons, the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres and revolutionary intellectuals are exposing the class nature of that unrepentant Party capitalist-roader who whipped up the Right deviationist wind. They are indignantly criticizing his revisionist programme of "taking the three directives as the key link," his revisionist line, and his reactionary words and deeds in attempting to reverse the correct appraisal of the Great Cultural Revolution and settle accounts with it. **"Reversing correct verdicts goes against the will of the people"**; the unrepentant Party capitalist-roader is under attack on all sides and is very isolated. The socialist revolution in all spheres of the superstructure is deepening, and the socialist new things are growing sturdily in the struggle. Spring farming is going full steam ahead, industrial production is thriving, and work is improving in all fields.

We have won great victories. But class struggle is acute and complicated, and there will still be resistance and twists and turns on the road of our advance. We must take class struggle as the key link, firmly keep to the general orientation of the struggle, and carry through to the end the struggle to repulse the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts.

In criticizing the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, Chairman Mao points out: **"In 1949 it was pointed out that the principal contradiction within the country was one between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Thirteen years later the question of class struggle was reiterated, and mention was also made of the fact that the situation began to turn for the better. What is the Great Cultural Revolution for? To wage class struggle. Liu Shao-chi advocated the theory of the dying out of class struggle, but he himself never ceased to wage class struggle. He wanted to protect his bunch of renegades and**

Peking Review #15, April 9, 1976. (Translation of *Renmin Ribao* [People's Daily] Editorial, April 6, 1976.)

sworn followers. Lin Piao wanted to overthrow the proletariat and attempted a coup. Did class struggle die out?" Hitting the nail on the head, Chairman Mao's instruction exposes the reactionary character and fraudulence of the theory of the dying out of class struggle peddled by Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and that unrepentant Party capitalist-roader. It penetratingly expounds the nature of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and once again teaches us that we must analyse the contradictions in socialist society from the viewpoint of class struggle. The counter-attack against the Right deviationist attempt is a continuation and deepening of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution; it is also a serious class struggle. We must analyse the class nature of the tendencies and slogans that appear in the course of the movement from the viewpoint of the struggle by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. **"We must not be academic and oversimplify the complex class struggle."**

It is essential to put the study of Chairman Mao's important instructions in the first place. These instructions are a sharp weapon for us to beat back the Right deviationist wind and a beacon illuminating our way in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. We should study conscientiously and be clear about the nature of the current struggle and the guiding principles and policies for it. If we do not study, we are liable to lose our bearings and be taken in.

We should direct the spearhead of the struggle at the Party capitalist-roader who has refused to mend his ways. Chairman Mao points out: **"With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the co-operative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road."** The unrepentant Party capitalist-roader is the general representative of the bourgeoisie. His revisionist programme, his revisionist line and his reactionary words and deeds are a concentrated embodiment of the desire of the bourgeoisie for restoration. By directing the spearhead of the struggle at him and making a penetrating exposure and criticism, we shall be able to distinguish between right and wrong political lines, unite upwards of 95 per cent of the cadres and masses, and win still greater victories in the counterattack against the Right deviationist wind. If we keep a firm grip on this point, the class enemy's scheme to switch the general orientation of the struggle will be brought to total bankruptcy.

It is imperative to heighten our revolutionary vigilance. Being a serious class struggle, the counterattack against the Right deviationist

attempt is bound to meet with rabid resistance and disruption from class enemies at home and abroad, particularly the bourgeoisie in the Party. We should keep a watchful eye at all times on the new trends of class struggle. It is necessary to stop the class enemies from spreading rumours, creating disturbances, inciting the masses to fight against one another, sabotaging the revolution and production. It is imperative to exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat over the handful of class enemies who fabricate political rumours in an attempt to confuse and poison people's minds and attack and split the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, track them down sternly and deal resolute blows at them.

It is necessary to strengthen leadership over the movement. The current anti-Right deviationist struggle is being conducted under the unified leadership of the Party committees at various levels. We should not establish inter-unit ties; we should not organize fighting groups or gang up in factions. We should have faith in the masses and rely on them. We should educate the few people who are misled and duped by rumours and do ideological work well among them.

Let us unite and advance along the course indicated by Chairman Mao!

TEXT 30

A GENERAL PROGRAM FOR CAPITALIST RESTORATION

—An Analysis of “On the General Program for
All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Nation”

Cheng Yueh

The great struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts is pressing ahead from victory to victory. The revisionist program of “taking the three directives as the key link” set forth by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party has come under penetrating criticism by Chairman Mao and by the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country. Chairman Mao pointed out: **“What! ‘Take the three directives as the key link’! Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it.”** This instruction by Chairman Mao fundamentally and explicitly points out the reactionary essence of “taking the three directives as the key” in negating class struggle as the key link and the Party’s basic line, in opposing the dictatorship of the proletariat and in restoring capitalism.

A small number of people once held that “taking the three directives as the key link” only involved the question of “formulation.” Well, then, let us take a look at an article written under the instigation of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party. The article, entitled “On the General Program for All Work of the Whole Party and the Whole Nation” (here under the “General Program” for short). In even blunter words, it thoroughly exposes the program of “taking the three directives as the key link” dished up by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party as a program for all-round capitalist restoration.

I.

The “General Program” begins with setting forth realization of the “four modernizations” as the objective of struggle for the Party in the next 25 years, and then proposes “taking the three directives as the key link.” The article says: “The three directives” “are not only the general program for all work of the whole Party, the whole army and the whole

Selections from People’s Republic of China Magazines #867 (76-11). (Translation of article in *Hongqi [Red Flag] #4, 1976.*)

nation at present, but also the general work program in the entire course of struggle for fulfilling the grand goal during the next 25 years." This generalization pointedly shows that the program of "taking the three directives as the key link" dished up by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is entirely aimed at countering Chairman Mao's instructions on taking class struggle as the key link and at negating the basic program and basic line of our Party.

What is the basic task for the whole Party and the people of the whole country in the entire historical period of socialism, including the coming 25 years? Our Party's Constitution in its "First Chapter—General Principles" clearly provides: "The basic program of the Communist Party of China is the complete overthrow of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in place of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the triumph of socialism over capitalism. The ultimate aim of the Party is the realization of communism." To fulfill this basic program of our Party, Chairman Mao has set forth the Party's basic line for the entire historical period of socialism, that is: **"Socialist society covers a fairly long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. We must recognize the protracted and complex nature of this struggle. We must heighten our vigilance. We must conduct socialist education. We must correctly understand and handle class contradictions and class struggle, distinguish the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy from those among the people and handle them correctly. Otherwise a socialist country like ours will turn into its opposite and degenerate, and a capitalist restoration will take place. From now on we must remind ourselves of this every year, every month and every day so that we can retain a rather sober understanding of this problem and have a Marxist-Leninist line."** Therefore, the basic task for the whole Party and the people of the whole country not only at present but also throughout the entire historical period of socialism, including the next 25 years, is to fight for nothing but the realization of our Party's basic program and the execution of its basic line. Should we develop the national economy? Should we achieve all-round modernization of agriculture, industry, national defense, and science and technology in two stages before the end of this century? Of course we should! However, this is only a task we should fulfill in order to realize the basic program of our Party. Although it is a magnificent task, it is not the basic task of the Party, still less the whole task of our Party. Originally the "four modernizations" were set forth as a plan in connection with

the task of developing the national economy. However, to pull off a monumental hoax, the "General Program" sets forth the realization of "four modernizations" as a major premise for all work both at present and in the next 25 years, a premise on which all of our work must be based. This fully shows that, in the eyes of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, at present, the only task is to undertake production and construction, there being no need for class struggle, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This then completely negates our Party's basic program and thoroughly tampers with the basic task and the orientation of advance for the whole Party and the people of the whole country.

After setting forth the major premise, a premise which requires no attention to be paid to class struggle and socialist revolution, the "General Program" then goes on the offensive, alleging that "taking the three directives as the key link" is the "general program for all work" not only at present but also in the future, including the next 25 years. Thus, it absurdly regards Chairman Mao's important instructions on such questions as the theory of proletarian dictatorship as something serving only the purpose of achieving the "four modernizations." This is an out-and-out distortion of Chairman Mao's instructions. Those who resort to eclecticism and sophistry are opposed to dialectics and pay no attention to dialectical logic, but that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" even make no reference to formal logic or reasoning. On the pretext that "a unified whole cannot be cut apart," he arbitrarily proposed "taking the three directives as the key link" and in no time turned it into a "general program for all work" of the whole Party and the whole country in the coming 25 years. Isn't that imposed on others? It is precisely by using this tactic that that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party negates class struggle as the key link, rejects the Party's basic line and concocts a revisionist program which is fundamentally antithetical to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and has nothing to do with Chairman Mao's instructions.

It is not accidental that the "General Program" begins and ends with calling for realization of "four modernizations." Here a question of utmost importance is raised, namely, what historical course China should take in the future, including the next 25 years? We believe that China is now in an important period of historical development: to adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, carry the socialist revolution through to the end, build a more prosperous great socialist country and gradually march toward communism, or to practice revisionism, restore the old order and take the beaten track of Soviet social-imperialism? The next several decades will certainly be a period marked

by a violent struggle between the two roads and two kinds of future. For the sake of the basic interests of the Chinese people and the people of the world, we must fight for the first kind of future and against the second. The Party's basic line is the only correct line for achieving this goal, a lifeline of the proletariat and the revolutionary people. That is why Chairman Mao has time and again pointed out: **"Never forget classes and class struggle"** and **"we must remind ourselves of"** the Party's basic line **"every year, every month and every day."** Since that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party substitutes "taking the three directives as the key link" for the Party's basic line and negates class struggle as the key link, he naturally wants to have the second kind of future and opposes the first. As a matter of fact, his so-called realization of "four modernizations" is nothing but a blueprint for all-round restoration of capitalism. Against this revisionist line our whole Party, whole army and the people of the whole country must of course wage a tit-for-tat struggle.

II.

Does "taking the three directives as the key link" really include the study of the theory on proletarian dictatorship? It is entirely false and deceptive. People need only to take a look at how the "General Program" distorts and opposes Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of the theory of proletarian dictatorship to be able to understand the tricks played by the revisionists.

Toward the end of 1974, Chairman Mao issued an important instruction on the question of theory, pointing out: **"Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to make this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation."** Speaking of the socialist system, Chairman Mao said: **"In a word, China is a socialist country. Before liberation she was more or less the same as a capitalist country. Even now she practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution to each according to his work and exchange through money, and in all this is scarcely different from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has been changed."** Chairman Mao pointed out: **"Our country at present practices a commodity system; the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. Therefore, we should read more Marxist-Leninist works."** The main feature of these instructions of Chairman Mao's is to emphasize the necessity and importance of

restricting bourgeois rights in combatting and preventing revisionism, further pointing out to us the orientation of continuing the revolution both in the superstructure and in the economic base under the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, what does the "General Program" say about the instruction on the question of theory? It completely casts aside the main theme of Chairman Mao's instruction, namely, the question of restricting bourgeois rights, and even does not say one word about it. The question of bourgeois rights being the soil and conditions engendering a new bourgeoisie, the question of revisionism as the main danger, the question of struggle between the two lines in the Party, and the question of dealing with capitalist roaders—all these disappear out of sight in the "General Program." This clearly shows that the so-called "taking the three directives as the key link" is solely aimed at twisting and abolishing Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, the theory of proletarian dictatorship.

Abolishing the actual content of the theory on proletarian dictatorship reveals the bourgeois nature of capitalist roaders. Chairman Mao, hitting the nail on the head, pointed out recently: **"With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the cooperative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois rights they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road."** This Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of Chairman Mao's profoundly points out the errors in line committed by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and the ideological origin and class root-causes of the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts stirred up by him. It is precisely because that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party is afraid that the socialist revolution may cause him to come under fire, restrict the bourgeois rights they like and affect their bourgeois stand and world outlook that he cannot wait to dish up "taking the three directives as the key link," oppose taking class struggle as the key link, distort and tamper with Chairman Mao's instruction on the question of theory, and advocate the theory of the dying out of class struggle in order to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party. Confronted with the Marxist revolutionary edge and afraid that their class would soon die out, those who hang up the signboard of "communists" but who actually represent the interests of the bourgeoisie always try by all possible means to distort and castrate the revolutionary content of Marxism, blunt its revolutionary edge, and make it suit the needs of the bourgeoisie. Is this not what that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his "General Program" have

done?

Do things stop here? No. Those who reject taking class struggle as the key link and advocate the theory of the dying out of class struggle have always wanted to "put out" only the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and not the bourgeois offensives against the proletariat. The fact that while opposing class struggle, the "General Program" fiercely attacks the proletariat shows more than anything else this characteristic of class struggle.

Our Party's basic theory and basic practice tell us: The principal contradiction throughout the historical period of socialism is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the main danger is revisionism, the subject of revolution is the bourgeoisie, and the target is persons in power in the Party taking the capitalist road. But what does the "General Program" say about this? Hoisting the banner of opposing the ultra-"Left," it says that the main problem at present is that some "class enemies who oppose Marxism inherit the mantle from Lin Piao, always take over our revolutionary slogans and then distort and emasculate them," that they "throw the good cadres of the Party and advanced model personalities off the stage." It even alleges that "this struggle is the concentrated expression of the present struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines."

The "General Program" here uses the term "class enemies who oppose Marxism," but deliberately covers up its class content. To whom does it allude? The capitalist roaders in the Party? No. Not only is the "General Program" as silent about the concept of capitalist roaders in the Party as Ah Q is about the scabs on his head, but it also forbids others to refer to it. Does it allude to landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, and old and new bourgeois elements? No, either. Because the "General Program" explains clearly that these people are not included in the concept "class enemies who oppose Marxism." In fact, judging by the fact that they regard persisting in class struggle as the key link as going against "taking the three directives as the key," this "unified whole which cannot be cut apart," "class enemies" who "emasculate revolutionary slogans" are those Chinese Communists who adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, Marxists who persevere in taking class struggle as the key link. Taking a bourgeois reactionary stand, they brand all revolutionary people who persist in exercising proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie as "class enemies." They do so both in writing and in practice. They describe Lin Piao's ultra-Right revisionist line as ultra-"Left." In this way, they can use such phrases as "inheriting Lin Piao's mantle" to attack all revolutionary people who criticize revisionism, i.e., Right opportunism, denounce the Great Proletarian

Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, and take the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao as treasure. The so-called “inheriting Lin Piao’s mantle” (and not a bit inheriting Liu Shao-chi’s mantle!) and “taking over our revolutionary slogans, distorting and emasculating them”—this Hu Feng-type rhetoric can be appreciated by the new landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements, old and new bourgeois elements, by unrepentant capitalist roaders and people who want to reverse the verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and settle scores with it. It delights them because these are the words in their hearts they want to express.

The “General Program” also attacks class struggle and the struggle between the two lines, alleging that they “throw our Party’s fine cadres and advanced model personalities off the stage.” This is sheer fabrication and slander. That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party once said: “Proper policies must be implemented for old workers and experienced cadres because once a movement starts it often hurts them.” Those words said in the “General Program” are copied from here. The phrase “once a movement starts” applies to all the important line struggles waged by our Party in the past, and all these struggles are totally negated. It may be asked: Is it true that from criticizing Chen Tu-hsiu, Li Li-san, Chu Chiu-pai, Lo Chang-lung, Wang Ming and Chang Kuo-tao to criticizing Kao Kang, Peng Te-hua, Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, “once a movement starts,” all experienced cadres and old workers were “hurt.” Did they all “throw the Party’s fine cadres and advanced model personalities off the stage”? Is this not a distortion of and slander against the series of political movements carried out by our Party under Chairman Mao’s leadership, including the Great Cultural Revolution? Here, the “General Program” completely lays bare its reactionary features by pointing the spearhead at Chairman Mao and his proletarian revolutionary line. We say: “Once the movement starts,” it is bound to “hurt” people. But people it “often hurts” are not experienced old cadres and workers, but those “old” chieftains of the revisionist line and the erroneous line they push. If we did not wage struggle against their erroneous line, our Party would not have developed nor led the people of the whole nation to triumphantly enter the socialist revolution from the democratic revolution, and we would not have been able to continue our advance toward communism. It is precisely because “once a movement starts” it will “hurt” the revisionist line that the unrepentant capitalist roaders in the Party feel sad about this and want to reverse the verdicts and re-write our Party’s history. However, this can only be sheer wishful thinking!

That unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party frantically tries to

reverse the verdicts of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and settle scores with it, and to carry out restorationist activities in all spheres by his “taking the three directives as the key link.” He repeatedly clamors for “readjustment.” How to “readjust”? The “General Program” says clearly: It is necessary to “readjust work in all fields” by “taking the three directives as the key link.” “Readjustment is needed in industry, agriculture, communications and transport, finance and trade, science and technology, culture, education and health, literature and art, the army and also the Party.” My goodness, nine major “readjustments”! From the economic base to the superstructure, from within the Party to outside it, from the localities to the center, everything is bad and must be “readjusted,” and not a bit or drop should be allowed to escape from the net. We also say that certain work in certain fields should be readjusted, but that is aimed at further implementing Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line, principles and policies, and at doing our work better. What, then, is the all-inclusive “readjustment” which that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party wants to carry out? Through the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts in such fields as education, science and technology, literature and art, and health, we have seen very clearly that he wants to use “readjustment” to reverse the verdicts of the Cultural Revolution and settle accounts with it and to go back to the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. In calling for an all-round “readjustment,” he actually wants to launch an all-out counter-attack in revenge, that is, to restore capitalism in an all-round way.

If, as the “General Program” says, some people “practice revisionism by hoisting the banner of anti-revisionism and carry out restoration by hoisting the banner of anti-restoration,” that is no more than a self-portrait of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and of his “General Program” of “taking the three directives as the key link.”

III.

On the question of relationship between politics and economics and between revolution and production, the “General Program” also grossly distorts and tampers with Chairman Mao’s instructions. Making no mention of class struggle and socialist revolution in the economic sphere, it draws the development of the national economy into the orbit of the revisionist theory of productive forces.

As we all know, although the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of the means of production has been in the main completed in our country it has not been fully finished. Even in those sec-

tors where socialist transformation has been carried out, a fierce struggle between transformation and anti-transformation and between restoration and anti-restoration is still present. In respect to relations between men and distribution, there is still the question of continuing to deepen the socialist revolution. Therefore, while carrying out socialist construction, we must strive to solve various problems in the relations of production and do a good job of revolution in the superstructure. This means that we must grasp class struggle as the key link, grasp revolution and promote production. Because it is opposed to the correct policy of **“grasping revolution and promoting production,”** the “General Program” goes all out to attack the Great Cultural Revolution by saying that since it was started, “attention has been paid only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production. Anyone who mentions the need to grasp production and do a good job of economic construction would be accused of promoting ‘the theory of productive forces’ and practicing revisionism.” Such an attack precisely exposes the reactionary stand of the “General Program” in upholding the revisionist theory of productive forces.

Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution began, the revolutionary masses have applied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to revolutionary mass criticism of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, including the criticism of the theory of productive forces peddled by them. Such mass criticism is a class struggle waged by the proletariat to smash capitalist restoration. This is what the “General Program” slanders as “attention has been paid only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production.” However, many living facts show that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a strong motive force in the development of China’s productive forces. Mass criticism of the revisionist line and the theory of productive forces has promoted the substantial development of socialist production and produced solid fruits. Is it right for the masses of people to label Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and their like as “revisionists” and “promoters of the theory of productive forces”? Absolutely right! These two labels are quite appropriate and should not be removed! Lenin said it well: **“The negation of revisionism is aimed at covering up one’s own revisionism.”** The negation of the criticism of the revisionist theory of productive forces by that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and by his “General Program” is aimed at inheriting the mantle of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, at continuing to push the counter-revolutionary revisionist line and theory of productive forces.

To say that we pay “attention only to politics but not to economics, only to revolution but not to production” is nothing but to confuse black and white and right and wrong. It may be asked: When the eight

hundred million people, by relying on their own efforts, grow their own food and make their own clothing and establish an independent national economic system on the basis of self-reliance, and when they have smashed the economic blockades and blackmail by imperialism and social-imperialism, do they “not pay attention to economics” and “not pay attention to production”? Eating the food grown by the masses of people, wearing the clothes made by the masses of people and living in the houses built by the masses of people and yet uttering such nonsense as “paying no attention to economics and production”—this is virtually a shameless vilification against our Party and the vast masses and cadres battling at the frontline of industrial and agricultural production for a long time!

The difference between Marxism and the revisionist theory of productive forces is not on the question of whether or not it is necessary to grasp production and do a good job in economic construction. Marxism has always attached great importance to the development of productive forces, but it has also held all along that the development of productive forces cannot be separated from the reform of the relations of production and the superstructure, and that only by grasping revolution will it be possible to promote production. And the adjustment in the relations of production will pave the way for the development of productive forces. Man is the most important productive force. As long as proletarian politics is placed in command and man’s enthusiasm for socialism is fully aroused under socialist conditions, production will flourish at a swift tempo. But the theory of productive forces does away with class struggle and the socialist revolution in the superstructure and the relations of production. It regards the development of production as the only decisive thing. Such is the crux of the matter. If we, as that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party advocates, devote ourselves only to production and construction without paying attention to class struggle and revolution and let revisionism prevail and capitalism be restored, then the developed economy, production and “four modernizations” will become material forces oppressing and enslaving the proletariat and the working people. Therefore, after the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin repeatedly reminded the Party and the people that **“90 percent of our attention and activities are and should be centered on this basic issue—overthrow the bourgeoisie, establish the proletarian political power, and eliminate all possibilities of capitalist restoration.”**

When that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party and his “General Program” so energetically attack others for “paying no attention to economics” and “paying no attention to production,” is he really interested in socialist production? No! His only interest is in

capitalist production, in undermining the socialist relations of production and the productive forces. In his eyes, “do a good job in production” is actually intended to restore what belongs to capitalism. This is clearly disclosed in the section of the “General Program” on enterprise management. The “General Program” says: Following the development of production and technology, “rules and regulations will become increasingly strict, demanding that people strictly abide by these rules and regulations.” “This is so not only in capitalist society but in socialist society as well, and will be so in the future communist society.” These views totally negate the class nature of rules and regulations and ignore the essential difference between socialism and communism, and capitalism. As we know, rules and regulations reflect human relations in production, and have a clear-cut class nature. Rules and regulations of economic sectors in capitalist society oppress and fleece the working class and the laboring people. We are a socialist country, whose masters are the working class and laboring people. We are in favor of relying on the working class and the laboring people in setting up rules and regulations suited to the development of socialist economy. We oppose anarchy, and also object to “Control, restriction and repression” of the workers and laboring people by exercising bourgeois dictatorship. The “Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company,” personally approved by Chairman Mao, embodies the basic principles that should be followed by the rules and regulations of socialist enterprises. Yet the “General Program” says nothing about this but, instead, cries for the need to set up “increasingly strict” rules and regulations. The rules and regulations in the economic sectors of capitalism are indeed very strict and rigorous. The time workers spend in the toilet also has to be taken into account, and they will be punished in various ways if they exceed the time-limit allowed. But the “General Program” looks upon such rules and regulations as above-class, above-time things, claiming that this is so not only in capitalist society but also in socialist and communist societies. If this is not a call for restoring capitalism, what is it? If it is not a call for a dictatorship over the working class and the laboring people, what is it? If we link this to other words and deeds of that unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, we can see even more clearly that the reason why he proposes “taking the three directives as the key link” and regards development of the national economy also a “key link” is that he wants to implement his revisionist line of “disregarding the distinction between the white cat and the black cat” and disregarding the difference between imperialism and Marxism, a line which actually wants capitalism and not socialism.

IV.

“Taking the three directives as the key link” is couched in Marxist phrases and concocted by an eclectic sleight of hand. It is a hypocritical and reactionary revisionist program. The “General Program,” as a means of publicizing “taking the three directives as the key link,” also reflects this characteristic. It is a big hodgepodge which is very poor theoretically, very bad in tactics, fragmentary, confusing in logic and contradictory in ideology. But it helps us further understand and criticize the reactionary essence of “taking the three directives as the key link.” On this point, it is valuable teaching material by negative example.

To criticize in depth “taking the three directives as the key link” is of tremendous significance to us in upholding Marxism, and combatting revisionism, sticking to socialism and opposing capitalism. A political program can be a long thesis or a simple general outline. But, be it a long thesis or a short outline, it invariably involves the principled question of whether to practice Marxism or revisionism, including the question of whether to keep to or oppose the theoretical basis of a proletarian political party. The teachers of proletarian revolution have always attached major importance to the principled nature and purity of the proletarian political program, always adopted a clear-cut stand in uncompromising struggles against all kinds of opportunist and revisionist programs, deeply and thoroughly criticized them politically and ideologically, and pointed out the correct direction for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. When criticizing *The Gotha Program*, Marx said: **“It is my duty not to give recognition, even by diplomatic silence, to what in my opinion is a thoroughly objectionable program that demoralizes the party.”** The moment the opportunist Duhring emerged to oppose the Party’s theoretical basis, Engels intended to criticize him, and with Marx’s support, he determinedly **“put everything aside to deal with this nuisance—Duhring.”**

On the question regarding the theoretical basis of Marxism, we must adopt a serious, militant attitude. This is because the mistaken views or slogans on the question of theoretical basis will often lead to thoroughly betraying Marxism, to the evil path of revisionism. When Khrushchev put forward the revisionist line of “peaceful transition,” Chairman Mao sharply pointed out: **“Is the October Revolution still good? Can it still be taken as a model for all other countries? Khrushchev’s report delivered at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party said that political power could be seized through the parliamentary road. This means that other countries need not learn from the October Revolution. Once this door is open, Leninism will be**

basically cast away.” When Liu Shao-chi advanced the so-called “contradiction between the four-cleans and the four-uncleans” during the socialist education movement, Chairman Mao realized that this was an attempt to reject the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the principal contradiction and to ignore the principled question that classes, class contradictions and class struggle still exist in socialist society. He pointed out: **“If we forget this basic theory and practice of our Party in the past dozen years, we will go astray.”** When Lin Piao dished up his revisionist theoretical program of the “theory of innate genius,” Chairman Mao promptly exposed its reactionary nature. He pointed out: the question of whether **“history is made by heroes or by slaves,”** whether man’s knowledge (and ability which also falls into the category of knowledge) is innate or acquired after birth, and whether we should keep to the idealist theory of transcendentalism or the materialist theory of reflection, is a major question of right and wrong concerning two classes, two lines and two kinds of world outlook. He called on the whole Party to take the Marxist stand and draw a clear demarcation line with Lin Piao’s revisionism. Today, when that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party proposes “taking the three directives as the key link,” it is likewise not a simple question of formulation, but a question involving whether we can uphold our Party’s basic program and basic line and whether we should consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat or restore capitalism. If we are to uphold Marxism and defend the theoretical basis of the proletarian party and prevent it from being altered or distorted, we must fight and thoroughly criticize the fallacy of “taking the three directives as the key link.” We believe that through the struggle to hit back at the Right deviationist wind of reversing verdicts and the thorough criticism of “taking the three directives as the key link,” our Party and the revolutionary cause of the proletariat will certainly advance still more rapidly and win still greater victories.

TEXT 31

CRITICISM OF SELECTED PASSAGES OF “CERTAIN QUESTIONS ON ACCELERATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY”

“Certain Questions on Accelerating the Development of Industry” (hereafter “20 Points” for short), cooked up by order of the unrepentant capitalist roader, Teng Hsiao-ping, is a sinister banner for capitalist restoration on the industrial front. It fanatically trumpets the theory of productive forces and the theory of the dying out of class struggle; energetically peddles material incentives, putting profit in command, dictatorship by stereotype, management of factories by specialists and the slavish comprador philosophy that have been totally discredited and repudiated by us workers; and opposes putting proletarian politics in command, wholehearted reliance on the working class, the policy of maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our hands and regeneration through self-reliance, developing the initiative of both central and local authorities, and the “Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company.” The “20 Points” is a product of the counter-revolutionary revisionist line pushed by Teng Hsiao-ping. Under the excellent situation marked by the victoriously developing struggle against the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, we must fully utilize this teaching material by negative example to further expose Teng’s reactionary features in opposing the great leader Chairman Mao and his revolutionary line.

The So-Called “Foreword”

The “20 Points” pretentiously begins with an extract from Premier Chou En-lai’s “Report on the Work of the Government” delivered at the 4th National People’s Congress that deals with the realization of the four modernizations. In that report Premier Chou stressed: “Socialist revolution is the powerful engine for developing the social productive forces,” “While tackling economic tasks, our leading comrades at all levels must pay close attention to the socialist revolution in the realm of the superstructure and keep a firm grasp on class struggle and the struggle between the two lines. Only when we do well in revolution is it possi-

Survey of People’s Republic of China Magazines #873 (76-15). (Translation of article in *Hsueh-hsi yu P’i-p’an [Study and Criticism]* #4, April 14, 1976.)

ble to do well in production.” These most important words, however, were all dropped. By the tactic of chopping the head and keeping the tail, the “20 Points” publicizes revisionist contraband with stolen revolutionary phrases. Recently, criticizing the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping, Chairman Mao pointed out: **“This person does not grasp class struggle; he has never referred to this key link. Still his theme of ‘white cat, black cat,’ making no distinction between imperialism and Marxism.”** What kind of stuff are the “modernizations” Teng Hsiao-ping vowed to promote at all costs? The answer was given by a band of counter-revolutionaries who engineered the recent counter-revolutionary incident at Tienanmen Square. The “day when the four modernizations are achieved,” a day of which they dreamed, was no more than the day when capitalism was restored. By a concrete analysis of the “20 Points,” we may see clearly that Teng Hsiao-ping’s claim to promote modernization is false while his opposition to revolution is real, and that his pledge to push production forward is false while his intention to pull down the red flag is genuine.

