

LIU'S THEORY OF DYING OUT OF CLASS STRUGGLE CRITICIZED

Peking, Jen-min Jih-pao, 20 August 1967

[Full text of an article entitled "Thoroughly Criticize and Repudiate the Reactionary Fallacy of the 'Dying Out Of Class Struggle'" by Fan Hsiu Ping.]

After the basic completion of socialist transformation in respect of the system of ownership of means of production, would class and class struggle continue to exist? Is it necessary to continue to wage socialist revolution? This is a fundamental question that concerns the destiny of the socialist revolution, one which concerns whether the proletarian dictatorship can be consolidated or not.

After the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of means of production in our country, Chairman Mao made a report, "On Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," at a Supreme State Conference in February 1957, in which he answered this fundamental question of revolution. This brilliant report is an important milestone that marks the development of Marxism-Leninism to the brand new stage of the thought of Mao Tse-tung, a powerful theoretical weapon for waging revolution under conditions of proletarian dictatorship.

A month or more after Chairman Mao made his report, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road hastily toured the five provinces of Hopei, Honan, Hupeh, Huna, and Kwangtung, singing a contrary tune to that of Chairman Mao everywhere he went. In April he went to Shanghai, where he made a "Speech at Congress of Party Members and Cadres of Shanghai." In this speech he openly distorted the situation of the class struggle after the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of means of production, freely propagated the theory of the "dying out of class struggle," and opposed and abolished the socialist revolution, in a vain attempt to change the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship.

The "theory of dying out of class struggle" is one of the most dangerous, most vicious reactionary "theories" which China's Khrushchev has produced for the purpose of subverting the proletarian dictatorship. We must overthrow it by criticism and completely discredit it.

I

In his brilliant work, "On Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," our great leader Chairman Mao made a scientific, systematic, and profound analysis of the situation of the class struggle in a socialist society, pointing out clearly:

"In China, although in the main socialist transformation has been completed with respect to the system of ownership, and although the large scale and turbulent class struggles of the masses characteristics of the previous revolutionary periods have in the main come to an end, there are still remnants of the overthrown landlord and comprador classes, there is still a bourgeoisie, and the remolding of the petty bourgeoisie has only just started. The class struggle is by no means over. The class struggle between the proletariat and 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. The proletariat seeks to transform the world according to its own world outlook, and so does the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the question of which will win out, socialism or capitalism, is still not really settled."

Openly singing a contrary tune to that of Chairman Mao, China's Khrushchev freely declares that classes have died out and class struggle has come to an end. He does not want revolution, but wants to abolish it instead. He says: "The enemies in the country are now basically annihilated. The landlord class was wiped out long ago, the bourgeoisie is basically destroyed, and the same may be said of counterrevolution." In his view therefore, "The term 'class' deserves to be reconsidered." He says that class struggle has come "to an end" and "after the institution of public-private joint operation, the principal contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is also resolved," and that therefore "the principal class struggle in the country has basically come to an end or may be said to have been basically resolved."

Chairman Mao has greatly developed the theory of class struggle in the period of socialist society. He teaches us patiently and repeatedly that the struggle between the two classes and two-reads, as well as that between restoration and counter-restoration, is protracted, and that it must be discussed every year, every month, every day for a long time to come. China's Khrushchev, on the other hand, has peddled his wares with increasing vigor. He propagated his "theory of dying out of class struggle" every year. Even on the eve of the great proletarian cultural revolution, he still said, "Now we have done away with classes."

The history of class struggle in the decade after the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of means of production completely confirms Chairman Mao's brilliant thesis and administers a resounding slap in the face of China's Khrushchev. As a matter of fact, the socialist transformation of the capitalist system of ownership was itself an extremely acute and violent class struggle. Some capitalists of Shanghai said that socialist transformation was "forcing the capitalists to write confessions." They "beat gongs and drums at day and cried bitterly at night," crying "This is insufferable" and "How can we eat this bowl of rice!" The bourgeois openly handed over their means of production, but in reality they still kept large amounts of property, including means of production, for themselves. By means of a ruse, they changed their fixed assets into fluid assets, immovable property into movable property, means of circulation into means of deposit, and concealed large amounts of gold, silver, money and valuables. In this way they stubbornly resisted socialist transformation.

