

Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung: Vol. VIII

[Talks at the Nanning Conference](#) *(January 11, 12, 1958)*

[To the Kwangsi Regional Party Committee on Newspapers](#) *(January 12, 1958)*

[Speech at the Supreme State Conference \[excerpts\]](#) *(28 January 1958)*

[Red and Expert](#) *(January 31, 1958)*

[Sixty Points on Working Methods - A Draft Resolution from the Office of the Centre of the CPC](#) *(February 2, 1958)*

[Talks at the Chengtu Conference](#) *(March 1958)*

[National Minorities](#) *(March 1958)*

[Speech at the Hankow Conference](#) *(April 6, 1958)*

[Introducing a Co-Operative](#) *(April 15, 1958)*

[Speeches at the Second Session of the Eighth Party Congress](#) *(May 8-23, 1958)*

[Speech at the Conference of Heads of Delegations to the Second Session of the 8th Party Congress](#) *(May 18 1958)*

[Speech at the Group Leaders Forum of the Enlarged Meeting of the Military Affairs Committee \[excerpts\]](#) *(28 June 1958)*

[Communes Are Better](#) *(August 9, 1958)*

[Speech at the Supreme State Conference](#) *(September 8, 1958)*

[Interview with a Hsinhua news Agency Correspondent](#) *(September 29, 1958)*

[The Masses Can Do Anything](#) *(September 29, 1958)*

[Instructions](#) *(June-September 1958)*

[On Huan Hsiang's Comment on the Disintegration of the Western World](#)
(November 25, 1958)

[A Letter to Chou Shih-chou](#) *(November 25, 1958)*

[Speech at the First Chingchow Conference](#) *(November 1958)*

[On the Question of Whether Imperialism and all Reactionaries are Real Tigers](#) *(December 1, 1958)*

[Talks with the Directors of Various Cooperative Areas](#) *(November, December 1958)*

[Speech at the Sixth Plenum of the Eighth Central Committee](#) *(December 19, 1958)*

[Reply to Article "Tsinghua University Physics Teaching and Research Group Inclines Toward the 'Left' Rather Than Right in Handling Teachers"](#) *(December 22, 1958)*

[Speech At Conference Of Provincial And Municipal Committee Secretaries](#) *(February 2, 1959)*

[Talk At Symposium Of Hsin, Lo, Hsu And Hsin Local Committees](#)
(February 21, 1959)

[Speech At Cheng-chow](#) *(February 27, 1959)*

[Intra Party Correspondence](#) *(March 1959)*

[Comment On T'ao Lu-Ch'ieh's Report On The Five-Level Cadre Conference](#) *(March 30, 1959)*

[Intra Party Correspondence](#) *(April 29, 1959)*

[Talk At Seventh Plenum Of The Eighth Central Committee](#) *(April 1959)*

[Sixteen Articles Concerning Work Methods](#) *(May 1959)*

[Several Important Instructions](#) *(June 29, July 2, 1959)*

[Speech at the Lushan Conference](#) *(23 July 1959)*

[Talk At The 8th Plenary Session Of The CPC 8th Central Committee](#)
(August 2, 1959)

[Letter To Chang Wen-tien \[excerpt\]](#) (August 2, 1959)

[Comment On A Report: 'The Tao-chu Production Brigade Of Tan-ling Commune In Pingchiang County, Hunan, Abolished Scores Of Mess-halls And Then Restored Them Again'](#) (August 5, 1959)

[Comment On Two Reports: "The Situation Of Wang-kuo-fan Commune Has Always Been Very Good" And "Who Are The People Engaged In Idle Talks Now In The Countryside"](#) (August 6, 1959)

[Comment On A Report On Secretary Chang Kai-fan Of Secretariat Of CPC Anhwei Provincial Committee Giving Order To Abolish Mess-Halls In Wu-Wei County](#) (August 10, 1959)

[Comment On The Report On Liaoning Province Carrying Out CPC Central Committee's Directive To Oppose Right-Deviation \[excerpt\]](#)
(August 12, 1959)

[Concerning Mei Sheng's "Chi Fa"](#) (August 16, 1959)

[Why Do Right Opportunists Now Launch An Offensive?](#) (August 16, 1959)

[Comment On Chang Wen-tien's Letter](#) (August 18, 1959)

[Comment on Peng Te-huai's Letter of 9 September](#) (September 9, 1959)

[Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Military Affairs Committee and the External Affairs Conference](#) (11 September 1959)

[Intra-Party Correspondence](#) (11 October 1959)

[Comment on Reply to Comrades A.V. Sanina and V.G. Vinshire](#) (Circa 1959)

[Evamples of Dialectics \(Abstracted Compilation\)](#) (1959)

[Note On The "Charter Of The Anshan Iron And Steel Company"](#) (March 22, 1960)

[On The Anti-China Question](#) (March 22, 1960)

[Comments On Vice Premier Nieh Jung-chen's Report On The Technical Revolution](#) *(March 25, 1960)*

[The People Of Asia, Africa And Latin America Should Unite And Drive American Imperialism Back To Where It Came From](#) *(May 7, 1959)*

[Summing Up Ten Years](#) *(June 18, 1960)*

[Dissemination Of The CC, CPC's Criticism Of The Shansi Provincial Party Committee's Report On The Rural Labor Force Problem](#) *(October 27, 1960)*

[Opinion On The Free Supply System](#) *(1960)*

[Classical Works Recommended To High-Ranking Cadres](#) *(1960)*

[Principles Of Educating Youth](#) *(1960)*

[Directive On The Question Of Class Distinction](#)

[Speech At The Ninth Plenum Of The Eighth CPC Central Committee](#) *(January 18, 1961)*

[Preface To "Oppose Book Worship"](#) *(March 11, 1961)*

[To The Communist Labour University In Kiangsi](#) *(August 1, 1961)*

[Talk At An Enlarged Working Conference Convened By The Central Committee Of The Communist Party Of China](#) *(30 January 1962)*

[Speech At The Tenth Plenum Of The Eighth Central Committee](#) *(24 September 1962)*

[Reading Notes on the Soviet Text 'Political Economy'](#) *(1961-1962)*

[Concerning 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR'](#) *(November 1958)*

[Critique of Stalin's 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR'](#) *(1961)*

All remaining documents from this volume are forthcoming. - Marxists.org

Transcription by the Maoist Documentation Project.
HTML revised 2004 by Marxists.org

PDF created by dudeman5685

Talks At The Nanning Conference

January 11, 12, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication, 1969]

1. Talk on 11 January, 1958

As for the report to the People's Congress, I have not read it in two years (in order to maintain solidarity this has not been mentioned in the newspapers and I am not responsible). Chang Po-chun^[1] said that the State Council provided only the finished product and did not allow others to participate in the planning. I am quite sympathetic; however, he is trying to set up a bourgeois political planning council while we constitute the proletariat's political planning council. Some people have only finished products from the very start. They called meetings in haste and practically forced people to approve them. They provided only the finished products instead of the materials. It is necessary to discuss problems from a practical standpoint, exchange ideas of importance, and explain why things are being done this way rather than that way. The finance and economics departments do not keep the Political Bureau informed. Generally, the reports, too, do not lend themselves to discussions as they do not mention textual research, phraseology, and essence. The former is a question of rhetoric and the latter are questions of concepts and reasoning.

For the comrades in the party committees the main danger is to be "red but not expert," mindless politicians divorced from reality. Not only are they not expert but they also gradually lose their redness. We are working with "intangibles" and you are working with "tangibles." The "tangibles" and "intangibles" must be integrated. Those dealing in "intangibles" must do some research on "tangibles" and those dealing in "tangibles" must use some politics. Hung-an county report on their experimental plots is a very important document. I have read it twice and ask all of you read it. The "four abundances," the "three desirables" and the "three undesirables" mentioned in the Hung-an report are nationwide problems. That is, people want to lead without fully understanding "tangible" matters. Criticizing others as expert but not red will lack forcefulness if this problem is not resolved. Party committee leaders cover three areas: industry, agriculture and ideology. The provincial committees should also operate some experimental fields. Shouldn't they? Otherwise, those mindless politicians will change color.

People working with "tangibles" who become high, middle or low level officials early, think of themselves as red. They became entangled and can not extricate themselves, and they will not even discuss essence, as, for example, opposing "bold advances."^[2] In 1956 it was "bold advances." It was "boldly advance" in 1957, and in that same year it was oppose "bold advances." But in 1958 it was again "bold advances." Let us see which is better, to "boldly advance" or oppose "bold advances"? In 1956 Hopei province

undertook construction of water-conservancy projects covering 17 million mou, in 1957, 20 million mou, and in 1958, 27 million mou. Seven or eight years after liberation, 1.2 billion yuan was spent on the control of the Huai River to build only 1.2 billion cubic meters of earthwork. This year, Anhwei province worked 1.6 billion cubic meters at a cost of only a few tens of millions of yuan.

Please do not mention this term opposition to “bold advances,” all right? This is a political problem. Any opposition would lead to disappointment, and 600 million disappointed people would be an overwhelming problem. Put out both hands for people to see how many fingers have sores. “The storehouses are empty,” “The market is tense,” using too many people spending too much money — should we oppose them? All these must be opposed. At that time it would have been best not to bring up the subject of opposition to “bold advances,” and merely say that one finger had a sore. Thus it would not have raised the storm which blew away three things: 1) the achievement of greater, faster, better and more economical results; 2) the forty article program; and 3) the promotion committees.[3] These are all political rather than functional problems. If one finger has a problem it can be cured with a little treatment. Did not “storehouses are empty” and “the market is tense” finally change half year later?