The So-Called “General Program of Work”

(Text) “Chairman Mao’s directives concerning the study of theory, combating and preventing revisionism, stability and unity and pushing the national economy forward constitute a general program for all work of the whole Party, the whole army and the whole nation. This key link must be firmly grasped if we are to accelerate the development of industry.”

(Criticism) Behind the back of Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee, the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping put forward the revisionist program of “taking the three directives as the key link” in an attempt to confuse the primary and secondary issues and replace the primary issue with the secondary. He tried to alter the Party’s basic line by the abominable tactic of covering up the real facts. Between May and July last year, he described the “three directives” as “the key link for a period.” A month later, in August, he described them as “the key link for all work.” Then, between August and September the “20 Points” which he had concocted became the “General Program for All Work of the Whole Party, the Whole Army and the Whole Nation.” It follows that Teng’s “three directives as the key link” was not an accidental matter of “improper formulation,” but a planned and organized action for restoration.

Chairman Mao points out: **“What! ‘Take the three directives as the key link’! Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it.”** Recently,

through the struggle to repulse the Right deviationist wind, we workers of Shanghai further raised our consciousness of class and line struggle and of the need to continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This has given a strong boost to production. In the first quarter of this year, output in the light industry, chemical, instrument, electric power and other industries showed increases over the corresponding period of last year. When the key link is grasped, the situation will improve and production will rise step by step. This is powerful criticism of "taking the three directives as the key link" and a strong head-on blow to the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts.

So-Called "Importing Advanced Technology"

(Text) "It is necessary to stick to the policy of combining study with independent creation. It is imperative to study with an open mind all advanced and superior things from abroad, to import foreign advanced technology in a planned and appropriate manner and put it to our use in order to speed up the development of the national economy. We must insist on maintaining independence, keeping the initiative in our hands and regeneration through self-reliance, and oppose the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of crawling behind others at a snail's pace. However, under no circumstances must we become cocky, close our doors and refuse to learn from the good things of other countries.

"It is necessary to combat not only the practice of copying things from others wholesale but also the practice of changing them and acting recklessly without learning to master them."

(Criticism) Chairman Mao teaches us: "**Rely mainly on our own efforts while making external assistance subsidiary.**" It is necessary to import some advanced technology from abroad, but the keynote in doing so must be regeneration through self-reliance. Countries which develop their economies by relying on others cannot possibly hold their fate in their own hands. As a socialist country, we must have an independent economic system and can only take our own road of industrial development. Innumerable facts prove that the Chinese people are entirely capable of catching up with and surpassing the world's advanced standards in the field of science and technology. However, the "20 Points" lauds foreign technology as having "much higher efficiency," consistently stressing the need to "study the good things of other countries" "as soon as possible," "with an open mind," and "swiftly." Please look at the facts: "building 10,000-ton freighters with 10,000 tons of effort," we have built an increasing number of ships and with increasingly better results. Yet they insisted on spending

up to a million U.S. dollars on importing a “scrap ship” discarded by the foreign capitalists. We built long ago such advanced equipment as turbo-generators with inner water-cool rotor and stator, yet they still wanted to accept out-dated generators produced by the Soviet revisionists in the 1940’s and 1950’s. They always fixed their eyes on other countries, stretched out their hands abroad, and begged from foreign bigshots such things as “advanced technology.” Wasn’t this an attempt to tie the fate of our industry to the belts of foreign capitalists?

Chairman Mao says: **“Learn from the good experience of other countries conscientiously, and be sure to study their bad experience too, so as to draw lessons from it.”** Foreign technology must be divided into two. Technical designs of capitalist countries serve the pursuit of the highest profits by the monopoly bourgeoisie and bear a clearcut class coat of arms. How can we use them without distinguishing the “white cat and black cat”? In Teng Hsiao-ping’s eyes, all foreign things are “good things.” He would angrily denounce anyone who criticizes and transforms the irrational elements of foreign things as being “cocky, and closing the doors,” and would issue the order to prohibit “reckless changing and doing.” This fully reveals his reactionary features as a slavish comprador.

So-Called “Stepping Up the Export of Industrial and Mineral Products”

(Text) “In order to accelerate the exploration of our country’s coal and petroleum resources, we may—on condition of equality and mutual benefit and according to such generally accepted practices as deferred payments and installment payments in international trade—sign long-term contracts with other countries, fix a few production points to which they will supply whole sets of suitable modern equipment, and then pay them with the coal and crude oil we produce.”

(Criticism) To beg “advanced technology” and equipment from foreign capitalists, the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping did not even scruple to pledge our country’s precious natural resources as security. Falling to his knees, he did not hesitate to sell out our state sovereignty and national dignity. This cannot but anger us workers. As we find out, not long ago the Soviet revisionist *Pravda* also advocated: “We must make fuller use of our country’s natural resources and, to this end, we must absorb foreign capital and experience so that we may in the future pay back our loans with a part of the products produced by our construction projects.” It is no wonder that this “major policy” advertised by Teng Hsiao-ping was “imported” from the Soviet revisionists!

According to this “major policy,” we should import without restriction those things which we can produce and step up at all costs the export of those things which we need badly. If this state of affairs were allowed to continue, wouldn’t our country turn into a market for the imperialists to dump their goods, into a raw material base, a repair and assembly workshop and an investment ground? Wouldn’t we workers become wage laborers for foreign capitalists? To use our country’s mineral reserves and labor with technology and equipment provided by foreign capitalists and let foreign bosses reap a huge fortune—such things had been done before, by Li Hung-chang, Yuan Shih-kai, and the enemy of the people Chiang Kai-shek. We will never forget those days when foreign bosses were fattened by the blood and sweat of Chinese workers. If economic independence is lost, it will also be impossible to maintain political independence. By setting forth that “major policy,” Teng Hsiao-ping in fact wanted to capitulate to imperialism and social-imperialism, to auction off our state sovereignty. This will never be tolerated by us workers!

So-Called “Adjusting Enterprise Management”

(Text) “Indiscriminate opposition to enterprise management is bound to cause anarchy.”

(Criticism) Enterprise management has a class character. In a class society, there has never been any above-class enterprise management. We oppose not only anarchism but also imposing on the worker masses bourgeois dictatorship in the form of “control, checks and coercion.” By fabricating the rumor of “indiscriminate opposition to enterprise management,” the “20 Points” merely resorts to the dirty tactics of **“imposing on the enemy in a polemic the apparently foolish ideas and then refuting them.”** (Lenin, “The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky”) And its aim is to negate the achievements of struggle-criticism-transformation since the start of the Great Cultural Revolution and to reverse the verdict passed on the revisionist line on running enterprises.

Since the beginning of the Great Cultural Revolution, we have, in accordance with Chairman Mao’s directive concerning doing a serious job of struggle-criticism-transformation, criticized the revisionist line on running enterprises and further confirmed the role of workers as masters of factories. Within enterprises the relations between people have undergone impressive changes. In Shanghai alone, the worker masses have created many forms of participation by workers in management in accordance with the fundamental principles of the “Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company” and have moreover

institutionalized them. We warmly hail such revolutionary order! Taking the reactionary bourgeois stand, the "20 Points" smears our struggle-criticism-transformation as "indiscriminate opposition to enterprise management" and causing "management chaos," and submits that "it is necessary to readjust enterprise management and raise the management level." In reality it seeks to restore that kind of package consisting of "control, checks and coercion" before the Great Cultural Revolution, and engages in the dirty deal of restoring capitalism by hoisting the banner of opposing "anarchy."

(Text) "(It is necessary to) set up, under the unified leadership of Party committees, production management command systems which are effective and capable of operating independently to take charge of the day-to-day production activities in managing and directing enterprises, to handle promptly problems arising from production, and to assure the normal progress of production. Party committees should not be asked to handle directly all big and small matters, so that they will not be interfered with in attending to major issues and grasping ideological-political work."

(Criticism) Chairman Mao points out: "**In industry, agriculture, commerce, education, the army, government and the Party—in these seven sectors the Party must exercise leadership in everything.**" In factories and enterprises, it is only when we take class struggle as the key link and adhere to the Party's basic line under the centralized leadership of the Party that we can make the enterprises keep to the socialist orientation and fulfill the task of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat at the grass-roots level. The revolutionary committees established during the Great Cultural Revolution represent a creation by the worker masses. But the "20 Points" makes no reference to the need to fully develop the role of revolutionary committees and instead, calls for setting up a "production management command system operating independently," and this is aimed at negating the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and socialist new things. They stress "independence" of Party leadership in "handling problems arising from production"; this in effect is to prohibit Party committees from handling problems that relate to the line, principles and policies in the sphere of production, to form their own system and a separate center, to put the Party committees aside, to separate the Party from government, to practice the revisionist "one chief system" to usurp the leadership of enterprises and to turn socialist enterprises into capitalist ones.

(Text) "The system of responsibility is the core of the rules and regulations of an enterprise. Without a strict system of responsibility, production can only be carried out in a chaotic manner. It is hence necessary to set up a system of responsibility as a vital step of readjusting enterprise

management. The responsibility must be clearly defined for each job and each post; every cadre, every worker, every technician must have a clearly defined responsibility.”

(Criticism) What does a socialist enterprise mainly rely on in carrying out production and management successfully? To rely on the system of responsibility or on man's consciousness? In carrying out socialist large-scale production, we must of course have the necessary system of responsibility, but the more important thing is to conduct socialist education among cadres and workers, to continuously raise the political consciousness of workers and staff and to establish newtype socialist relations. “Any system must benefit the masses.” The workers are the masters of socialist enterprises. We are in favor of relying on the worker masses in setting up rules and regulations conducive to the development of the socialist economy. If an enterprise does not rely on the worker masses in management, even rational rules and regulations may be used to impose “control, checks and coercion” on workers. By elevating the system of responsibility to the position of the “core,” the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping wanted nothing other than to reject the leading position of the working class and attempt to lure workers into only doing “one job” well and sticking to “one post,” engrossing themselves in production without bothering about politics and submitting to the revisionist line they push.

After comparing the changes in enterprise management before and after the Great Cultural Revolution, we deeply feel that if we do not talk about the line and the communist style of work but only about the system of responsibility, then such system of responsibility would even have the effect of disrupting production. In some industries, for instance, it was clearly stipulated in the past that production workers and repairmen should not step out of the bounds of their duties. As a result, when machines broke down, the production workers who were able to put them back to work had to stop their work and wait for the repairmen to arrive and put things right for them. This practically throttled the initiative of workers within the framework of division of work and turned them into slaves of division of work. Since the start of the Great Cultural Revolution, the worker masses have said: “Though we do different jobs, we are all masters.” We not only practice rational division of work and a necessary system of responsibility at individual posts but also break down the past narrow confines of division of work which stifled the initiative of the workers. Campaigns in various forms and activities of “specializing in one thing and capable of doing many other things” have developed flourishingly. Many of us workers have gone beyond the system of responsibility at individual posts and the demands we imposed on ourselves. By hurling the false accusation at us

that we now are “without a system of responsibility” and “carry out production in a chaotic manner,” doesn’t Teng want us to go back to the old road? We must tell him bluntly: You can’t do that!

So-Called “Two Kinds of Initiative”

(Text) “As for dual leadership bearing on the overall national economic situation, the central departments concerned should not only take care of the principles, policies and unified planning for large enterprises of mainly local nature, but should also take care of the allocation of products produced by these enterprises and handle the problems of major material supplies which localities are unable to solve.”

(Criticism) In accordance with Chairman Mao’s directive “**Having two kinds of initiative is much better than having only one kind of initiative**” and “**localities should be encouraged to do more things under central unified planning,**” we criticized the dictatorship by stereotype and conducted positive reform of the industrial administrative system during the Great Cultural Revolution. This is an important achievement of the Great Cultural Revolution.

But the “20 Points,” leaving no stone unturned in spreading slander, makes ten charges such as “wilful,” “violation,” “unauthorized,” and “indiscriminate allocation and use” to negate the excellent situation that has appeared on the industrial front since an overwhelming majority of enterprises have been handed over to local management after the start of the Great Cultural Revolution. Saying that enterprises handed over to local management “must not be left without control,” it tries by every possible means to stifle the local initiative, to reverse the verdict passed on “the dictatorship by stereotype” promoted by Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and company, launch a counter-attack in revenge and seeks restoration and regression on the industrial front. Under the pretext of “concentration” and “centralization,” they call for “control” and “resumption” in an attempt to “rigidly control” those enterprises that have been handed over to local management as well as national economic plans so as to hold the local initiative “in check.” They vainly try to “centralize” enterprises that have been handed over to local management and bring them onto the road of capitalist restoration and to “concentrate” the power of decentralization in the hands of the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping so as to turn socialist ownership by the whole people into ownership by capitalist roaders.

(Text) “From each according to his ability and to each according to his work is a socialist principle. In the socialist period this principle must be resolutely enforced since it basically meets the demands of the developing productive forces. Practicing egalitarian distribution without regard

to the nature of work, the physical capacity of people and the amount of contribution made would dampen the socialist enthusiasm of the broad masses.”

(Criticism) From each according to his ability and to each according to his work is a socialist principle of distribution. Lenin said, **“In the sense that products are distributed ‘according to work,’ ‘bourgeois rights’ still hold the dominating position.”** (“The State and Revolution”) From each according to his ability is the premise of distribution according to work. Only when everyone does his best, promotes the communist spirit of labor and criticizes bourgeois rights is it possible to correctly handle and carry out distribution according to work. The worker comrades say rightly: “To make contribution to the best of one’s ability, one must not bother solely with distribution according to work.”

Not only must we see the necessity of practicing distribution according to work in socialist society, but we must also see the necessity of restricting bourgeois rights manifested in the course of distribution according to work. The “20 Points” mentions only the aspect of “basically meeting the demands of the developing productive forces,” but not the other aspect of incompatibility, thus essentially denying the existence of bourgeois rights in the field of distribution in a vain attempt to protect and extend the soil engendering capitalism and new bourgeois elements and undermine the socialist economic base.

To advocate that distribution should be carried out according to “the physical capacity of people and the amount of contribution made” is to openly preach the virtue of working for money, that whoever works better makes more money. This is material incentive, pure and simple. Enthusiasm “stimulated” in this way can never be socialist enthusiasm but bourgeois individualist “enthusiasm.” We workers still remember vividly the harm done by the practice of material incentives before the Great Cultural Revolution. In those days, work performance was assessed and bonuses were given every month and with “increasing rigidity,” thereby seriously corroding the workers’ ranks. Didn’t the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping cry aloud that he himself “had done hard work if he had won no merit, or even if he had done no hard work, he had done tiresome work”? Since he himself made the “greatest contribution,” it was only logical that he should “receive” the most. In the final analysis, “to reward according to merit” was intended to protect the interests of the revisionist big officials.

(Text) “Bourgeois rights must not be restricted in isolation from material and spiritual conditions at the present stage. Under no circumstances must we reject distribution according to work, refuse to recognize the necessary differences and instead practice egalitarianism.”

(Criticism) It is utterly nonsense to make the false accusation that bourgeois rights are criticized and restricted “in isolation from the material and spiritual conditions at the present stage.” Talking about conditions, the most important one is the communist consciousness on the part of the broad masses of workers. In 1958, we workers voluntarily proposed the abolition of piece-work wages, thus effectively pounding at bourgeois rights in the sphere of distribution. Do you still remember this? During the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, criticism of the revisionist lines of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao resulted in the appearance of large groups of socialist new things and the continuous emergence of heart-stirring deeds reflecting the communist spirit. Have you forgotten that? It is our belief that only by persistently criticizing and restricting bourgeois rights is it possible to gradually create conditions for the elimination of bourgeois rights and, failing that, bourgeois rights will prepare the conditions for capitalist restoration. Bourgeois rights are the root of life for capitalist roaders, and no wonder that they resent and are hurt by our criticism of bourgeois rights.

Chairman Mao says: **“Even now China still practices the eight-grade wage system, distribution according to work and exchange through money, and in all this differs little from the old society.”** It should be seen that the main tendency we must prevent and combat in the field of distribution at present is not toward “egalitarianism” but toward expansion of differences between grades. Even in the case of so-called “egalitarianism,” what we oppose is “absolute” egalitarianism, and we are in favor of general equality and common affluence. In opposing “practice of egalitarianism,” the “20 Points” actually counters Chairman Mao’s important directive on the question of theory and paves the way for the extension of bourgeois rights and the enforcement of the revisionist line of material incentives and putting banknotes in command.

(Text) “It is necessary to introduce a normal system of promotion. According to the attitude of the workers and staff toward labor, the rise in their technical capability and performance in labor and work . . . each year the wages of a number of workers and staff should be increased.”

(Criticism) Here the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping smilingly made out a check: “Increase the wages each year.” It sounds very nice indeed, but on a close examination, it isn’t right. Only “a number” will see their wages increased. Which “a number”? Here there are three criteria, which are concerned only with labor and not with putting proletarian politics in command, and only with techniques and not with revolution. In other words, you must honestly toe his revisionist line and become his docile tool, and he will give you a reward. If you criticize revisionism and the bourgeoisie, he will give you hardship.

Such a “system of promotion” is one of “carrot” and “stick” by means of which he imposes bourgeois dictatorship over the workers. Buying off workers and suppressing them was what capitalists had done in the past. If his “system of promotion” were followed, “a number” of workers who were so “promoted” would become worker aristocrats and betraying the working class, while the vast majority of workers who persevere in revolution not only would not be “promoted” but would be “degraded” and “reduced” into wage laborers to be exploited by a handful of capitalist roaders. Nothing can be more vicious than this method, but we workers will never fall into the trap.

So-Called “Concern for the Livelihood of Workers and Staff”

(Text) “It is basically wrong to adopt an indifferent attitude toward the difficulties in the livelihood of the masses.”

(Criticism) Our Party has always shown concern for the livelihood of the masses. It is an undeniable fact that since the Great Cultural Revolution began and in the wake of continuous development of the national economy, the livelihood of the masses of people has further improved. But the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping, hoisting the signboard of “pleading for the people,” gives the expression that he alone understands the sufferings of the people most and is most concerned about their livelihood. His “concern” actually harbors a sinister motive. He alleges: “Without vegetables and without meat, how can we develop industry well?” This is a malicious vilification of the excellent situation of the national economy, a shameless slander against the working class, and a vicious provocation aimed at driving a wedge between the Party and the masses. The workers of Taching opened up the Taching Oilfield at a high speed and with satisfactory results by sheer hard work on a barren plain. The poor and lower-middle peasants of Tachai transformed nature and reaped bumper harvest on barren hills short of water and under harsh circumstances where crops failed in nine years out of ten. Can it be that this was achieved through “stimulation” by “pork”? Such socialist enthusiasm is generated only if we arm ourselves with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought under the guidance of Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line. Teng Hsiao-ping’s fallacies are no better than a reprint of Lin Piao’s “inducements in the form of official appointments, high emoluments and favors,” and are sugar-coated poison.

So-Called “Red and Expert”

(Text) “To create an atmosphere where everyone strives to study

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and at the same time delves into technical and vocational studies, it is particularly necessary to pay heed to making the two mutually coordinated and not antagonistic to each other. It is necessary to positively create conditions for the broad masses of workers and staff to become both Red and expert.”

(Criticism) Chairman Mao has always encouraged everyone to be Red and expert. Since the beginning of the Great Cultural Revolution, mass movements to study Marxist-Leninist and Chairman Mao’s works have flourished in factories and enterprises. Socialist new things—such as workers’ theoretical contingents, July 21 workers’ universities, mass scientific research activities, and “three-in-one” technical innovations and new product experiments—have sprung up endlessly like bamboo shoots after rain, and large groups of both Red and expert personnel have grown up rapidly.

But the “20 Points” charges us with making Red and expert “antagonistic to each other,” while at the same time resorting to eclectic tactics, it puts “study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought” and “technical vocational studies” on an equal footing with a view to emasculating the role of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in guiding technical and vocation work in order to achieve the criminal goal of transposing the relationship between Red and expert and publicizing the white and expert road. They negate the Party’s policy of uniting, educating and transforming intellectuals, accuse the Party of being unconcerned about intellectuals, and do everything they could to advocate that “white and expert is good for the Chinese People’s Republic” and “should be cherished and praised.” In the light of their absurd arguments spread everywhere to incite people to stir up the “vocational typhoon” and “economic typhoon,” and “if the 8th-grade typhoon is not strong enough, blow the 12th-grade typhoon,” it is not difficult to see that while hoisting the banner of “creating conditions for the broad masses of workers and staff to become both Red and expert,” the “20 Points” actually encourages some people to take the white and expert road and train “talent” for capitalist restoration.

So-Called ‘Methods of Work and Style of Work’

In its last two sections, the “20 Points” pretentiously deals at length with “promoting materialist dialectics” for the purpose of attaching the “materialist dialectic” label to these regulations.

What is false is false, and the mask should be taken off. What does the “20 Points” promote after all: dialectics or passing off eclecticism for dialectics? As the “general program” for industrial development, the revisionist program of “taking the three directives as the key link”

puts the primary and secondary issues on an equal footing and confuses them altogether. It exemplifies eclecticism of confounding the primary with secondary issues. Take another instance. On the question of relationship between revolution and production, they say, on the one hand, that "it is quite wrong" to fail to pay attention to continuing the revolution in the superstructure and the economic base. On the other hand, they say that "it is quite wrong" to fail to pay attention to production and make no effort to carry on production successfully. On the question of Party leadership, they talk about "unified leadership by Party committees" on the one hand and, on the other hand, they talk at length about "setting up production management systems which are effective and capable of operating independently." And so on and so forth. In all this, they make no distinction between the principal and secondary contradictions and confuse the principal and secondary aspects of a contradiction. **"Judging by the philosophical source of this phenomenon, this is to secretly replace dialectics with eclecticism and sophistry."** (Lenin, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*) In talking big about "dialectics," the "20 Points" is intended entirely to hoodwink people.

However, when we analyze and criticize the "20 Points" with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the weapon, we will unmask the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping as a man who pretends to follow dialectics, catch his black hand attacking the proletariat, and grasp his fox tail in restoring capitalism. It is precisely they who "affirm everything or negate everything without making any differentiation." In the "20 Points," without making the slightest differentiation, they negate and condemn all the great achievements made and all the new socialist things that appeared on the industrial front since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. However, they laud to the skies that revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. The "20 Points" is filled with nothing but revisionist sinister stuff such as the theory of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces which Liu Shao-chi trumpeted for 17 years and Lin Piao vainly attempted to inject into his report at the 9th Party Congress. If the proposals contained in the "20 Points" were implemented, that would lead to general restoration of capitalism on the entire industrial front.

* * *

The working class is the main force in repulsing the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts. We firmly support the CCP Central Committee's resolution on appointing Comrade Hua Kuo-feng to be the First Vice Chairman of the CCP Central Committee and Premier of the

State Council of the Chinese People's Republic and the resolution dismissing Teng Hsiao-ping from all his posts both inside and outside the Party. We wrathfully condemn the counter-revolutionary political incident which took place at Tienanmen Square in the capital. We must take concrete action to protect Chairman Mao, the Party Central Committee and Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. **“Oppose the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, carry on both revolution and production”**—this is the common resolve of the broad masses of workers. We must unite around the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, thoroughly criticize the unrepentant capitalist roader Teng Hsiao-ping's counter-revolutionary revisionist line, and make greater contributions to defending and developing the grand achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, speeding up the pace of socialist construction and further strengthening and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(This article was based on collective discussion conducted at a study class attended by a number of worker theoretical backbone elements.)

COMMENTS ON TENG HSIAO-PING'S ECONOMIC IDEAS OF THE COMPRADOR BOURGEOISIE

Kao Lu and Chang Ko

The arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party Teng Hsiao-ping made many absurd statements about economic construction. In a nutshell, his economic ideas are essentially those of the comprador bourgeoisie. Domestically speaking, he represented the bourgeoisie and wanted to seize the leadership over the national economy from the proletariat and turn China's socialist economy into a bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist economy. In foreign affairs, he practised capitulation and national betrayal, and vainly attempted to turn China into a colony or semi-colony of imperialism and social-imperialism.

Reimposing "Direct and Exclusive Control of Enterprises By the Ministry Concerned"

After Teng Hsiao-ping took up work again, he imposed without the knowledge and approval of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao an economic administration system of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned." This means a few top persons in the central ministries concerned could directly issue orders to enterprises in all parts of the country and exercise leadership over them. Enterprises of the same trade thus formed into a separate system operating by themselves, thereby liquidating the controlling power of the Party Central Committee and the local Party committees over the economy and negating the unified leadership of the Party committees at various levels.

As early as 1956, Chairman Mao pointed out that in order to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, strengthen the socialist economic base and build a strong socialist country, it is necessary to handle correctly the relations between the central and local authorities and "**let the localities undertake more work under unified central planning.**" This will bring the initiative of both the central and local authorities into play. However, Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping for a long time refused to implement this correct principle; instead, they lauded the imperialist trusts to the skies.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution smashed the two

Peking Review #35, August 27, 1976. (Abridged translation of article in *Hongqi [Red Flag]* #7, 1976.)

bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. During the revolution, the masses and the revolutionary cadres rose to revolt against "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" and promoted the implementation of Chairman Mao's correct principle. China no longer has to ship grain from the south to the north nor coal from the north to the south. Deposits of coal, petroleum and natural-gas have been discovered in the south. Small iron and steel, chemical fertilizer, cement, machinery and hydro-electric power industries have mushroomed in the various localities and output has multiplied, while many small and medium-sized cities have developed into new industrial centres. All this shows the absolute correctness of Chairman Mao's instruction that **"it is far better for the initiative to come from two sources than from only one."** This is of great and far-reaching significance to developing the national economy with greater, faster, better and more economical results.

After Teng Hsiao-ping resumed work, he lapsed into his old ways. On the pretext of exercising "centralized and unified" leadership, he wanted to "turn over to the higher authorities" what he called "key enterprises which serve the whole nation and require organized co-ordination on a national scale." If this policy had been followed, most of the big enterprises and the lesser ones working in co-ordination with them in all parts of the country would have been "turned over." This would inevitably have undermined the initiative of the localities and the broad masses of the people and sabotaged socialist construction as a whole. What Teng Hsiao-ping undertook to do fully shows that he was stubbornly opposed to Chairman Mao's principle of bringing into play the initiative from both the central and local authorities, that he wanted to reverse the correct appraisal of the Cultural Revolution, and that he wished to continue pushing the revisionist line and take the beaten track of imperialist trusts.

The system of "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" is diametrically opposed to the Party's unified leadership. It is splittism and advocates the doctrine of "many centres" in opposition to the Party Central Committee; it is despotism and bourgeois dictatorship over the localities and the masses. The purpose of Teng Hsiao-ping's reimposing "direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned" was the liquidation of our socialist economy through "rectification." This kind of "control" would inevitably divide up the socialist economy of ownership by the whole people and turn it into the "private property" of respective trades. And the various trades and departments would become sharply opposed to each other. The overly distinct division of labour would lead to undermining each other's work and the relations between them would be turned into

capitalist relations of competition.

Since “direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned” disregarded inter-departmental equilibrium in the national economy, it would inevitably undermine the rational distribution of the national economy and the multi-purpose utilization of resources and obstruct extensive socialist co-operation.

Teng Hsiao-ping’s “rectification” of the economy by means of “direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned” was intended to bring about a capitalist concentration of production and monopoly and enforce the revisionist practices of running factories by relying on experts, putting profits in command, offering material incentives, giving first place to production and putting technique above everything else. It also aimed at negating Chairman Mao’s line and policies concerning the socialist revolution and construction, at expanding and strengthening bourgeois right, at changing the socialist orientation and road of our enterprises and turning the socialist economy into a bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist economy.

Pushing the Soviet Revisionist Managerial System

Resurrecting the economic administration system of “direct and exclusive control of enterprises by the ministry concerned” and introducing the Soviet revisionist managerial system in the enterprises to exercise bourgeois dictatorship over the working class are two aspects of the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalism Teng Hsiao-ping worked for. Chairman Mao pointed out in 1964: **“Management itself is a matter of socialist education. If the managerial staff do not join the workers on the shop floor, eat, live and work 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.”** Teng Hsiao-ping always acted in contravention of Chairman Mao’s instruction that **“we must wholeheartedly rely on the working class,”** and obstinately tried to push his revisionist line characterized by the hostility to the working class. He openly declared that “reliance on the workers, peasants and soldiers is relative,” categorically refused to regard the working class and the poor and lower-middle peasants as masters of the state, and denied that they had the right to control the economy. He showed the utmost hatred for the revolutionary action of the working class during the Great Cultural Revolution in criticizing the capitalist and revisionist managerial principles, rules and regulations, and he lost no time in mounting a vengeful counterattack the moment he came into office again. He not only brought out again the set of rules

aimed at “controlling, checking and repressing” the workers but clamoured for dealing with them “as strictly as possible.” This proves to the hilt that he was indeed the general representative of those **“bourgeois elements sucking the blood of the workers”** whom Chairman Mao had scathingly criticized.