The bourgeoisie would never voluntarily and happily hand over their "paradise." Marx said that the bourgeoisie and their representative organizations "would condone an act attacking 38 of the 39 articles of faith, but

would not condone an act attacking one-thirty-ninth of their income." Could this law have suddenly become inapplicable to the bourgeoisie that have not yet been eliminated in a socialist society?

In 1957, when China's Khrushchev went to Shanghai and the areas to propagate freely his "theory of dying out of class struggle," the bourgeois Rightists were recklessly attacking the Party. They cried that "early spring" had arrived. Li K'ang-nien, a big unscrupulous merchant of Shanghai, openly demanded for "an extension of the fixed dividends for another twenty years." Yet China's Khrushchev at that time praised the bourgeois elements for their "goodness" and the "firmness" of their stand. Did that not play a highly vicious role of shielding these class enemies and inciting them to attack the proletariat?

After we repulsed the attack of the bourgeois Rightists, the bourgeoisie did not stop their attack on the proletariat. But the means they adopted were even more cunning and concealed, and the struggle became even more acute and complex. The bourgeoisie actively sought their own agents within our Party, and attacked us by all ignoble means.

Operating from bases in their enterprises and adopting the means of lawful struggle, they desperately fought with the proletariat for leadership power. Employing such ignoble and shameless means as flattery, giving of dinner parties, giving of presents, lending out of money, bribery, and beautiful women, they succeeded in dragging a number of cadres into the water, so that these cadres became their tools, spoke for them, and did jobs for them. They monopolized and controlled the powers of some enterprises and discriminated against and hit at the revolutionary cadres, openly crying, "If the fences are closely erected, wild dogs will not be able to come in." Some of the capitalists even paid out secret wages and directed their henchmen from behind the scenes to confront us. Such a reactionary scoundrel was the big boss of the old Yung An Company of Nanking Road, Shanghai, whom China's Khrushchev and his agents in Shanghai praised and called the living model of a "Red capitalist."

They sabotaged the socialist economy and developed forces of capitalism by all means. Making use of their position in their enterprises, they fostered "peaceful evolution" by all conceivable means, in a vain effort to drag the socialist economy onto the capitalist track and turn the socialist system of whole-people ownership and collective ownership into capitalist economy. In the three years of temporary difficulties in particular, the new and old bourgeois elements, in conspiracy with landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionaries, bad elements, and Rightists, rabidly opposed socialism. They openly clamored for "three freedoms and one contract." Their activities to restore capitalism were extremely reckless.

They energetically opposed the proletarian world outlook with their bourgeois world outlook, and tried to corrupt the proletariat and other

working people with bourgeois ideology. The stench from the corpse of the bourgeoisie enveloped, affected, and corrupted the proletariat. It vitiated the atmosphere and poisoned our thought. With decaying and dead things they surrounded the fresh and young things of youthful vigor. They continued to receive fixed dividends amounting to thousands and thousands of yuan, and lead an utterly rotten, licentious, and shameless parasitic life. Some even privately built "Dragon's Palaces" or "Crystal Palaces." As a result, a bourgeois evil wind prevailed for some time in society; in which "capitalists were not stinking, fixed dividends were not stinking, and Hong Kong was not stinking," and which corrupted a number of cadres and young people.

In trying to restore capitalism, the class enemies always adopt both civil and violent means. Normally the bourgeoisie will use principally the tactic of "Peaceful evolution," but they are also prepared to use "violent" means. The current great proletarian cultural revolution has exposed their true nature. These old bloodsuckers concealed not only signboards, seals, account books, vouchers, deeds, and all such documents for counter-reckoning of accounts, but also transmitters, daggers, guns, ammunition, and other lethal weapons.