The problem of the ten fingers must be clarified since it is a problem that concerns 600 million people. After all, are achievements important or are mistakes important? Are we to preserve enthusiasm, encourage hard work and the spirit of surging ahead, or are we to dampen spirits and be discouraging? The Rightists grasped this point and launched full-scale opposition to “bold advances.” Ch’en Ming-shu[4] criticized me for “craving after greatness and success, listening to and believing only one side, having inconstant feelings and disliking antiquities.” Chang Hsi-jo (not yet classified as a rightist)[5] criticized me as “having a fondness for greatness and success, seeking quick success and instant benefits, belittling the past and superstitious about the future.” In the Past, per mou production in the north was some 100 catties and 200 to 300 catties in the South. With an accumulated experience of 20 years Generalissimo Chiang left us only 40,000 tons of steel. If we do not belittle the past and have faith in the future what hope do we have? As for listening to and believing one side, it is impossible not to do so. The question is which side you should listen to, the bourgeoisie or the proletariat? There are some comrades who are not one sided enough and need to lean more. We cannot listen only to Liang shu-ming[6] or Ch’en Ming-shu. As for inconstant feelings it it’s not necessarily good to be constant. One cannot always be fond of the bourgeois rightists. As for the dislike of antiquities, it is a question of either emulating the advanced, or being backward, and things of antiquity are always a little backward. We eradicated the four pests, wiping out flies, mosquitoes and sparrows. There has been no precedent, and it will not be done again. Generally, newcomers are better, and it is not “the present is inferior to the past.” One cannot help being fond of antiques, but one also cannot be too fond of them. When the memorial arches were dismantled in Peking and tunnels were driven through the city walls, Chang Hsi-jo wept. This is politics.

The New Year editorial advocated going all out and aiming high (Ch’en Po-ta interrupted to say that there should be more stockpiling).

On the question of reducing personnel, the commercial section and the cooperatives are not responding to political guidance. I have talked about this for several years but they will not reform. Any thing handed down to the local level [for implementation] is halved. Since my arrival in Peking the pedicabs have not been reduced by even one unit. There were too many of our “imperial edicts”, leaving no room for thoughts. I would be a little happier if you said you would give it some thought. Our status quo faction is too large. The study of value judgment must be done again. For example, “Chiang Kai-shek is counter-revolutionary.” Value judgments must be made anew on some concepts.

Chang Po-chun intends to set up a bourgeois planning council. Our planning council is the Political Bureau, which operates through an exchange of information. They don't carry notebook and talk about guidelines. How about establishing an agreement? If you don't agree I have a way to resist you, and that is to not read your reports. I have not read for two years and the local finance departments have also chosen this approach.

These few years of opposing departmentalism has produced a saying: seize the great powers and divide up minor powers; the party committees make decisions and each locality carries them out; carrying out decisions is a form of power and so does not deviate from the principle. Investigation of work is the responsibility of the party committees.

A number of people in political and legal organizations have noted that party and government are not separate. Do we want half for each? That will not do. There should be no division at first, although, later they can be divided. Otherwise, it will just be seizing minor powers, and how will such things as the forty article program be divided? Twenty for the Central Committee and twenty for agriculture? This cannot be done. The Central Committee worked up the forty articles and then divided them up for implementation. This is the way to divide. We cannot have the central committee operating under one constitution and some other organizations operating under another. When minor powers are divided up small, the major powers then cannot be monopolized. Was not everybody in favour of group leadership? Was not the unified command system abolished (The army of the Soviet Union implemented the system of unified command; Chu-ko-fu committed an error)

2. Talk on 13 January, 1958

For the past eight years I have struggled for such a work method. I have said it a thousand times, ten thousand times. This is an exaggeration, but when it is said once too often it becomes empty talk. Invariably, a man's thinking is influenced gradually. It should be a “steady drizzle” instead of a “heavy downpour”, because the latter will cause washouts. The Political Bureau dose not have a sufficiently cohesive granular structure to absorb a heavy downpour; it will simply run off (they must have a book each on pedology and agriculture, otherwise they will not be able to remain as secretaries of provincial party committees. Inevitably, there will be a day when they will be dismissed from office. This is not a threat). Like the United Nations of Dulles^[7], the Political Bureau has become a voting machine. You give it a perfect document and it has to be passed. Like the opera,

you have to go on stage and perform since the show has been announced. The document itself does not go in to textual research and essence, and it also has foreign words. I do have a method, and that is passive resistance. I will not read it. For two years I have not read your documents and I do not expect to read them this year either.

Did comrade Chou En-lai mention what I said at the Hangchow conference?[8] In December of 1955, I wrote a foreword to the book *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*. [9] It made a tremendous impact on a nation-wide scale. Regardless of whether it was because of a personality cult or idolatry, it was published by area newspapers throughout the country and by major and minor periodicals, producing a great impact. I have thus become the chief culprit of "bold advances". I have said that a condition of inadequacy in situational analysis exists in various departments. The army has been increased by 800,000 men, worker apprentices by one million, but why should there be an increase in the ranks of those opposing right conservatism? I don't understand and I also don't know.

The "bold advances" of the Peitaiho conference held in the summer of 1955 was for the purpose of increasing steel production to 15 million tons (second five-year plan). The opposition to "boldly advance" occurring at the Peitaiho conference held in the summer of 1956 influenced the National People's Congress's report adversely. It is always so, that people do not think alike. Imbalance is the law of universal progress. Meniclus said: "All things are not alike, and all things complement each other." People do not think alike and yet it is possible to reach accord. Progress is made in a zigzag spiral pattern. Of course everyone is for the party and for the country, and not for himself.

My method against departmentalism is passive resistance and also criticism in small meetings. The finance and economics departments do not go into textual research, phraseology, and essence. They must operate in a gentle fashion, giving out some information beforehand. With them it has always been a heavy downpour causing washouts. They have been always ungracious, inadequately prepared, and incomplete. This is blockade. This is a Stalinist method. Ten minutes before the conference opens, the document is produced for resolution, without any consideration being given to the state of mind of people. You are experts, and also red. The majority in the Political Bureau is red but not expert. My attack is directed chiefly at cadres at the ministerial level and above in the Central Government and it is not levelled at everyone. It is an attack on those who caused heavy downpours and who set up blockades. If small group conferences do not resolve this problem, then a plenary session of the Central Committee will be convened (an article settled this matter but it has not been seriously resolved. In the letter to the Kwangsi provincial party committee the question of newspapers was discussed.[10]) While I was in the Soviet Union I wrote a letter saying that it will not be beneficial to your work if you do not have the support of the Central Committee. By doing otherwise you will become isolated, like the "gentleman on the beams" (a burglar).

The Political Bureau is not the Planning Council. The heavy downpour has run off our bodies but [they] kept on saying it didn't do a good job. This is, in reality, a blockade. There is also departmentalism in it, but not very serious. Now, each has his own feelings

and, placing myself in your position, I imagine you must be thinking that the Central Committee is a model of perfection. You feel that even though it is not all perfect, it is still near perfection. Besides, it is like Marguerite, the heroine of the novel “La Dame Aux Camelias”, who felt it necessary to put on makeup when she saw her lover, although she was dying. In *Fei-yen Wai-chan* (Biography of Fei Yen) Chao Fei-yen became ill and refused to see Emperor Han Wu. After all, she was simply unwilling to meet people because of her poor appearance. What is wrong with seeing people in a dishevelled ungroomed condition? You write them down one at a time as they come to mind, setting forth opinions which are not yet well defined in your mind and ideas which are not yet crystal-clear, and discuss them with others. Don't treat everything that has been issued as an “imperial edict”, and that once it has been discussed, it becomes inflexible. It was like that with the forty articles. In the beginning, 11 articles were drafted in Hangchow, then it was increased to 17 in Tientsin, and only upon arrival in Peking were they increased to 40. “A widow bringing up her son is beholden to the efforts of all the people”. This is a question of work method.

I perceive that we will have to create a unity of opposites. It just will not do without having a tit-for-tat confrontation. It will either be you persuading me or my persuading you. Or be a middle-of-the-roader. Some people are just that; they will not take a stand on major issues. Marxism is supposed (to teach us) not to camouflage one's own view, is it not? If that is so, then I don't understand. The banner should be displayed clearly. Probably it is desirable to be like Ch'u Chuany Wang (A prince in the State of Ch'u) who “for three years emitted no sound, but when he did, people remarked: for three years he did not fly, but when he did, he soared into the heavens.[\[11\]](#)”

Another one is that obdurate Hu X X arrived. Speak of the devil and he is bound to appear. The revolutionary party of *Jen-min Jih-pao* [Peoples Daily] does not make revolution. The democratic parties and factions took the speech I made at the Supreme State Conference held on 29 February[\[12\]](#) and expanded on it, extracting what they needed. The *Jen-min Jih-pao* did not make a single move. It did write an editorial beginning with Engels. Ever since the beginning of February I have been telling them: since you are not carrying it out why don't you resign? At the Second Plenary Session of the Central Committee held in November,[\[13\]](#) the January Conference of Provincial Party Committee Secretaries[\[14\]](#), and the Propaganda Conference held in March[\[15\]](#), as well as at the I-nien-t'ang Conference, contradiction among the people was mentioned. They were told not to worry, that it was resolvable. But it did not convince Comrade XXX. I said that it would be fine if I had one out of ten cadres supporting me. He would not say he was opposed to it but simply would not implement it. I would be well of if a thousand out of the ten thousand deputy secretaries of district party committees and above supported me. Who could have opened up the schools in Peking? In making his report at the Chung-chih Conference held on 22 May, Comrade X X X had a well-known saying: “An opportune moment that cannot be bought with one thousand ounces of gold” as well as “an inch of gold cannot buy an inch of time.” This brought about an opening up. During the blooming and contending, several party branches in Tsinghua University rebelled, and the rightists were happy. Otherwise, there would be no way to uncover these rebellious elements. There is a certain kind of indulgence in people which cannot

be easily discarded. The arctic ice could not have thawed for Comrade X X X if it had not been for that conference. XXX is a good man; He is just incompetent. I described him as a professor running a newspaper, a student running a newspaper. I also said that he was like a corpse running a newspaper.