Which political line is followed and which class wields the power of leadership in an enterprise are factors determining which class actually owns it. If Teng Hsiao-ping had been allowed to carry on with his revisionist line, the leadership of the enterprises would inevitably be seized by the capitalist-roads, the bourgeoisie in the Party, who would use the power in their hands to embezzle and squander huge amounts of wealth created by the working class and ride roughshod on the backs of the workers. In that case, the socialist enterprises would exist only in name and would be turned into bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist enterprises.

What Teng Hsiao-ping pushed was merely a carbon copy of the so-called “economic reforms” introduced by Khrushchov and Brezhnev. To develop bureaucrat-monopoly capitalism, the Soviet revisionists energetically pushed what they called a “new economic system” with material incentives and putting profits in command as the core. They gave top priority to expertise and relied on specialists to run the enterprises, and the bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist class completely controlled the leadership over the national economy. The rules and regulations of their enterprises stipulate explicitly that the managers are vested with the power to sell, transfer or lease any part of the enterprises’ means of production, to recruit and fire workers at will, and to do whatever they like to the workers, that is to say, exercise bourgeois dictatorship over them. The Soviet revisionists exercise vertical leadership over the enterprises through the two-level organizational system of “ministry—production combine enterprises” or the three-level system of “ministry—industrial combines—production combine enterprises.” These combines, which are large in scale, have centralized practically all the managerial functions of the enterprises. By pushing this “new economic system” the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has intensified its monopoly and control over the enterprises throughout the country.

The reality of the Soviet Union is a mirror. It helps us to see clearly that once the socialist economy turns into bureaucrat-monopoly capitalist economy, it will bring disaster to the labouring people. Powerless politically and exploited economically, the working people of the Soviet Union today are having a very hard time. The Ninth Five-Year Plan, decked out by the Soviet revisionists as a “welfare plan,” has gone bankrupt; the rate of industrial growth is constantly diminishing; agriculture is in a hopeless mess; there are serious

disproportions between the various departments of the national economy; and the contradiction between the worker-peasant masses and the handful of bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists is sharpening with each passing day. All this is steadily aggravating the political and economic crisis of Soviet social-imperialism. Teng Hsiao-ping's attempt to follow in the footsteps of the Soviet revisionists could only lead to a serious disruption of China's socialist relations of production and superstructure and destroy the socialist economy.

“Major Policy” of Capitulation and National Betrayal

Chairman Mao has pointed out that under China's historical condition, those who stubbornly choose to take the capitalist road are in fact **“ready to capitulate to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism.”** This was the case with Teng Hsiao-ping. In his eyes, the Chinese people were no good at carrying out economic construction or bringing about the modernizations of agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology, nor, for that matter, was the socialist system of any help. The only feasible way to “speed up the technical transformation of industry and raise labour productivity” is to “import foreign techniques and equipment.” For this purpose he put forward a so-called “major policy” under which China would sign “long-term contracts” with foreign countries, with the foreign capitalists supplying the “most up-to-date and the best equipment” to be “paid for” by China with its mineral products. This “major policy” was purely a policy of out-and-out capitulation and national betrayal.

In economic construction, whether to rely on the strength of our own people or to worship everything foreign and rely on foreign countries represents two diametrically opposed lines. Chairman Mao has taught us: **“Rely mainly on our own efforts while making external assistance subsidiary, break down blind faith, go in for industry, agriculture and technical and cultural revolutions independently, do away with slavishness, bury dogmatism, learn from the good experience of other countries conscientiously and be sure to study their bad experience too, so as to draw lessons from it. This is our line.”** Teng Hsiao-ping completely betrayed this line advanced by Chairman Mao. His so-called “major policy” actually opposed putting China's economic construction on the basis of the strength of the Chinese people and advocated instead “importing foreign techniques and equipment.”

Whether or not to adhere to the principle of independence and self-reliance is not only an economic question but, first and foremost, a political one. An important means employed by imperialism and social-imperialism to control and plunder other countries is to monopolize ad-

vanced techniques and equipment and use their economic strength to check the other countries' development and carry out extortion, infiltration and expansion. In the world today, if a country is not independent and self-reliant economically, it cannot become politically independent or cannot consolidate its independence and is liable to fall under the control of one or the other superpower.

We hold that, under the guidance of the principle of independence and self-reliance, it is necessary to import some foreign techniques and equipment on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and in accordance with the needs of our country's socialist revolution and construction. But we absolutely cannot place our hopes for realizing the four modernizations on imports. If we do not rely mainly on our own efforts but, as Teng Hsiao-ping advocated, rely solely on importing foreign techniques, copying foreign designs and technological processes and patterning our equipment on foreign models, we will forever trail behind foreigners and our country's development of technology and even its entire national economy will fall under the control of foreign monopoly capital.

Some economists of the monopoly capitalists allege that industrially backward countries can only "take off" by relying on the techniques of imperialism. That Teng Hsiao-ping, with the label of a Communist Party member, should chime in with such nonsense was a big irony indeed! This of course was not a mere coincidence. It showed that Teng Hsiao-ping's economic concepts fully met the needs of imperialism.

The Soviet revisionists' newspaper *Pravda* had advocated mortgaging Soviet resources to bring in foreign capital and experience and using part of the products turned out by the factories to be built to pay back the debts some time in the future. Teng Hsiao-ping's "major policy" is of the same stuff as that of the Soviet revisionists. The essence of this "policy" is to ask for foreign loans by selling out China's natural resources and state sovereignty.

Teng Hsiao-ping shamelessly asserted that his "major policy" had three "advantages," namely, the policy made it possible for China to export, to promote technical transformation and to absorb labour power. What kind of "advantages" are these? They mean nothing but this: the foreign monopoly capitalists would contribute money and equipment while China would supply the necessary labour power, thus the doors would be thrown wide open for the imperialists to plunder China's natural resources and bleed its people. The Chinese people had more than enough of such "advantages" before liberation. If this capitulationist "major policy" of Teng Hsiao-ping's were followed, China would be reduced step by step to a raw materials supplying base for imperialism and social-imperialism, a market for their commodities

and an outlet for their investments. And not only would the fruits of socialist revolution be forfeited but those of the democratic revolution would also be brought to naught. This fully reveals the ugly features of Teng Hsiao-ping who worked as a comprador for the imperialists and represented the interests of big foreign capitalists.

Historical Experience Merits Attention

Historical experience over the past hundred years tells us that it is but an illusion to think that China can become strong and prosperous by depending on imperialism for techniques and loans to develop its economy. In the latter half of the 19th century, advocates of the "Westernization Movement" of the late Ching Dynasty stressed the need to "accept loans to develop the country." They considered that China's only "chance of making progress" and "way of survival" was to use the country's natural resources as mortgage to borrow large amounts of money from the imperialist countries and to "copy" foreign techniques to build up an industry. Things turned out to be just the opposite. It was these capitulationist ideas which suited the imperialists perfectly to dump their surplus goods, export capital and carve up China. The "Westernization Movement" drained China's resources day by day and deepened her national crisis.

In the semi-feudal and semi-colonial old China, there were some people enthusiastically advocating "saving the country by industrialization." They deemed that the root cause of China's poverty and backwardness was her underdeveloped industry, and they believed that China would become strong and prosperous by developing industry and commerce on a large scale. They did not have the courage to launch a thorough-going struggle against imperialism and feudalism but harboured the illusion that China could develop a capitalist industry without overthrowing imperialist rule. However, under the dual oppression of the imperialists and their lackeys, the destiny awaiting those advocates of "saving the country by industrialization" was either failure with all their illusions rising in bubbles or throwing themselves into the embrace of the imperialists and ending up in the same way as comprador capitalists. During his youth, Teng Hsiao-ping had cherished the idea of "saving the country by industrialization." In the decades that followed, his bourgeois stand and world outlook had not changed a bit. As the revolution develops in depth, his reactionary bourgeois nature became more and more exposed. From opposing the socialist revolution and attempting to restore capitalism to taking over the mantle of the comprador capitalists and practising capitulations and national betrayal, Teng Hsiao-ping could not but end up in the

same ignominious way as compradors in China's history.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“Only socialism can save China.”** This is the historical conclusion arrived at by the Chinese people after protracted revolutionary struggles. Departing from Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, from the dictatorship of the proletariat and from the socialist road, it would be wishful thinking to hope for China's independence and prosperity and the Chinese people's freedom and happiness. Revolution is changing and can change everything. So long as we firmly implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, persevere in taking class struggle as the key link and adhere to the principle of independence and self-reliance and resolutely rely on and bring into full play the enthusiasm and creativeness of the broad masses of people, we will surely be able to build China into a powerful socialist state with modern agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology before the end of this century and continue to advance towards the great goal of communism.

TEXT 33

A NEW TYPE OF PRODUCTION RELATIONS IN A SOCIALIST ENTERPRISE

—An account of how the Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory observes the “Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Works” and effects the system of “two-way learning on the spot”

In what way can an enterprise establish a new type of socialist relations of production and continue to improve it?

How can we prevent leaders of an enterprise, as servants of the people, from gradually degenerating into capitalist-roaders and members of the bureaucratic class, and how can we prevent the working masses, masters of the enterprises, from being reduced once again to hired hands?

Through what means can we ensure that the leadership of an enterprise will be firmly kept in the hands of genuine Marxists and the working masses?

Chairman Mao’s series of important directives issued during the Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the struggle to beat back the right deviationists who attempted to reverse correct verdicts have indicated the right direction and approach for resolving the above problems.

In which way should these directives be implemented in an industrial enterprise? Many advanced industrial units have answered this question with their own actions. The Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory is one of them. At the high tide of criticizing Teng Hsiao-p’ing in depth, we paid a visit to the factory. To our excitement, we saw with our own eyes a brand-new scene of how a socialist enterprise operates.

Fresh Experience in Managing a Socialist Enterprise

Because of the Cultural Revolution the political movements concerning the criticism of Lin Piao and Confucius, the study of the theory of proletarian dictatorship, and especially the great ongoing struggle to criticize Teng Hsiao-p’ing’s counter-revolutionary revisionist line and repulse the right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, the Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory has gained new ground in its effort to launch in depth the mass movement of learning from Taching in industry and adhering to the “Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel

Chinese Economic Studies, Fall 1977. (Translation of article from *Renmin Ribao [People’s Daily]*, July 18, 1976.)

Works.” Fresh experience has been gained in organizing the cadres to take part in physical labor and the workers to participate in management. They have initiated a system of “two-way learning on the spot” in which each cadre takes a turn in workshops a hundred days a year while groups of workers serve for four to six months in offices, participating in management. Throughout the entire factory, cadres who were divorced from manual labor have mastered at least one production skill, while the secretary of the factory Party committee and his deputies, five in all, have learned to do two or three kinds of technical production work. When they work in the workshops, they are assigned to the daytime or nighttime shift like other workers and fulfill the same required production tasks. With the workers, they take part in study and criticism conducted by teams and squads. Workers from the forefront of production are sent to the factory headquarters in turns, undertaking leadership and administrative jobs in offices and sections. When their assignments to the headquarters are completed, they return to their former teams and squads. In addition to the above, mass management committees are set up at the team and squad levels and various types of workers’ administrative groups are established in workshops. As a rule, workers who directly participate in the administration of the factory account for more than a third of the total number of workers. Acting in the capacity of masters of both the state and factory, the workers exercise revolutionary supervision over the cadres. On top of that, the extensive participation in administrative work on the part of the workers has continuously propelled institutional reforms in the superstructure. Having streamlined the factory organization, administrative personnel now only account for 8 percent of the total number of staff members and workers in the factory.

The revolutionary practice of “two-way learning on the spot” has brought about a revolutionary and profound change in the relations among men, among units, and between the cadres and the masses in the factory. They have made new breakthroughs in such areas as the drive to restrict bourgeois rights and gradually narrow the three major differences, the effort to formulate regulations and conventions convenient for the masses in order to establish a revolutionary order and discipline, and in their endeavor to promote productive capacity.

Cadres Voluntarily Toil as Workers

During the past few years, it has become a voluntary practice for leading cadres of the Shanghai Watch and Clock Factory to learn on the spot in certain grass-root units and take part in production labor. Let’s begin with some examples.

In March this year, according to schedule, it was the turn of Lu Wen-hsi, secretary of the factory Party committee, to learn on the spot and take part in physical labor in the No. 3 Workshop. At that time, the entire factory was ablaze with the struggle to criticize Teng Hsiao-p'ing, a campaign that was in need of leadership. However, it was the opinion of the Party committee that sending Party leaders to participate in production labor at this juncture would strengthen the leadership rather than weakening it. Old Lu took part in labor like other workers and learned from the masses while working along with them. At the same time, he punctually brought back to the Party committee the masses' fresh experience in criticizing Teng Hsiao-p'ing so that the committee could give instructions to the factory as a whole and step by step guide the progress of the campaign against Teng. Deputy Committee Secretary Ch'ou Chin-tao was in charge of the entire factory's production. After Lu's turn to labor at the lower level, Ch'ou went to learn on the spot by participating in production labor in the pilot manufacturing group for new products.

The maxim of the cadres at the Shanghai Watch and Clock Factory is that they should learn how to toil as workers. They bear in mind the historical experience of the Paris Commune, namely, that it was necessary to prevent cadres from "seeking their particular interests" after the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship (*Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Chinese edition, Vol. 2, p. 334). They are constantly on the alert not to convert the power in their hands into privilege. To join the workers in their struggle, every year during the hot season, the cadres go to the hottest and dirtiest spot to take part in production. The cadres regularly make public to the entire factory the number of days in each month that they engaged in direct production work. As for workers who take part in management in the headquarters of the factory, the cadres frequently report to them concerning the progress of the factory's work and also concerning the cadres' own views and ideas. To intensify the struggle to criticize Teng Hsiao-p'ing, the cadres often invite workers to join the sessions of the nucleus study group held by the Party Committee twice a week so that the workers can educate the cadres in the studies and expound any specific topic concerning the criticism of Teng. On festive occasions, the cadres and workers rehearse, sing revolutionary songs, and stage plays and operas together.

Why is it that cadres in this factory can persist in taking part in labor and voluntarily toil as workers? The basic reason is that the vast numbers of cadres, through the education of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, have come to understand that these two requirements constitute a major aspect of their commitment to prevent and combat revisionism.

What was the relationship between the cadres and workers prior to

the Cultural Revolution when Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line was dominant? Here is how the workers describe things at that time: "The factory manager's office was an impassable threshold which the workers had no right to step across. As a turnip is only allowed to grow in its hole, a worker was obliged to work quietly where he belonged." The workers looked upon this kind of relationship as the one between a cat and a mouse; the cadres thought it was designed to uphold the cadres' prestige and guarantee that they could run the enterprise well. Whenever the workers tried to initiate a technical innovation, they had to present their case to seven related offices and sections for their approval, involving altogether twenty-three procedures. The revisionist-oriented supervision, barriers, and pressure reduced the workers into hired hands and put the cadres in a position sharply conflicting with the workers.

Like a rainstorm, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution washed away the mud and slops left over from the revisionist line pursued by Liu Shao-ch'i. The broad masses of workers broke down the evil traditions which restrained their initiative and created a new situation in which the working class, led by the Party, retains the leadership over the enterprise. Under the guidance of the Party committee, cadres in the entire Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory persist in taking part in production labor as ordinary workers. By working with the workers, the cadres learned through personal contact the fine character of the working class and the workers' lofty spirit of behaving themselves as the masters of the enterprise. They became aware of the extreme importance of improving relations between the leadership and the masses. Deputy Secretary of the Factory Party Committee Chao Hsiu-hua was assigned to work on the morning shift in the materials section of No. 2 Workshop. On the first day, he got to the workshop punctually at six o'clock in the morning. However, he found he was late, for it had become a regular practice over the past few years for workers in the section to start work ahead of schedule. As Little Chao had had no knowledge of this beforehand, he was deeply impressed. He realized that cadres were liable to estrange themselves from the masses once they stopped taking part in production labor. Without sharing the joys and hardships of the masses, the cadres could not appreciate the working masses and learn from them. From that time on, Little Chao has consciously and persistently participated in labor and mingled with the workers as an ordinary laborer.

Deputy Secretary of the Factory Party Committee Liu Chih-lung is a new cadre from a worker's background. Once when he was assigned to learn on the spot and do production labor in the arc-shaping section, he found a worker cutting a stamp while on the shift. Liu was angry and

wanted to criticize the worker. However, since Liu remembered that one has no right to speak without having conducted an investigation beforehand, he decided to have a heart-to-heart talk with the worker. What he discovered through the talk was a great surprise to him. The workers had succeeded in making a new technical innovation. To distinguish the specifications of different products, they needed nine sets of stamps. In order to save state expenditure, the worker took the initiative and cut the stamps on his own. After this episode, Liu made a penetrating examination of his own sentiments at the full meeting of the factory's cadres. He questioned himself about why his attitude toward the workers was liable to change after he himself had been promoted to be a cadre. This incident showed that, though a new cadre himself, he was susceptible to the influence and erosion of ideas about upholding bourgeois rights. For this reason, even a new cadre from a worker's background should pay attention to placing himself in the right position when dealing with the masses. It is a revisionist idea to regard a cadre as someone who takes charge of workers. It is therefore a bad idea, and we should never allow ourselves to be affected by it. The strict demands Liu Chih-lung made on himself served as an education to the cadres throughout the factory.

Chairman Mao taught us: "Management is socialist education in itself. If administrative personnel do not practice the three unities with the workers in workshops and sections and respect them as teachers from whom they can learn a few skills, they will be locked all their lives in a state of severe class struggle with the working class and will finally be knocked out by the workers as capitalists. Without gaining technical know-how and by remaining an outsider all the time, one can never be a good administrator. It is impossible for a muddle-head to give explicit directions to others." In association with their own experience of doing production labor in fixed units at the grass-roots level, responsible comrades of the factory Party committee, as well as cadres in offices and sections, conscientiously studied this important directive of Chairman Mao. They further understood that in order for the leaders of a socialist enterprise to thoroughly break away from the revisionist line pursued by Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao, and Teng Hsiao-p'ing, completely disassociating themselves from the old relations of production as well as conventional ideas, they have no choice but to toil as an ordinary worker and perseveringly take part in collective production labor. Through participation in labor, they improve the relations between the leadership and the masses and realize a fundamental transformation of their own world outlooks. Right now, the vast numbers of cadres and masses in the factory carry forward the fine tradition of cadres and masses sharing each other's joys and hardships, a tradition which prevailed

during the period of revolutionary war. They have gained fresh ground in developing socialist production relations and have created a new political situation in which both the cadres and the masses are active in thinking and are united as one in fighting for a common goal.

Workers Have Truly Become Masters of the Enterprise

The workers' participation in managing the enterprise constitutes a major aspect of "two-way learning on the spot." As group after group of workers have taken part in administrative work and exercised revolutionary supervision over the cadres, carefully helping and educating them, the Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory has undergone a tremendous change in its relations of production. Take a small incident for example. Last June, several workers sat in on sessions of the nucleus study group held by the factory Party committee. They saw Hsu Aihsin, a member of the Party committee and branch secretary of the No. 1 Workshop, receive six phone calls in a row within ten minutes after he sat down for the study session. Then somebody beckoned to him from outside the meeting room. He asked for leave and went away without returning. This incident aroused the workers' deep thinking and concern. Why were there so many people who wanted to consult Old Hsu and interrupt his study? The workers looked into the matter and found out that the six phone calls were all in reference to trifles. They felt that Old Hsu kept a tight hold on small matters but neglected major issues. The workers made Old Hsu understand what they saw in this situation, and their opinion sounded like a warning to him. Deeply moved, Old Hsu sincerely understood that the workers' supervision indicated their concern and assistance for him.

Worker comrades in the factory said: "Participating in management and exercising supervision over cadres does not mean that we merely post wall posters. We must constantly and patiently come to the cadres' aid with meticulous ideological advice. Only by doing so can we consider ourselves to be working in compliance with Chairman Mao's teachings."

Since workers can be assigned to work at leading posts and participate in leadership and management, can cooks be allowed to do the same? Last year a cook and Party member by the name of Yu Hsin-chi was recommended by his comrades to learn on the spot in the armed defense squad. With a vigorous spirit, he learned to work hard and strengthen his ties with the masses. Adhering to political principles, he did a good job during his stay there. Not long after his return to the kitchen as a cook, the head of the defense squad was assigned to learn on the spot in a workshop. Yu was again invited to the squad and worked as its head for two months. Again he achieved good results in

his work, having a notable impact on the entire factory. Lenin once said: "Among the common people, that is, the workers and peasant masses who do not exploit others' labor, there is an extremely large number of people who have a talent for organization." ("Current Task for Soviet State Power," *Selected Works of V.I. Lenin*, Chinese Edition, Vol. 3, p. 514). What Lenin said is a fact, is it not?

The historical period of socialism is an era during which declining capitalism and growing communism are locked in a protracted fight. Having workers participate in management is a factor embodying the growth of communism. Teng Hsiao-p'ing opposed the "Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Works" and pursued a revisionist line in running enterprises. His purpose was to strangle socialist new things and nip elements of growing communism in the bud in an attempt to restore capitalism. Comrades of the Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory have opposed Teng's line and have created fresh experiences in having workers take part in management. This indicated the direction in which the management of a socialist enterprise should proceed.

Through the great revolutionary practice of persistently implementing the "Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Works," the Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory has effected profound changes in the two realms of the superstructure and the economic basis. By adhering to the revolutionary system of "two-way learning on the spot" in which cadres are allowed to participate in production labor and workers in management, relations among people have become entirely different. The workers say, "The cadres and the workers, though different in their division of labor, are both masters of the enterprise." The revisionist line pursued by Liu Shao-ch'i interfered with the cadres and workers and divided them into two separate camps by means of the division of labor prior to the Cultural Revolution. Sometimes they were even locked in a state of class struggle. Now, since they have adhered to the "Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Works" and implemented the system of "two-way learning on the spot," they have been as close to each other as a fish in water.

The system of "two-way learning on the spot" serves as an education for many cadres. They have arrived at an even deeper understanding of revolution after having studied Chairman Mao's teaching that the bourgeoisie is "right in the Communist Party" and after having studied his major instructions on the Socialist Education Movement launched in 1964. Said the cadres: "It was the revisionist line and the old relations of production that alienated cadres from labor and the masses. Leading cadres in our factory are all promoted from among the rank and file workers. However, if we were divorced from labor and the masses for a long time, holding ourselves loftily aloof and acting as overlords, we

would probably evolve into newly emerging bureaucrats and capitalist-roaders who would finally be kicked out by the working class.”

“In the past,” they continued, “we spoke of adding a brick or a tile to the edifice of socialism. Now, merely stating this is not enough. We must also add a pickaxe or a spade so that we can gradually dig away the soil engendering capitalism and the bourgeoisie. It is a great struggle during which we must prepare ourselves for the protracted fight ahead. We must persist in the struggle against the bourgeoisie in the Party and behave ourselves as proletarian revolutionaries all the time.”

Adherence to the policy of putting proletarian politics in command of everything as well as the continual improvement of production relations has propelled production in this factory rapidly forward. The factory's total output value in 1975 was 7.3 times that of 1965. During the ten years of Cultural Revolution, it registered an average increase of 23 percent per year. Labor productivity rose by 5.6 times, and production costs went down by 55 percent. The profit it turned over to the state increased by sixteen times, and it has completed more than a thousand items of technical innovation. It has also succeeded in making many advanced machines and much advanced equipment. These include the automatic laser diamond drill, the automatic aligning machine, and the automatic spherical grinder which make it possible for the factory to develop its production in the direction of mechanization and automation. All these facts bear ample evidence for Marx's famous thesis that “the most powerful force of production is the revolutionary class itself.” To hell with Teng Hsiao-p'ing's concept that “class struggle is dying out” and the theory that “productive forces decide everything.” Under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, cadres and workers of the Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory use their brilliant accomplishments as ammunition to combat Teng Hsiao-p'ing's crime of attempting to reverse correct verdicts and being the overall representative of the bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party and of all exploiting classes.

The Shanghai Clock and Watch Factory has always adhered to the “Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Works” and effected the system of “two-way learning on the spot” so that the worker masses can be mobilized on an extensive scale for participation in management. All this serves as a powerful restriction on bourgeois rights and also as a symbol indicating the tremendous and powerful changes which our country's industrial front is now undergoing and must continue to undergo. Class struggle is the key link. The proletariat must hold it fast in its hands in order to propel the various socialist enterprises. Revolution commands production, and revolution boosts production. As long as we adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, we will

achieve even greater growth in socialist productivity. The proletarian dictatorship in our country will be further strengthened, and we will win still greater victories in our effort to advance the cause of socialism.

An NCNA Reporter and a *Jen-min*
Jih-pao Reporter and Correspondent

TEXT 34

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO LINES IN EDUCATION

On February 14, *Renmin Ribao* frontpaged an article written by the Party committee of Chaoyang Agricultural College in northeast China's Liaoning Province. The article discusses the fundamental differences between the two lines in education, warmly praises Chairman Mao's policy on education and criticizes the revisionist educational system.

This is one of the many important articles that have appeared recently in the Chinese press counterattacking the Right deviationist trend in educational, scientific and technical circles which tries to negate the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Since last summer, the Right deviationists in educational circles have spread absurdities in an attempt to blur the distinction between the two lines in education and reverse the verdict on the revisionist line in education which has been criticized during the Great Cultural Revolution. The Right deviationist trend has met with prompt and powerful rebuttal by the people throughout the country.

There has been an acute struggle between the proletarian line and the revisionist line on the educational front since the founding of New China. The current mass revolutionary debate is a continuation and deepening of this struggle.

The article by the Party committee of Chaoyang Agricultural College says: Our college was founded and expanded during the Cultural Revolution. Our experience over the years can be summed up as follows: Firmly carry out Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, fight tit-for-tat against the revisionist line that dominated education during the 17 years preceding the Cultural Revolution, and strive to make our college an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

However, the Right deviationists in educational circles asserted that the formulation "fighting tit-for-tat against the revisionist line in education of the 17 years" is wrong. They tried to blur the essential differences between the old line and the new in education. Since this is a cardinal issue of right and wrong concerning the line, the question must be thrashed out.

Peking Review #10, March 5, 1976.

1. Old Agricultural Colleges Were Dominated by Bourgeois Intellectuals; New Agricultural Colleges Must Strengthen Working-Class Leadership

Owing to the lack of a powerful contingent of proletarian intellectuals during the 17 years before the Cultural Revolution, the schools were dominated by bourgeois intellectuals whose influence went far beyond numerical superiority. Because the question of leadership in the educational field was not fundamentally solved and the important theoretical question of all-round dictatorship by the proletariat over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure was not clarified, the result was that some of the people sent by the Party and the working class to the schools were either edged out or turned into mouthpieces of the bourgeoisie. This enabled the bourgeoisie to exercise dictatorship over the proletariat in the schools.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution initiated and led by Chairman Mao smashed the rule of Liu Shao-chi's counter-revolutionary revisionist line in education. In 1968 Chairman Mao issued the instruction: **"The working class must exercise leadership in everything."** The working class and its most reliable ally, the poor and lower-middle peasants, along with People's Liberation Army fighters, moved into the schools to break the monopoly of bourgeois intellectuals and establish working-class leadership in the educational field, thereby opening a new chapter in the history of proletarian education.

The workers' and armymen's Mao Tsetung Thought propaganda teams in our college broke through strong resistance and guided the teachers and students to move from the city to the countryside. This was done in accordance with the directive issued by our great leader Chairman Mao more than a decade ago that all agricultural colleges should move to the rural areas. Running our school in the midst of the poor and lower-middle peasants, we have thus placed it under their direct management. A new-type socialist agricultural college has come into being with the educational system and the principles and methods of teaching completely overhauled.

Staunch working-class leadership and direct participation in management by workers and peasants are basic guarantees for carrying out Chairman Mao's proletarian line in education. But some people in educational circles prate absurdities, alleging that workers know nothing about education and so it "must be placed under the leadership of non-professionals who are enthusiastic about science." In other words, they want to eliminate working-class leadership and restore the domination of the revisionist line in the schools. Practice has shown that the working class is well versed in transforming the old educational

system in the image of the proletariat, and only the working class is capable of carrying the proletarian revolution in education through to the end. Attacks on working-class leadership in the schools are, in effect, directed at the dictatorship of the proletariat and amount to betrayal of the proletariat and capitulation to the bourgeoisie.

2. Old Agricultural Colleges Were Concentrated in Cities; New Agricultural Colleges Are Scattered in the Countryside

Before the Cultural Revolution, all agricultural colleges were located in urban areas and did little to serve the socialist revolution and construction in the rural areas. The poor and lower-middle peasants were furious about this. They said: "It's better not to have any such agricultural colleges at all."

