

Two Diametrically Opposed Lines In Building the Economy

THERE are two diametrically opposed lines in building up a country after the proletariat has gained political power.

One is the Soviet modern revisionist line, which stresses only the material — machinery and mechanization, and goes in for material incentives. It opposes giving prominence to proletarian politics, ignores the class struggle and negates the dictatorship of the proletariat. It can only lead to capitalism, never to socialism. The Soviet Khrushchov renegade clique and its successors are fanatical advocates of this line. In tune with the Khrushchov of the Soviet Union, the Khrushchov of China also vehemently pushed this line in China for the purpose of restoring capitalism.

Our most respected and beloved great leader Chairman Mao resolutely criticized and repudiated this revisionist line and put forward the only correct Marxist-Leninist line. He had already laid down the basic principle for the building of the socialist economy in his *Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China* in 1949. In that report, he devoted special attention to an analysis of the various sectors of the economy then existing in China and pointed out the need to **“enable the state-owned economy to become the leading sector of the entire national economy,”** gradually to carry out the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce, and step by step bring about socialist industrialization. In 1958, Chairman Mao gave further concentrated expression to the firm determination and great wisdom of the 700 million Chinese people in the formulation of the general line of **“going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism”** and a complete set of policies for the development of socialist construction by **“walking on two legs.”** This ushered in the completely new situation characterized by China's big leap forward in building socialism. In 1960, Chairman Mao himself summed up the experience gained by advanced enterprises during the big leap forward, put forward the well-known **“Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company”** in opposition to the Soviet revisionist **“Constitution of the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Combine,”** and laid down five basic principles, namely: **Persevere in putting politics in command; strengthen Party leadership; develop the mass movement in a big way; institute the system under which cadres take part in productive labour, workers take part in management, irrational and out-dated rules and regulations are revised, and**

leading cadres, workers and technical personnel work in close co-operation; and vigorously carry out the technical revolution. In 1963 Chairman Mao pointed out: **“Class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment are the three great revolutionary movements for building a mighty socialist country.”** This series of masterly instructions from Chairman Mao charted the correct course for building up our country. This line stresses giving prominence to proletarian politics, carrying the struggle between the two classes and the two roads through to the end, constant efforts to consolidate and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, promoting the revolutionization of people's thinking, mechanization under the guidance of revolutionization, and the principle of **“taking firm hold of the revolution and promoting production.”** It is precisely under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line that our great motherland has achieved brilliant successes in building socialism, that the economic base of socialism has steadily been consolidated and developed, and that it is ensured that our proletarian land will never change its colour.

Ever since New China was founded, there has been a sharp and intense struggle between the two lines on the economic front. This struggle focused on whether or not to give prominence to proletarian politics, whether or not to put it in command and whether or not to build up the country in accordance with the great thought of Mao Tse-tung. In the final analysis, the essence of the struggle is whether China should build a socialist or a capitalist economy, whether it should take the socialist or the capitalist road.

In leading us in building a socialist state Chairman Mao has always given top priority to revolutionizing people's thinking. He teaches: **“Political work is the life-blood of all economic work”**; **“not to have a correct political point of view is like having no soul.”** Among the innumerable ways of expanding socialist production, carrying out a political and ideological revolution is cardinal. If this is done well, there will be an all-round increase in the production of grain, cotton, oil, iron and steel and coal. Otherwise, production will not rise in any field. The fundamental guarantee for the success of our socialist construction lies in instilling Mao Tse-tung's thought in the minds of the masses.

China's Khrushchov does exactly the opposite. He opposes putting proletarian politics in command and spreads the lie that we are using **“ultra-economic methods”** to guide the country's economic construction. He advocates **“using economic methods to run the**

economy." Shaking his finger he said fiercely: "Why must we run the economy by administrative methods instead of by economic methods?" There has never been an economy independent of politics. No part of a class society exists in a political vacuum. If proletarian politics is not in command in any department or any field, then bourgeois politics must be in command; if Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, is not in command, then revisionism, bourgeois ideology, must be in command. **By opposing putting proletarian politics in command and by putting bourgeois politics in command instead, China's Khrushchov seeks to restore capitalism.**

Let us now analyse what China's Khrushchov calls "using economic methods to run the economy" and see what sort of stuff it really is.

It is in fact putting profits in command. Everything for profit, and profit is everything. China's Khrushchov openly declared: "A factory must make money. Otherwise, it must close down and stop paying wages to the workers." In other words, in order to make money, one is allowed to ignore the unified state plan and the over-all interests and engage in all sorts of selfish, speculative activities detrimental to the socialist economy.

This is simply that notorious "material incentive." In capitalist fashion, China's Khrushchov said: "Give him a good reward if he works honestly"; "if you don't give him more money, there'll be no incentive and he'll not do a good job for you." He attempted to corrupt the masses by instilling bourgeois egoism, divert people's attention from politics, widen the income gap and create a privileged stratum. This is a crying insult to the revolutionary workers and staff; this is a knife which kills without spilling blood!

This also means shamelessly glorifying capitalism. China's Khrushchov said bare-facedly: "Capitalist economy is flexible and varied," "we should learn from the experience of capitalism in running enterprises, and especially from the experience of monopoly enterprises." He told our cadres to "learn seriously" from the capitalists, saying that the latter's "ability in management surpasses that of our Party members." In his eyes, money-grabbing capitalists are a hundred times wiser than Communists.

