

# The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and That Renegade—China's Khrushchov

THE theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism. Whether to uphold or to oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat has always been the focal point of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism on the one hand and revisionism of all kinds on the other; this has always been the watershed between genuine proletarian revolutionaries and renegades to the proletarian revolutionary cause.

Once China had in the main completed the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, it faced two possible alternatives: to persevere in the dictatorship of the proletariat, unfold the socialist revolution on both the political and ideological fronts and carry the revolution through to the end, or to betray the dictatorship of the proletariat, proclaim

the dying out of class struggle and the non-existence of classes and bring about a capitalist restoration.

It was at this crucial moment that Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the Chinese people and of all the world's revolutionary people, made public *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, *Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work* and a series of important directives. For the first time in the history of the development of Marxism, he made a scientific, systematic and profound analysis of the contradictions, classes and class struggle in socialist society and solved both in theory and practice the problem of how to make revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus Marxism-Leninism was raised to a brilliant, new stage—the stage of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Chairman Mao has clearly pointed out: **“The class struggle is by no means over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the different political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will continue to be long and tortuous and at times will even become very acute.”** **“There are still a number of people who vainly hope to restore the capitalist system and fight the working class on every front, including the ideological one.”**

However, China's Khrushchov came out at this juncture to oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought by unscrupulously publicizing the theory that “class struggle is dying out.” He babbled that classes had been eliminated and class struggle was dying out since the system of ownership had been transformed and the exploiting classes were deprived of their means of production. This was an out-and-out fraud and a naked betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Class is not only an economic concept; more important, it is a political concept. During the thousands of years of their rule, the exploiting classes held a dominant position not only in the economic but in the political, ideological and cultural fields. Class struggle manifests itself in different forms—political, economic and ideological. In the political and ideological fields the struggle is far more acute and fierce than in the economic field.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, “the landlords have no land,” “the rich peasants are no longer rich” and “the capitalists have no capital.” This is splendid! It is the outcome of the transformation of the ownership of the means of production and a victory of the socialist revolution. They are deprived of their means of production and have also lost their ruling position politically. But the forces of the exploiting classes are still very strong. They can still exist by virtue of their dominance in the fields of ideology and culture or their traditional influences. If the socialist revolution is carried out only on the economic front

and not on the political and ideological fronts, and if there is no great proletarian cultural revolution, it is impossible thoroughly to remould the elements of the exploiting classes and finally abolish classes.

Although the bourgeois elements have become administrative personnel in joint state-private enterprises, they still receive payments at a fixed rate of interest on their share of capital in the joint enterprises and have not yet cut themselves loose from the roots of exploitation. **“Even when they stop receiving their fixed interest payments and the ‘bourgeois’ label is removed, they will still need ideological remoulding for quite some time.”** The landlords have been deprived of their land, but they still keep their title-deeds in secret places and continue to record their family trees. In the vain hope of staging a come-back, they have never for a moment forgotten their documents reminding them of their lost property and forfeited rights. Even the rich peasants always hanker after the old days when they lived on exploitation! Chairman Mao points out: **“The social economic system has been changed, but the reactionary ideas, namely, those of the bourgeoisie and upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie, which were left over from the old days and which still remain in the minds of a considerable number of people, cannot be changed immediately. It takes time, and a very long time at that, to change these ideas. This is class struggle in society.”**

The existence of the bourgeoisie and its influences is bound to corrode the ranks of the proletariat, and the bourgeoisie invariably finds its agents inside the apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat. These agents are the main and most dangerous class enemy. They usurp leading positions and turn the power of leadership into their prerogative to oppress and exploit the masses; they recruit deserters and renegades and form cliques serving their selfish interests in a vain attempt to exercise a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and restore capitalism. Have they not become new capitalists, new landlords and new rich peasants? Isn't the “new-type capitalist” that China's Khrushchov talks about a true description of himself?

It is under such circumstances that class struggle continues to exist. But the form of struggle changes as circumstances change. The principal feature of the change in the form of struggle is that the enemies have wormed their way into our vital organs where they try to make a breach from within and organize a palace coup to usurp the leadership of the Party, army and government. The class struggle, therefore, becomes even more acute and complicated.