Led by the workers' propaganda team, a number of teachers and students of the then Shenyang Agricultural College left the city in 1970 and set up a socialist agricultural college in the mountainous Chaoyang Prefecture. The local peasants welcomed them with open arms.

Once settled in the rural area, the teachers and students took part enthusiastically in the movement to learn from Tachai in agriculture. They ran evening courses in the production teams to disseminate Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. They formed scientific experimental groups and joined the peasants in improving soil and farming scientifically so that grain output in their host production brigades increased considerably that same year. The teachers and students also helped the production teams with orchard management, pruning the trees and spraying pesticides. The apple crop doubled that year. In the meantime, the students deepened their specialized knowledge.

Moving an agricultural college from the urban area to the countryside is not merely a move in location. It involves such questions as whom should they serve, what road they should take and the line they should follow. If an agricultural college is isolated from the rural areas, it cannot be of any help to the learn-from-Tachai movement, nor can it train workers with both socialist consciousness and culture.

3. Old Agricultural Colleges Advocated "He Who Excels in Learning Can Be an Official"; New Agricultural Colleges Practise the System of "From the Communes and Back to the Communes" and Train New-Type Peasants With Both Socialist Consciousness and Culture

The Confucian concept that "he who excels in learning can be an official" has been the guiding principle of all exploiting classes in running

schools. Aiming at training so-called “red agronomists” and “top specialists in construction,” the old agricultural colleges actually were revisionist dyeing-vats and hotbeds for bringing up bourgeois intellectual aristocrats. It is imperative for our new college to break thoroughly with the old educational traditions in order to train workers with both socialist consciousness and culture.

Chairman Mao issued the directive on July 21, 1968: **“Students should be selected from among workers and peasants with practical experience, and they should return to production after a few years’ study.”** This is a powerful ideological weapon to destroy thoroughly the reactionary feudal, bourgeois and revisionist traditions in education. We have implemented this brilliant instruction of Chairman Mao’s by carrying out the system of “from the communes and back to the communes,” which means students come from people’s communes and, after graduation, return to the communes to work as peasants.

Over 340 three-year-course students, enrolled under the system of “from the communes and back to the communes,” have graduated from our college since 1971. They have become new-type peasants. They have broken with the age-old tradition of “studying to become officials” and carried out the principle of the Paris Commune that **“careerism be fought not merely in words, but in deeds.”** Working vigorously in the forefront of the three great revolutionary movements of class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment, they have made contributions in the learn-from-Tachai movement. The poor and lower-middle peasants praise them as “vanguards in restricting bourgeois right” and “new-type socialist-minded peasants.”

The system of “from the communes and back to the communes” is an important indication that the schools have become instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat instead of the bourgeois dictatorship. Since it came into being, this system has been strongly opposed by the bourgeoisie and the old force of habit. To train workers and peasants, according to them, there is no need to run colleges, and those who have received a college education should not be workers and peasants. Does this not mean that the difference between mental and manual labour and the monopoly of culture and science by the privileged few should be perpetuated? We should always bear in mind how the Soviet Union has been turned into a revisionist country. In the Soviet Union, many sons and daughters of the workers and peasants managed to climb up to leading positions after finishing college, but they have betrayed the proletariat and become revisionists.

4. Old Agricultural Colleges Stressed “Giving First Place To Intellectual Development”; New Agricultural Colleges Stress Putting Proletarian Politics in Command

The old agricultural colleges followed the bourgeois principle of “giving first place to intellectual development” through stress on specialization, thereby making the schools tools of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

To thoroughly change this serious situation, we have in our practice maintained that socialist agricultural colleges, like other institutions of higher learning, must be made instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our students must first of all be trained to understand class struggle and the struggle between the two lines and become fighters who dare to criticize revisionism and capitalism and who strive to build socialism and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only in this way will the scientific and technical knowledge acquired by the students be of real use.

We have strengthened our efforts in ideological and political education in the past several years in accordance with Chairman Mao’s teaching: **“In all its work the school should aim at transforming the student’s ideology.”** The study of works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and Chairman Mao’s works is a required course, and learning from Tachai in agriculture and participation in productive labour are basic courses. The students take part in all political movements and return to their respective communes and production brigades regularly to take part in the three great revolutionary movements. There is ideological education throughout their period of study to strengthen the students’ determination to make revolution in the rural areas all their lives. And after their graduation, the college continues to pay attention to the students’ political maturing and helps them raise their vocational skill.

5. Old Agricultural Colleges Advocated “Regularization”; New Agricultural Colleges Adhere to Part-Work, Part-Study System

Agricultural colleges before the Cultural Revolution followed a “regular” system that shut the students within the four walls of the classroom and divorced education from productive labour, mental from manual labour and theory from practice. Our new agricultural college upholds the Party’s educational policy of combining education with productive labour, mental with manual labour and theory with practice, and puts into practice the system requiring the students to “do

part-time work and part-time study, working while studying.”

We have over the years included productive labour in the curriculum. Students do part-time work and part-time study while teachers do part-time work and part-time teaching, so that manual labour has gradually become the basis of school life. The teachers and students rely on their own efforts and work hard to put up school buildings and open up land for cultivation. Since 1972, they have put up 120 rooms and reclaimed 66 hectares of land. They harvested 30 tons of grain in 1972 and 150 tons in 1975, striving gradually to achieve self-sufficiency in grain, vegetables, edible oil and meat. In this way, the students have not only created wealth for the state but also learnt how to build new socialist villages. Only by persistently taking part in productive labour can worker-peasant-soldier students retain the fine qualities of the labouring people.

As society develops, the historical phenomenon of education divorced from productive labour, mental from manual labour, and theory from practice will eventually disappear with the elimination of classes. Marx, Lenin and Chairman Mao have all given incisive explanations regarding the significance of combining education with productive labour. As early as 1847, Marx and Engels advocated **“combination of education with industrial production.”** In 1919 Lenin called for **“the closest connection between schooling and productive social labour of the child.”** Our great leader Chairman Mao, in formulating an educational policy for us, said: **“Education must serve proletarian politics and be combined with productive labour. Working people should master intellectual work and intellectuals should integrate themselves with the working people.”** These directives of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Chairman Mao, however, were ignored before the Cultural Revolution by the old schools which trumpeted: “Those who work with their minds govern, those who work with their hands are governed.” The old schools opposed students’ participation in productive labour and encouraged the isolation of students from the workers and peasants, thus widening the differences between mental and manual labour and extending the scope of bourgeois right.

**6. Old Agricultural Colleges Advocated “Three Centres” and “Three Conventional Stages”;
New Agricultural Colleges Set Up “Three-in-One” System**

To train intellectual aristocrats of the bourgeoisie, the old agricultural colleges stressed a teaching process “centered around teachers, books and classrooms” and based on the “three conventional stages—basic theory, basic principles of various specialties, and

specialized courses.” To bring up a new generation of peasants with socialist consciousness and culture, our new agricultural college must integrate teaching, scientific research and production.

The great teacher Lenin pointed out: **“An ideal future society cannot be conceived without the combination of education with the productive labour of the younger generation: neither training and education without productive labour, nor productive labour without parallel training and education could be raised to the degree required by the present level of technology and the state of scientific knowledge.”**

We have in the past few years tried out a new system of conducting teaching on the basis of scientific research and production in the departments of agronomy, forestry and animal husbandry. For example, the agronomy department organizes the students immediately after their enrollment into eight groups, each specializing in sorghum, cultivation, plant protection, soil and fertilizer or some other subjects. Subjects for scientific research are determined according to the needs of production and the content of teaching is decided on in accordance with the requirements of production and scientific research. Under this system, the students have become more lively and show greater enthusiasm and initiative in study. In this way, they are able to acquire solid knowledge and raise the ability to analyse and solve problems, thus enriching and developing science.

7. Old Agricultural Colleges Were Housed in Buildings And Isolated From Society; New Agricultural Colleges Are Closely Linked With the Three Great Revolutionary Movements

The old agricultural colleges were estranged from proletarian politics, from the workers and peasants and from productive labour. As a result, the longer the student studied, the more stupid he became. Concerning this old educational system, Chairman Mao pointed out that it would take a student 16 or 17 years to advance from primary school through college, and for over 20 years he had no chance to see how rice, sorghum, legumes, wheat, millet and panicked millet were grown or how workers worked, how peasants tilled the land and how commodities were exchanged. Moreover, his health was ruined. It really did a lot of harm.

In order to end this situation in which abilities were stunted and damage done to the young people, our college adopted the training system of “goings-up, goings-down.” “Going-up” means that the students engage in certain activities in the college or at research and teaching centres. “Going-down” means that the students return to the communes and production brigades and teams to take part in the three

great revolutionary movements. The duration and frequency of the students' field training in their own production brigades or teams vary with their specialities and length of study.

Experience in the last few years shows that this method is a revolution in the teaching system. Its salient feature is that the concept of wholehearted reliance on the workers and poor and lower-middle peasants in running schools runs through the whole educational process. Students remain commune members and maintain close contacts with the poor and lower-middle peasants at all times. This enables the students to understand clearly the aim of their study—"going-up" for the sake of "going-down." The students bring the problems in production of their own communes or production brigades to the college for study and return promptly to apply what they have learnt to production. This promotes the constant improvement of teaching material and methods and enables the students to contribute their share to the learn-from-Tachai movement.

8. Old Agricultural Colleges Were "Pagodas" for Privileged Few; New Agricultural Colleges Spread Out on Ever-Widening Scale, Reaching to Grass Roots and Providing Education for Masses

Schools before the Cultural Revolution discriminated against the children of workers and peasants and created an intellectual elite tapering off at the top like a pagoda. This was a continuation of the cultural autocracy over the people by the landlord and capitalist classes.

Since the start of the Cultural Revolution, guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, our college has made great efforts to change this situation and provided the masses with more and more opportunities to study. Our college first set up six research and teaching centres in six counties of the prefecture. These centres were later incorporated with county-run agricultural colleges. Thus agricultural colleges were set up at both the prefecture and county levels. Communes run agricultural middle schools and brigades organize teams for scientific experiments. A network of agricultural science and education is thus formed embracing the entire prefecture. Our college works in close co-operation with schools run by counties and communes to enable this network to perform good work. Beginning in 1973, our college established seven additional research and teaching centres in the counties. The aim is to run the schools near the poor and lower-middle peasants' homes for their convenience and make maximum efforts to meet the needs of Chaoyang Prefecture. The poor and lower-middle peasants in the prefecture are both our teachers and the recipients of our service. In the past few years, our college has trained 16,000 ac-

tivists in the learn-from-Tachai movement through forming scientific experimental teams, running spare-time peasant schools and short-term training courses and organizing mobile classes, thereby contributing to building Tachai-type counties in the prefecture.

9. Old Agricultural Colleges Enslaved Students; New Agricultural Colleges Enable Worker-Peasant-Soldier Students To “Attend the University, Manage It and Transform It”

In the old schools, the students were led to bury themselves in books and ignore affairs of the state. The old examination system treated the students as if they were enemies and the absolute authority of the teachers was upheld, while the students must obey and be subservient without the slightest hesitation.

Now the worker-peasant-soldier students are the new force in the educational revolution. They attend colleges, manage them and transform them with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

To help them fully play their role in “attending, managing and transforming” colleges, we have set up special groups for this purpose at all levels in our college. The leaders of these groups are in the leading bodies of the Party organizations at the corresponding levels. This ensures organizationally that the worker-peasant-soldier students discharge their duties to the best of their ability.

Under the leadership of the college Party committee, the worker-peasant-soldier students always hit back at erroneous trends of thought and defend Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line in education with a firm, clear-cut class stand in the struggle to build a socialist agricultural college. They courageously break with the traditional ideas of all exploiting classes and are determined to become a new generation with socialist consciousness and culture. They share the tasks of teaching, scientific research and production together with the teachers and act as masters of the college in all respects.

Our experience over the past few years shows that with the worker-peasant-soldier students as the rising force in educational revolution, working-class leadership in education is consolidated and strengthened.

10. Teachers in Old Agricultural Colleges Were Divorced From Workers and Peasants; New Agricultural Colleges Help Teachers Integrate With Workers and Peasants and Strive To Build a Contingent of Proletarian Teachers

Chairman Mao has pointed out: “**In the problem of transforming education it is the teachers who are the main problem.**” The old agricultural colleges barred workers and peasants from the lecture plat-

form. As for the vast majority of the teachers whose world outlook was by and large bourgeois, the colleges did not guide them to integrate with the workers and peasants and thoroughly remould their world outlook. Such teachers could only train bourgeois intellectual aristocrats and not successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. In order to transform our college into an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat, we must train a contingent of proletarian teachers.

Over the past few years, our college has organized the students to go to advanced people's communes and production brigades and army units so that they can learn from the workers, peasants and soldiers. Our college has also invited a number of workers and poor and lower-middle peasants to give lectures as full-time or part-time teachers, and we have selected new-type peasant-teachers from among our graduates who receive their pay in work points. This has enabled more and more poor and lower-middle peasants to take a direct part in the educational revolution, so that the proletariat gradually has a superior force in this field. The worker-peasant teachers have profound proletarian feelings and their lectures are delivered in vivid, popular language. In line with the Party's policy of uniting with, educating and remoulding intellectuals, our college guides and encourages the veteran teachers to take the road of integration with the workers and peasants, and this has stimulated their enthusiasm for socialism.

In the past, many teachers worked hard behind piles of books for fame and gain and ignored agricultural production. Now they think what the poor and lower-middle peasants think and do their best to contribute to the three great revolutionary movements. Veteran professor Kung Chi-tao has gained renewed energy in the course of integrating with the poor and lower-middle peasants. Once in helping the poor and lower-middle peasants develop a new strain of sorghum, he walked 20 kilometres of mountain roads to get back to his experimental centre. The professor remarked that he had taken a wrong path before. Now, under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, he would try to do more for the people in his later years.

* * *

The article says in conclusion: Our achievements in the educational revolution in the last six years have been won under the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line in education and by fighting a tit-for-tat struggle against the revisionist line in education. The slogan "Fighting tit-for-tat against the revisionist line in education of the 17 years" demonstrates the determination of the revolutionary teachers and students to break thoroughly with the old educational system. We will adhere to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and carry the proletarian revolution in education through to the end.

TEXT 35

REPULSING THE RIGHT DEVIATIONIST WIND IN THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CIRCLES

*Mass Criticism Group of Peking
and Tsinghua Universities*

Around last summer, several leading members in the scientific and technological circles pushing the revisionist line, instigated by the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party Teng Hsiao-ping, tried to negate the achievements gained in science and technology during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Their attempt was to pull scientific research back to the old revisionist road of Liu Shao-chi before the Great Cultural Revolution.

The struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse the correct verdicts in the scientific and technological circles is a component part of the great counterattack initiated and led by Chairman Mao on the Right deviationist wind.

The following article deals with issues involved and the essence of the two-line struggle in that field.—P.R. Ed.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, initiated and led personally by Chairman Mao, has criticized in a penetrating way the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao and promoted the vigorous development of China's science and technology. Many new, important achievements in this field, including the recovery of a man-made earth satellite according to plan after orbiting the earth, the man-made synthetic insulin and measurement of its crystallized structure, are indications that China's science and technology have continued to advance to a new high level. However, for a period recently, a Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts was whipped up in the scientific and technological circles. Several people clinging to the revisionist line clamoured: "What is the revisionist line in scientific research? Can anyone give a clear answer?" This reactionary fallacy is itself an example of the revisionist line in the scientific and technological circles.

Peking Review #18, April 30, 1976.

The Necessity to Uphold the Dictatorship of The Proletariat

“Unite for one purpose, that is, the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This must be fully achieved in every factory, village, office and school.” This brilliant directive of Chairman Mao’s which sets forth in explicit terms the fundamental task on various fronts must be firmly implemented without exception. Yet, advocates of the Right deviationist trend in the scientific and technological circles openly declared: “Don’t talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat in the scientific and technological circles.” One of their reasons was: “You can’t exercise dictatorship over science and technique.”

Dictatorship always means the relations between classes, not the relations between human beings and things. The task of natural science is to study the laws of nature. In class society, those engaged in scientific and technological work as well as research institutes and their leading and administrative organs are all conditioned by class struggle and the two-line struggle, and they all serve the dictatorship of a certain class. In capitalist society, science and technology are in the hands of the capitalists who make **“natural science subservient to capital.”** They are tools serving the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the interests of the capitalists. In socialist society, science and technology should be in the hands of the labouring people and serve as a tool for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the interests of the labouring people. It is necessary to exercise proletarian dictatorship in the scientific and technological circles, but advocates of the Right deviationist wind distorted it to mean exercising dictatorship over science and technology; in doing so, they tried to make use of the particularity of the objects of scientific research to negate the necessity of exercising proletarian dictatorship on the scientific and technological front. This is a revisionist sleight of hand.

The proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure, including all spheres of culture. For a long time the scientific and technological field was dominated by the exploiting classes and bourgeois prejudices and traditional influences were deep-rooted. In the 17 years prior to the Great Cultural Revolution, Liu Shao-chi and his cohorts pushed a revisionist line in the scientific and technological circle. Many scientific research institutes were dominated by bourgeois intellectuals. Since the Great Cultural Revolution started, many new things conducive to the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship have come to the fore. But the achievements obtained through struggle have to be consolidated and some places are still controlled by the bourgeoisie today. The struggle is still very acute and complicated as to who will hold the dominant position, what line is

implemented and what direction and road should be followed in developing science and technology. To advocate the nonsense "Don't talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat in the scientific and technological circles" means, in essence, negating the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, negating the principle of taking class struggle as the key link and pitting the theory of the dying out of class struggle against the Party's basic line. This is in effect a counterattack in an attempt to liquidate the achievements gained in the Great Cultural Revolution and to let the bourgeoisie exercise dictatorship over the proletariat in science and technology.

To exercise proletarian dictatorship in the scientific and technological field means not only the suppression of a handful of counter-revolutionaries who oppose socialist revolution and undermine socialist construction. In a more fundamental sense, it means firmly implementing Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and the Party's principles and policies, persisting in the criticism of revisionism and the bourgeoisie as well as bourgeois ideology in scientific theories so that scientific research will serve proletarian politics, serve the workers, peasants and soldiers and be combined with productive labour.

In the scientific and technological field, there are large numbers of intellectuals. One of the important tasks of the proletarian dictatorship is to use proletarian world outlook to prevail over bourgeois world outlook and to unite, educate and transform the intellectuals. To help the intellectuals remould their ideology is entirely different from regarding them as "objects of the dictatorship," which was a slander by advocates of the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts with ulterior motives. Tempered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Biao and Confucius, the vast majority of the intellectuals have made progress to varying degrees. Yet the advocates of the Right deviationist trend had put out the reactionary fallacy that the intellectuals were regarded as "objects of the dictatorship." This was an attempt to vilify and oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat and it showed nothing but their own fear of the proletarian dictatorship.

Use Marxism to Occupy the Scientific and Technological Field

An important aspect in the exercise of proletarian dictatorship on the scientific and technological front is to use Marxism to occupy all the positions and guide scientific research, so as to continuously wipe out idealism, metaphysics and other bourgeois ways of thinking.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: "**Marxism embraces but cannot replace realism in literary and artistic creation, just as it embraces but cannot replace the atomic and electronic theories in physics.**" This

explains in an all-round way the relation between Marxism and natural science. Advocators of the Right deviationist wind, however, chose to quote out of context. Without mentioning that Marxism embraces natural science, they one-sidedly emphasized that Marxism could not replace natural science. Their aim was to oppose using Marxism to guide natural science.

It should be noted that, in the first place, Marxism embraces natural science. In creating Marxism, Marx and Engels not only summed up the experience of class struggle, but generalized the rich achievements of natural science. Marxism is the crystallization of the entire human knowledge including natural science. Just as Chairman Mao has pointed out that Marx **“studied nature, history and proletarian revolution and created dialectical materialism, historical materialism and the theory of proletarian revolution.”** Marx wrote *Mathematical Manuscripts*. Engels, in his *Dialectics of Nature*, made a theoretical summary of many fields of natural science. By summing up the new discoveries in natural science after Engels' death, Lenin wrote *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* to criticize the reactionary philosophy of the bourgeoisie. Chairman Mao has always paid attention to the philosophical generalization of natural science. In *On Contradiction* and *On Practice*, Chairman Mao has summed up in a penetrating way the achievements of natural science, and in *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, Chairman Mao has generalized on a high plane the dialectical law of the development of natural science.

Since Marxism has generalized natural science, the general laws of dialectical materialism it expounds are applicable to every branch of natural science. Because of the variation in the forms of motion of matter and the particularity of contradictions, every branch of science has its specific object of study. While we say that Marxism cannot replace natural science, we do not mean to weaken the guiding role played by Marxism. Rather, people are required to learn to apply the Marxist stand, viewpoint and method to make a concrete and dialectical analysis and study of their own vocational work.

As a result of the sabotage carried out by Liu Shao-chi and his gang prior to the Great Cultural Revolution, people engaged in scientific and technological work did not conscientiously study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and Chairman Mao's works, and idealism and metaphysics dominated quite seriously over the scientific and technological field. During the Great Cultural Revolution, scientific and technical workers have enhanced their consciousness in studying Marxism. But this is only the beginning. It requires persistent efforts and struggle over a long period in order to be able to really use Marxism to guide scientific research and occupy the scientific and technological

field. In these circumstances, the reactionary fallacies advocated by the Right deviationists were actually aimed at strangling the mass movement of the scientific and technical personnel to study Marxism.

Historical experience has proved that the revisionists often make use of natural science to attack Marxism. Marxists must gird themselves for battle in this field. An important aspect of Marx' and Engels' struggle against Duhring concerned natural science. In *Anti-Duhring*, Engels criticized Duhring's anti-Marxist viewpoints in cosmogony, physics, chemistry and biology. After the defeat of the revolution in Russia in 1905, to oppose Bogdanov's revisionist line, Lenin made deep-going researches into the new discoveries of natural science and the "crisis of physics" and thoroughly criticized Machism and its disciples in Russia. Chairman Mao's directive "**Break down blind faith, go in for industry, agriculture and technical and cultural revolutions independently**" and his instruction on opposing the suppression of newborn forces have incisively criticized the philosophy of servility to things foreign and other idealistic and metaphysical views in the scientific and technological field. But the advocators of the Right deviationist trend openly opposed using Marxism to occupy all positions in natural science.

Integration With Workers and Peasants

Professional scientific and technical personnel integrating with the workers and peasants and the conducting of scientific research in an open-door way are socialist new things that have emerged in the Great Cultural Revolution. The Right deviationists, however, did their utmost to find fault with these revolutionary newborn things. They asserted that conducting scientific research in an open-door way would mean "too much linking with practice to the neglect of theory" and "too much emphasis on integration with workers and peasants, which would make people not dare to study theory."

To set linking scientific research with production against the development of scientific theory is that kind of theory of knowledge which puts the cart before the horse. What is theory? "**There is only one kind of true theory in this world, theory that is drawn from objective reality and then verified by objective reality.**" Man's activity in production is the most fundamental practical activity. In the last analysis, the emergence and development of the theories of natural science originate from practice in production. "**If society has a technical need, that helps science forward more than ten universities.**" Today, the vigorous development of China's industrial and agricultural production and construction poses many urgent theoretical problems to be solved by natural science, and on the other hand accumulates rich practical exper-

ience for solving these problems and developing scientific theories. If the scientific and technical personnel were to follow what the Right deviationists advocated, completely ignore the needs of China's industrial and agricultural production and cudgel their brains behind closed doors, then they could only find topics for study from foreign magazines and be led by the nose by others. Before the Cultural Revolution, under the pernicious influence of Liu Shao-chi's revisionist line in scientific research, many research units tried to "raise the standards" through study behind closed doors, and had no contact whatsoever with factories and the villages. The result was lots of money were wasted, no success was gained and the scientists turned revisionist. Having criticized the revisionist line during the Cultural Revolution, scientific and technical workers began to take an active part in the three great revolutionary movements of class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment. Working according to the theory of knowledge of "practice—theory—again practice," they have begun to achieve some successes.

By integrating themselves with the workers and peasants, the brilliant road charted by Chairman Mao, scientific and technical workers receive re-education politically and this helps them remould their world outlook. At the same time, it is also very necessary for them to study again vocationally. The Right deviationists emphasized "fanning up a hurricane for vocational work" and forbade stressing the integration of scientific and technical personnel with workers and peasants. Isn't it quite clear what they opposed and what they advocated?

"From the very beginning the origin and development of the sciences has been determined by production." The labouring people are those who directly engage in production. In the long process of practice, they have accumulated rich experience, both successful and unsuccessful. This is the source for developing scientific theories. Only by modestly learning from and summing up the masses' new experience and gathering together their wisdom can scientific and technical personnel give full play to their professional skills and make greater contributions in their work. By promoting open-door scientific research, we do not mean doing away with laboratories or negating study and research by the scientific workers and technicians themselves. What we mean is to link research in the laboratories with experiments by the masses and to adhere to the correct orientation of integration with productive labour and with workers and peasants.

Launch Vigorous Mass Movement

Should the masses be mobilized in developing science and technology?

This is a question of principle concerning the political line. The Right deviationists regarded the scientific and technological field as a sacred place where ordinary labourers must not be admitted. In their eyes, the cultural level of the workers, peasants and soldiers was “too low” and they were therefore not qualified to do research work. This was an attempt to bar the masses from scientific and technological work.

“The mass movement is necessary in all work. Things won’t go without the mass movement.” To launch vigorous mass movements in scientific and technological work is an extremely important feature of the development in China’s science and technology.

China is a socialist country. We cannot rely on foreign aid to develop our science and technology. **Maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts** is a fundamental principle in socialist revolution and socialist construction. We must never trail behind others at a snail’s pace, but should race against time to catch up with and surpass advanced world levels. To achieve this, it won’t do just to rely on a few people; we must launch vigorous mass movements and rely on the masses’ wisdom and strength.

The masses doing scientific research is of great importance to narrowing the three major differences between worker and peasant, between town and country and between manual and mental labour, and to restricting bourgeois right. By launching vigorous mass movements on the scientific and technological front, ordinary labourers are able to master science and technology, thereby breaking the monopoly of science and technology by the exploiting classes. In present-day China, workers, peasants and soldiers are toppling blind faith and emancipating their minds and are enthusiastically taking part in the mass movement of scientific experiment. From the creation of the new series of oil-extracting technology in Taching to the “sponge farmland” in Tachai which is a development in the science of soil, from the manufacture of a “mass drill” to the invention of new electric light source, from automatic production lines in neighbourhood-run small factories to the building of 10,000-ton vessels with home-made materials and equipment, from the swift progress in industry to reaping rich harvests for 14 years in a row—all are splendid feats performed by China’s workers and poor and lower-middle peasants. They vividly speak of the truth that **“the masses are the real heroes.”** Mass contingents engaged in scientific research constitute the main force in promoting science and technology in China.

We have always attached importance to the role of professional scientific and technical personnel. We have always held that they should integrate themselves with the masses and we regard this as the only way to developing China’s science and technology at a quick tempo. When

we say that vigorous mass movements should be launched in the scientific and technological field, we also mean reliance on professional scientific and technical personnel and we advocate and put into practice the principle that they should integrate themselves with the masses. China's successes in nuclear and thermonuclear tests and in launching man-made earth satellites are all fruits of the combined efforts of workers, cadres, scientific workers and technicians and the result of mass movements. The aim of the Right deviationists was to lead scientific and technical personnel astray on to the road of separation from the workers and peasants; there could be no future for any vocational work if scientific and technical personnel were to go up this blind alley.

Non-Professionals Can Lead Professionals

Which class wields the power of leadership is of great importance concerning which line is followed. The Right deviationists openly advocated that "first-rate" "authorities" "publicly acknowledged in the scientific and technological circles" should hold the leading posts. They tried to use this to oppose the leadership of the proletariat over scientific and technological work.

This is a typical example of the fallacy that "experts should be in charge of the institutes." Its essence was to slash Party leadership, just as what Liu Shao-chi had done before the Cultural Revolution in letting bourgeois intellectuals control the leadership in science and technology. In this respect, the weapon used by the Right deviationists was the same as that used by the Rightists in 1957 when they attacked the Party, saying: Those who do not have vocational skill cannot hold responsible positions; non-professionals cannot lead professionals.

Dialectical materialism holds that it is a universal law for non-professionals to lead professionals. Anyone who maintains that only those with scientific and technical knowledge can lead a certain branch of work is not only negating the leadership of politics over vocational work but is actually denying any possibility of giving unified leadership over various departments of vocational work. Of course, this does not mean that comrades engaged in Party work on the scientific and technological front should not learn scientific and technological knowledge at all. Our Party has always maintained that cadres should learn the vocational work they lead and strive to be both red and expert, because this helps them to implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in a still better way and is conducive to strengthening Party leadership.

The fact that the hackneyed tune that "non-professionals cannot lead professionals" surfaces again and again in the scientific and technological circles shows that the exploiting classes will never retreat from their

hereditary domain of their own accord. In this field, in particular, which requires special knowledge, the bourgeoisie often regard the scientific and technological knowledge it possesses as capital in contending with the proletariat for leadership. Therefore, Party leadership in this field should in no way be weakened but should be greatly strengthened.