In the last analysis, "using economic methods to run the economy" means letting the capitalist law of value reign supreme, developing free competition, undermining the socialist economy and restoring capitalism. If we acted in accordance with these "economic methods" advocated by China's Khrushchov, the discomfited capitalists would be very happy again, the emancipated working class would again suffer enslavement and a group of new bourgeois elements would build their "paradise" on the corpses of millions of labouring people.

The opposition of China's Khrushchov to putting politics in command also manifests itself in his opposition to the large-scale mass movement. The socialist cause is the revolutionary cause of millions of the masses. We must fully arouse the masses and rely on

their revolutionary initiative to build a socialist economy. Whether or not one launches an energetic mass movement is an important gauge of whether or not one carries out the principle of putting proletarian politics in command; it is also an important aspect of the basic antagonism between the two lines in economic construction.

Our great leader Chairman Mao has the utmost faith in the masses, fully relies on them and respects their initiative. He has taught us: **"Of all things in the world, people are the most precious. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, as long as there are people, every kind of miracle can be performed,"** and **"the mass movement is necessary for all work. It cannot progress without mass movement."** It is precisely because we persevered in putting politics in command and vigorously launched a mass movement that we achieved the momentous big leap forward and made rapid advances in industry, agriculture, national defence, science and culture.

With his reactionary bourgeois standpoint, China's Khrushchov bitterly hated the revolutionary mass movement and did his utmost to boost the one-man-leadership system and the reactionary line of relying on experts. He went to Tientsin in 1949 and told the staff members of state-owned enterprises there that they were "organizers in state-owned factories" and that "reliance should be placed particularly on the directors, engineers and technicians" in construction. In a 1952 speech, he said: "There are many difficulties in building industry. China has money, manpower and machinery (this can be solved in the main with the help of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies), but has no engineers." In a still more unbridled way he attacked the surging revolutionary mass movement launched in 1958. He spread around such nonsense as that the movement was brought about "in a rush" "on the basis of some vague news or inaccurate information."

According to China's Khrushchov, in economic construction we can rely only on a few "experts," "rely on directors, engineers and technicians" who give orders while the revolutionary masses are only "manpower" and "ignorant rabble" "rising up in a rush," who can only obediently "carry out other people's orders." In order to exercise a bourgeois dictatorship over the workers, he and his followers racked their brains to work out a series of revisionist regulations that hold the workers' initiative in check and put them in a straight jacket. In doing this they not only dampened the socialist initiative of the masses and obstructed the development of socialist economic construction, but also placed the few cadres, administrative personnel and technicians in a position of antagonism to the workers, turning them into bureaucrats and new bourgeois elements who rode roughshod over the masses. In this way the nature of the socialist enterprises was being gradually changed.

Such is the struggle between two diametrically opposed lines in building China's economy.

Marxism tells us that **politics is the concentrated expression of economics**. The degeneration of the socialist economic base inevitably leads to a restoration of capitalism in politics. The whole set of lines, principles, policies and measures advocated by China's Khrushchov for so many years were aimed at fostering capitalist forces in both the cities and the countryside and undermining the socialist economic base so as to cause the socialist economy to degenerate into a capitalist economy. Once the economy degenerated, our Party and state would inevitably change colour step by step and capitalism would be restored throughout the country. The struggle between the two lines in economic construction is, therefore, a struggle between two political lines, two roads and two destinies for China.

Our proletarian political party is intended to engage in politics, wage the class struggle and implement the dictatorship of the proletariat. If our Party refuses to do all this but busies itself solely with economic construction according to China's Khrushchov's ideas, will it not become an instrument purely for organizing economic life; will it not become an "industrial party" or "agricultural party" like that of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique? The political party is the highest form of class organization and an instrument for waging the class struggle. This is elementary Marxist knowledge. Is there any political party in the world that is engaged only in production and construction but not in class struggle? The so-called "industrial party" or "agricultural party" is simply a ruse to make the party an appendage of economic construction, an appendage of the bourgeoisie, which orbits around "profits." Such a party's sole purpose is to make money and concern itself with exploitation and capitalism. Isn't such a party an out-and-out bourgeois political party?

The facts of the struggle between the two lines on the economic front have taught us that we should always keep firmly in mind Chairman Mao's teachings,

never forget to give prominence to politics and give it first place at all times.

Chairman Mao has taught us: **"While we recognize that in the general development of history the material determines the mental and social being determines social consciousness, we also — and indeed must — recognize the reaction of mental on material things, of social consciousness on social being and of the superstructure on the economic base."** The most powerful moral strength of our time is the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung, and the greatest fighting power is people armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought. Those who see only the material force will tremble with fear before an enemy with one or two new weapons and shamelessly capitulate to him in war. They will have blind faith in foreigners, crawl after them and be their obedient slaves in the period of construction. We Chinese Communists, however, firmly believe that the people are the creators of history; that, once they grasp Mao Tse-tung's thought, the people will become infinitely wise and brave and display inexhaustible strength. The current great proletarian cultural revolution, initiated and led by Chairman Mao himself, is the best of schools for studying and applying Mao Tse-tung's thought in a creative way, a great moving force for the development of our country's social productive forces. The bourgeois reactionary line of China's Khrushchov in economic construction will be eradicated through this revolution, and, with the continuous consolidation and strengthening of proletarian state power, a mighty new upsurge will surely appear in our socialist construction. **"The Chinese people have lofty aspirations and ability. They will certainly catch up with and surpass the advanced world levels in the not too distant future."** There is no doubt that we will leave all the imperialist and revisionist countries far behind!

(By the editorial departments of the "Wenhui Bao," the "Jiefang Ribao" and the "Life of the Party Branch," Aug. 23.)