More on textual research, phraseology, and essence. Workers in the field of finance and economics have made great achievements. Of the ten fingers only one is bad. I have said this ten thousand times, but to no effect. I hope work methods will be reformed. I am the one with the least knowledge and I am not a member of a committee. I have talked with democratic people and told them that I was only an actor playing the part of an old domicile, while they were the stars. Anyway, I do have some seniority, and I should be informed. I am rather disappointed. Letting you come from far away places to the south was a suggestion made by the Premier.

I am the culprit. In December of 1955, I wrote an article opposing rightist tendencies[16]. On impulse I held a discussion with 34 ministers. Ten major relationships[17] were discussed, my head swelled, and I “boldly advanced.” After that I was afraid to come near a minister. At the Third Plenary Session of the Central Committee I said that three things were abolished last year (greater, faster, better, and more economical results, the forty articles, and the promotion committees)[18] and there was no opposition. I had a stroke of luck, I was restored [to favor]. I then had the courage to talk with the ministers again. There has been a set-back in these three years. The rightists attacked, throwing back some of our comrades to a distance only 50 meters away from the rightists. The rightist launched full-scale opposition against “bold advances,” asserting that the present is inferior to the past, and “bold advances are more injurious than conservatism.” Let us study it, study which is more injurious. The opposition to “bold advances” discouraged 600 million people. The anti-bold advance editorial of June 1956 opposed right conservatism and also hasty bold advances. It seemed to be impartial, but, actually, the emphasis was on opposition to bold advances. It was not one finger having a sore. On this editorial I noted “will not read.” Why should I read something that attacks me? It was so frightening, it has such power to sway. This writing seemed to be even-handed, but in reality, it was in opposition to “bold advances.” It has not formed the pattern well. The ten fingers form a pattern, and only one finger has a sore. This is a nine-to-one ratio. It is a bourgeois method, if this relationship of the ratio is not clarified, a method like that of Ch'en Chi-tung, Huang Yen-pei[19] and Ch'en Ming-shu.

I must have the opportunity to speak. From January to November of 1956 it was opposition against “bold advances.” The Second Plenary Session of the Central Committee devised seven articles[20]. It was a compromise formula, and the solution was not thorough. The conference of provincial and municipal party committee secretaries admitted that part of the money was not properly spent. However, the discussion was not carried through thoroughly enough, thereby causing the trend of opposing “bold advances” to spread all over. Liao X X reflected to me that there seemed to be no regrets although the forty articles had been blown away. How many people regretted it? How many people breathed a sigh (of relief)? Three things were blown away, and there were three kinds of people: the first kind said: “China can be saved only by blowing away the

forty articles;” the second kind is the middle-of-the-roader. It did not affect him either way. When a mosquito bites he took slap at it and let it go at that; and the third kind sighed. It is necessary to clearly define the demarcation line between the Kuomintang and the Communist party. The Kuomintang is for bold retrogression, and the Communist Party is for bold advance.

X X X was full of anxiety for party and country, and opposed “bold advances”. He became divorced from the majority of the ministers and secretaries of provincial party committees, and from the 600 million people. Please read the article by Sung Yu, “Ode to Teng Tu-tse’s Fondness of Women”. For two thousand years Teng Tu-tse was unable to recover from this article. Sung Yu’s method was to “attack a single point and ignore the rest”. Teng Tu-tse reported to King Hsiang of Ch’u that Sung Yu was beautiful, articulate, and fond of sex. Sung Yu repudiated point by point. Sung Yu counterattacked Teng Tu-tse as being fond of sex by relating that Teng Tu-tse married a pockmarked, hunched-back woman and had seven children from her. Was this not fondness of sex? The attack was just on fondness of sex. In judging cadres we should take into account morality, talent, and qualifications. We cannot ignore morality and talent and consider qualifications only. Mentioning only one finger and ignoring the other nine is the very same kind of method. I see that we must have gentle rain, not heavy downpours, for several years. We must have a gentle attitude and refrain from sudden attacks and catching people off-guard.

In May, the rightists attacked, heightening the level of consciousness of those comrades with rightist tendencies in their minds. This is an “achievement” of the rightists, a way to spur people on.

Government procurement for the 1954-1955 grain year was 92 billion catties, and it purchased another 10 billion catties. Talking about bold advances, there was some boldness here. It created a storm of “every one talking about centralized purchasing, every family discussing food rations.” Chang Nai-ch’i was the Minister for Food and he approved this plan. Was it an attempt to turn the farmers against us? There could be a conspiracy. Quite a lot of food was sold last year, and this reflected the fact that the farmers were discouraged. Are we not advocating the mass line? What mass line would there be once 600 million people become discouraged? In reviewing problems we must proceed from the standpoint of 600 million people and place in proper perspective the main trends, side issues, basic nature, and phenomena of matters coming to our attention.

The major powers grasped by the Central Committee consist only of revolution and agriculture. The rest in the hands of the State Council.

People are superstitious and indolent. For instance, there was an intervening 30 years in my swimming.

In the extermination of the four pests “everyone talks about public health, every household discusses hygiene.” There are 12 months in a year and inspections are to be carried out once every month. In this way hospitals will run schools, doctors will go to do

farming, the number of sick people will drop sharply, every one will be mentally alert, and rates of attendance will increase greatly. These must be done in a concerted way, and the best will be to complete it in two years.

I have made an agreement with the five provinces in East China to hold four meetings this year — small scale meetings — in order to bring about a coordination of two elements. Once the two elements of the central and the local are coordinated things will be different. Small scale meetings will also be held in the various provinces.

Liao X X told me to observe the first five years of a ten-year [program], the first three of a five-year [program], and the first year of a three-year [program]. In one year I will hold four meetings for you and inspect 12 times. Double accounting systems, striving to over-fulfil quotas — this is an invention of the Soviet Union.

Please read once again Hung-an County's report. One man setting a precedent pushed it forward. A deputy secretary of the county committee bought a hoe, and 80 percent of the people bought hoes. There is also the example of that commune in Ying County, Shantung province. [But] one example is enough.

Notes

[1.] Chang Po-chun, a Rightist member of the Democratic League, and director of the Newspaper Wen Hui Pao. Also refer to comrade Mao's article "Wen Hui Pao's Bourgeois Orientation Should be Criticized", *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp.451-456.

[2.] In the year 1956 the Rightists launched a campaign to oppose the so called 'Rash advances'. This campaign dampened the enthusiasm of the masses.

[3.] In this connection refer to comrade Mao's article "Be Activists in Promoting the Revolution", *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp 491-492.

"Greater, faster, better and more economical results" — Comrade Mao set forth the ideas underlying the general line for building socialism with greater, faster, better and more economic results in his speech delivered at an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC of the CPC, held on April 25, 1956. (See "On Ten Major Relationships" *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp. 284-307. See also "Talk On Opposing Right Deviation and Conservatism", *S.W.*, Vol. VII, pp.355-358, (Kranti Publications).

The 40 articles of the Programme for Agricultural Development, refers to the revised draft of the National Programme for Agricultural Development (1956-67). The draft was adopted at the Third Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese

Communist Party convened from September 20 to October 9, 1957 and was published on October 25 after discussion at the Supreme State Conference.

This programme for building China's socialist countryside defined the goals for the 500 million Chinese peasants to strive to attain in 12 years and worked out basic methods for their realization. It called for consolidation of the agricultural co-operative system and a substantial increase in the output of grain and other farm products; it called on the majority of the co-operatives to promptly catch up with or surpass the level in production and income reached by well-to-do middle peasants during the period of individual farming. It also stipulated that, wherever necessary and possible a big leap forward should be brought about within 12 years in agriculture and in all fields of rural work as well, including measures to be worked out for boosting agricultural production, popularization of advanced production experience, production in forestry, animal husbandry, side-line occupations and fishery, and in the work of science, culture, education, public health, family planning, communications, commerce and credits as well as the reforming of landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bad elements.

[4.] Chen Ming-shu (1889-1965), was a member of the standing committee of the CC of the Revolutionary Committee of the KMT, and was also a member of the Central People's Governing Council.

[5.] Chang' Hsi-jo (c.1889-), a political scientist educated at Columbia University in New York and at the London School of Economics, where he studied under Harold Laski, was Minister of Education until February 1958, when he became chairman of the Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. He made the criticisms to which Mao is referring on 15 May 1957, at a forum called by the United Front Department.

[6.] Liang Shu-ming (1894-1977), a traditionist philosopher. He served as a General Secretary of the China Democratic League, and as a special nominated member of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. Please also see Comrade Mao's article "Criticism of Liang Shu-ming's Reactionary Ideas". *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp. 121-130.