Chairman Mao has time and again taught us: “**Guard against revisionism.**” The Right deviationist wind in the scientific and technological circles to negate the achievements of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is by no means an isolated phenomenon. It was whipped up by the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party Teng Hsiao-ping who pushed a revisionist line which is diametrically opposed to Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line. The essence of this revisionist line is to negate class struggle as the key link, change the Party’s basic line and negate the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in a vain attempt to restore capitalism. The current great struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind is to consolidate and develop the fruits of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and to prevent capitalist restoration.

TEXT 36

WHAT IS THE INTENTION OF PEOPLE OF THE LIN PIAO TYPE IN ADVOCATING “PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF KNOWLEDGE”?

Liang Hsiao

Whom should knowledge belong to and serve after all? On this question there has all along been a sharp struggle between the two classes and the two lines. Since the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the broad masses have persistently taken class struggle as the key link and energetically criticized “private ownership of knowledge.” This is entirely essential. However, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party who calls for “taking the three directives as the key link” in a vain attempt to reverse verdicts forbids the criticism of “private ownership of knowledge,” and says that “so long as White expertise is of advantage to the People’s Republic of China,” it “should be cherished and praised.” Under his instigation, some people in educational, scientific and technical, and literary and art circles openly cry that with “private ownership of knowledge” criticized, “how can we get along!” Or else, they unreasonably ask, “Who has seen private ownership of knowledge? Is it square, round or flat?” As they see it, “private ownership of knowledge” fundamentally cannot and should not be criticized! With an ulterior object in view, they even describe the criticism of “private ownership of knowledge” as the pernicious influence of the Lin Piao line so as to confuse people, create chaos and whip up a Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts.

Has Lin Piao ever criticized “private ownership of knowledge”? Fundamentally nothing of the sort. There is irrevocable criminal evidence to show that Lin Piao, like Liu Shao-chi, was a frenzied advocate of “private ownership of knowledge.” This renegade Lin Piao and his gang vociferously advertised that “vocational knowledge is cash” and “ability is capital” for the purpose of luring people into looking upon knowledge (including skill and ability) as private property, a commodity for exchange of “cash,” and capital for snatching fame and gain.

Essentially speaking, scientific knowledge is “a kind of weapon for people to win freedom.” In order to be free in society, people should use social science to recognize and reform society; in order to be free in

Survey of People’s Republic of China Press #6062 (76-12). (Peking Kuang-ming Jih-pao, March 11, 1976.)

the natural world, they should use natural science to recognize and reform nature. When Engels spoke of Marx, he said: **“He first looks upon science as an effective lever of history and a revolutionary force of highest significance. Furthermore, he is making use of science precisely as such a force. As he sees it, here lies the use of the vast knowledge he has mastered—especially knowledge of all spheres bearing on history.”** (*Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. XIX, pp. 372-373.) This attitude of the revolutionary teacher to scientific knowledge makes us clearly see how despicable is the soul of people of the Lin Piao type in advocating “private ownership of knowledge”!

Knowledge comes from the people. In socialist society the opportunities, expenses and conditions for people to study are all provided by society. It is natural that **“the results created by complicated labor, that is, things of greater value, should also belong to society.”** (*Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. III, p. 241) Therefore, all revolutionary people, including the revolutionary intellectuals, have only the obligation to serve the people, but never the right to bargain with the people. Today, the broad masses of worker-peasant-soldier students sonorously cry: “It is the people who send me to university, and I go to university for the people.” Many college students “come from and go back to the communes.” This revolutionary action that knows no precedent is the best criticism of “private ownership of knowledge” and “studying in order to become officials,” and is also the most effective restriction on bourgeois rights.

It must be pointed out that the taking of knowledge as private property and commodity is not any invention of the Lin Piao type of “genius,” but a reflection of the private ownership of the means of production and the commodity economy of the past several thousand years. The slave-owner class and the reactionary feudal landlord class once vociferously publicized that “there is emolument in learning” and that “literary and military skills are acquired for sale to the imperial household.” Confucius even compared himself to the “fine jade” and loudly cried: “For sale! For sale! I am for sale!” He even wanted to auction himself also to the slave-owning rulers at the higher level. The bourgeoisie turned everything into the commodity and further made a commodity of knowledge. Lin Piao and company publicized that “vocational knowledge is cash” and that “ability is capital,” thus fully exposing their capitalist soul. This and the Soviet revisionist Kirov’s clamor that “knowledge” is “stable and reliable wealth” are songs sung with the same excellence and are almost the same. The profit-grabbing nature of the bourgeoisie and the avarice of the upstarts constitute the class origin of private ownership of knowledge and knowledge as a commodity advocated by people of the Lin Piao type.

The socialist society still practices the commodity system and there are still bourgeois rights. This economic base makes the dissemination of these fallacies possible. The reactionary essence of this trash wildly peddled by people of the Lin Piao type lies in their desire to submerge scientific knowledge in the ice water of egoism, to resist Chairman Mao's instruction that the intellectuals must be integrated with the workers and peasants, and to sabotage the turning of intellectuals into revolutionaries and laborers.

What is more, Lin Piao also wrote on a brilliant Marxist book this jargon: "The kind of merchandise the masses want to buy at the political store applies to the study of Marxist-Leninist works—method of study." Look! In the eyes of Lin Piao, Marxism-Leninism has also become a "commodity." The study of books by Marx, Lenin and Chairman Mao actually means the selection and purchase of "commodities" in the "political store." This rare teaching material by negative example enables us to see more clearly the repulsive features of this political swindler and commodity fetishist. He cried at the top of his voice that "flexible study for flexible application" or "proper study is something that gains enormous profit out of small capital investment." Actually he wanted to use it to practice political speculation on a large scale and to undermine the study of Marxist-Leninist works and Chairman Mao's writings by the masses, so that he could take over control and seize power for pushing the line of regression and restoration based on "subduing one's self and turning to propriety." So long as it was "profitable" to them, they were ever ready to trade away principle until they betrayed the revolution and the country and capitulated to the enemy. This was the dirty deal made by "Lin's Store."

The vilification and attack of the renegade do not impair in the least the brilliance of Marxism! The proletariat and the revolutionary people study and read seriously because our struggle needs Marxism. At present, the broad masses of cadres and the people exert themselves in the study of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and some Marxist philosophy, in the discussion and criticism of *Water Margin*, and in striking back at the Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts. They take class struggle as the key link for the purpose of better carrying out Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and solving this fundamental question of combating and guarding against revisionism and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The advocates of the Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts oppose the employment of college graduates as workers and peasants and maliciously attack the principle of "from the commune, back to the commune" and of allotment of work points without paying wages. The reason is nothing more than that in this way the tradition of the ex-

exploiting classes based on “want in farming and emolument in learning” and “vocational knowledge is cash” will be fundamentally shattered and the channel to “private ownership of knowledge” will be blocked. In his attitude toward Marxism-Leninism, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party also waves the red flag to oppose the red flag and cast forth “taking the directives as the key link” to oppose taking class struggle as the key link and the basic line of the Party. The vital essence of this is to restore capitalism. To him, the “study of theory” is like the signboard of a shop or the “trade mark” for peddling the trash of the theory of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces. It can be seen that on these fundamental questions it is none other than he himself who is a true disciple of the Lin Piao line in opposing Marxism and practicing revisionism.

II

In the socialist society under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the advocacy of private ownership of knowledge by people of the Lin Piao type is bound to usher the capitalist principle of commodity exchange into the ideological and cultural sphere to endanger the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. One of the examples of their nonsense is the saying that “I sell my knowledge when paid by the students.”

More than 2,000 years ago, Confucius confessed that “I will not deny instruction to those who come with tuition fees.” To him, there was a relationship of buying and selling between the students and the teachers. Those who could afford to produce ten strips of dried meat naturally were not the slaves who had not even personal freedom. The bourgeoisie declared that all citizens were completely equal, but as Lenin said, **“Class schools fundamentally do not offer secondary education to those who are not in position to pay for their tuition and teaching material fees as well as board and lodging for the whole school term.”** (*Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. II, p. 405) This shows that this kind of education based on “my selling knowledge when paid by the students” has always been for training men of ability of the exploiting classes for serving their reactionary rule. Lin Piao and company publicized the buying and selling of education for the purpose of resisting the revolution in education and turning the school which should be a tool of the dictatorship of the proletariat once again into the “money-making school” of the bourgeoisie which bought and sold knowledge so as to undermine our great cause of bringing up successors to the proletarian revolution.

Capitalist commodity exchange commonly practices pricing and according to grade. The implementation of this principle in cultural and

educational circles is bound to look upon the intellectuals as a commodity. By promoting the “three-famous” and “three-high” principle, didn’t Liu Shao-chi mean that the intellectuals should strive to turn themselves into “goods of well-known brands” so as to fetch “higher prices”? Lin Piao and company also took this course of action. They brought in the business logic of the Western bourgeoisie that “it always pays to buy knowledge at a high price,” added to it the reactionary craft of the Confucian school, and wanted to use “high prices” in the form of “high office,” “high salary” and “great power” to buy over their needed intellectuals. Confucius cried that “the superior men hate to die without making themselves known.” Lin Piao and company vociferously advocated the idea of becoming famous and an expert. They interpreted the old proverb, “The peach and plum trees are dumb, but trails automatically appear under them,” as follows: “Those with true learning will become well known like the peach and plum trees which though dumb are beautiful and laden with fruits, and people coming to see them will beat tracks leading to them.” So it appears that anyone with knowledge will spread its fragrance far and wide and become well-known throughout the country; he can trade with the working people for “rich remuneration and special treatment.”

Look at that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party. Before the Great Cultural Revolution, he energetically stood for vocational work in command and stated that “technical cadres must mainly be evaluated according to their technical skill” and that the “promotion” and “selection” of engineers “should mainly be based on their vocational and technical conditions.” In 1974 he also said that “the barefoot doctors have little knowledge at the beginning and can only treat some common diseases, but after a few years they will wear straw sandals because they have more knowledge, and after a few more years, they will put on cloth shoes.” According to this logic, when they have still more knowledge, they will wear leather shoes, “ride in special coaches and feed on special meals”! What else is this if not for maliciously attacking such a revolutionary new thing as the barefoot doctors, continuously publicizing “private ownership of knowledge,” and evaluating social standing according to knowledge? Evidently, people like Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao are pushing an out-and-out counter-revolutionary revisionist line here in a vain attempt to exercise dictatorship over the proletariat in the ideological and cultural sphere.

This line severely corrupts the soul of the intellectuals. Due to pursuit of fame and gain, it is inevitable that some people will not go to serve the people and can only become educated sharks struggling for fame at court and gain in the market. These people have no correct political orientation. They look upon their proficiency in vocational work and

technical skill as means to uplift themselves. They either regard themselves as a rare commodity which can be hoarded for sale at the right price, or behave as Tso Chung-ho in *Breaking with Old Ideas* who “comes to join the revolutionary force with culture as capital” to trade for a “discount certificate.” They even behave like those intellectuals whom had been strongly denounced by Engels: **“As a rule, they look upon the bourgeois university as the Saint Cyr Military Academy of socialism, and think that a student from it will have the right to join the Party ranks with the title of an army officer or even the title of a general.”** (*Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. IV, p. 476) Before the Great Cultural Revolution, many among the intellectuals had come to the brink of revisionism, and some even had fallen or rotted away. Going back to the origin, wasn't this due to the revisionist line?

This line severely hampers the development of science and culture. Because they are interested in personal fame and gain, they will not painstakingly pursue scientific truth for the revolution or brave difficulties and dangers to scale the pinnacles of science. With their minds filled with bourgeois ideas and the idealist or metaphysical world outlook, their recognition and mastery of objective truth will also be affected. “People are afraid of becoming famous and pigs are afraid of growing plump.” The idea of fame and gains often makes people with a little fame become timid and cowardly. They either look upon themselves as an “authority” or repress the new things. They even take the evil road of falsifying, copying and plagiarizing things until they have become braggarts and wild and ignorant charlatans like Duhring. Historical experience shows that if the intellectuals are fettered by the chains of fame and gain and depart from this sole source for the development of science and culture—the worker-peasant masses and the three great revolutionary movements, they can only make a living by copying so-called changeless dogmas from piles of old papers, or put blind faith in that “the moon over foreign countries is rounder than that over China” and promote the slavish comprador philosophy and the doctrine of trailing behind others at a snail's pace. In this way, how could there be any creation in science and technology, and how could there be any talk of surpassing the advanced standards of the world?

For the sake of opposing the criticism of “private ownership of knowledge,” those advocates of the Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts oddly ask whether there is now “private ownership of knowledge” or “no private ownership of knowledge” after all. Paraphrased, this means that if you have no knowledge, you are not fit to criticize “private ownership of knowledge,” and if “private ownership of knowledge” is criticized again, nobody would bother to acquire knowledge. Gentlemen, we really possess not a bit of such “profound”

knowledge as whether “private ownership of knowledge” is round or flat, and this is also the first time we have the good fortune of hearing it. However, the working class and the poor and lower-middle peasants valiantly fighting on the forefront of class struggle, struggle for production and scientific experiment have most abundant knowledge of the practice of the three great revolutionary movements, and they see most clearly the danger of “private ownership of knowledge” advocated by people like Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. As regards the allegation that knowledge will not be learned if “private ownership of knowledge” is criticized, this is but a major exposure of the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie who contend for what is profitable and refuse to do anything unprofitable, as well as a self-portrayal of the gloomy minds of the concocters of the revisionist absurd arguments. As they see it, knowledge not “privately owned” is equal to an extinct “engine” of life and everything looks dismal. How can there be energy for learning knowledge to speak of?

However, practice shows that only when the intellectuals break away from the restraints of the revisionist line, make a clean break with such traditional concepts as “private ownership of knowledge,” “are re-educated by the workers, peasants and soldiers under the leadership of the correct line and thoroughly change their old way of thinking” can they mature healthily and bring their ability and wisdom into full play. Tempered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, the broad masses of intellectuals in China are further integrated with the workers and peasants and have taken on a new spiritual outlook. Some of them have also been credited with inventions and creations. The new ranks of the intellectuals of the working class wax stronger with each passing day. On our cultural, educational, scientific and technical front, a vigorous and prosperous scene has appeared. These facts are an effective criticism of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. They also give the apologists of “private ownership of knowledge” a resounding box on the ear. The fact that the two lines yield two different kinds of results makes us further understand that the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything. Just as Marx said, only the working class can **“turn science from the instrument of class rule into the strength of the people, and the scientists themselves from the peddlers of class prejudices, the parasites of the state chasing after fame and gain and the ally of capital into free thinkers!”** (*Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. II, p. 422) Aren’t those people who describe themselves as “enthusiasts in science” concerned with the intellectuals but are opposed to the criticism of “private ownership of knowledge” and energetically turn back the wheel of

history precisely desirous of impeding the development of science and culture and “pulling back the four modernizations” in a vain attempt to turn the broad masses of revolutionary intellectuals once again into “parasites of the state chasing after fame and gain”?

Those big Party lords and big warlords of the Lin Piao type who do not read books and newspapers and have no learning whatsoever frenziedly advocate “private ownership of knowledge” entirely out of the counter-revolutionary need of the exploiting classes. What then is their reactionary political objective after all?

Lin Piao wrote in his sinister notes: “Knowledge is the business of the intelligentsia.” A very important member of the Lin Piao anti-Party clique also wrote: “Let everybody take part in practice” and “let theory go to a few people.” They completely separated practice from theory, and “everybody” or the worker-peasant-soldier masses from the “intelligentsia” and stood them against each other. Such “few people” who monopolize “theory,” look upon knowledge as their monopoly and ride roughshod over the people can only be the bourgeois spiritual aristocracy, and they naturally are not included in what is called “let everybody take part in practice.” What is the difference between this kind of wild rumor, which openly publicizes the monopoly of culture and theory by “a few people” so as to widen with every effort the disparity between physical labor and mental labor, and the teachings of Confucius and Mencius, such as, “the people may be made to follow a path of action, but they may not be made to understand it” and “those who labor with their minds govern others; those who labor with their strength are governed by others”? This is entirely the same kind of trash of the Soviet revisionists who call for “the leadership of the intellectuals with the actual work carried out by the workers.”

Beginning in 1956, that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party publicized that “the cadres who are well versed in production techniques and other kinds of specialized vocational knowledge form the basic force in building socialism.” By 1957, he clamored that “the White experts are of advantage to the People’s Republic of China” and it was necessary to “cherish and praise” those intellectuals taking the “White expert” road. The reactionary stand and world outlook of the bourgeoisie determine that he is “in communion” with Lin Piao and company. All of them wish that they could knock down the broad masses of workers, peasants and soldiers with one blow so that the bourgeois intellectuals could continue to preserve their “hereditary territory” in cultural, educational, scientific and technical circles. This absolutely cannot be tolerated.

There is a jargon credited to Lin Piao: “Implement a policy of special privileged treatment to bring up pace-setters.” As a represen-

tative of the new and old bourgeoisie, Lin Piao also pinned his hope on energetically bringing up new bourgeois elements. Lin Li-kuo belonged to such a category. Lin Piao and company cried, "Universities are run by us!" He asked Lin Li-kuo and his ilk to get hold of knowledge and technique in certain fields for the counterrevolutionary cause. He also made use of his unique conditions to enable them to get in touch with abundant feudal, capitalist, revisionist and imperialist ideology and culture so as to give them a course of reactionary education. He also gave them all kinds of prerogatives in the political and economic fields. This was Lin Piao's "implementation of a policy of special privileged treatment." The new bourgeois elements of the Lin Li-kuo type also became the sworn confederates and backbone elements of the counter-revolutionary coup d'etat unleashed by the Lin Piao anti-Party clique, and played the role of pace-setters in restoring capitalism.

It can be seen from this that the fundamental object of people of the Lin Piao type in publicizing "private ownership of knowledge" is to effect the monopoly of knowledge by a few exploiters and to bring up a spiritual aristocracy so as to extend their social foundation for the practice of "subduing one's self and returning to propriety" on a large scale. In the final analysis, in this opposition to the criticism of "private ownership of knowledge," those who whip up the Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts also seek to preserve this piece of "fertile land" for restoring capitalism. This once again makes us understand that for the sake of preventing people of the Lin Piao type from coming into power, the proletariat must exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure including all spheres of culture. It must oppose bourgeois prerogatives, restrict bourgeois rights and realize Chairman Mao's instruction on "imparting knowledge to the working people and requiring the intellectuals to take up manual work." It must energetically foster new things with communist factors, gradually narrow the three major differences until they are eliminated in the end in the future, and strive to create conditions that will make it impossible for the bourgeoisie to survive and to emerge again.

Chairman Mao teaches us, "**In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines.**" The criticism of "private ownership of knowledge" seeks to eliminate the pernicious influence of the revisionist line of people of the Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao type, and to call on the broad masses of intellectuals to further correctly orient the line, solve the question of for whom, and hence master more properly cultural and scientific knowledge for the revolution and consciously serve the workers, peasants and soldiers as well as proletarian politics.

The advocates of the Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts say that the criticism of "private ownership of knowledge" means that

knowledge is not wanted and is criticism of the intellectuals. This kind of unfounded reports and sophistry seeks nothing more than to smother the movement to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat which has just emerged, to undermine the criticism of the bourgeoisie and revisionism by the broad masses, and to sow discord in the relations between the broad masses of intellectuals and the Party.

Lenin once pointed out, **“Negation of revisionism is for covering up one’s own revisionism.”** (*Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. XX, p. 324) Those who insist on saying that “private ownership of knowledge” is no longer in existence and that “everything is for serving the people, private ownership or not” are precisely trying to cover up their own despicable behavior in peddling “private ownership of knowledge” and practicing revisionism on a large scale. In “taking the three directives as the key link” to revise and negate taking class struggle as the key link, it is apparent that that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party seeks to abolish the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, including the criticism of “private ownership of knowledge,” so as to facilitate his launching a counter-attack in revenge against the revolutionary masses. The great leader Chairman Mao has most recently pointed out, **“Reversing verdicts is against the will of people.”** That unrepentant capitalist roader who goes against the tide of history is picking up a rock only to drop it on his own feet.

Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line has clearly pointed out to the broad masses of intellectuals a bright future. The socialist system has opened up a broad world for the development of science and culture. The excellent situation at home and abroad marked by “the world is being turned upside down” and “past scenes are transformed” is encouraging the broad masses of revolutionary intellectuals to work hard and forge ahead along the promising Red-and-expert road. We surely must firmly grasp this key link of class struggle, resolutely strike back at the Right-deviation wind to reverse verdicts, and more penetratingly criticize that unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party who stubbornly pushes the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. We must criticize the idea of bourgeois rights, including “private ownership of knowledge,” continue to criticize the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius, and expose the criminal conspiracy of the followers and descendants of Confucius who want “to subdue one’s self and return to propriety” at the first opportunity. Under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, the broad masses of revolutionary intellectuals certainly will play a full part in combatting and guarding against revisionism, consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and building a socialist modern power, and strive to make contributions worthy of our era.

A REACTIONARY PHILOSOPHY THAT STANDS ON ITS HEAD

—A criticism of Teng Hsiao-p'ing's sophistic tactics in opposing the restriction of bourgeois rights

Hung Yu

Inside "On the General Program for All Work of the Party and the Country" concocted on instructions from Teng Hsiao-p'ing, the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader within the Party, no mention is made of the struggle against Party persons in power taking the capitalist road, nor is there any mention of the restriction of bourgeois rights, on which the capitalist-roaders rely for peace and stability. This is by no means a matter of coincidence but the inevitable exposure of Teng Hsiao-p'ing's bourgeois nature.

In his directive on the question of theory, Chairman Mao clearly points out that regarding bourgeois rights, "they can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat." Although "On the General Program" touches on this directive of Chairman Mao's, it does not say a word about the most important content of this directive—the restriction of bourgeois rights. This is sufficient to show that what Teng Hsiao-p'ing calls the need to study Chairman Mao's directive on the question of theory is completely false, and what is true is his opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the restriction of bourgeois rights. Doesn't Teng Hsiao-p'ing openly cry that "in order to restrict bourgeois rights, there must also be a material foundation; otherwise, how is restriction to be effected?" This most clearly shows that Teng Hsiao-p'ing actually opposes the restriction of bourgeois rights on the ground that conditions are not available for restricting bourgeois rights.

Since Teng Hsiao-p'ing is opposed to the restriction of bourgeois rights, he naturally is also opposed to the criticism of bourgeois rights. Nevertheless, he plays another trick, saying that even if "criticism" has to be made, only the idea of bourgeois rights can be "criticized." This is in fact to sever the idea of bourgeois rights from the bourgeois rights arising from it. The consequence is bound to be the "criticism" of the idea of bourgeois rights on the one hand, and the unrestricted

Survey of People's Republic of China Press #6204 (76-42). (Peking Kuang-ming Jih-pao, August 31, 1976.)

strengthening and extension of bourgeois rights on the other. Such a trick played by Teng Hsiao-p'ing takes standing philosophy on its head as its ideological foundation. This kind of reactionary philosophy must be thoroughly criticized.

First, this kind of philosophy takes away the actual foundation of the idea of bourgeois rights, and describes it as something independent and divorced from bourgeois rights. A basic viewpoint of Marxist philosophy is "the need to explain social consciousness with social being." (Karl Marx, *Selected Works of Lenin*, Vol. II, p. 584) While "conceptual things are nothing more than the reformed material things transferred into human minds." (Marx's "Afterword to 2nd Edition of *Das Kapital* Vol. I," *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. II, p. 217) The idea of bourgeois rights is a reflection of bourgeois rights in man's mind. There are still bourgeois rights in socialist society, and this is the objective foundation which makes possible the indefinite existence and functioning of the idea of bourgeois rights.

However, in Teng Hsiao-p'ing's philosophy which stands on its head, the idea of bourgeois rights seems to have become the decisive thing of prime importance, the thing which determines rather than rely on social being. Therefore, bourgeois rights "are forgotten and distorted by idealism 'right from the beginning.'" (Excerpts from Hegel's "Recorded Speeches on History of Philosophy," *Collected Works of Lenin*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 324) According to this kind of idealist philosophy that stands on its head, the restriction of bourgeois rights becomes "an infeasible truth," which the handful of counter-revolutionaries yelled when staging the T'ienanmen Square incident.

Next, this kind of philosophy has taken away from the idea of bourgeois rights its concrete class content and turned it into a class concept that stands above classes. Marxist philosophy holds that any social consciousness in class society has its specific class content. For example, the idea of bourgeois rights is what the bourgeoisie looks upon as the "concept of their having the prerogative to exploit the workers." (Engels: "On the Question of Housing," *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. II, p. 476) Only by fully understanding the class essence of the idea of bourgeois rights can we heighten our understanding of the necessity to restrict bourgeois rights. Otherwise, the idea of bourgeois rights can only be criticized falsely while bourgeois rights are genuinely shielded.

What is the fact? Like Teng Hsiao-p'ing, such unrepentant capitalist-roaders within the Party are also opposed to criticizing the idea of bourgeois rights. For instance, such typical ideas of bourgeois rights as "study in order to become officials," "private ownership of knowledge," pursuit of the "White-and-expert" road, "acquiring

fame and prestige," should have been criticized according to logic! However, the Teng Hsiao-p'ing-type of capitalist-roaders within the Party yell that "they cannot be unanalytically criticized." After their "analysis," these corrupt ideas all become things that stand above classes and "are good to the People's Republic of China." Therefore, he can carry on his sinful activities in strengthening and extending bourgeois rights and restoring capitalism.

Next again, this kind of philosophy negates the important role of revolutionary practice. Marxism fully affirms the dynamic role of social consciousness and emphasizes the importance of struggle in the ideological sphere, but it particularly attaches significance to the enormous role of revolutionary practice in transforming the objective world under the guidance of the correct ideology. The criticism of the idea of bourgeois rights is doubtlessly very important, but this cannot replace entirely the restriction of bourgeois rights in actual life. Teng Hsiao-p'ing's sinister attempt in advocating that the idea of bourgeois rights can only be "criticized" in isolation is to negate the significance of revolutionary practice, write off a section of revolutionary measures adopted by our Party for restricting bourgeois rights, smother a large number of socialist new things for restricting bourgeois rights on all sides and cover up his true image in transforming the idea of bourgeois rights into restorationist action.

The philosophy which stands on its head publicized by Teng Hsiao-p'ing is no new invention. In the workers movement, the opportunists and new and old revisionists, for the sake of opposing the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, have all vociferously peddled this kind of idealist philosophy that stands on its head because it is particularly suitable to the political need of the reactionary class on the decline to deceive and corrupt the masses of the people and to defend and restore the old things. Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao, Teng Hsiao-p'ing and the capitalist-roaders within the Party of their kind—similar to the reactionary class on the decline in history—all go against the historical tide and have no truth in their hands. Therefore can only seek help from this kind of reactionary philosophy that stands on its head. Liu Shao-ch'i chanted for several decades his idealist "self-cultivation," and Lin Piao openly advocated "to reverse" Marxist historical materialism and publicized with every effort the fallacy of "the eruption of revolution in the depth of the soul." What they worshipped is precisely this kind of philosophy which stands on its head—subjective idealist philosophy.

At the time of opposing the restriction of bourgeois rights, Teng Hsiao-p'ing toys with sophistic tactics. This is determined by his subjective idealist world outlook. His ideology is "characterized by the breach

between the subjective and the objective, the separation of knowledge from practice.” (Chairman Mao, “On Practice”) He fundamentally ignores objective existence and the practice of struggle by the people, overestimates his own counter-revolutionary “subjective” force and underestimates the strength of the masses of people. As he sees it, so long as he plays with sophistic tactics and casts forth the philosophy that stands on its head, he can befuddle and hoodwink the masses, and hence continue to strengthen and extend bourgeois rights and practice his own fraudulent deals for restoring capitalism. However, the proletariat armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung thought is an irresistible “material force which changes society and changes the world.” (Chairman Mao, “Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?”) Such kind of capitalist-roaders within the Party as Teng Hsiao-p’ing can only be swept by the proletariat onto the garbage pile of history together with their philosophy which stands on its head.

Marx points out: “Nothing can prevent us from integrating our criticism with political criticism, and with the clearcut political stand of these people. Hence, we also integrate our criticism with actual struggle and look upon criticism and actual struggle as one and the same thing.” (“Excerpts from Letters in the *German-French Almanac*,” *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. I, pp. 417-418) We must adhere to these several “integrations” mentioned by Marx, thoroughly criticize Teng Hsiao-p’ing’s reactionary philosophy that stands on its head, link the criticism of the idea of bourgeois rights and the criticism of bourgeois rights with the restriction of bourgeois rights, consolidate and develop the achievements gained from the restriction of bourgeois rights, carry through to end the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and gradually create conditions which make it impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist or to emerge again.