These startline facts fully show that the "theory of dying out of class struggle" advocated by China's Khrushchev is pure humbug. Advocacy of the "theory of dying out of class struggle" is itself waging of class struggle by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. What China's Khrushchev wants to put out is the class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. He vainly hopes to relieve us of our ideological arms, so that we may "quietly," "comfortably," and peacefully evolve into capitalists. Once the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is put out, the bourgeois attack on the proletariat will increase in fury by one hundred times. By advocating the "theory of dying out of class struggle," China's Khrushchev once more proves that he is the general agent of the bourgeoisie in our Party.

II

Chairman Mao points out: "All revolutionary struggles in the world are for the seizure and consolidation of political power. It is entirely for the purpose of maintaining their political power that the counterrevolutionaries desperately struggle against the forces of revolution." After the basic completion of the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of means of production, the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is in the final analysis a struggle to decide who will reform and lead whom. It is also a struggle of power-seizure and counter-power-seizure.

The "theory of dying out of class struggle" advocated by China's Khrushchev serves his plot to usurp the leadership of the Party, the Government, and the Army. It is a smoke bomb to cover up the vain effort of the

bourgeoisie to usurp the leadership of the proletariat. To make it easier for the bourgeoisie to seize power, China's Khrushchev deliberately obliterates the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and advocates class cooperation and class reconciliation. In his black report, he energetically emphasized that after the institution of joint public-private operations, the capitalists had become "new-type capitalists," that the character of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie had changed so that it now became a "non-antagonistic contradiction," that therefore in "dealing with this contradiction, the guideline is emphasis on agreement and not on antagonism," and that "it would be wrong... to emphasize the antagonism and not agreement" so that the contradiction was "unnecessarily aggravated."

Chairman Mao has always taught us that "agreement" in a contradiction is conditional and relative," whereas "antagonism in a contradiction is unconditional and absolute." He also says: "The antagonism of contradiction goes on throughout the whole process and causes the process to change into another process." Since the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are two basically antagonistic classes, the struggle between them can only be a life-and-death struggle and their relationship is one of oppression of one class by another class, a relationship of dictatorship by the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and never a relationship of class cooperation and peaceful coexistence. Under conditions of socialism, our united front policy toward the bourgeoisie is in essence a special form of class struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie by relying on a powerful State machinery. The object is the ultimate destruction of the bourgeoisie and capitalism through prolonged, repeated, and violent class struggle. It is absolutely not abolition of class struggle, reconciliation of class contradictions, or preservation of the bourgeoisie and capitalism.

The argument of China's Khrushchev that "emphasizes agreement" would require us to abandon our struggle against the bourgeoisie and forever preserve the bourgeoisie and capitalism. What China's Khrushchev means by "agreement" is to make the proletariat "agree" with the bourgeoisie and surrender to the bourgeoisie.

The facts were just like that. Under the general principle of "emphasis of agreement," China's Khrushchev put forward a whole set of policies and measures for class cooperation, implementing a line of complete class capitulationism. He held that the bourgeoisie should "have office, power, and responsibilities," that we should "actively work and democratically cooperate" with the bourgeoisie, that we should "underwrite one end and underwrite to the end," (he said, "We guarantee to take care of industrial and commercial businessmen," and "we will guarantee to the end... You may set your mind at ease"), that "[the bourgeoisie] will be promoted and trained in the same way as others," that there would be "no change in five things" (i.e., fixed dividends, high salaries, academic titles, job assignment, and peaceful reform), etc. etc. He took every care of the bourgeoisie and was extremely humble to them.

A number of leading bourgeois cried vociferously that "the private side has no responsibility at all," that they had "office but no power," that [the Communists] cooperated but did not work with them, etc. They impudently wanted to seize power from the proletariat.