[7.] A reference to the then American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

[8.] For Comrade Mao's talk at the Hangchow conference, see "Talk at the Hangchow Conference of the Shanghai Bureau", *S.W.*, Vol VII, pp. 396-405 (Krant Publications).

[9.] *S.W.*, Vol V, pp. 235-280.

[10.] Please see the next article in this volume.

[11.] A quotation from Shin-chi, the Historical Records, — meaning achieving great success in one attempt.

[12.] See “On The Correct Handling of Contradictions Among The People”, *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp. 384-421.

[13.] See “Speech at the Second Plenary Session of the Eight Central Committee of the Communist Party of China”, *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp 332-344.

[14.] See “Talks at a Conference of Secretaries of Provincial, Municipal and Autonomous Region Party Comminees”, *S.W.*, Vol V, pp. 350-383.

[15.] See “Speech at the Chinese Communist Party’s National Conference on Propaganda Work” *S.W.*, Vol V, PP. 422-435.

[16.] See “Talk on Opposing Right Deviation and Conservatism”, *S.W.*, Vol VII, pp. 355-358 (Kranti Publications).

[17.] See “On the Ten Major Relationships”, *S.W.*, Vol V, pp. 284-307.

[18.] See “Be Activists in Promoting the Revolution”, *S.W.*, Vol. V, pp.483-497, especially pp. 491-492.

[19.] Hung Yen-pei (1878-1965) was the Chairman of the Democratic National Construction Association in 1945. He was also a founding member of the China Democratic League. From 1949 to 1954 he served as a minister of Light Industry.

[20.] See [note 13](#) above.

To The Kwangsi Regional Party Committee On Newspapers

January 12, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication, 1969.]

Comrades Liu Chien-hsun^[1] and Wei Kuo-ch’ing,

Here attached for your reference are a few copies of local papers each one of which has its characteristics and is well edited. They are attractive to the reader and their contents are good.

Provincial newspapers are an exceedingly important problem which deserves careful study. A solution can be found in a few months if you work with the editors of the *Kwangsi Daily* (‘Kwanghsi Jih-pao’), to study the format, news items, editorials, features

on theoretical problems, and literature and art [supplements], and think and analyze [these] over and over again, and if you compare it with other provincial newspapers. Careful writing of editorials is extremely important work. This must be studied by you, by the head of the propaganda department, the secretary-general, and the editor-in-chief of the newspaper. It is imperative that the first secretary must have full authority in revising major editorials. The papers will help to organize, encourage, stimulate, criticize, and promote the work of all the people in a province. Would you like to give some thought to this problem.

Notes

[1.] Liu was born in Shansi, 1908, a graduate of the Teachers' Training College, Taiyuan, and a member of the Sacrifice League during the Anti-Japanese War. At the beginning of the Cultural Revolution in 1966, he was the first secretary of the CPC Honan branch and concurrently the first political commissioner of the military district of Honan.

Speech At The Supreme State Conference

28 January, 1958

Today we shall talk about more general questions.

When I review the past seven or eight years, I see that this nation of ours has a great future. Especially in the past year you can see how the national spirit of our 600 million people has been raised to a level surpassing that of the past eight years. After the great airing of views, blooming and debating, our problems and tasks have been clarified: we shall catch up with Britain in about fifteen years; the publication of the Forty Point Programme for Agricultural Development has given great encouragement to the masses. Many things which we could not do before we can do now, and we have the confidence to do them: for example the extermination of the four pests,[1] for which the masses have great enthusiasm. As for me, I may not be able to catch rats, but I can have a go at catching flies and mosquitoes!

Anyway isn't it generally the flies and mosquitoes which attack us? . . . In ancient times there actually was a man who wrote an essay advocating the extermination of rats. Now we are going to exterminate the four pests. For 4,000 years nobody — not even Confucius — made it their ambition to exterminate the four pests. Hangchow municipality is planning to exterminate the four pests in four years; some other places are planning to do it in two years, three years or five years. So there is great hope for the

future development of our nation. There are no grounds for pessimism. Pessimism is wrong. When we criticize the pessimists we should not come to blows but reason with them. We must tell them that we really have great hope and not just a little hope. The stress here should be placed on the word 'great'. Or as the Japanese say [in speaking Chinese] we have 'great great hope' (*laughter*).[\[2\]](#)

Our nation is waking up, just like anybody waking from a night's sleep. We have overthrown the feudal system of many thousands of years and have awakened. We have changed the system of ownership; we have now gained victories in the Rectification Campaign as well as in the Anti-Rightist Campaign. Our country is both poor and blank. Those who are poor have nothing to call their own. Those who are blank are like a sheet of white paper. To be poor is fine because it makes you inclined to be revolutionary. With blank paper many things can be done. You can write on it or draw designs. Blank paper is best for writing on.

If we are to have drive, if we are to see to it that the Western world is left far behind, do we not have to rid ourselves of bourgeois ideology? If the West wanted to rid itself of bourgeois ideology, who knows how long it would take! If Dulles had the desire to get rid of bourgeois ways he would have to ask us to be his teachers (*laughter*).

Whenever we talk about it we say that our country has such an enormous population, it has such a vast territory, abundant resources, so many people, 4,000 years of history and culture . . . we have bragged so much about this, yet we cannot compare with a country like Belgium. In short we are an outstanding people with a very long history, yet our steel output is so low. We only harvest 100+ cattles of grain per *mu*[\[3\]](#) in the north and 300+ in the south; our literacy rate is so low. We cannot compare with Belgium on any of these counts. Yet we have great drive and we must catch up. We shall catch up with Britain within fifteen years.

These fifteen years depend on the first five. The first five depend on the first three, the first three on the first one, and the first year depends on the first month.

Now our enthusiasm has been aroused. Ours is an ardent nation, now swept by a burning tide. There is a good metaphor for this: our nation is like an atom . . . When this atom's nucleus is smashed the thermal energy released will have really tremendous power. We shall be able to do things which we could not do before. When our nation has this great energy we shall catch up with Britain in fifteen years; we shall produce forty million tons of steel annually — now we produce only just over five million tons; we shall have a generating capacity of 450,000 million kWh. of electricity — at present we can generate only 40,000 million kWh., which means increasing our capacity ten times, for which we must increase hydro-electric production and not only thermo-electric. We still have ten years to carry out the Forty-Point Programme for Agricultural Development[\[4\]](#), but it looks as if we shall not need ten years. Some people say five years, others three. It would seem that we can complete it in eight.

To reach those targets in the present situation we must have great drive. When I was in Shanghai a professor discussed with me the *People's Daily* editorial, 'Ride on the Wind and Break through the Waves'. He said that we must summon up our energy to swim upstream. What he meant was to swim from Shanghai to Szechwan. This needs hard work; it's not like swimming downstream. He was quite right. I really appreciate this man. He is a good man with a sense of what is right. Some people^[5] criticize others for 'craving greatness and success, being impatient for quick results, despising the past and putting blind faith in the future'. What sort of craving for greatness and success? Is it the craving for greatness and success of the revolutionaries or of the reactionaries? Is it a subjectivist, formalistic craving for greatness and success or is it a realistic one? When in olden times people used to talk about 'good fortune as wide as the Eastern Ocean, long life as extensive as the Southern Mountains', this was craving greatness and success, and what was wrong with that? Being impatient for quick results is not so bad either! . . .

As for despising the past, this is not to say that there was nothing good in the past. There were indeed good things in the past. But always to put so much stress on the past, every day thinking of Yü, T'ang, Wen Wang, Wu Wang, the Duke of Chou and Confucius — I don't believe in this way of looking at history . . . I consider that human history advances. One generation is not as good as another — people who went before are not as good as those who follow later . . .

As for blind faith in the future, our aims are concerned with the future. We believe that to put trust in the future is quite right, though our trust should not be . . .

There are two ways to give leadership. One is good, the other not so good. I do not mean that one is Dulles's way and one is ours, nor that one is the rightist way and the other ours. I mean that in building socialism there are two methods of leadership, two styles of work. On the question of cooperativization some people advocate more speed, others a more gradual approach. I believe that the former method is correct. It is better to strike while the iron is hot and to get it done in one go than to spin it out. For example, is it right to have a rectification campaign or not? It is right. To carry it out properly it is best to have a great airing of views and blooming . . .

I stand for the theory of permanent revolution. Do not mistake this for Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution. In making revolution one must strike while the iron is hot — one revolution must follow another, the revolution must continually advance. The Hunanese often say, 'Straw sandals have no pattern — they shape themselves in the making.' Trotsky believed that the socialist revolution should be launched even before the democratic revolution is complete. We are not like that. For example after the Liberation of 1949 came the Land Reform; as soon as this was completed there followed the mutual-aid teams, then the low-level cooperatives, then the high-level cooperatives. After seven years the cooperativization was completed and productive relationships were transformed; then came the Rectification. After Rectification was finished, before things had cooled down, then came the Technical Revolution. In the cases of Poland and Yugoslavia, democratic order had been established for seven or eight years, and then a

rich peasantry emerged. It may not be necessary to establish a New Democratic government, but even so one must still unite all those forces which can be united.

It is possible to catch up with Britain in fifteen years. We must summon up our strength and swim vigorously upstream . . .