TEXT 38

FROM BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATS TO CAPITALIST-ROADERS

Chih Heng

The great struggle initiated and led by our great leader Chairman Mao to beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse previous correct verdicts is developing soundly in various spheres of the superstructure, including education, science and technology, and art and literature. The spearhead of the criticism is directed at the capitalist-roader inside the Party who refuses to mend his ways, the one who put forward the revisionist programme of "taking the three directives as the key link." A continuation and deepening of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, this struggle is yet another major trial of strength on the political and ideological front between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism, and between Marxism and revisionism.

Through this struggle, the cadres and masses will certainly receive a profound lesson in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and further raise their consciousness of class struggle and the struggle between the two lines. Through it our country's socialist revolution and construction will certainly take a giant stride forward.

The deepening of the revolutionary mass debate has raised a number of thought-provoking questions: Why is it that some people who were revolutionaries in the period of the new-democratic revolution have become capitalist-roaders in the period of the socialist revolution? Why does the capitalist-roader who refuses to mend his ways deny the existence of classes, class contradictions and class struggle in socialist society, oppose taking class struggle as the key link and run counter to the basic line formulated by Chairman Mao for our Party?

We can find the class and ideological origins of the Right deviationist wind by using the Marxist method of class analysis and draw beneficial lessons accordingly.

At the Eighth Plenary Session of the Party's Eighth Central Committee in 1959, Chairman Mao penetratingly pointed out that Right opportunist elements in the Party had never been proletarian revolutionaries. They were merely bourgeois or petty-bourgeois democrats who had found their way into the proletarian revolutionary ranks. Nor had they ever been Marxists-Leninists, but were fellow-travellers of the Party.

Peking Review #13, March 26, 1976.

The capitalist-roader in the Party who refuses to mend his ways is also one of this kind. When he and other such people joined the proletarian revolutionary ranks, they brought with them the ideology of bourgeois democracy. When they accepted to varying degrees the Party's minimum programme, that is, the programme of the new-democratic revolution, they did not associate it with the Party's maximum programme, that is, the winning of socialism and communism. They do not understand the Party's maximum programme, nor are they prepared to work for its realization. In other words, their world outlook is not a proletarian communist world outlook but a bourgeois one. Furthermore, this bourgeois stand and world outlook have not been remoulded in the course of protracted revolutionary struggles. When the revolution advanced from the stage of the new-democratic revolution to that of socialist revolution, their ideology failed to keep pace with the revolutionary advance. On the contrary, although they had physically entered socialist society, ideologically they were still in the stage of the democratic revolution. This determined their inevitable conflict with and even opposition to the socialist revolution. The bourgeois democratic stand and world outlook represent the bourgeoisie and are the class and ideological origins of the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts.

The new-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution led by the Chinese Communist Party are two revolutionary stages whose character, targets and tasks are essentially different. The former took place in the old China of semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. The principal contradiction it aimed to resolve was the contradiction between the masses of the people including workers, peasants, the petty and national bourgeoisie on one side and imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism on the other. Therefore, it was anti-imperialist and anti-feudal bourgeois democratic revolution in character. Its task was to strive under the leadership of the proletariat to overthrow the rule of imperialism, the feudal landlord class and the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie in China, and to lead the revolution to socialism.

With the victory of the new-democratic revolution, the character and principal contradiction of the Chinese society changed. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie became the principal contradiction in our country. This contradiction not only exists in society at large but is also reflected in the Party. The socialist revolution we are carrying out is a revolution waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes. The spearhead of the revolution is directed mainly against the bourgeoisie and against Party persons in power taking the capitalist road. Its task is to replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat, use socialism to

defeat capitalism, and through protracted class struggle gradually create conditions in which it will be impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist, or for a new bourgeoisie to arise, and finally eliminate classes and realize communism. The founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 marked the beginning of the socialist revolutionary stage.

If one's ideology still remains at the old stage and views and treats the socialist revolution from the stand and world outlook of bourgeois democrats, one will become a representative of the bourgeoisie, a capitalist-roader and a target of the socialist revolution.

After the victory of the new-democratic revolution in China, the ideology of some people in the Party remained at the stage of the democratic revolution and they did not want to continue the revolution along the socialist road. Isn't this true of the capitalist-roader in the Party who refuses to mend his ways? He and his followers are afraid that the socialist revolution will bring them under fire and will affect private ownership, bourgeois right which they cherish, the traditional ideas they want to uphold and their bourgeois class stand and world outlook. They therefore become representatives of the bourgeoisie. The deeper the socialist revolution goes, the sharper becomes the contradiction between them and the revolution and between them and the workers and poor and lower-middle peasants who persevere in continuing the revolution. As the socialist revolution moves forward, they fall back and oppose revolution.

It is precisely the capitalist-roader refusing to mend his ways who opposed agricultural co-operation and the people's commune and supported "the fixing of farm output quotas for individual households with each on its own." Later, he set himself up against the Great Cultural Revolution and suppressed the revolutionary mass movement, and now made every effort to reverse correct verdicts and restore capitalism.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: "**Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line.**" (*Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work.*)

In terms of ideology and class origin, the bourgeois class stand and world outlook are in accord with revisionism. Opportunism, or revisionism, is a faction and school of thought in the workers' movement which represents the interests of the bourgeoisie. Its special feature is betrayal of the fundamental interests of the proletariat and capitulation to the bourgeoisie. Revisionists invariably preach class conciliation, the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces from a bourgeois class stand. They invariably use these revi-

sionist fallacies to oppose the class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat. From Bernstein and Kautsky to Trotsky and Bukharin, and from Khrushchov and Brezhnev to Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, all acted in this way. This is true also of the capitalist-roader who has refused to mend his ways. He put forward the revisionist programme of “taking the three directives as the key link” and advocated the theories of the dying out of class struggle and of productive forces to counter the theories of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought on class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. He also used it to interfere with and undermine the movement to study the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the criticism of the novel *Water Margin*, both initiated and led by Chairman Mao. He also used it to push the revisionist line in various fields. The absurdities, which appeared last year in the educational, scientific and technological fields, in literature and art and other spheres in opposition to Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line, the Great Cultural Revolution and the socialist new things, all stemmed from this revisionist programme. He whose ideology remains in the stage of the democratic revolution, denying the existence of classes, class contradictions and class struggle in the socialist period, is bound to practise revisionism.

Chairman Mao has said: **“What ‘taking the three directives as the key link’! Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it.”** This is a penetrating criticism of the revisionist programme of “taking the three directives as the key link.” We have won great victories in socialist revolution in the past 20 years and more but class struggle has not died out. Members of the defeated class are still around, this class still exists and is still struggling and dreaming of a comeback; the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie still exist; large numbers of intellectuals who have not been thoroughly remoulded still exist; the force of habit and conventional influences of the small producers still exist and are still engendering the bourgeoisie and capitalism. Are these not facts known to everyone? Were people not greatly shocked at the subversive activities of the anti-Party cliques of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, agents of the bourgeoisie inside the Party who attempted to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism? Isn’t the emergence of new bourgeois elements in the Party such as Lin Piao and his like a profound lesson to us? Under such circumstances, how can it be said that class struggle has died out? In putting forward ideas such as “taking the three directives as the key link” and talking of the dying out of class struggle and the theory of productive forces, people like the capitalist-roader in the Party who has refused to mend his ways do not

really want to abolish class struggle. What they are really after is to extinguish the struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and fight the proletariat on behalf of the bourgeoisie. They pretend to want stability and unity and to develop production; what they really want is to reject the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism. Their revisionist line is in fact detrimental to stability and unity and socialist production.

After the victory of the democratic revolution, the issue is whether to stop the revolution at the old stage and not going forward or to persist in making socialist revolution and strive for the goal of communism, that is, whether or not to persevere in making revolution against the bourgeoisie. Herein lies the fundamental difference between proletarian revolutionaries and bourgeois democrats and between Marxists and revisionists. The struggle between the two lines within the Party during the socialist period precisely centres on this issue.

Why does the capitalist-roader in the Party who refuses to mend his ways so resent the Great Cultural Revolution? Why does he regard the socialist new things which have emerged in the Great Cultural Revolution as a thorn in his flesh and something to be got rid of at all costs? Why is he so reluctant to part with the capitalist and revisionist trash which was repudiated in the Great Cultural Revolution, and is so eager to reinstate it? This is because, as Chairman Mao has said, **“the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is in essence a great political revolution carried out under the conditions of socialism by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes.”** This great revolution smashed the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao, criticized their revisionist line, brought the capitalist-roaders in the Party under fire, made the bourgeoisie in the Party the target of the revolution, criticized the ideologies of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, and transformed education, literature and art and other parts of the superstructure not in conformity with the socialist economic base. All these run counter to the bourgeois interests represented by the capitalist-roader in the Party who has refused to mend his ways and to the capitalist road he is so eager to take. Because of this, people like him have inevitably become opponents of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The birthmarks of the old society remain in socialist society as is the case with bourgeois right and the three major differences between worker and peasant, between town and country and between manual and mental labour. These provide the soil and conditions for engendering the bourgeoisie and capitalism. The long-term task in the period of socialism is to restrict bourgeois right and gradually wipe out the vestiges of the old society. The deeper the socialist revolution goes, the more imperative it is

for us to put forward this task and set about to accomplish it.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“Our country at present practises a commodity system, the wage system is unequal, too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat such things can only be restricted. Therefore, if people like Lin Piao come to power, it will be quite easy for them to rig up the capitalist system. That is why we should do more reading of Marxist-Leninist works.”** This instruction of Chairman Mao’s reflects the desire and demands of the proletariat and the revolutionary people to push the socialist revolution forward. At the same time it arouses fear and opposition from people whose ideology still remains at the stage of the democratic revolution. They want to retain these fundamental aspects of bourgeois right. These people come out in opposition when the revolution hits them directly by moving to restrict those aspects of bourgeois right which they wish to uphold. Why does this capitalist-roader who refuses to mend his ways hate the socialist new things which restrict bourgeois right in various fields? Why does he censure in every way the criticism of material incentives and of regarding knowledge as private property and other ideas arising from bourgeois right? Why is he so afraid of raising the question of restricting bourgeois right and why is he dead against it? It is because he represents the bourgeoisie and wants to safeguard and strengthen bourgeois right and safeguard and expand the basis on which the bourgeoisie is engendered and survives.

Resentment of and opposition to the socialist revolution stemming from ideology which remains at the stage of the democratic revolution—this is a historical phenomenon which has repeatedly appeared in the Party over the past 20 years and more. For example, our Party in 1953 decided to carry out the policy of planned purchase and marketing, an important step in undertaking socialist revolution and construction. At that time, there were people in the Party who leapt out in firm opposition. They were Communists in name, but spoke out for the urban and rural capitalist forces against the socialist revolution. In the period when agricultural co-operatives were being developed, Liu Shao-chi and his like disbanded large numbers of co-operatives and attacked the movement. What they planned and did was contrary to the wishes and doings of the peasants numbering hundreds of millions. In 1957, when the bourgeois Rightists took advantage of the Party’s rectification drive to launch a wild attack upon the proletariat, there were also people in the Party who advocated a bourgeois programme in co-ordination with the bourgeois Rightists of that time. In 1959, Peng Teh-huai’s Right opportunism opposed the Party’s general line, negated the great leap forward and the people’s communes. This once again exposed the true colours of those who remained bourgeois democrats.

These people, who tried to push forward a capitalist programme and bourgeois slogans in the period of socialist revolution, could not but be washed away by the current of the socialist revolution.

It is by no means strange that, in the period of the socialist revolution, there are still some in the Party whose ideology remains at the stage of the democratic revolution and who deal with things from the standpoint and world outlook of the bourgeoisie. Ours is a great, glorious and correct Party. Under the guidance of our great leader Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, the revolution led by the Party has won great victories. But because the Party over a long period in the past led revolutionary movements which were bourgeois democratic in nature, many bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats joined the revolutionary ranks and the vanguard of the proletariat. Many who were educated in Marxism-Leninism and were tempered in protracted revolutionary struggles gradually abandoned their bourgeois world outlook and accepted or fostered the proletarian stand and world outlook. But there are still a few who have been profoundly influenced by bourgeois ideology but have not accepted the Party's education and remoulding, and their stand and world outlook remain unchanged. In socialist society, the bourgeoisie still exists and its ideology will inevitably influence certain people in the vanguard of the proletariat and turn them into bourgeois democrats and revisionists. Their world outlook is bound to find expression stubbornly on political and ideological questions by every possible means. One cannot expect it to do otherwise. When the socialist revolution is rolling forward, there inevitably are people who obstinately want to stop it and turn it back. Such people appeared in the past, are still around at present and will emerge in the future.

The proletarian Party must wage resolute struggles against such attempts to transform the Party and society in the image of the bourgeoisie. With regard to those comrades who have made mistakes, our Party's consistent policy is: **"learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones and cure the sickness to save the patient."** In the current struggle, we should continue to adhere to this policy, patiently help those comrades who have made mistakes to mend their ways so as to promote unity and do our work well.

TEXT 39

CAPITALIST-ROADERS ARE THE BOURGEOISIE INSIDE THE PARTY

Fang Kang

In the great struggle to criticize Teng Hsiao-ping and beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts, Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“With the socialist revolution they themselves come under fire. At the time of the co-operative transformation of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticizing bourgeois right, they resent it. You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don’t know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road.”** This scientific thesis has incisively laid bare the bourgeois essence of the capitalist-roaders in the Party, further indicated the main target of the revolutionary struggle throughout the historical period of socialism, and defended and developed the great Marxist-Leninist theory on class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a powerful ideological weapon for us to persist in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and to combat and prevent revisionism.

An Important Feature of Class Struggle in The Historical Period of Socialism

The emergence of capitalist-roaders—the bourgeoisie inside the Party—is an important feature of class struggle in the historical period of socialism and is closely linked with the change in class relations under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the period of democratic revolution, the principal contradiction in our society was the contradiction between the proletariat and the masses of the people on the one hand and imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism on the other. At that time, there were also opportunists, revisionists and chieftains of the various opportunist lines inside the Party; they were agents of the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes in the Party, but for the bourgeoisie as a whole, they were merely its appendages. Since the landlord and comprador-capitalist classes held the reins of government at that time, the nucleus and the main force of the bourgeoisie, its head-

Peking Review #25, June 18, 1976. (Slightly abridged translation of an article in *Hongqi [Red Flag]* #6, 1976.)

quarters and its chief political representatives were outside and not inside the Party.

After great victory had been won in the new-democratic revolution, the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism was overthrown and the proletariat led the people of the whole country in seizing the political power of the state. Since then China has entered the historical period of socialist revolution and the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has become the principal contradiction in society. Since our Party has become the ruling party, the struggle between Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and the bourgeois and revisionist line determines not only the nature of our Party but also the character and prospects of our country as a whole. From that time on, our struggle against the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party has gradually developed in depth in all spheres, centering around the basic question of whether or not to carry out the socialist revolution. The *san fan* and *wu fan* movements,* the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production and the anti-Rightist struggle** were all major struggles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie since the founding of New China. In these struggles, the bourgeoisie outside the Party still had some strength to engage in a trial of strength with the proletariat and was still able to nominate its own protagonists; but even then a complicated situation had already developed in which the bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party responded to and colluded with each other. In their unbridled attacks on the Party, the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes outside the Party had the support of the bourgeoisie inside the Party and banked on its help. Through the two-line struggle in the Party, we brought to light the activities of the bourgeoisie inside the Party against the socialist revolution and criticized its revisionist line, thereby ensuring the victories of the various major campaigns in the socialist transformation.

With the continuous deepening of the socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie outside the Party which is in a position of being ruled has lost its means of production economically and met with one defeat after another on the political and ideological fronts; consequently, its

*These movements were carried out between December 1951 and June 1952. The former was against the three evils of corruption, waste and bureaucracy in the Communist Party and government organs and the latter was against the capitalists' five evils of bribery of government workers, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts, and stealing economic information from government sources for private speculation.

**This refers to the struggle in 1957 to counterattack the bourgeois Rightists who took advantage of our Party's rectification campaign to launch wild attacks on the proletariat.

strength has been gradually weakened. If during the bourgeois Rightists' attack on the Party they still had the so-called "Chang-Lo alliance"* playing the commander's role, then after the anti-Rightist struggle it has become much more difficult for the bourgeoisie outside the Party to openly muster its forces to wage an all-round struggle against the proletariat, subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism.

The principal contradiction in the entire historical period of socialism is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. With the balance of class forces having undergone a change, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie finds expression in the Party in an increasingly profound and acute way. Thus the capitalist-roaders emerge in the Party as the force at the core of the bourgeoisie as a whole and become the main danger in subverting the proletarian dictatorship and restoring capitalism. While carrying out the socialist revolution, we must not only see that the old bourgeoisie and its intellectuals still exist in society and that large numbers of the petty bourgeoisie are still in the course of remoulding their ideology, but we must be especially aware of the bourgeoisie hidden inside the Party, that is, those Party persons in power taking the capitalist road. Only by waging a resolute struggle against the capitalist-roaders in the Party like Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping and persisting in directing our revolution at the bourgeoisie inside the Party can victory be ensured in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and the capitalist forces in society at large; only thus can it be said that the main target of the socialist revolution has been really grasped. Anyone who fails to understand that the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party is not a sober-minded proletarian revolutionary.

In summing up the historical experience of the Paris Commune, Engels pointed out that after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is necessary to guard **"against this transformation of the state and the organs of the state from servants of society into masters of society"** **"in pursuance of their own special interests."** (Introduction by Frederick Engels to Karl Marx's *The Civil War in France*.) After the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin analysed the actual social conditions in the Soviet Union and clearly pointed out that a new bourgeoisie existed in the country and that it was arising from among the Soviet government employees and the small producers.

*Chang-Lo refers to Chang Po-chun and Lo Lung-chi who were protagonists of the bourgeois Rightists in attacking the Party in 1957. The objective of this reactionary alliance was to topple the Chinese Communist Party and turn the proletarian dictatorship in China into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In the light of the historical lesson of how the Soviet Union has turned revisionist and the practical experience in exercising the dictatorship of the proletariat in China, Chairman Mao has put forward the brilliant thesis that the bourgeoisie **“is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road.”** This is an important development of Marxism-Leninism. Over the last 20 years and more following the founding of the People’s Republic of China, Chairman Mao has not only made a profound analysis of the bourgeoisie inside the Party from a theoretical angle, but has also in practice led us in carrying out repeated struggles against it. The chieftains of the revisionist line Kao Kang, Peng Teh-huai, Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping were all commanders of the bourgeoisie inside the Party, and the several major two-line struggles in the socialist period have been struggles waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie inside the Party with them as the ringleaders. It is precisely in the course of these struggles that our socialist system of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been continually consolidated and developed.

Class Nature of Capitalist-Roaders

Chairman Mao has pointed out in his *Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society*: **“To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution.”** It is, therefore, extremely necessary for us to apply the Marxist scientific method to reveal, both politically and economically, the bourgeois nature of the capitalist-roaders so that we can clearly see that the bourgeoisie is right in the Communist Party.

The most essential political characteristic of the capitalist-roaders in the Party is that they push the revisionist line and cling to the capitalist road. In analysing them, we must first and foremost grasp this characteristic and, from the viewpoint of political line, get a clear understanding of their essence. It is on the basis of a common effort to push the revisionist line that the capitalist-roaders form a political faction in the Party in a vain attempt to restore capitalism. And the chieftains of the revisionist line that emerged on many occasions in the past were all general representatives of this line. These chieftains, like Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping, all held a very large portion of the Party and state power, so they were in a position to recruit deserters and renegades, form cliques to pursue their own selfish interests and set up bourgeois headquarters, turn the instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat into those of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and hoodwink for a time a number of people who lack an

understanding of the real situation and do not have a high level of consciousness, inveigling them into following their revisionist line. They were more ruthless and dangerous than the bourgeoisie outside the Party in their efforts to restore capitalism. The revisionist line pushed by the capitalist-roaders in the Party represents in a concentrated way the interests of the old and new bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, and this determines the bourgeois nature of the capitalist-roaders. The socialist period is **“a period of struggle between moribund capitalism and nascent communism.”** (Lenin: *Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.*) It is beyond doubt that the capitalist-roaders as the bourgeoisie inside the Party are part of the declining bourgeoisie as a whole. Precisely because the bourgeoisie is a moribund and decadent class, its reactionary nature is all the more pronounced. **“The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie.”** Bent on practising revisionism, Lin Piao went so far as to cook up the *Outline of Project “571”* and to launch a counter-revolutionary armed coup d’etat, while Teng Hsiao-ping who persisted in practising revisionism caused the counter-revolutionary political riot like the incident at Tien An Men Square. These soul-stirring facts of class struggle have bared in an extremely sharp and clear-cut manner the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie inside the Party.

Economically, the reason why the capitalist-roaders are the bourgeoisie inside the Party is that they represent the decadent capitalist relations of production. In the socialist period, the proletariat wants to constantly transform those parts of the superstructure and the relations of production which are not in harmony with the socialist economic base and the productive forces and carry the socialist revolution through to the end. The capitalist-roaders in the Party, however, do everything possible to preserve those parts of the superstructure and the relations of production which hamper the development of the socialist economic base and the productive forces; their vain attempt is to restore capitalism.

If we examine the position of the capitalist-roaders in the Party in the relations of social production by following Lenin’s teaching on the meaning of classes as expounded in his *A Great Beginning* and Chairman Mao’s analysis in *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* regarding classes and class struggle in socialist society after the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, we will get a fairly clear understanding of their bourgeois nature. We can see from real life that once the leadership in certain units or departments was controlled by capitalist-roaders like Lui Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping, they would use the power in their hands to energetically push the revi-

sionist line and turn the socialist mutual relations among people into capitalist relations between employers and employees; they would use legal and numerous illegal means to expand bourgeois right with respect to distribution and appropriate the fruits of other people's labour without compensation; and they would also take advantage of their position and power to dispose of state- or collectively-owned means of production and consumption, with the result that socialist ownership exists only in name but is actually turned into capitalist ownership under the control of the capitalist-roaders. In the final analysis, the revisionist line pushed by Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping was designed to preserve the decadent and declining capitalist relations of production, to **"cling to the bourgeois ideology of oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and to the capitalist system"** and to serve the economic interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole, so as to drag our country back to those dark days of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal old China.

Class and Historical Roots of the Emergence of Capitalist-Roaders

The emergence of capitalist-roaders—the bourgeoisie inside the Party—in the socialist period is by no means accidental but has deep class and historical roots. In the struggle to repulse the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, Chairman Mao has pointed out: **"After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle peasants did not stand still, they want revolution. On the other hand, a number of Party members do not want to go forward; some have moved backward and opposed the revolution. Why? Because they have become high officials and want to protect the interests of high officials."** This instruction of Chairman Mao's has stung the capitalist-roaders in the Party to the quick. The switchover from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution is a fundamental change in the course of which division is bound to take place within the revolutionary ranks. The workers and poor and lower-middle peasants want revolution and Chairman Mao's revolutionary line reflects their demand and guides the whole Party and the people throughout the country to continue to make the socialist revolution, but a number of people in the Party who cling to bourgeois democratic ideas and refuse to remould themselves do not want to go forward. In the eyes of these people, imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, which were like three big mountains weighing down on the Chinese people, were overthrown while they themselves had gained enormous political and material benefits, and that meant the end of the revolution. Some of them whose

revolutionary will had sagged failed to keep pace with the times; some others clung to the reactionary bourgeois stand and, in order to protect their own interests which are, in essence, those of the bourgeoisie as a whole, came out into the open to oppose the proletarian socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, in a vain attempt to turn back the wheel of history and restore capitalism, and these people are none other than those Party persons in power taking the capitalist road. The arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party Teng Hsiao-ping is just such a person, and turning from a bourgeois democrat into a capitalist-roader is the course he actually followed.

An important reason why the capitalist-roaders oppose the socialist revolution is that they are against restricting bourgeois right. Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“Lenin spoke of building a bourgeois state without capitalists to safeguard bourgeois right. We ourselves have built just such a state, not much different from the old society: there are ranks and grades, eight grades of wages, distribution according to work, and exchange of equal values.”** Bourgeois right is inevitable in the socialist period and this birthmark left over from the old society cannot be eliminated overnight. But it must be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat, otherwise it would lead to capitalist restoration. Bourgeois right is an important economic basis for engendering the new bourgeoisie. Some people in the Party whose world outlook has not been thoroughly remoulded and who try hard to strengthen and expand bourgeois right are bound to turn step by step into capitalist-roaders, or members of the bourgeoisie. To expand bourgeois right is, in essence, to safeguard the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole and to reinforce the social basis for restoring capitalism. That Teng Hsiao-ping was so resentful and panic-stricken when he heard that bourgeois right was being criticized was because bourgeois right is the lifeblood of the bourgeoisie inside the Party, and any restriction of bourgeois right means directing the revolution against it. In the socialist period, what attitude one takes toward bourgeois right—to restrict it or expand it—is an important criterion for distinguishing whether one is continuing the revolution or is standing still or even opposing the revolution. On this issue, our struggle against the capitalist-roaders in the Party—a struggle between restriction and counter-restriction—will continue for a long time to come.

The Fall of the Bourgeoisie and the Victory Of the Proletariat Are Equally Inevitable

The Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat. Does the existence of the bourgeoisie inside the Party affect its proletarian nature?

This question should be explained by applying materialist dialectics. Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“The law of the unity of opposites is the fundamental law of the universe. This law operates universally, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in man’s thinking.”** (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.*) A socialist society is an entity in which there are contradictions and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Such contradictions and struggle also find expression in the Party. **“Outside any party there are other parties, inside it, there are groupings; this has always been so.”** **“A grouping is one wing of a class.”** The capitalist-roaders are the Rightists inside the Party or the bourgeoisie inside the Party during the socialist period. Whether or not the existence of the bourgeoisie inside the Party will change its nature depends on the roles of the two contradictory aspects. **“The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position.”** (Mao Tsetung: *On Contradiction.*) The criterion by which we judge whether a party is Marxist or revisionist is not whether there is a bourgeoisie in the Party but, most fundamentally, whether Party leadership is in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries or bourgeois representatives and whether the Marxist or revisionist line holds the dominant position in the Party.

The Chinese Communist Party, founded and nurtured by our great leader Chairman Mao himself, is a great, glorious and correct Party. Under the leadership of Chairman Mao and under the guidance of his proletarian revolutionary line, our Party has persisted in carrying out the two-line struggle, constantly got rid of opportunist factions within the Party, overcome the interference of “Left” or Right opportunist lines, thereby maintaining the dominant position of the Marxist-Leninist line in the Party and its proletarian nature. Tempered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, our Party has become purer and stauncher and grown from strength to strength; it has given full play to its role as the vigorous vanguard organization in leading the proletariat and the masses of the people to fight against the class enemies. This is the essential and main aspect of our Party. It is precisely because ours is a genuine proletarian revolutionary Party that we dare to admit the existence of the bourgeoisie within it and dare to mobilize and rely on the masses to persistently wage a struggle against it. Since Khrushchov, Brezhnev and their like came to power, they have pushed a revisionist line effecting an all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, caused the Soviet Communist Party founded by Lenin to degenerate into a revisionist party, a bourgeois party and a fascist party, and turned the first socialist country in the world into a social-imperialist country. These renegades of the proletariat not only

do not dare to admit the existence of the bourgeoisie within the Soviet party, but do not dare even to acknowledge the existence of classes and class struggle in the Soviet society. They can only use such fallacies as the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the whole people” to deceive others. The reason why they do so is that should they admit these facts, it would be tantamount to admitting that they themselves are the monopoly-capitalist class in the Soviet party, and this would mean their own destruction.

Some people are of the opinion that it is not easy to discern the capitalist-roaders inside the Party because they not only have the title of “Communist Party members” but are leading persons and some of them hold very high posts. It should be admitted that since the capitalist roaders, who are the bourgeoisie inside the Party, are in power in the Party and have a variety of political “protective colours” and since they invariably resort to all sorts of wiles and intrigues to deliberately put up a false front, it is therefore much more difficult for us to detect them. But dialectical materialism tells us that all objective things can be known step by step in the course of practice; agnosticism is both idealist and metaphysical. No matter how crafty the capitalist-roaders in the Party are in disguising themselves, they are bound to expose their true colours since they oppose Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line and pursue a revisionist line. So long as we really have a good grasp of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought—the telescope and microscope in political affairs—we will be able to distinguish between right and wrong on cardinal issues from the viewpoint of political line and recognize the reactionary bourgeois essence of the capitalist-roaders. As a matter of fact, when Teng Hsiao-ping energetically stirred up the Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts, workers, peasants and soldiers, revolutionary cadres, revolutionary intellectuals and educated youth in many places took a clear-cut stand and, going against the evil wind, firmly defended Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line and waged a tit-for-tat struggle against Teng Hsiao-ping’s revisionist line. They have provided us with valuable experience in discerning and defeating the bourgeoisie inside the Party. We can surely increase our ability of discernment if we assiduously study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and earnestly sum up the experience gained in practical struggle.