The whole series of class capitulationist policy of China's Khrushchev was designed to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie, so that he might conspire and collaborate with the bourgeoisie to usurp the leadership of the proletariat. As a result of the implementation of this class capitulationist line, many of our socialist enterprises were "justifiably" in the control of the bourgeoisie.

In the commercial system in Shanghai, more than 170 capitalists were on one occasion assigned to more than 100 specialized corporations as managers and vice managers, and more than 14,000 capitalists were assigned to socialist, whole-people owned factories and commercial stores as directors and vice directors and managers and vice managers. Two hundred and four leaders of underworld gangs of various guilds in the city were also appointed to specialized corporations as managers or vice managers, so that they actually managed State-owned enterprises.

Not contented with this, China's Khrushchev issued a black directive to his agent in Shanghai, telling him that "a Second Personnel Division may be established," which would exclusively take care of the capitalists. Thus he openly seized power from our proletariat on behalf of the bourgeoisie, revealing his reactionary face of a big scab.

In many enterprises so-called "regulations of cooperation between public and private personnel" and "mutual-aid contract between public and private sides" were vigorously carried into effect. In these it was openly written: "The public side must respect the office and powers of the private side" and "The public side must guarantee that the private side would become Leftists within two years, while the private side must impart technical knowledge to the public side." The result was that a number of representatives of the public side were "transformed" by the private side and turned Right. That was a living example of class cooperation so painstakingly fostered by China's Khrushchev!

What is "having office and having power"!? In reality it amounted to handing over the proletarian leadership to the bourgeoisie, so that the bourgeois might freely "reform" us. Was that not true in some enterprises? In some Party branches, reports made by the secretaries were valid only after a summing-up had been made by the private side. It was like "having the public side as housekeepers and the private side as the master." Capitalists were sometimes actually invited to Party Committee meetings, and they were even allowed to read important documents. The old blood-sucking vampires were also invited to general meetings of labor unions, where they were seated high up on the presidium. Was that not turning our Party into a Social Democrat Party that served the bourgeoisie!

In the eyes of China's Khrushchev, the proletariat cannot lead in socialism, which must be led by the bourgeoisie. In his view, capitalists are very clever. They belong to "cultural level higher than that attained by any other class," "have technical know-how," "are astute and capable," "are competent," and "even their management ability is higher than that of our Communist Party members." Therefore, he had a bright idea and said self-deceptively: "If they can be persuaded to manage factories not with capitalist but with our method — the socialist method, and if they manage them well, then why can't they be allowed to do it?" Thus China's Khrushchev faithfully relies on the bourgeoisie. It is what he meant by letting them "have office, power, and responsibility."

The proletariat and the bourgeoisie cannot "sit and stand" together as equals. With the proletariat in power, the bourgeoisie must not be allowed to hold power. If the bourgeoisie holds power, the proletariat will lose power. It will mean a change of order, restoration, death of the Party and the State.

III

Under the condition of proletarian dictatorship, the greatest characteristic of class struggle is the effort made by the class enemies through their agents in the Party to usurp the leadership of the Party, the Government and the Army, to turn the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship, and to change the Communist Party into a revisionist party. Therefore, the small handful of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road are our most dangerous enemies, because they can play a role which the landlords and the bourgeoisie cannot.

Working hand in glove with the bourgeoisie outside the Party, these power-holders within the Party try to bring about "peaceful evolution" and corrupt the mind of our Communist Party. The "theory of dying out of class struggle" is just such a virulent ideological corrosive. To the proletariat no enemy need be feared, no matter how ferocious he is and no matter what is in his bag of tricks. What is to be feared is our own insensibility and loss of class vigilance, which amounts to our own ideological disarmament. The "theory of dying out of class struggle" wants us to be contented with the results of the transformation of the system of ownership respecting means of production. If we are, we shall be politically paralyzed, ideologically befuddled, and organizationally indifferent. Our only concern will be grain, cotton, and oil, but we shall not be able to distinguish enemies from friends. In this way, the proletarian realm, won after several decades of hard struggle by the people of the whole country led by Chairman Mao, will be quietly stolen with the utmost ease by the bourgeoisie. "If things go on like that, then it will not take much time — perhaps a few years or a dozen years or at most several decades — before a nationwide counterrevolutionary restoration inevitably takes place. The Marxist-Leninist Party will surely change into a revisionist, fascist party. The whole China will change its political color."