Our strength must be aroused and not dissipated. If we have shortcomings or make mistakes, they can be put right by the method of great airing of views and blooming. We must not pour cold water. We are criticized for craving greatness and success. Well then, should we seek pettiness and failure? Should we value the past and despise the future? We must crave greatness and success. The people who say so are good people. We must indeed keep up our fighting spirit.

‘The revolution has not yet been completed. Comrades must still bend every effort.’[\[6\]](#)

Notes

[\[1.\]](#) At this time, and earlier, the ‘four pests’ which the entire population was mobilized to destroy included rats, flies, mosquitoes and sparrows. The following year, sparrows having been found to play a useful role in controlling insects, they were replaced on the list by bed-bugs.

[\[2.\]](#) ‘Ta-ta yu’. Mao is here making fun of a characteristic peculiarity of Japanese speakers of Chinese, the repetition of the adjective or adverb.

[\[3.\]](#) The *mu* or *mou* is a traditional Chinese unit of area, about 0.15 acre.

[\[4.\]](#) Put forward by Mao in January 1956. For his speech at that time, see H. Carrère d’Encausse and S. Schram, *Marxism and Asia* (Allen Lane, 1969), pp. 291-3.

[\[5.\]](#) In [Talks at the Chengtu Conference](#), Mao identifies the culprit.

[\[6.\]](#) This is a quotation from Sun Yat-sen’s political testament to his comrades of the Kuomintang.

Red And Expert

January 31, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication, 1969.]

Red and expert, politics and business are the unification of two pairs of opposites. [We] must criticize the a-political attitude. (We) must on the one hand oppose empty-headed politicians and on the other confound practical men.

There is no doubt that politics and economy, and politics and technology should be united. It has been so in the past and will be so for ever. This is what red and expert mean. In future, the term 'politics' will continue to exist but in a different sense. To pay no attention to politics and to be fully occupied with business matters is to become a perplexed economist or technician. And that is dangerous. Ideological and political work is the guarantee for the accomplishment of our economic and technological work; it serves the economic basis. Ideology and politics are the commanders, the soul. A slight relaxation in our ideological and political work will lead our economic and technological work astray.

Political workers must have some knowledge of business. It may be difficult for them to have a lot, but it may not do for them to have only a little. They must have some. To have no practical knowledge is to be pseudo-red, empty-headedly political. Politics and technology must be combined together. In agriculture, this means carrying out experiments; in industries, understanding advanced models, trying out new techniques, and producing new goods.

Sixty Points On Working Methods – A Draft Resolution From The Office Of The Centre Of The CPC

February 2, 1958

The people of our country, under the leadership of the CP, having won basic victories in the socialist ownership system in 1956, achieved further basic victories on the ideological and political front in the rectification campaign of 1957. In that year, [they] also over-fulfilled the first Five-year Construction Plan. In this way, more than 600 million people of our country, led by the CP, clearly see their own future and duties and have exorcized the evil anti-party, anti-people, and anti-socialist wind fanned up by bourgeois rightists. At the same time they have rectified, and are still rectifying, the mistakes and weaknesses rooted in the subjectivism which the party and people have inherited from the old society. The party has become more united, the morale of the people further heightened, and the party-masses relationship greatly improved. We are now witnessing greater activity and creativity of the popular masses on the production front than we have ever witnessed before. A new high tide of production has risen, and is still rising, as the people of the whole country are inspired by the slogan — 'Overtake Britain in Iron and Steel and Other Major Industrial Production in Fifteen or More Years'. To meet this new situation certain methods of work of the party Center and local committees have to be modified.

Not all the points listed below are new. Some are; others come from years [of experience]. They are the conclusions reached at the Hangchow and Nanning conferences of the comrades in the Centre and regions in January 1958. These points, largely indebted to the inspiration of what was said at the conferences, are thought over and written down by me. Some are simply notes of what other comrades have said; the important points (on rules and regulations) are drafted by Comrade Liu Shao-ch'i after consultations with comrades working in the regions; only a few are put forward by me. Not all the points concern working methods — some are on actual work tasks and some on theory and practice, but mostly on working methods. Our main purpose is to improve our working methods so as to meet the changed political conditions and needs. The points are suggestions for [your] comments. Their number can be increased or reduced, as it is by no means definite. Comrades, you are hereby invited to study them and make known your views on them. These points will be revised in the light of your comments before being submitted to the Politburo for approval, in the hope that they may become a document for internal circulation.

Mao Tse-tung
31 January, 1958

1. Party committees above the county level must get down to the work of construction and there are fourteen items: *a.* industries; *b.* handicrafts; *c.* agriculture; *d.* village subsidiary production; *e.* forestry; *f.* fishery; *g.* animal husbandry; *h.* transport and communications; *i.* commerce; *j.* public and other finance; *k.* labor, wages, and populations; *l.* sciences; *m.* culture and education; *n.* public health.
2. Party committees above the county level must get down to socialist industrial work and here there are also fourteen items: *a.* targets of output; *b.* quality of products; *c.* experiment in new products; *d.* new techniques; *e.* advanced targets; *f.* raw material economy and discovery and use of substitutes; *g.* labor organization, labor insurance, wages, and welfare; *h.* costs; *i.* sinking fund and variable capital for production; *j.* division of labor and co-ordination between enterprises; *k.* equilibrium of supply, manufacture, and sales; *l.* geological exploration; *m.* uses of resources; *n.* design and manufacture. These are preliminary items. Later [we] must step by step develop a forty-point program for industrial development.
3. Party committee at all levels must get down to socialist agricultural work. Again fourteen items: *a.* targets of output; *b.* irrigation; *c.* fertilizers; *d.* soil; *e.* seeds; *f.* changes in the system of farming, such as enlarging the areas of a second crop, changes from late to early crops, from dry [rice] to paddy, etc.; *g.* diseases and pests; *h.* mechanization (modern tools, two-wheel and two-blade ploughs, pumps, tractors designed to suit different local conditions in China, motorized transport vehicles, etc.); *i.* intensified farming; *j.* animal husbandry; *k.* subsidiary products; *l.* afforestation; *m.* elimination of the 'four pests', *n.* medical and health services. These are fourteen items in the forty-point program of agrarian development, which should be put into practice as a whole.

The purpose of singling out these fourteen items is to show where the emphasis of the program lies. Once they are grasped, the program as a whole will consequently be materialized.

4. The three important methods are: over-all planning, regular inspection, and annual reviews and comparisons. By them, both the over-all situation and the details will receive appropriate attention, experiences can be summed up and outstanding achievements can be made known in time; morale can be heightened in order to make a concerted progress.

5. The method of timing is: the previous winter determines what can be done in this year, this year determines what can be done in the next two years, and the first three years determine what can be done in a quinquennium. [We] should have greater confidence [in our work] with emphasis on different periods of time.

6. There must be at least four inspections per annum — once each season at the Center and the provincial level whereas [the number of inspections] at lower level is to be decided according to [local] conditions. Monthly inspection is necessary before an important task gets into a smooth running order. This is a method of timing over the period of a year.

7. How to review and compare? Province with province, city with city, county with county, commune with commune, factory with factory, mine with mine, and work site with work site. Agreed rules of comparison are not absolutely necessary. It is easier to review and compare agricultural [than industrial achievements]. In industries, [we] just compare what is comparable in a given line of production.

8. When to submit plans? Province, autonomous regions, cities, special regions, and counties should formulate their plans according to Points 1, 2, and 3, which must have foci of attention. They must not try to do everything at the same time. The plans of districts, villages, and communes must essentially be based on Point 3, but the items may be increased or reduced in the light of local conditions. They should draw up a five-year plan first, which may be in an outline form, to be submitted before 1 July 1958. The plans should be examined level after level. To facilitate comparison, a provincial committee should select the best and worst from county, district, village, and commune plans and submit them to the Center for consideration, but all provincial and special region plans should be sent up to the Center.

9. There are three production plans: two are central plans — one must be fulfilled; this is the one to be published and the other is expected to be fulfilled but not to be published. Two are local plans — the first local plan is the second central plan which from the point of view of a locality must be fulfilled, and the other is expected to be fulfilled. The second central plan is the basis of comparison.

10. From this year onward, the party committees of provinces, cities, and autonomous regions must really get down to manufacturing industries, public and business finance, and commerce. Each year, they should review these problems four times, especially in

July (or August), November, and the first ten days in January. If we refuse to come to grips with them the slogan of 'Overtaking Britain in Fifteen Years' will be like a burst bubble. Cadres shouldering important responsibilities in industrial, financial, and commercial departments should go to local meeting places — those at the Central level should go to the regions; those at the provincial, city, and autonomous region levels should go to special regions, suburbs, and counties. This is also what the comrades at the Center and in the regions want to do.

11. The [total] value of industrial output at a place (including those of the factories and mines taken over from the center and of the publicly Owned industries and handicrafts which have always been managed by local authorities, but excluding those of the factories directly managed by the center) must within five, seven, or ten years overtake the (total) value of agricultural output of that place. All the provinces and cities must at once get down to drawing up their plans before 1 July. This is in the main to make industries serve agriculture. All of us should do some industrial work so that we know what it is all about.

12. The forty-point program for agrarian development should be fulfilled in five, six, seven, or eight years and it should be discussed by all the provincial, city, and autonomous region party committees. In the country as a whole, it may not be possible to fulfil all the forty points in five years, but it may be generally possible in six or seven years or more likely in eight years.