In 1962, after analysing the situation of class struggle at home and abroad, our great leader Chairman Mao pointed out with far-sightedness: **“The next 50 to 100 years or so, beginning from now, will be a great era of radical change in the social system throughout the world, an earth-shaking era without equal in any previous historical period. Living in such an era, we must be prepared to engage in great**

struggles which will have many features different in form from those of the past.” Chairman Mao’s wise conclusion that the bourgeoisie is right in the Party is a brilliant example of the integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of China’s socialist revolution. The struggle between the proletariat and the broad masses of the people on the one hand and the bourgeoisie inside the Party on the other is a great struggle which has many features different in form from those of the past. However arduous the tasks of the socialist revolution are and however tortuous the road of advance is, we are firmly convinced that, under the leadership of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao and under the guidance of his revolutionary line, the prospects of the revolution are bright. As Marx and Engels pointed out in *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: **“Its fall [the bourgeoisie’s] and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.”**

TEXT 40

CAPITALIST-ROADERS ARE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CAPITALIST RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION

Chuang Lan

Class analysis is an important weapon for revolution. In his brilliant work, *Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society*, Chairman Mao points out: **“To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes toward the revolution.”** This directive of Chairman Mao’s is of equally important guiding significance to our analysis of the class essence of Party capitalist roaders today and our understanding that Party capitalist roaders are the main target of the socialist revolution.

An economic status means a position in the relations of production in a given society. As Lenin pointed out, socialist society cannot but possess the features or characteristics of two kinds of socio-economic structure, and this is **“the period of struggle between decaying capitalism and nascent communism.”** (“Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat”) Capitalist roaders within the Party vainly attempt to restore capitalism by making the utmost effort to uphold the superstructure and relations of production which hinder the socialist economic base and the development of productive forces. In socialist society they are the representatives of the capitalist relations of production which have been vanquished but have not yet been eliminated.

Let us first take a look at the condition of ownership of the means of production. Our country at present practices basically the socialist system of state ownership and the socialist system of collective ownership. Under these two systems of ownership, the laboring people possess and allocate the means of production they collectively own through the state of proletarian dictatorship or collective economic units, and the power to allocate and manage the means of production and the power to distribute products are expressed in a concentrated way as the power of political leadership. Due to the existence of these two systems of ownership and the practice of the commodity system and exchange by means of money, the law of value and other economic

Selections from People’s Republic of China Magazines #879 (76-20). (Translation of an article in *Hsueh-hsi yu P’i-p’an [Study and Criticism]* #6, 1976.)

categories which hold the dominating position in capitalist production are still operative, though they have been restricted. Not only between units of ownership by the whole people and units of collective ownership but also between various units of ownership by the whole people, independent economic accounting must be practiced under the socialist planned economy. Hence, whether people who control the power of leadership can genuinely carry out Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, whether they can exploit certain positive effects at the present stage of such things as the law of value under the socialist planned economy or willfully extend the principle of exchange of commodities and diminish or undermine the socialist planned economy, has a direct bearing on the class nature of the system of ownership. Chairman Mao points out: **"It seems that it won't do not to carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, for our foundation is not solid. Judging from my observations, I am afraid that in a fairly large majority of factories—I don't mean all or the overwhelming majority of them—leadership was not in the hands of genuine Marxists and the masses of workers. Not that there were no good people among those in charge of the factories. There were. There were good people among the secretaries, deputy secretaries and members of Party committees and among Party branch secretaries. But they were following that line of Liu Shao-chi—simply resorting to material incentives, putting profit in command and, instead of promoting proletarian politics, handing out bonuses, and so forth."** Here material incentives and putting profit in command are a manifestation of the vicious inflation of the principle of exchange of commodities. If leadership over a department or unit is controlled by capitalist roaders who energetically push the revisionist line, socialist production will turn into a movement to multiply the value of capital with the pursuit of maximum profits as the only goal, a capitalist wage labor system. While the socialist system of ownership is reduced to an "outer shell," it will actually become a capitalist system of ownership under the control of capitalist roaders, and the proletariat and the laboring people will in fact lose this part of the means of production.

Judging from the mutual relations between people, the socialist system, which is not based on exploitation and oppression of man by man, is one under which the relations between cadres and masses and between the higher and lower levels within revolutionary ranks should be comradely relations of equality. But after all, the three major differences still exist and the old practice of division of labor in society and the gradation system exist, and in these respects bourgeois rights still exist to a serious extent. Even those bourgeois rights in the mutual relations between people which must be eliminated today, such as rigid

gradation, lording it over and being divorced from the masses, unequal treatment of others, and so forth, often re-emerge after they have been broken. If the leadership of certain departments is usurped by capitalist roaders, they will strengthen and extend bourgeois rights in the relations between people, subject workers to "control, check, and repression," turn the socialist relations between people into capitalist mercenary relations, and enforce the bourgeois dictatorship. This situation is particularly obvious in the Soviet Union of today. In Soviet state-owned enterprises, the working class has become human material to exact surplus value. Managers can use any "reason" to lay off workers, who have only the "obligation" to "abide by labor discipline and internal rules," to work submissively. On Soviet collective farms, the directors lord it over the peasants and "do whatever they wish." As they themselves have admitted, they are "playing the role of a whip" toward the peasants. Look, the relations between a handful of capitalist roaders within the Soviet Party and the broad masses of workers and peasants have become relations between the employer and the employed, the ruler and the ruled. When exposing the relations between workers and capitalists in capitalist society, Marx and Engels pointed out: the workers **"are not only the slaves of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois state, but are also enslaved every day and every hour by machines and the foremen, in the first place by the factory owners themselves."** (*Communist Manifesto*) Today, the revisionist lines pushed by the arch Party capitalist roaders like Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping are, in the final analysis, aimed at re-tying the proletariat to the chains of capital and making them slaves of the bourgeois state.

Another feature of the bourgeoisie within the Party is its vigorous effort to strengthen and extend bourgeois rights in the field of distribution and possess the labor of others without compensation. Chairman Mao says: **"Our country at present practices a commodity system, the wage system is unequal too, as in the 8-grade wage scale, and so forth. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat."** In the period of socialism, there is no alternative to practicing the principle "from each according to his best, to each according to his work." This means distribution according to the different amounts of labor each laborer provides to society. But as Marx pointed out, **"Here the right of equality is in principle still a bourgeois right."** (*Critique of the Gotha Program*) In fact, many phenomena of inequality still exist in the field of distribution. Whether such inequalities should be gradually restricted and ultimately eliminated under the dictatorship of the proletariat or strengthened and extended at will is an important mark of distinction between Marxism and revisionism. Touching on the birth of

classes, Engels pointed out: **“With the appearance of disparities in distribution, class differences also appear. Society is divided into the privileged and the under-privileged, the exploiter and the exploited, the ruler and the ruled.”** (*Anti-Duhring*) To extend bourgeois rights in distribution actually smacks of allowing a section of people to possess the labor of another section of people without compensation, which means extending class differences. Today in the Soviet Union, hasn't a handful of the bourgeois privileged stratum and spiritual aristocracy headed by Brezhnev formed and developed into an exploiting class in the course of restoring capitalism? By exploiting the position and authority they have usurped, through such means as raising wages, bonuses and payments for manuscripts, and by way of all sorts of privileges, corruption, theft and profiteering, they expropriate the fruits of labor of the workers and peasants in a big way. On the other hand, the masses of workers and peasants are entirely placed in the position of the enslaved and the exploited and are increasingly stricken with poverty. The historical lesson of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union fully shows how important it is for a socialist state, while consolidating the proletarian dictatorship and public ownership of the means of production, to strive to restrict bourgeois rights in the field of distribution in order to prevent the Party and state from changing color. That was why Marx, in summing up the experience of the Paris Commune, especially praised the measures taken by the heroes of the Commune: **“All public functionaries from the top down, beginning with members of the Commune Committee, should draw a salary equivalent to the wages of the worker. All privileges enjoyed by senior state officials and their office expenses should disappear with the disappearance of these officials.”** (*The Civil War in France*) The reason why renegades from Marxism like Teng Hsiao-ping resent and fear the criticism and restriction of bourgeois rights is that bourgeois rights are the very lifeblood of the bourgeoisie inside the Party and that to restrict bourgeois rights is to make revolution against them.

Through a class analysis, we can see clearly that Party capitalist roaders in power like Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping, by the position they occupy in the relations of production in society today, fully represent the decadent capitalist relations of production. As individuals, they may not necessarily own capital, run factories and operate banks like the former capitalists, but their political line which energetically upholds the capitalist relations of production reflects in a concentrated way the economic interests and political aspirations of the bourgeoisie as a whole. If the capitalist **“is only the personalization of capital, then his soul is the soul of capital”** (*Capital*). In that case, the soul of these members of the bourgeoisie within the Party like Liu

Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping is the soul of the old bourgeoisie which is dreaming of a comeback though it has been overthrown and of the new bourgeoisie which is being engendered and vainly attempts to seize control. Once they usurp the Party and state power, they will completely overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system, change the nature of the socialist system of public ownership and openly restore the capitalist system. By then, capitalist roaders, big and small, will re-divide among themselves and in proportion to their capital and power, all the wealth created by the laboring people. Lin Piao cooked up the "Outline of Project '571'" and staged a counter-revolutionary armed coup d'état; Teng Hsiao-ping made every effort to promote restoration and reverse verdicts and engineered the counter-revolutionary political incident at Tienanmen Square. This exposed in a big way the reactionary essence of the bourgeoisie.

The appearance of capitalist roaders within the Party in the socialist period, apart from being attributed to various causes such as the existence of bourgeois rights and encirclement by imperialism and social-imperialism, is not fortuitous, judging by the social position capitalist roaders occupy. After describing "how people who were public servants of society at first gradually turned into its masters while the going was smooth" in the latter stages of the primitive society, Engels pointed out that one of the underlying factors was that: the work of safeguarding public interests, **"though it was under the supervision by all society, could not but be carried out by individual members."** (*Anti-Duhring*) Because these "individual members" took advantage of the opportunity accorded by their management of public property and exploited their power to distribute articles of consumption and products to make private gains and own more surplus product than others, sprouts of private ownership appeared on the land under the clan system of public ownership and, as a result, those who were originally "servants" of society became rulers enjoying all sorts of privileges. Although the birth of capitalist roaders is much more complicated, there are also similarities. When later Engels summed up the historical experience of the Paris Commune, he again stated that after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it was necessary to **"prevent the state and state organs from turning from servants of society into its masters"** and **"pursuing their own special interests."** ("Engels Introduction to the 1891 edition of *The Civil War in France*") Chairman Mao also pointed out recently: **"After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle peasants did not stand still, they want revolution. On the other hand, a number of Party members do not want to go forward; some have moved backward and opposed the revolution. Why? Because they have become high officials**

and want to protect the interests of the high officials.” These remarks made by the mentors of revolution not only hit the Party capitalist roaders where it hurts most, but also elucidate an important cause behind the appearance of capitalist roaders within the Party in the socialist period.

The appearance of capitalist roaders within the Party in the period of socialism is not strange at all. Everything is divided into two. The political party of the proletariat is no exception. So long as classes, class contradictions and class struggle remain, such struggles will inevitably be reflected in the Party. **“The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road”**—this will be a long-term historical phenomenon. Marxism is different from revisionism in that the latter is afraid of mentioning the existence of class struggle in socialist society, and particularly the appearance of the bourgeoisie within the Party. Khrushchev, Brezhnev and their like tried to deceive themselves and others with such fallacies as “The party of the whole people” and “the state of the whole people.” And Teng Hsiao-ping is as afraid of hearing the term “capitalist roaders” as Ah Q is of hearing others talk about the scab on his head. This is because if they admit this fact, it is tantamount to admitting that they themselves are the bourgeoisie inside the Party and it means their destruction. This to them is both painful and unthinkable. The proletarian revolutionary party and Marxists not only dare to admit that the bourgeoisie may exist within the Party but also dare to wage the Great Cultural Revolution and arouse the masses in airing views, putting up big-character posters and holding mass debates in a resolute struggle against capitalist roaders. For it is only in this way that we can consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent capitalist restoration and finally send the bourgeoisie to its grave and realize communism. The socialist revolution is a great revolution aimed at burying the last exploiting class ever since mankind came to existence. **“Living in such an era, we must be prepared to wage a great struggle which has many features different in form from those of the past.”** This then requires us to apply the method of class analysis to fully understand the features of class struggle and the changes in class relations so as to make clear this important problem—the bourgeoisie being in the Party, persist in the exercise of overall proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, and thus carry the socialist revolution through to the end.

TEXT 41

TALKS CONCERNING “CRITICIZING TENG HSIAO-PING AND REPULSING RIGHT DEVIATIONIST WIND”

Chang Chun-chiao

Comrades:

In a fiduciary capacity assigned by the Central, I pay regards to you Comrades from various organic agencies of the Central and from leadership organs at various provinces, municipalities, and autonomous regions who are attending the Study Class; I am going to say a few words to you.

Storm-Like Struggle

After the occurrence of the April 5th counterrevolutionary incident, on April 7 the Politburo of the Central Committee reached two decisions based on Chairman Mao's recommendation. These timely pointed out to the people throughout the country the general direction of the struggle, smashed the right deviationist wind to reverse previous verdicts being whipped up by a handful of capitalist roaders headed by Teng Hsiao-p'ing, suppressed the sabotaging and trouble-making counterrevolutionary elements, braced against the adverse current and stopped the evil wind, and consolidated the social system and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under the correct leadership of Chairman Mao and the Party Central, hundreds of millions of the worker-peasant-soldier masses throughout the country are now riding the revolutionary east wind of these two decisions and, by taking concrete actions, stirring up a new high tide throughout the country to repulse the right deviationist wind to reverse previous verdicts and to search out the counterrevolutionaries.

The April 5th counterrevolutionary incident is a continuation of the struggle between two lines in the Party, and is the inevitable outcome of the life-and-death struggle on the question of political power and between the two classes, which is associated with the continuously deepened development of the socialist revolution. Similar to all previous class struggles, it ended as a stage marked by failure of the counterrevolutionary and victory of the revolutionary. This storm-like struggle tells

Issues and Studies, December 1976. (Speech to leading cadres at provincial and municipal levels attending the Central Study Class in Peking on June 28, 1976.)

the whole Party and all the people throughout the country a very important subject: "Class struggles still exist, the capitalist roaders are still moving; all revolutionaries must never be full of the air of bookish intellectuals who think that the country is in peace."

At present, all in the Party must, in the first place, clearly understand the new trend of the struggle. After issuance of the two decisions on April 7th, many comrades only managed to see the small circles before their eyes, lacking a sufficient assessment and understanding of the whole environment and the overall situation. Not a few comrades even brought up the theme that "we can catch our breath after all these in a moment," thinking about resting for a while. Actually, this viewpoint is not only impractical but also harmful, because the class enemy exactly hopes that we would relax, that is to say, "you catch your breath, and he'll catch his breath." Class struggle experience tells us: "Any relaxation of fighting will bring extremely great losses in the revolution." In the past, the Yunnan Provincial Party Committee brought up the incorrect slogan of "conscientiously embodying into the tasks of production the class struggle in the sphere of production." As a result, not only was production not grasped well and the tasks not accomplished; on the contrary, owing to ignorance of grasping the class struggle, the class enemy exploited the chance to sabotage while capitalist tendencies were rampant everywhere, almost to the degree of irreparability. This time, the responsible comrades of the Yunnan Provincial Party Committee who are attending the Study Class said with profound understanding that "Our brains lacked a sensing nerve and we cast away the key link in our work; thus the tasks were not accomplished. If we had not reined in the horse at the edge of the precipice, we might have lost the power." Hsiao-chia-chuan has implanted the great grasping of class struggle into all kinds of work, in an unswerving manner which never missed any production work and wasted no time, and thus enabled the revolutionary production to go one level higher and created everywhere a new atmosphere of vigorous and refreshing socialism. Since there are similar examples everywhere, I'm not going to dwell on it. What I'm going to mention are a few manifestations reflected by cadres at various levels after publication of the two decisions. Affirmatively speaking, the overwhelming majority of cadres are good—they have cherished and carried out without discount the Central's decisions, they have led in a satisfactory manner the members of their leadership squads by using themselves as models, they have mingled with the masses to study and understand the spirit of the decisions, they have conscientiously implemented it and led the others to conduct grand criticism, to grasp works and production. Because the Party committeemen have had such good squad leaders, the areas are

able to have a new situation and new atmosphere.

Leadership Squads Put "Fear" in the Fore

One of the other situations is that the cadre comrades, especially the squad leaders of the leadership squads, put "fear" in the fore; they dare not open-handedly support the new-born things which have emerged in the movement, they regard localized troubles in the society as great chaos under the whole heaven and don't know how to cope with them, they dare not to take decisive action against the class enemy's sabotage, they have acted indecisively during the entire movement and appeared weak and strengthless and failed to bring into play the Party organizations' role as fortresses in battle. The "fear" of these cadres can be summarized as the fear of chaos, which is a question of world outlook. China has an old adage: "Once bitten by a snake, one will have a fear of ropes throughout his lifetime." Because in previous political movements some cadres were affected in varying degrees, or were somewhat wronged, and they failed to have a correct understanding about the impacts they received in previous mass movements, therefore, whenever a movement comes along, they fear that there might be tigers in front and wolves behind, that the revolution might fall on their own heads and have their official hats revolutionized away. All the cadres who put "fear" in the fore have had, after the April 5th counterrevolutionary incident, manifestations of indiscrimination between ourselves and the enemy. Thus, neither do they dare to come out to support the newborn things, nor do they dare to exercise dictatorship over the handful of bad guys. The masses say: "Our cadres failed to distinguish good and bad, right and wrong; they stick to old practices and made the movement quite cold." We must encourage this portion of cadres to replace "fear" with "dare." One must at first have a determination of conscious revolution in order to comprehend the Party's basic line in the socialist period, search out the cause of "fear" in his world outlook, and then ready himself to lead the movement. Otherwise, he will be sooner or later rejected by the time.

Carry the Struggle to Repulse Right Deviationist Wind to the End

The third situation is that the capitalist-roaders in the Party have managed to usurp leadership power in a certain area and they are colluding with the class enemy in the society of that area to suppress various opinions emerging among the masses, suppress democracy, turn the proletarian dictatorship into bourgeois dictatorship, and greatly

whip up the capitalist wind, which makes the movement in that area frustrated, production unpromoted, the genuine revolutionary masses oppressed, and the spirit of justice depressed. Those areas exactly resemble independent kingdoms. They have adopted the attitude of overt obedience and covert disobedience towards the Central's decisions. On the surface, they also convened mass rallies with scores of thousands, or even a hundred and scores of thousands, of people in support of the Central's two decisions; in the manner of never falling behind the others, they sent cables or wrote letters in support of the Central's two decisions. In fact, no matter how high they raise the flags, or they shout the slogans sufficiently loud, they can never cover up their true essence and original forms. "Even the pedestrians on the streets know well what Ssu-ma Chao [an usurper who took over the Wei Dynasty] is thinking of" means exactly these persons. For the time being, perhaps they may fool the masses for a certain period of time; but, from a longer perspective, they will inevitably show their fox-tails, for the reason that their essence is counterrevolutionary.

The reason that Teng Hsiao-p'ing still dares to fight back when cornered is because there are these Teng-like persons, big and small in his following. Some of them wave flags and shout in the open, while some shoot murdering arrows and spread poison behind the scene. No matter whether they are in the open or behind the scene, as long as they want to be counterrevolutionaries, they will inevitably expose their counterrevolutionary faces. Now, the Central calls the whole Party and the people throughout the country to "continuously take Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, ruthlessly grasp class struggle, carry to the end the political struggle to repulse the right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts with criticism of Teng Hsiao-p'ing as its main objective, and stir up throughout the whole country a high tide of searching out counterrevolutionaries on a still larger scale." "If we cannot push it through this year, we will continue next year. If one year's time won't do, then, two years, three years, five years if necessary, and we will carry it on for even ten years." We can eat less, sleep less, need not be afraid of losing a few catties of muscle; we can tighten up our waist bands and we can afford to lose some other things, but we must never ignore this while we are concentrating on other matters, and thus relax the conduct of political struggle. This is a matter of great importance which concerns the future of the Party and the state, which may cause thousands of millions of heads to fall onto the ground. Some people say this is only a "desire for power." We told the Chairman about this saying. Chairman Mao says: "Tell them our power is given by the workers, peasants and soldiers, is given by the broad masses of people who occupy more than ninety per cent of the populace. The Communist Party

will, for the existence of this political power, exercise dictatorship over those who oppose [our] seizing power, never wavering." The Chairman also says: "What is desire for power? The proletariat has the proletarian desire for power and will never share a bit of its acquired power with the bourgeoisie. What is the bourgeoisie's desire for power? It is that they will never give a bit to the proletariat. We have learned it from them, but we learned it better." The fifty-five years of struggle by the Chinese Communist Party is for this political power. For creating this political power we have shed our blood and sacrificed ourselves; and in order to protect this political power, we are prepared to shed blood and sacrifice at any time until the Communist revolution has won a thorough victory.

The Ultra-Leftist Trend Is Raising Its Head

What we must pay attention to at this moment is that in the movement to repulse the right deviationist wind there is a Leftist inclination and the ultra-Leftist trend of thought is raising its head. "Using a positive trend to cover up a negative trend" is the usual trick invariably adopted by the counterrevolutionaries. When the situation of the revolution is developing continuously and puts them in great disadvantage, for the sake of survival they will inevitably pick up revolutionary slogans. When you go to the right, they will go further right, and when you go to the left, they will go further left, in order to interfere with the general direction of the struggle and confuse the others' hearing and seeing. In some areas there emerged very recently an abnormal adverse current. The bourgeoisie inside the Party stepped behind the scene and let a handful of class enemy and persons with ulterior purposes use the pretext of anti-Teng Hsiao-p'ing for attacking the majority. They have brought up the slogan of "Every official has made mistakes and every mistake will be opposed." No matter whether one is a big cadre or a small cadre, as long as one is a cadre, he will be held responsible. As a result, there is now not a single county Party committeeman who can be trusted, not a single prefectural Party committeeman who can be trusted; and among the provincial Party committeemen and those of the Central, no one can be trusted except Chairman Mao. In Shansi and Shensi provinces, there is the old Central instruction which says: "Drive the big and small cadres upstairs, and then let them come downstairs and through the check-point one by one for examination." Wouldn't this be something like Liu Shao-ch'i's sham Four Clean-Ups and Taoyuan Experience which were Leftist in form and Rightist in nature? Is it not an odd thing that a member of the Chinese Communist Party, or the leadership organ of an area, would

not listen to and ask question about it when they were confronted with such things? What I am saying does not mean that I or some of the responsible comrades in the Central are the tiger's ass which one cannot touch or oppose. Without exception, if any of the responsible comrades in the Central has made mistakes or engaged in serious anti-Party activities, not only should you mobilize the masses to expose and criticize him, but also struggle him and purify the remnant poison. But, there must be leadership for it, there must be sufficient evidence. A chaotic bombardment can make the matter fail, not succeed. It can neither wipe out the agents of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the Party, nor can it purge away the remnant poison through the movement to educate the broad masses and enable them to distinguish what is right and wrong, what is Marxism-Leninism, what is revisionism, what is the correct line, what is socialism, and what is capitalism. On the contrary, it can only frustrate the activeness of the overwhelming majority of revolutionary cadres and masses. Repulsing the right deviationist wind and searching for counterrevolutionaries is a part of the socialist revolution; and this is the checkpoint everyone must pass through. But the spearhead is primarily directed at the handful. As to the majority of cadres, we must first look into [them] and then help [them]. To cope with questions concerning the ideology of the masses, there can be nothing but education. The ultra-Leftist trend of thought now emerging in the society and the evil wind of anarchism among the masses are a new trend in the class struggle. On the one hand, Party organizations at various levels must strive to reverse it while, on the other hand, one should never abandon the current general direction for the reason that there exists this adverse wind.

About Methods to Suppress Counterrevolutionaries

In certain provinces and municipalities some problems emerged. Peking has suppressed a bunch of counterrevolutionaries and smashed their sabotage and disturbances. It is right to take resolute and decisive action to handle things in places where counterrevolutionary sabotage activities have emerged, such as Chengchow, Changsha, Wuhan, and Nanking, etc., as long as one pays attention to grasping the policy well, and it will not cause expansion of suppressing of reactionaries, for fear of that the policy may not be carried out, which pushes those who are not enemies over to the side of the enemy. But, to haphazardly arrest and drag out people, on the strength of the Central's instruction to suppress counterrevolutionaries and at places where no counterrevolutionary incidents similar to that which happened in Peking has occurred, is erroneous "arresting of people," no matter whether it is done con-

sciously or unconsciously and is not a good thing. Such things can only be done when there is no other choice. It is common for the masses to argue on different opinions, even take some excessive actions. But, it is something entirely different in nature from counterrevolutionary sabotage. To use instruments of the proletarian dictatorship to solve contradictions among the people, when improperly handled, may lead it to contradictions between ourselves and the enemy; and this can only be in favor of the enemy, not ourselves. It is undeniable that in some individual areas the capitalist-roaders inside the Party have usurped the leadership power there; and these handfuls of persons are afraid that the masses might rise to make revolution and afraid that the east wind of revolution might blow away their "divine mountains and jade-built pavilions" and these vampires' top buildings. Therefore, they are scared when the masses rise. In the beginning, they try to use all kinds of plots and tricks to hinder the mass movements, then they whip up ghost winds, shoot murdering arrows in the dark, confuse right and wrong, and reverse black and white. When they can no longer muddle through, they simply reveal their hideous faces and direct the spearhead of the struggle at the genuine revolutionaries, even resort to using tools of the [proletarian] dictatorship and measures of the dictatorship to suppress the correct and uphold the wrong. But, this way of doing things has produced something contrary to their expectation, for it has not scared off the genuine revolutionaries, but, on the contrary, exposed themselves. For the sake of the revolution, such an early exposure is better than a later exposure. At present, some accusation groups in certain areas have come to Peking to reflect local situations directly to the Central, while some of them have reported through letters or other means the local situations as they were to the Central. These situations will be handled by the Central one by one. Comrade Hua Kuo-feng, Comrade Chiang Ch'ing, and other responsible comrades in the Central have repeatedly stated, in their reception to comrades concerned, and student delegations from various provinces and municipalities as well as to representatives of the militia, the people's police, and the garrison fighters [soldiers] who have participated in the suppression of the April 5th counterrevolutionary incident, that problems will be solved one by one, by province and by prefecture, from the Central to local areas and from inside the Party to outside the Party; and "the movement must be carried on, the bourgeois antagonists who have wormed their way into the Party must be cleaned away, problems in local areas must be solved; this is our decision, and it should also be the wish and decision of every responsible cadre in the audience as well as that of the whole Party, the whole army, and the people throughout the country."

Here, we also hope that comrades who have made mistakes, for the

reasons that they have unconsciously carried out erroneous lines or policies, that they lacked a high enough awareness of the line, that they have directly or indirectly implemented the things advocated by Teng Hsiao-p'ing, would be able to consciously make corrections and would not stubbornly persist in taking the erroneous direction. Comrades who are willing to correct their mistakes, no matter who they are, are still welcomed by the Party and the people. There will be absolutely no good outcome for those who persist in being stubborn.

Some Important Tasks for the Time Being

In the following, I am going to talk to you about some important tasks for the time being:

1) The Party's centralized leadership is the key link to guarantee the victory of the struggle to repulse the right deviationist wind. Our Party is a great, glorious, and correct party, is a party cherished and supported by people of all nationalities throughout the country. Such a great party can never have its greatness jeopardized by the existence of bourgeois elements. On the contrary, our Party is a party which is courageous enough to make self-criticism, daring enough to expose contradictions, and having no guilty conscience toward the broad masses of people. Thus, Party organizations at various levels must repeatedly explain to the masses, pointing out that mistakes made by individuals and the very few bourgeois elements emerged inside the Party must never be identified with the Party itself and that they should not negate the Party's leadership role in the entire socialist revolution by citing the problems of a few. One must remember at all times that the central power of our cause is the Communist Party of China and that the theoretical foundation which guides our cause is Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung Thought. At no time can one try to weaken the Party's leadership; weakening, resisting, and sabotaging the Party's leadership are counterrevolutionary actions. As a leadership member of a cadre, one must "grasp the power well, use the power well," and persevere in the centralized leadership. In Party committees, it is mandatory to achieve "unified planning, unified command, unified policy, unified goal, and unified action." Cadres of the old, the middle-aged, and the young must have mutual respect, stressing principles on great matters, seeking general consensus on small matters, disregarding trivial details, not cooking up mountaintops, and not cooking up factionalism.