The "theory of dying out of class struggle" will lead inevitably to abolition of the proletarian dictatorship and to a "whole-people Party" and "whole-people State." That will be the inevitable result of the development of the counterrevolutionary logic of China's Khrushchev. It is also the ultimate object of his peddling of the "theory of dying out of class struggle."

To usurp the leadership of the Party, the Government and the Army, the small handful of top Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road must strive hard to cover up their own counterrevolutionary face. They must shield one another and conspire with one another at all levels, gather together capitulationists and renegades, form groups for private ends, and make organizational preparations for restoring capitalism. It is in this respect that the "theory of dying out of class struggle" provides a theoretical basis. Under the banner of the "theory of dying out of class struggle," the small handful of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road enrolled in the Party one after another a number of bourgeois elements, bourgeois representatives, bourgeois reactionary academic "authorities," and degenerate elements. When speaking to a big capitalist relative, China's Khrushchev openly tried to persuade him to join the Party, saying, "You are a capitalist," "it would be even better if you also join the Party." It fully revealed his true face of a counterrevolutionary revisionist who wanted to turn our Party into a bourgeois "whole-people Party."

China's Khrushchev also energetically propagates the revisionist, preposterous theory of a "whole-people State." He said, "Since the class Struggle has basically concluded..., State organs of dictatorship may now be reduced." "From now on the most important task of the State is to organize social life." He also said, "The principal task of the Party is to develop productivity as quickly as possible." He even put forward an extremely reactionary slogan, "Dictatorship for all," which in reality would have the bourgeoisie exercise dictatorship. He said preposterously that proletarian politics was something that concerned all, and wanted the proletariat to sit and stand together as equals. He wanted to "reduce the organs of dictatorship" and the State to "organize social life," but made no mention whatever of the necessity of suppression of class enemies by the proletarian dictatorship. Superficially he said he wanted to "reduce the organs of dictatorship," but in reality what he wanted to reduce was the proletarian dictatorship, abolish it, and enlarge the bourgeois dictatorship. In this way, China's Khrushchev, the usurper of the State, vainly hopes to change gradually the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship.

The "theory of dying out of class struggle" is just such a counter-revolutionary "theory" designed to subvert the proletarian dictatorship and to topple the Party and the State. The peaceful evolution of the socialist system of the Soviet Union took place exactly on the basis of such a counterrevolutionary "theory". Under cover of the notorious "theory" of abolition of the proletarian dictatorship and bringing about of a "whole-people Party" and "whole-people State," Khrushchev has gradually changed

the Soviet Party into a fascist party that oppresses the people and turned the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship. China's Khrushchev hopes vainly to do the same. Under cover of the "theory of dying out of class struggle," and in conspiracy with a small handful of big Party panjandrums, warlords, and scholar tyrants, this big usurper of the State, who has been concealed for a long time in the organ of proletarian dictatorship, has set up a camouflaged bourgeois headquarters within our Party and the organ of proletarian dictatorship. He has audaciously launched an all-out attack on the proletarian headquarters ideologically, organizationally, and politically in the vain hope of usurping the leadership of the Party and the State, subvert the proletarian dictatorship, and bring about a capitalist restoration. But under the brilliant light of the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung, all his sinister plans and tricks have become bankrupt.

The "theory of dying out of class struggle" of China's Khrushchev must be thoroughly criticized, repudiated, and completely discredited.

Long Live the proletarian dictatorship!