13. [We] must strive to make a basic change in the appearance of most areas in three years and the [next] three years will determine [the achievement] of the [next] decade. In the rest of the country [we] may fix a longer period [for the task]. Our slogan: Bitter struggle for three years. Our method: Arouse the masses in an entirely uninhibited manner — and everything must be tried out first.

14. Oppose wastefulness. During the rectification, each unit must devote a few days to a bloom-contend-rectify-reform campaign directed against wastefulness. Every co-operative, every shop, every office, every school, and every military unit must seriously conduct its own anti-wastefulness campaign and will continue to do so once every year.

15. In our national economy, the question of an optimum ratio between [capital] accumulation and consumption is one of cardinal importance to our economic development, which should be studied by all of us.

16. What should also be studied is the question of the ratio between accumulation and consumption in the agricultural co-operatives. The views of comrades in Hupei are as follows. On the basis of the production and distribution of 1957, future increases in production should be divided 40/60 (i.e. 40 per cent to members of co-operatives and 60 per cent for co-operative accumulation), 50/50, or 60/40 (i.e. 60 per cent to members of co-operatives and 40 per cent for co-operative accumulation). At places where production and income have reached the level of wealthy middle peasants, after bloom-contend debates and after agreement has been reached among the masses, the increase in

production may be either divided 30/70 (i.e. 30 per cent to the members of co-operatives and 70 per cent for co-operative accumulation) or not divided at all in one or two years in order to enlarge the accumulation in preparation for a great leap forward. All the regions are requested to discuss the adequacy of this suggestion.

17. The contradiction between collective and individual economies must be resolved by fixing an adequate ratio between them. The present situation is like this. In the income of some rural households at some places, the ratio between individual and collective economies is 60/40 or 70/30 (i.e. income from domestic subsidiary production and the private plot makes up 60 or 70 per cent of the total income of a household). This situation inevitably affects the peasants' enthusiasm for socialist collective economy and must be altered. The provinces can find a way to control it through bloom-contend debates, and make suitable readjustment of the economic relations. On the basis of encouraging the peasants' enthusiasm in production and a comprehensive development in production, [we] must in a few years gradually change the ratio of individual and collective economies to 30/70 or 20/80 (i.e. the peasants get 70 or 80 per cent of their income from co-operatives).

18. Popularize experimental fields. This is a very important method of leadership. In this way the style of our party's leadership in the field of economy will rapidly change. In the country, the experimental fields are important; in the cities it is the advanced factories, mines, machine-tool shops, work sites, or work sections. A break-through at one point may induce the rest [of the entire system] to move.

19. Seize both ends and drag the middle along with them. This is an excellent method of leadership. Every situation has two ends — the advanced and backward extremes. Once you seize them, the middle can be dragged along with them. This is a dialectical method, too, [because] to seize the two ends, the advanced and backward extremes, is to seize a pair of opposites.

20. Two other good methods of leadership are to organize tours for cadres and the masses to see and learn from advanced experience and to organize exhibitions of good quality products and their techniques of production. These methods can raise the technological level, popularize advanced experience and encourage competition. Many problems can be solved by an on-the-spot inspection. Communes, villages, provinces and counties may organize tours to visit each other, while the Center, provinces, cities, special regions and counties may organize exhibitions of manufactures.

21. Uninterrupted revolution. Our revolutions come one after another. Starting from the seizure of power in the whole country in 1949, there followed in quick succession the anti-feudal land reform, the agricultural co-operativization, and the socialist reconstruction of private industries, commerce and handicrafts. The three great socialist reforms — i.e. the socialist revolution in the ownership of means of production — were basically completed in 1956 and there came the socialist revolution on the ideological and political front last year. This revolution may draw to the end of one stage by 1 July this year, but the problems [involved] are not yet solved. For a considerable

period of time to come they will continue to be solved by annual bloom-contend-rectify-reform campaigns. [But] now we must start a technological revolution so that we may overtake Britain in fifteen or more years. Chinese economy is backward and China is materially weak. This is why we have been unable to take much initiative; we are spiritually restricted. We are not yet liberated in this sense. We must make a spurt [forward in production]. We may have more initiative in five years, and more still in ten. After fifteen years, when our foodstuffs and iron and steel become plentiful, we shall take a much greater initiative. Our revolutions are like battles. After a victory, we must at once put forward a new task. In this way, cadres and the masses will forever be filled with revolutionary fervour, instead of conceit. Indeed, they will have no time for conceit, even if they like to feel conceited. With new tasks on their shoulders, they are totally preoccupied with the problems for their fulfilment. The technological revolution is designed to make every one learn technology and science. The rightists say that we are small intellectuals incapable of leading big intellectuals. Some even suggest that we ‘buy’ old cadres — pensioning them off, because they do not understand science and technology although they know how to fight and how to conduct land reform. We must summon up our energy to learn technology so as to accomplish the great technological revolution history has left to us [to accomplish]. This question must be discussed at a conference of cadres, to find out what other talents we have. In the past we had talents in fighting and land reform. These talents are not enough now and we must learn new things such as a real understanding of business matters, science and technology. If we do not, we shall not be able to lead. In ‘On the People’s Democratic Dictatorship’, which I wrote in 1949, I have said: ‘The serious task of economic reconstruction lies before us. We shall soon put aside some of the things we know well. This means difficulties. . . . We must overcome difficulties. We must learn what we do not know.’ Eight years have passed [since this was written]. In the eight years, one revolution followed another. They preoccupied our thoughts, thus leaving little time for us to learn science and technology. From this year onward, simultaneously with the accomplishment of the continued socialist revolution on the ideological and political front, [we] must shift the foci of attention of the whole party. Members of party committees at all levels may prepare the ground for this by explaining it to the cadres, but for the time being there is not yet the need to publicize it in the newspapers. We shall say a great deal about it after 1 July when the basic level rectification will have been more or less completed and when the party’s focus of attention can be transferred to a technological revolution. With the focus on technology, [we are] apt to neglect politics. Therefore [we] must carefully combine technology with politics.

22. Red and expert, politics and business—the relationship between them is the unification of contradictions. We must criticize the apolitical attitude. [We] must oppose empty-headed ‘politicoes’ on the one hand and disoriented ‘practicoes’ on the other.

It is beyond any doubt that politics and economy, politics and technology must be unified. This must be so and will for ever be so. This is the meaning of ‘red and expert’. The term, ‘politics’, will continue to exist, but in a different sense. To ignore ideology and politics, to be always preoccupied with business matters—the result will be a disoriented economist or technologist and that is dreadful. Ideological and political work

is the guarantee for the completion of economic, technological work and it serves the economic base. Ideology and politics are, moreover, the commanders, the 'sour'. A slight relaxation in our ideological and political work will lead our economic and technological work astray.

At present there is on the one hand the grave class struggle between the socialist and imperialist worlds; on the other there still exist classes and class struggle within our country. [We] must give these two aspects [of class struggles] our full consideration. In the past politics meant basically struggles against [our] class enemies. But once the people have seized political power, the relationship between the people and the government is essentially an internal relationship among the people. The method [of political struggle] to be employed is [therefore] persuasion not suppression. This is a new political relationship. This government uses various degrees of suppression only temporarily on the criminals who break the law and order of society, and used them to supplement persuasion. In the transition from capitalism to socialism, there are still anti-socialist elements hiding among the people, e.g. the bourgeois rightists. With regard to the problems of these people, our solutions are essentially the bloom-contend type of mass debate. Suppression applies only to serious counter-revolutionary saboteurs. When the transition is over and classes are eliminated, the politics of a country become purely a matter of internal relationship among the people. Even then, ideological and political struggles between men and revolutions will continue to occur; they will never cease. The laws of unification of contradictions, of quantitative to qualitative changes and of affirmation and negation will hold good universally and eternally. However, the nature of struggles and revolutions will be different. They will not be class struggles, but struggles between advanced and backward techniques. The struggle during the transition from socialism to communism will also be a revolution. In the communist era there will be many, many phases of development. The development from one phase to another must necessarily be a relationship between quantitative and qualitative changes. All mutations, all leaps forward are revolutions which must pass through struggles. The theory of cessation of struggles is sheer metaphysics.

Political workers must have some knowledge of business matters. It may be difficult to know a lot [about them]; but it will not do to know only a little. They must know something. [Those who] have no practical knowledge are pseudo-red, empty-headed politicoes. . [We] must unite politics and technology. In agriculture [this means] experimental fields and in industries it means picking out the advanced types and trying out new techniques and new products. The method to be used is comparison. Compare the advanced with the backward under identical conditions and encourage the backward to catch up with the advanced. They are the two extremes of a contradiction and comparison is the unification of them. Disequilibria exist between enterprises, machine shops, teams and individuals. Disequilibrium is a general, objective rule. The cycle, which is endless, evolves from disequilibrium to equilibrium and then to disequilibrium again. Each cycle, however, brings us to a higher level of development. Disequilibrium is normal and absolute whereas equilibrium is temporary and relative. The changes into equilibrium or disequilibrium in our national economy consist of the process of an overall quantitative change and many qualitative changes . After a certain number of years,

China will complete a leap by transforming herself from an agrarian to an industrial country. Then she will pick up the process of her quantitative changes again.

Comparison applies not only to production and technology, but also to politics, i.e. to the art of leadership in an endeavor to find out who are better leaders.