2) Strengthen organizational construction and ideological construction. Through studying Chairman Mao's theory concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat, elevate consciousness of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line; using the class struggle as the key link, satisfactorily

carry out investigation and research work and mass mobilization work in movements; continue good work in Party-building, drag out, on the strength of the east wind of the movement, the class antagonist elements who have wormed their way into the Party, strike them down and purge them from the Party. Before this question of great right and wrong, one must not become soft-handed and dish out "benevolent administration." Not only must the handful of bad guys who have wormed their way into the Party be dragged out, but also struggled down and thoroughly discredited politically, ideologically, economically, and in all other spheres. But one should not handle these things hastily; request instructions beforehand. In Party rectification, one must also do Party construction and pay attention to cultivation and elevation of the advanced worker-peasant-soldier masses who emerged out of the movement—boldly absorb them into the Party when they have sufficient conditions, and pay attention to promotion and cultivation of new blood and getting them into Party leadership organs at various levels. July 1 is the Party's birthday. On this date, millions of advanced elements who have emerged from the movements and from various battle fronts have joined the Party. This is a joyful event, an indication of our Party's prosperity, and the best counterblow to Teng Hsiao-p'ing. To do organizational construction well we must first grasp the ideological construction well. Deviating from the road of ideological construction of the Party committees will cause the Party organizations to lose the right direction, becoming devoid of great plans and disorderly, even resulting in disintegration of the Party organizations which renders the places where "all people can have their say" into places where "my word is final." Then the organizations become undisciplined and cannot move a single inch ahead in the movement.

3) Development of grand revolutionary criticism. Grand criticism cannot be rendered in such a way that the more the criticism, the more the chaos, without purpose and direction, shooting arrows without definite targets. Criticism is an important weapon of Marxism-Leninism. This kind of criticism must have bones and muscles; it must be able to give reasons and expose mistakes, so that people can learn from the criticism and then be able to distinguish that this thing is right and should be upheld and that thing is wrong and should be cast away. Not only should criticism be well explained in terms of theories, but also with content. One must prevent criticism for criticism's sake which may lead a political struggle to the evil road of pure academic criticism. At the same time, one must prevent the kind of criticism which is simplistic and rude name-calling. One must remember Lu Shun's word that "Name-calling does not equal fighting." Now, I am going to bring up a few opinions for your consideration.

a) From now on, criticism should be deepgoing exposure and criticism with emphases on some major points, aim at the targets accurately, find the right weapon, and criticize them one by one systematically. Every blow must be dealt where it hurts most. During the criticism, cadres and Party members must take the lead. In the grand revolutionary criticism, leading cadres must persevere in association of study, criticism, and the actual situations of their own unit together with the masses. They must put themselves into the picture, not merely criticizing Teng without a conscious remoulding of their own world outlook. Don't be that kind of cadre, as depicted by the poor peasants of Huangsangtung Production Team in Kwangtung, who "Charge ahead when going to revolutionize somebody else, and sound the retreating drum when they are being revolutionized," and who become more muddle-headed after more criticism. Acting that way will not only flunk the grand criticism, but also makes one incapable of leading the masses well. We must achieve three combinations. 1) Combining development of grand revolutionary criticism with study of Chairman Mao's theory concerning the proletarian dictatorship and conscientious implementation of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line; this is a question of direction. 2) Combining development of grand revolutionary criticism with the unit's class struggle and the work of criticizing Teng and repulsing the right deviationist wind as well as that of cleaning up the class ranks. 3) Combining the development of grand revolutionary criticism with opposing revisionism and preventing revisionism as well as restriction of bourgeois right, criticizing capitalist tendencies, feudalism mentality, and all other non-proletarian thoughts. One can never develop grand revolutionary criticism on the one hand, letting capitalism flood on the other. Otherwise, when the criticism of Teng is ended, the unit will become completely rotten.

b) There are many big-character posters, and a good number of criticism articles. But, those of higher quality are comparatively few. What we see is either lengthy ones stuffed with quotations from canonical writings of Marxism-Leninism, or short and empty articles containing a few sentences. Not a few units look for quantity but not quality. But, one live bullet is always better than a hundred rounds of blank cartridges. The development of grand revolutionary criticism at this time is not polemics on paper by the scholars, competing to see who has copied down more quotations and memorized more Marxist-Leninist works, nor is it a basketball game to see who scores more shots. This is class struggle, a revolution, which must be conscientiously grasped and cannot be muddled through. The *People's Daily* published an article entitled "New Soldiers on the Theoretical Battle Front," in which several sentences are good: "The spring thunder resounds, urg-

ing me to march to the battle field”; “Going deeply into the tiger’s lair in order to kill the tiger”; “the weapons must be good, so they can hit the fatal points”; “Revolutionize continually, and persevere in protracted operations.” These are well said, and clearly expound the issues. All of you should read newspapers more when you have spare time. The newspapers have published many criticism articles written by workers, peasants, and soldiers; and they are of representative significance. They may not be lengthy, just short ones, but they excel the intellectuals who have been holding books in their arms for scores of years. You Comrades in the audience may not be able to write articles like those by the workers, peasants and soldiers. The reason that those articles are good is because they are written in simple language which conveys profound meanings, and are associated with reality, they are not shallow and empty. To see whether they are really so, you Comrades may make some study into it.

While talking about this question, I want to add that the *People’s Daily* urgently needs some criticism articles of representative value and articles which will reflect the advanced examples of local workers, peasants and soldiers, to be contributed by various localities. You Comrades in the audience should make it a task assigned by the Party, and commonly provide supports to run the Party’s newspaper well.

4) Concrete embodiment of policies and development of the search for counterrevolutionaries. “Policy and strategy are the life line of the Party.” When policies are erroneously carried out or with deviations, the Party’s cause will suffer losses. The success or failure in implementing policies depends on the Party leadership’s implementation of policies without any discount. Many times, the Party’s policies have been put through from the Central to lower levels. The middle echelon gives some discounts; when they reach the local areas, they become something unlike the original. Of course, deviations in policy implementation can be attributed in most cases to the cadres’ incomplete understanding of the policies; and it is something done unconsciously. But, no matter whether it is done consciously or unconsciously, the outcome is that we lose the masses, while, of course, the enemy also slips away. Not a few cadres do love the Party and do love Chairman Mao in their subjective consciousness; they work actively and always wish to implement the policies well. But owing to insufficient study, habits of doing things arbitrarily, and a dislike of inviting teachings from the masses and submitting briefings to higher echelons, they distort the policies in the process of implementation, cause the masses to lose faith, and impose losses on the revolution. Then they could no longer stay in their posts and were either suspended or transferred. Whom can they blame? Therefore, Chairman Mao has elevated the importance of

policy to high level of the Party's life line, for the purpose of letting you Comrades pay sufficient attention to it.

At the same time while the criticism of Teng Hsiao-p'ing and repulsion of the right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts has been deepened, a high tide of searching for counterrevolutionaries is also whipped up throughout the whole country. In this high tide, the one and only policy is emphasizing investigation and research. In all matters, evidence is the most important thing. In handling the April 5th counterrevolutionary incident, we have taken the stand of initiativeness from the beginning to the very end. What we relied on is the policy of making explanations to the masses. The counterrevolutionaries hope that we will open the gunfire. They want to become martyrs in order to incite the masses' sentiments. We just do not play into their hands. Practice has proven that this handful of counterrevolutionaries are afraid of the masses and afraid of criticism. In this grand search cooked up in various areas, the troops and public security organs should not open fire carelessly, unless it is absolutely necessary and for protection of the people's lives. While the Chairman has told the premier of Thailand that they should not create martyrs, we just cannot do things otherwise and create martyrs. Of course, it is permissible [to open fire] when necessary; but instructions must be elicited. Another thing is that those who are to be killed are very frequently the masses. Genuine counterrevolutionaries will never thrust out their chests to stop bullets. In the principle, the policy requirement is "No one is to be executed while the majority are not to be arrested." As to detailed scope and requirements of the policy, the Central will distribute related stipulations and documents to organs at various levels, and, in addition to that, Comrade Wang Tung-hsing, as a representative of the Central, is going to make more concrete explanations to you. At present, what must be prevented are the Leftist tendency of "rather Left than Right" and the erroneous Rightist thought of "theme of invisibility." In the process of the search [for counterrevolutionaries], participation by all the people is needed; not sole reliance on the public security agencies. But, mere emphasis on the dictatorship of the masses without coordination with the leadership and specialized organs will not do either. It needs a three-in-one combination. Steadiness, accuracy, and ruthlessness are important. One must pay attention to investigation and research; oppose distortion of confession, not cook up armed struggles, give [the criticized] a way out, and give consideration to strategies, in order to effectively deliver blows on the enemy.

This time, Peking has arrested a few too many persons. At the beginning, no one opened up fire and the policy was upheld; afterwards, things were less than desirable. In Peking alone 40,000 to 50,000 per-

sons were put under arrest. Every unit engaged itself in arresting and dragging out this or that person. A couple of lives were sacrificed also, while some were wronged. The good thing was that these situations were quickly rectified when pointed out by the Central. This must be taken as a lesson.

“In handling questions about persons, a prudent attitude must be adopted.” The units should do this well in the present movement to search for counterrevolutionaries. Only by uniting all forces that can be united can effective blows be dealt to the handful of the class enemy; and only effectively dealing blows to the handful of the class enemy can offer the best protection to the broad masses of people.

5) Grasp revolution, grasp production, promote work, promote early preparedness. In the struggle to criticize Teng and repulse the right deviationist wind, there is a refreshing scene full of socialist vigor on every battle front throughout the whole country. Hundreds of thousands of worker-peasant-soldier students have marched into the society, into the countryside, to take part in class struggle, to conduct investigation and research, and to associate the knowledge they have learned from books with practical work. Group after group, college graduates have rushed to border areas, the countryside, and the mountainous areas to take the road of associating with worker-peasant masses being pointed by Chairman Mao. May 7th Cadres Schools and July 21st Workers' Colleges have bloomed, like spring bamboo shoots rising out of the ground after raining, all over the whole country. As a result, we have also achieved very great accomplishments on the industrial battle front. Workers of the 7002 Drilling Team of the Petroleum Control Bureau of Szuchwan have drilled our country's first super-deep well with a depth of 6,011 meters. The generator system of double water-cooling turbine with the capacity of 300,000 kilowatts made in China has joined production. In the beginning of June, a great many industrial and mining enterprises had completed ahead of schedule the production missions for the first half of 1976. In the last couple of days, joyful events followed each other, with victory reports constantly coming from all battle fronts. The situation on the agricultural battle front is excellent; the enthusiastic wave of socialist competition to learn from Tachai and catch up with Hsiyang is just beginning. Two thirds of the communes and one half of the production brigades throughout the country have electricity. For a period of ten years, the countryside throughout the country has constructed more than 56,000 hydro-power stations, big and small. The spring planting of this year is good. Bumper harvests of the third-season wheat and rice, etc., are expected. In a word: “The situation is excellent.” This excellent situation not only brings spiritual encouragement to the people

throughout the country, but can also serve as the most powerful refutation of Teng Hsiao-p'ing's revisionist line of "using the three instructions as the key link" and "four modernizations." This is a great victory for Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, also a great victory in the movement to criticize Teng and repulse the right deviationist wind.

But, under the excellent situation there still exist some problems. These problems must be solved, not ignored. The growth and rise of anarchism has lowered working efficiency and caused production to fall below full capacity, which have resulted in failure to accomplish industrial projects missions for the year. Anarchism does not mean doing away with a government. What it does not want is the proletarian government but a government of individuals of the bourgeoisie, a government of their own small circle. This trend of thought must be well directed. One must be able to direct non-proletarian thought onto the track of proletarian thought. This is a mission for party organizations at various levels. A class struggle on the ideological battle front must be developed to criticize all kinds of non-proletarian thought so that production can be guaranteed. It is noteworthy that there exist a great many questions on the nature of contradictions among the people which cannot be treated in the same manner as the previously mentioned struggle against the enemy. Otherwise, great "disorder" will be the outcome.

In our criticism of the erroneous practice of using production to suppress politics, cadres must never, for this reason, leave production alone and give it a free rein. At present, industries of steel and iron, nonferrous metals, machinery, automobile, construction, chemical production and coal mining still have a certain distance from their completion of the missions projected for the first half of the year, especially the machine tool production in the machinery industry which has only maintained the production index of the first half of the year before last. These situations must be reversed. The Party Central and Chairman Mao call the whole Party and the people throughout the country to unite together to grasp revolution, to promote production even more. I believe that under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, our missions will be accomplished and our goals will be realized. Best wishes to you Comrades for creating still better achievements in study and in work.

(Translated by Chou Hsing-chih)

TEXT 42

DEEPEN THE CRITICISM OF TENG HSIAO-PING IN ANTI-QUAKE AND RELIEF WORK

Earthquakes serve to temper people's revolutionary will. Efforts to conquer difficulties bring heroism into sharper relief. During the present anti-quake and relief work, our people have waged an indomitable fight, stood rigorous tests, worked numerous wonders and won tremendous victories.

With the loving care of the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao and under its leadership, the masses of people, cadres and commanders and fighters of the People's Liberation Army fighting in the forefront in the quake-afflicted area have displayed the dauntless revolutionary spirit of fearing neither hardship nor death, rushing to places where the effects of the earthquake were the most serious and the hazards the greatest. They have carried forward the lofty communist spirit of working in unity and helping one another and risking their own lives to save others. They have demonstrated a high sense of organization and discipline, showing steadfastness and self-possession and obeying orders in all their actions. The stronger the quake, the harder their efforts—they are brimming with confidence and are high in morale and full of revolutionary optimism. With unstinting support and assistance from the people throughout the country, the Party organizations at all levels in the afflicted area have relied on the masses in waging an all-out struggle to offset the effects of the earthquake and carry out relief work. Maximum efforts have been made to rescue the victimized class brothers. Arrangements have been made to provide the people with clothing, food, accommodation and medical care. The damaged communication lines have been rapidly restored. Production is being resumed step by step in the Tangshan-Fengnan area. The people of Tientsin and Peking are remaining at their posts and grasping revolution and promoting production with still greater drive. The whole affected area is now a revolutionary scene marked by the people's united struggle and determination to conquer nature.

Our great leader Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything.”** The victories won in the anti-quake and relief work have

Peking Review #34, August 20, 1976. (*Renmin Ribao* [People's Daily] Editorial, August 11, 1976.)

once again confirmed this brilliant truth. To wrest further victories over the disaster, it is essential to take class struggle as the key link, carry on the study of Chairman Mao's important instructions, and resolutely implement Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line.

In class society, man's struggle against nature is closely connected with class struggle. The history since liberation has shown that the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines becomes acute every time a serious natural calamity occurs. Chieftains of the opportunist lines in the Party always try to take advantage of the temporary difficulties brought on by natural calamities to divert the revolution from its course and restore capitalism. To take class struggle as the key link and keep to the socialist road or to liquidate this key link and allow capitalism to spread unchecked, to put proletarian politics in command and have faith in the masses and rely on them or to ignore the human factor and see only the material factor and pay no heed to the wisdom and strength of the masses, to believe firmly that man will conquer nature and carry forward the spirit of self-reliance or to succumb to difficulties, remain passive and pessimistic and sit with folded arms—these are questions of principle on which Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line is diametrically opposed to the revisionist line. During the three years (1959-61—*tr.*) when our national economy met with temporary difficulties, Teng Hsiao-ping, the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party, was scared by the difficulties like Liu Shao-chi, and preached that "whether it is a white cat or a black one, it is a good cat as long as it catches mice." He energetically stirred up a sinister wind for going it alone and reversing past correct verdicts in an attempt to turn back the wheel of history. Chairman Mao sharply criticized the revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping and company, and issued the great call: "Never forget class struggle." It is precisely under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line that the Chinese people beat back the onslaught mounted by the bourgeoisie both inside and outside the Party, overcame the effects of the severe natural disasters and kept to the socialist orientation.

In the current anti-quake fight and relief work, we should bear in mind this historical experience, persevere in taking class struggle as the key link and deepen the criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping's counter-revolutionary revisionist line. We should use the heroic deeds of the masses of people and cadres in the anti-quake and relief work to criticize his "taking the three directives as the key link" and his other revisionist absurdities. Didn't Teng Hsiao-ping say that only "material incentives" could bring into play the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses of the people, and that a "material base" was essential in the restriction of bourgeois right? Our heroic people are selfless and

fearless; they keep the difficulties to themselves while leaving the conveniences to others, breaking through the narrow confines of bourgeois right and displaying the communist spirit. We should like to ask: Has all this been “stimulated” by “material incentives”? And hasn’t all this been achieved before there is a “material base”? How reactionary and petty the representatives of the bourgeoisie like Teng Hsiao-ping are in comparison with the revolutionary actions of millions upon millions of people! The site of the anti-quake and relief work is also a battlefield for criticizing Teng Hsiao-ping. We should take the criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping as the motive force to do the anti-quake and relief work well.

The revolutionary people armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought can stand the tests of acute class struggle and those of serious natural disasters as well. The heroic workers of the Kailan Coal Mine have put it well: “The imperialists and reactionaries failed to subdue us with guns in the years of war; the bourgeoisie in the Party and all the class enemies failed to destroy us with their onslaughts in the period of the socialist revolution; and the present severe natural disaster also will never overwhelm us.” The Chinese people, who have been tempered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and are now advancing triumphantly along Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line, have the aspirations, the confidence and the ability to overcome all difficulties by giving play to the spirit of self-reliance, win new successes in the anti-quake fight and relief work, and score still greater victories in the socialist revolution and construction.

TEXT 43

PROLETARIANS ARE REVOLUTIONARY OPTIMISTS

Pi Sheng

The struggle initiated and led by Chairman Mao to repulse the Right deviationist attempt at reversing correct verdicts has smashed the criminal plot of Teng Hsiao-ping, the arch unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, to subvert the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism. This is another great victory we have won in combating the bourgeoisie in the Party after the two bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao were shattered in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In spite of the fact that our struggle against the bourgeoisie in the Party will be protracted and tortuous and that there is the danger of capitalist restoration in the entire historical period of socialism, the bourgeoisie is doomed to fail and the proletariat is bound to win. There is no doubt whatsoever about this general trend of historical development.

Revolution Will Triumph Over Reaction

The emergence of the bourgeoisie in the Party and the existence of contradictions and struggles inside the Party are objective realities. Everything develops through the struggles of its internal contradictions. The Party is no exception. As Engels pointed out long ago: **“The development of the proletariat proceeds everywhere amidst internal struggles.”** **“And when, like Marx and myself, one has fought harder all one’s life long against the alleged socialists than against anyone else (for we only regarded the bourgeoisie as class and hardly ever involved ourselves in conflicts with individual bourgeois), one cannot greatly grieve that the inevitable struggle has broken out.”** (*Frederick Engels’ Letter to August Bebel, October 28, 1882.*) Speaking of the struggle against the bourgeoisie in the Party, Chairman Mao has stressed: **“Without struggle, there is no progress.”** **“Can 800 million people manage without struggle?!”** The capitalist-roaders in the Party, such as Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping, represent in a concentrated way the interests of the new and old bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes; they are the main force endangering the Party and

Peking Review #36, September 3, 1976. (Translation of an article in *Hongqi [Red Flag]* #8, 1976.)

subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat. Our struggle against them is a concentrated expression of the struggle between the two classes and the two roads in the period of socialism, and will decide the destiny and future of our country. If the capitalist-roaders' plot to usurp Party leadership and seize state power is not exposed and smashed in good time, there will be a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat; and if their revisionist line is not criticized, the gains of the revolution achieved by the proletariat both in the superstructure and in the economic base will be lost. It is quite clear that it won't do without struggle. Only when we fully realize the danger of capitalist restoration by the bourgeoisie in the Party and consciously wage a tit-for-tat struggle against it, can we effectively consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, prevent capitalist restoration and enable the cause of socialism to advance steadily. Denying or evading the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, to be weary or afraid of waging struggles against the bourgeoisie in the Party—this is not the attitude Marxists should take.

The proletarians are revolutionary optimists; they are fully confident of victory in the struggle against the bourgeoisie in the Party. **“The supersession of the old by the new is a general, eternal and inviolable law of the universe.”** (Mao Tsetung: *On Contradiction*.) Newborn things are bound to triumph over the decadent and revolution is bound to triumph over reaction. The bourgeoisie in the Party, just as the bourgeoisie as a whole, represents the decadent relations of production and is a declining reactionary force. The fact that the bourgeoisie has moved its headquarters into the Communist Party is not an indication of its strength. It only shows that the bourgeoisie outside the Party, after our repeated struggles against it, has become so notorious that it is difficult for it to hoist its own banner and concentrate its forces for an open, all-round trial of strength with the proletariat. Though the bourgeoisie inside the Party still possesses a certain amount of reactionary potentiality and counter-revolutionary destructive force, its perverse acts only reflect the death-bed struggles of the overthrown reactionary classes. Like all reactionaries in history, the bourgeoisie in the Party is also a paper tiger and is nothing to be afraid of. It goes against the trend of history and **“clings to the bourgeois ideology of oppression and exploitation of the proletariat and to the capitalist system.”** This determines that it will be crushed to pieces by the wheel of history. The socialist system will eventually replace the capitalist system; this is an objective law independent of man's will. No matter how the chieftains of the revisionist line Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping wailed in desperation and frantically attacked and smeared the excellent revolutionary situation, the Chinese people will

not waver in their iron will or lose their confidence of victory in taking the socialist road and continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Source of Strength

Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these principles, we shall accomplish nothing.”** (*On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation.*) To have faith in the Party and the masses is our inexhaustible source of strength in defeating the bourgeoisie in the Party.

Our Party is a political party of the proletariat founded and fostered by our great leader Chairman Mao. The emergence of the bourgeoisie in the Party will in no way change the nature of our Party as the vanguard of the proletariat, nor will it in the slightest obscure our Party's radiance. On the contrary, the fact that our Party dares to openly acknowledge the existence of the bourgeoisie in the Party and expose it shows precisely that our Party is strong and powerful. **“The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything.”** Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line holds the dominant position in our Party and is striking a deeper root in the hearts of the people with each passing day. This is the basic guarantee for our Party to vanquish the bourgeoisie in the Party. Our Party has become purer, stronger and more vigorous in the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution which exposed and criticized the representatives of the bourgeoisie, such as Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping, and the renegades and secret agents under their protection. Our Party has summed up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat both at home and abroad and has in particular drawn historical lessons from the fact that the Soviet Union has turned revisionist; our Party has also accumulated rich experience in its protracted struggles against opportunism and revisionism. This is an important condition for our Party to defeat the bourgeoisie in the Party. In the past 55 years our Party has been advancing in the great storms of the struggles between the two classes and the two lines. The chieftains of opportunist and revisionist lines have come forward one after another to split our Party from within, but they have all failed. On the contrary, through the elimination of these “worms” inside the revolutionary ranks, our Party has become more solidly united round the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao in its triumphant advance along Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. Historical experience has convinced us: **“This Party of ours has a bright future.”**

The masses of workers and poor and lower-middle peasants are the main force in vanquishing the bourgeoisie in the Party. Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“After the democratic revolution the workers and the poor and lower-middle peasants did not stand still, they want revolution.”** **“Will there be need for revolution a hundred years from now? Will there still be need for revolution a thousand years from now? There is always need for revolution. There are always sections of the people who feel themselves oppressed; junior officials, students, workers, peasants and soldiers don’t like big-shots oppressing them. That’s why they want revolution.”** The “big-wigs” of the bourgeoisie in the Party like Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping made use of the power in their hands to work for restoration and retrogression and to oppose revolution. Since they offended the majority, they were inevitably opposed and spurned by the masses of the people. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has fully demonstrated the great might of the masses in combating the bourgeoisie in the Party. Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping were haughty for some time, but they were overthrown one by one when the masses rose against them. By reading and studying conscientiously and having a good grasp of Marxism and by taking part in the great struggle of combating and preventing revisionism, hundreds of millions of people have enhanced their consciousness of class struggle and the two-line struggle and raised their ability to distinguish genuine from sham Marxism. No matter how the bourgeoisie in the Party changes its tactics and no matter what conspiracies and intrigues it resorts to, we are fully confident that it will be exposed, opposed and criticized by the revolutionary people who have a high level of political consciousness. In the current great struggle to repulse the Right deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, large numbers of ordinary workers, peasants, P.L.A. fighters, students and cadres at the grass-roots level were the first to step forward to resist and repudiate the revisionist programme of “taking the three directives as the key link” concocted by Teng Hsiao-ping, and they have become courageous fighters in the struggle against Teng Hsiao-ping’s revisionist line. This is indeed inspiring. History has proved and will continue to prove that in the great struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, there is bound to emerge from among the masses large numbers of outstanding people who uphold Chairman Mao’s revolutionary line, and tens of millions of successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause will be trained; they will carry through to the end the great cause initiated by the older generation of proletarian revolutionaries.

Thoroughgoing Materialists Are Fearless

“The future is bright; the road is tortuous.” (Mao Tsetung: *On the Chungking Negotiations*.) The revolutionary optimism of the proletariat differs from blind optimism in that we understand the dialectics of historical development. Blind optimists fail to see or cannot see clearly the law governing class struggle in socialist society. They are susceptible to a slackening of vigilance and are easily beguiled by the theory of the dying out of class struggle, or they become pessimistic and despondent when the revolution comes up against difficulties. We should not only see the bright future of the revolution and have full confidence in victory, but also see the twists and turns on the road of revolution so that we will enhance our revolutionary fighting will and be prepared to strive for the bright future consciously and with indomitable fortitude. The declining classes are like a giant tree which has lost its life and is rotten to its foundation. However, they will not retreat from the stage of history of their own accord but will carry on a death-bed struggle to protect their lives with every possible means. An old system will be buried only after many reverses for a fairly long historical period. In the past, the replacement of an old system by a new and the triumph of a rising class over a decadent and declining class invariably took place after a long and tortuous struggle. In China, the revolution in which the slave system was replaced by the feudal system—from 594 B.C. when the State of Lu started to levy taxes on private land in accordance with the acreage under cultivation* to 221 B.C. when Chin Shih Huang unified China—took more than 370 years which were replete with struggles between progress and retrogression and between revolution and restoration. After the rising landlord class seized the political power of the country, these struggles continued for many more years. The bourgeois revolutions in Britain, France and the United States lasted 48, 86 and nearly 100 years respectively, and the struggles were full of twists and turns. This is the case with the revolutions in the past in which one exploiting system replaced another. The proletarian revolution which aims at completely eliminating the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes and all exploiting systems will of course take much longer time and will go through many more twists and turns and reverses.

*This is a great change when slave society was replaced by feudal society. The land of a state under the slave system was previously owned entirely by the royal families. Since 594 B.C., taxes were levied on the private land owned by the rising feudal landlords, thereby recognizing the private ownership of land.

Chairman Mao has pointed out: **“Great disorder across the land leads to great order. And so once again every seven or eight years. Monsters and demons will jump out themselves. Determined by their own class nature, they are bound to jump out.”** So long as there are still classes and class struggle and bourgeois right at home and imperialism and social-imperialism abroad, it is inevitable that **“the capitalist-roaders are still on the capitalist road.”** The collapse of one or two chieftains of the revisionist line does not mean the complete destruction of the bourgeoisie in the Party or of the bourgeoisie as a whole. They will never take their defeat lying down, but are bound to rally their counter-revolutionary forces, change their counter-revolutionary tactics and continue to have a trial of strength with the proletariat. Class struggle and the struggle between the two lines are independent of man’s will. How can we cherish the illusion that the class enemies will change their reactionary class nature, that the monsters and demons will not jump out themselves, and that the old and new bourgeoisie will stop plotting and sabotaging? How can we harbour the illusion that after several struggles the entire bourgeoisie inside and outside the Party will be thoroughly vanquished, and that all the trash left over from the old society will be swept into the dust-bin? The fact that class struggles and struggles between the two lines are carried out repeatedly is something completely conforming to the law governing it; we should not feel surprised, still less should we feel annoyed. Chairman Mao has said: **“Swimming in rivers with counter-currents builds up will-power and courage.”** To the masses of cadres and people who persist in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, reverses and zigzags in revolutionary struggles will build up their will-power, stimulate their enthusiasm, enhance their talents and raise their ability to distinguish genuine from sham Marxism.

In the last analysis, it is a question of world outlook whether or not one takes a revolutionary optimistic attitude towards actual struggles and the future of the revolution. Dialectical materialism and historical materialism are the ideological foundation of revolutionary optimism, while idealism and metaphysics are the root cause of pessimistic views as far as the theory of knowledge is concerned. Some good-hearted comrades among us always have the illusion that the revolutionary ranks should be absolutely pure and the revolutionary road should be absolutely straight. So when they meet with twists and turns, they become depressed and fail to see the bright future. When analysing the situation of the revolutionary struggle, more often than not they overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people and arrive at an unrealistic estimate of class forces. The reason for this is that in looking at a question their way of thinking is to

a great extent subjective, superficial and one-sided; they cannot distinguish the essence from the appearance and the main aspect from the secondary aspect of things. So, when they analyse the class struggle and the future of social development, they are easily influenced by pessimistic ideas spread by the bourgeoisie. We must also take a revolutionary optimistic attitude towards natural disasters and display the spirit of revolutionary heroism, fearing neither natural disasters nor earthquakes. "Men will conquer nature," this is a great truth. **"Thoroughgoing materialists are fearless."** (Mao Tsetung: *Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work*.) To be proletarian revolutionary optimists, we must be thoroughgoing materialists. Therefore, we must diligently study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, take an active part in the fiery mass struggles, draw rich political nourishment from them, earnestly remould our world outlook and frequently rid ourselves of the influence of idealistic and metaphysical ideas. Only thus can we heighten our revolutionary spirit, strengthen our confidence in victory in the struggle against the bourgeoisie in the Party and become vanguard fighters in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