We should not think that everything is fine and that there is no need to worry any longer when “the landlords have no land,” “the rich peasants are no longer rich” and the “capitalists have no capital.” Once this gang, the most dangerous enemies, usurps state power, the “landlords who have no land” will again become landlords with land, “the rich peasants who

are not rich" will become rich again through exploitation and "the capitalists who have no capital" will again become capitalists with capital.

This has already become an indisputable reality in the Soviet Union, in Yugoslavia and in a number of so-called socialist countries in Eastern Europe.

The theories of the "dying out of class struggle" and the "withering away of the state" advocated by China's Khrushchov inevitably led to negation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

One piece of evidence is that when a revised edition of his book on self-cultivation was published in 1962, he deliberately deleted from it the phrase "**make the dictatorship of the proletariat necessary**" which had appeared in a passage he quoted from Lenin.

China's Khrushchov also said: "Class struggle has in the main ended, counter-revolutionaries have become fewer and so have the number of criminal cases, so the state apparatus of dictatorship can be reduced in size, . . . from now on, the most important task of the state is to organize social life."

May we ask: What kind of "social life" is to be organized? Can there be a "society" above classes when classes still exist? Is there such a thing as "social life" devoid of stress and struggle? What is this kind of "state" that "organizes social life"?

Chairman Mao says, our state apparatus "**is the instrument by which one class oppresses another. It is an instrument for the oppression of antagonistic classes; it is violence.**" At the same time, "**the people's state protects the people. Only when the people have such a state can they educate and remould themselves by democratic methods on a country-wide scale, with everyone taking part.**"

Our state implements democracy among the people and enforces dictatorship over people's enemies. It is an apparatus of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

During the entire period of the transition from socialism to communism, the dictatorial function of the state apparatus should be strengthened, not weakened. By setting what he called the organizing of social life in opposition to the state's dictatorial function, China's Khrushchov was trying his hardest to attack and negate the state's dictatorial function. He was trying to replace the socialist state with "a state of the whole people," trying to replace the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Since the bourgeoisie is bent on toppling the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletariat must do just the opposite and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat a hundred, a thousand times over.

As far back as 18 years ago, Chairman Mao taught us that the dictatorship of the proletariat, "**like food and clothing, . . . is something a victorious people cannot do without even for a moment. It is an excellent thing, a protective talisman, an heirloom, which should under**

**no circumstances be discarded before the thorough and total abolition of imperialism abroad and of classes within the country.**"

"The dying out of class struggle," "the withering away of the state" and all such talk by China's Khrushchov are utterly deceitful. To negate the existence of class struggle is in itself a form of fierce attack by the bourgeoisie on the proletariat.

To propose that "the state apparatus of dictatorship can be reduced in size" is tantamount to seeking to decrease the proletariat's dictatorship over the bourgeoisie and to extend greatly the bourgeoisie's dictatorship over the proletariat.

This is a life-and-death class struggle. It finds concentrated expression in the struggle being waged by the proletariat against the handful of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road and by the proletarian headquarters against the bourgeois headquarters.

The struggle has all along centred on the question of political power. On the side of the bourgeoisie, the person in command throughout has been China's Khrushchov. It was he who advanced the counter-revolutionary theories. It was he who planned the counter-revolutionary activities. He is the general behind-the-scenes boss of all the reactionary forces in China.

China's Khrushchov can no longer conceal himself in this great proletarian cultural revolution of unprecedented scale and depth. The sweeping mass movement has forced him to come out into the open and take personal command. All his lackeys, big and small, also came out en bloc.

This is very good. A great victory comes only after a decisive battle. In the decisive battle now being waged the echelons of the bourgeoisie are falling one after another before the powerful proletarian headquarters, and have been utterly routed. In accordance with inexorable historical dialectics, this bourgeois headquarters will inevitably be destroyed root and branch.

As Lenin pointed out in *Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, "**the working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this backsliding. . . .**"

In order to carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end and to hoist the red flag of communism in every corner of the world, let us continue to wage a ruthless struggle against China's Khrushchov, the rank renegade who has betrayed the dictatorship of the proletariat!

*(Slightly abridged translation of an article written by the editorial departments of "Wenhui Bao," "Jiefang Ribao" [Liberation Daily] and "Zhibu Shenghuo" [Life of the Party Branch] and first published on Aug. 25.)*