23. The superstructure must meet the needs of the development of the economic base and productive force. A part of the superstructure is the rules and regulations formulated by government departments. Many of them, drawn up during the past eight years, are still applicable, but a considerable number of them have become obstacles to heightening the activism of the masses and the development of the productive force. The latter kind should be revised or abolished. Recently, the masses had acquired many advanced experiences, e.g. the improved workers' welfare scheme at the Shihchingshan Power Station, the improved workers' dormitory system at the Hsiangchiang Machine Manufacturing Factory, the improved bonus system at the Ch'iyeh Power Station in Kiangsu, and the amalgamation of several first-grade commercial enterprises in Kwangsi thereby reducing their employees from 2,400 to 350 (i.e. a cut of six-sevenths). In revising or abolishing irrational rules and regulations, [we] must establish a general principle — under the premise of developing socialist enterprises according to the principles of 'more, faster, better and more economical', of planning and of [keeping things] to the right proportions, on the basis of raising [the standard] of understanding of the masses, [we] permit and encourage the masses to break those rules and regulations which restrict the development of the productive force.

All the departments of the Center and the party committees of all the provinces, cities and autonomous regions should send responsible comrades to the basic level units of all localities to sum up advanced experiences of the masses. They should develop innovations of this kind [attained] at the basic level and by the masses which are beneficial to socialist construction, recommend them to the authorities concerned for approval, stop the operation of some articles in the existing rules and regulations in these basic level units and spread their advanced experiences to other units.

All departments of the Center and the party committees of all the provinces, cities and autonomous regions should in this respect systematically sum up exemplifying and mature advanced experiences. The more important and nationally significant kinds should have the approval of the Center and the State Council; the locally significant kinds need only have the approval of the local party committees or local governments; the technically significant kinds have to have the approval of the departments concerned. Then they are popularized among similar units throughout the country or province. After a period of time, if it is necessary, old rules and regulations will be revised or new ones introduced in the light of new experiences. This is the mass-line method of formulating and revising rules and regulations.

24. The rectification must be carried through to the end. The party as a whole should summon up its energy to get rid of bureaucratism, to come to grips with reality, and to

unite with the people. It must do its best to rectify the mistakes and weaknesses in its work, style and institutions.

25. Members of the party committees of the Center, provinces, cities and autonomous regions, apart from the old and sick, should leave their offices for four months every year, to investigate and study at a lower level and to attend meetings at various places. They ought to adopt the methods of 'flower viewing on horse back' and 'flower viewing at a lower level'. It is of some use even if [one] pays a flying visit to a place for only three or four hours [one] must contact workers and peasants and enhance one's real understanding. Some of the conferences of the Centre may be held away from Peking; some of those of a provincial [party] committee may be held away from the capital of the province.

26. [We] must adopt an attitude of genuine equality towards cadres and the masses and make people feel that relationships among men are truly equal. [We] must make others feel that there is full and openhearted communication. [We] must learn from Lu Hsun, who communicated with his readers and evoked responses from them. People do different work and hold different jobs. No matter how high one's position is, one must appear among people as an ordinary worker. One must not assume airs; one must get rid of bureaucratism. One must patiently listen to the end [of what others say] and consider the divergent views expressed by the lower grades. One must not lose one's temper as soon as one hears an opinion different [from one's own] and take it as a personal insult. This is one way of treating people as one's equal.

27. Members of party committees at all levels, especially those responsible ones who resolutely follow the correct line of the Centre, must be prepared for criticism. If the criticism is correct, we must accept it and reform ourselves; if it is not, especially if it is foul, we must toughen the skin of our head^[1] and take [whatever is showered upon us]. Then we investigate [the charges] before acting on the criticism. Under such circumstances, [we] must not bend ourselves to whichever way the wind is blowing; [we] must fearlessly stand up against the wind. We have already passed the test in 1957.

28. The party's leadership principles must be discussed at the cadre meetings of the provincial, district and county and perhaps also the village levels, in an attempt to make sure whether the principles are correct.

'Concentrate important powers in one hand;
Diffuse less important ones.
Decisions are to be taken by party committees
And to be carried out by all concerned.
Implementation implies decision-making,
But this must not deviate from the principles.
As to inspecting work
Party committees have that responsibility.'

In these few lines, the responsibility of party committees is shown to consist of decision-making on matters of importance and inspecting the implementation of the decisions. 'Concentrate important powers in one hand' is an old saying which normally means personal dictatorship. We use it to mean that essential powers should be concentrated collectively in the hands of the party committees of the Center and regions, so as to combat the diffusion of powers. How can important powers be diffused? These eight lines were coined in 1953 with the diffusion of powers at that time in mind. 'And to be carried out by all concerned' does not mean implementation of decisions by members of the party alone. It means that members of the party should get in touch and discuss and consult with others in government organizations, in co-operatives, in independent bodies and in cultural and educational institutions, modify what is inadequate and obtain a general agreement before carrying out the decisions. The word 'principles' in the third couplet refers to the party representing the highest form of proletarian organization, democratic centralism, the unification of collective leadership and the role of the individual (i.e. the unification [of the contradiction] between a party committee and its first secretary) and decision-taking at the Center or a high level.

29. Is it necessary to consult the first secretary on everything? No, only on important matters. There must be the second and third in command who can take over when the first secretary is absent.

30. Party committees must handle military affairs, placing armed units under their supervision. Basically this remains the situation today and this has been a good tradition of our armed forces. Comrades engaged in military work want central and local party committees to handle these matters. In recent years, [however], we handled less because of our preoccupation with social reform-and economic construction. This tendency must be averted by dealing with military matters periodically every year.

31. Meetings of large, medium and small sizes are necessary and should be arranged well by the departments or at various places. Small size meetings of a few or one or two dozen are better for discovering and discussing problems. Large ones of over a thousand can adopt only the method of discussion following reports and they should not be too frequent, perhaps twice a year. But there must be at least four small and medium size meetings which are better held at a low level. [For instance] a provincial [party] committee may call a meeting of the county party secretaries of a district or of several districts; members of the Center or of the State Council may go to districts separately to call meetings there. An economic co-operative district may call a meeting whenever there are problems to discuss, at least four times a year.

32. The method of meeting must be the unification of [factual] materials and views. It is a very bad method if it fails to link up material with views, to review material without any view, or to expound views without material [to substantiate them]. The worst is to present a great pile of material without either a favourable or an unfavourable view. [We] must learn to use material to explain our views. [We] must have material but [we must] also have a clear and definite view [on how] to control it. There must not be too much material, just enough to make clear our views. [We] need anatomize only one or two

sparrows, not too many [so to speak]. Although [we] must have a great deal of material at our disposal, [we] present only the representative pieces. [We] must understand that to hold a meeting is not to write a *magnum opus*.

33. Generally speaking, [we] must not impose a huge pile of material and views in a matter of a few hours on those who are not familiar with them. There must be several meetings a year to make people familiar with them. There must be several meetings a year to familiarize people with business matters. [We] must give them the kind of primary and processed source materials they need. [We] must not present to them only the finished products, the conclusions, suddenly in a morning [so to speak]. [They] need a trickle not a deluge of several hundred centimeters. The system of 'compulsory instruction' must be abolished. 'Rubber stamping' must be reduced to the minimum. Perfect communication comes from sharing the necessary information in the first place.

34. The question of ten fingers. A man has ten fingers and a cadre must learn to see the differences between nine fingers and one, or the difference between a majority and minority of fingers. Nine fingers are not the same as one finger. This seems an elementary matter, but not many people understand it. Therefore we must publicize this point of view — the differences between the larger and smaller situations, general and specific [situations] and main and subsidiary trends [of development]. We must seize upon the main trend unless we want to tumble down. This is a question of understanding, of logic. It is more vivid and more suitable to our work to put it in the form of nine fingers and one finger. Unless there is a mistake in its basic line, our work depends mainly on its achievements. This view, however, does not apply to some people, e.g. the rightists. All the fingers of many extreme rightists are diseased. That is why they may remain at school.

35. 'Attack one or a few points, exaggerate them and ignore the rest.' This is an unpractical, metaphysical method. In 1957 the bourgeois rightists virulently attacked socialism in precisely this way. Our party had been harmed grievously by this method in its [past] history, i.e. when it was dominated by dogmatism. The [Li] Li-san line, revisionism, or rightist opportunism, the Ch'en Tu-hsiu line and Wang Ming line during the anti-Japanese war period, [all] employed this method. In 1935 Chang Kuo-t'ao used it and in 1953 the Kao Kang-Jao Shu-shih anti-party alliance used it too. We must sum up our experience in the past and criticize this method from the point of the theory of knowledge and methodology in an attempt to awaken our cadres so that they may not be harmed by it any more. Even good people when they are wrong may unconsciously adopt this method; therefore it is necessary for them to study methodology.

36. The process of conceptualization, judgment and reasoning, are the processes of investigation and study and thinking. The human brain can reflect the objective world, although it is not easy to do so correctly. Correct reflection or the reflection which is closest to reality can be arrived at only after thinking and rethinking. Having arrived at the correct point of view and correct thought, [we] must design an adequate way of expressing them [to make them intelligible] to others. The processes of conceptualization, judgment, reasoning are the processes 'from the people'; those of communicating one's

own points of view and thoughts to others are the processes 'to the people'. This simple truth is perhaps not yet grasped by many of our cadres. However great a man may be, his thoughts, views, plans and methods are a mere reflection of the objective world and the raw materials and half-digested facts [for this conceptualization] come from the practice of the masses or his own scientific experiments. His mind is only a processing plant in which finished products are manufactured. Otherwise it is utterly useless. The usefulness and correctness of such finished products are tested by the popular masses. Unless our comrades understand this, they will bang their heads on a nail.

37. Essays and documents must be written precisely, clearly and in a lively [manner]. Precision is a matter of logic, of concepts, judgments and reasoning. Clarity and liveliness are matters of both logic and rhetoric. Most essays nowadays suffer from, *a.* vague conceptualization, *b.* inadequate judgment, *c.* a lack of logic in the process of using concepts and judgment in reasoning, *d.* a lack of literary merit. [As a result] reading an essay becomes an ordeal, a gigantic waste of energy for very little reward. This bad tendency must be averted. Comrades engaged in economics work must pay attention not only to precision but also to clarity and liveliness when they are drafting [something]. [They] must not think [clarity and liveliness] are [only] for language and literature teachers, not for gentlemen like themselves. Important documents must be written, not by the second or third, but by [the first in command] himself or jointly [with the others].

38. [We] must not depend on secretaries or 'back-benchers' [underlings?] entirely. [We] must do things ourselves, accepting only other people's help. The secretary system should not be allowed to become an epidemic. Wherever a secretary is unnecessary, there should not be one. To depend entirely on secretaries for everything is a symptom of the decline of revolutionary spirit.

39. Learn some natural and applied sciences.

40. Learn some philosophy and political economy.

41. Learn some history and jurisprudence.

42. Learn some literature.

43. Learn some grammar and logic.

44. [I] propose that responsible comrades in the Centre, provinces, and cities voluntarily learn a foreign language, aiming at the middle school standard in five or ten years.

45. Those who are shouldering heavy responsibility at the Centre and the provincial level may each have an apprentice secretary.

46. A cadre from another place should learn the dialect of the place [where he works]; all cadres should learn the *p'u-t'ung-hua* [the standard Han-Chinese]. [We] must draw up a five-year plan, aiming at a certain [linguistic] standard. Han cadres who work in minority

area must learn the language of that minority. Likewise cadres of a minority must learn Han-Chinese.

47. All the departments of the Centre, provinces, special regions, and counties should foster '*hsiu-ts'ai*' [young people of intellectual potential]. It will not do to be without an intelligentsia. [But] the proletariat must have its own intelligentsia which knows more about Marxism and has achieved a certain cultural standard, scientific knowledge, and literary facility.

48. All secondary technical schools and schools for technicians should, if possible, experiment in setting up workshops and farms to attain complete or partial self-sufficiency by engaging in production. Students should do part-time study and part-time work. Under favorable conditions, these schools can take on more students but should not at the same time cost the country more money

All the industrial colleges should try to set up laboratories and workshops for teaching and research and also for production. In addition, their students and teachers may sign contracts with local factories to take part in their work.

49. All agricultural schools, apart from productive work on their own farms, may sign work contracts with local agricultural co-operatives. Their teachers should be sent to the co-operatives enabling them to unite their theory with practice. Local co-operatives should recommend qualified students to study at these schools.

The middle and primary schools of a village should sign contracts with local co-operatives to take part in agricultural and subsidiary production. Rural students should make use of their summer vacation, other holidays, and leisure time to work in their own village.

50. Under favourable conditions, universities and urban middle schools may jointly set up factories or workshops and they may sign work contracts with factories, work sites, or service industries.

All universities and middle and primary schools which have land should run their own farms. Those which do not have land of their own may participate in the production work of the agricultural co-operatives on the outskirts of a city.

51. Develop a patriotic public health campaign centering on the elimination of the 'four pests', and have monthly inspections this year, so that the groundwork of [this campaign] may be laid. Other pests may be added to the list according to local conditions.

52. The Center, provinces, and special regions may set up chemical fertilizer plants. The chemical industrial departments of the Center ought to help the regions in designing medium or small-scale plants of this kind and the engineering departments of the Center ought to help equip them.

53. The provinces, autonomous regions, and cities should set up farming-tool research institutes specially responsible for the improvement of tools and medium to small sized machines. They should have a close association with farming-tool factories so that once an improved tool is designed it can be given to a factory to produce.

54. In the Lien-meng commune of Hsiaokan, Hupei, some land produces 2,130 catties per mou in one crop a year; in the Ch'ien-chin commune of Jenshou, Szechwan, the land produces 1,680 catties per mou in one crop a year; in the Ch'ing-ho commune of Ichun, Shensi, some of its hilly land produces 1,650 catties per mou; in the Na-p'o commune of Paise, Kwangsi, some land produces 1,600 catties per mou in one crop a year. The experience gained by these examples of high yields in one crop should be studied and emulated by other places.

55. The problem of adequate proportions of different kinds of seeds [i.e. the sowing of several types of seed of the same crop in a given area] should be studied at various places.

56. Root-crops are extremely useful things — for human and pig consumption, for distilleries, for making sugar, and for making noodles, which may be manufactured at various places. The planting of root-crops should be popularized in conjunction with adequate planning.

57. Afforestation. Trees that can be planted at any time of the year should be planted every season; those that can be planted only in two or three seasons of the year should be planted in those seasons.

58. In the special region, Shanglo, in Shensi, every household grows a pint of walnuts. This experience is well worth studying. It may be extended to other cash crops such as fruit, mulberry, oak, tea, cashew and oil, if the masses agree to it after a bloom-contend type of discussion.

59. Forests should be measured in terms of covered areas. The covered areas and their ratios [to the un-covered areas] in all the provinces, special regions, and counties should be measured and then the target for covered areas [at each place] can be determined.

60. Before September this year the question of my retirement from the Chairmanship of the Republic should be raised at the bloom-contend type of meetings, first among cadres of all grades and then in factories, in an attempt to sound out the views of both the cadres and the masses and to arrive at a majority agreement to it. My retirement from the Chairmanship of the Republic and concentration on [the duties] of the Chairman of the party Center will enable me to save a great deal of time in order to meet the demands of the party. This is also the way most suitable to my condition. If during discussions the masses are opposed to this proposal, it must be explained to them. Whenever the nation is urgently in need [of my services] and if the party decides [to recall me], I will shoulder this leadership task once again. Now the country is at peace, it is better for me to be relieved of the Chairmanship. This request has been agreed to and regarded as a good

move by the Politburo of the Center and by many comrades in the Center and other places. Please explain all this clearly to cadres and the masses so as to avoid misconstruction.

The method of communication [of the results] of these conferences: The views should be explained clearly and gradually to cadres. Do not adopt the method of a 'sudden deluge'.

The views recorded here are all suggestions. Our comrades should take them back [to their respective regions] to sound out the cadres. They can be refuted or developed. They are to be drawn up as a formal documents after a few months.

Notes

[1.] To receive a setback in one's career is, in a Chinese metaphor, 'to knock one's head against a nail'. Therefore one needs to toughen the skin of one's head so as to be able to sustain setbacks.

[Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung](#)

Talks At The Chengtu Conference

March 1958

(a) Talk of 10 March

Codes and conventions constitute a problem, and I would like to use this problem as an example to discuss the question of ideological method — upholding principles while displaying the creative spirit.

Internationally we should be on friendly terms with the Soviet Union, all the people's democracies and the communist parties and working classes of all nations; we should pay proper attention to internationalism, and learn from the good points of the Soviet Union and other foreign countries. This is a principle. But there are two methods of learning: one is merely to imitate, and the other is to apply the creative spirit. Learning should be combined with creativity. To import Soviet codes and conventions inflexibly is to lack the creative spirit.

From its foundation up to the Northern Expedition (from 1921 to 1927) our Party was comparatively lively, even allowing for Ch'en Tu-hsiu's[1] bourgeois ideology dressed

up as Marxism. We founded our Party in the third year following the victory of the October Revolution. Those who founded the Party were all young people who had participated in the May Fourth Movement and been influenced by it. After the October Revolution, while Lenin was still alive, while the class struggle was very acute and Stalin had still not come to power, they too were full of life. The origin of Ch'en Tu-hsiu-ism lay in foreign social democracy and our native bourgeoisie. During this period, though there occurred the mistakes of Ch'en Tu-hsiu-ism, generally speaking there was no dogmatism.

From the beginning of the Civil War period up to the Tsunyi Conference (from 1927 to 1935) three separate 'leftist' lines arose in the Chinese Party, and the one from 1934 to 1935 was the worst.[2] At that time the Soviet Union had won victory over the Trotskyites, though on the theoretical plane they had only defeated the Deborin school.[3] The Chinese 'left' opportunists had nearly all been influenced while in the Soviet Union. Of course, this is not to say that all those who went to Moscow were dogmatists. Among the many who were in the Soviet Union at the time, some were dogmatists, others were not; some were in touch with reality, others had no contact with reality but saw only foreign conditions. What is more, Stalin's role was beginning to be consolidated (it became firmly consolidated after the purge of counter-revolutionaries). The Comintern at that time was [run by] Bukharin, Pikov[4] and Zinoviev, while the head of the Eastern Bureau was Kuusinen and the head of the Far East Department was Mif. XXX[5] was a good comrade, humane, creative, but a bit too nice a chap. Mif's influence was the greater. These were the conditions which enabled dogmatism to develop, and some Chinese comrades were influenced by it too. Among young intellectuals there was also 'Leftist deviation'. At that time Wang Ming[6] and others set themselves up as the so-called '28½ Bolsheviks'. When several hundred were studying in the Soviet Union, how was it that there were only 28½? It was because they were so terribly 'left' that they became self-restricting and isolated, thus reducing the Party's contacts.

Chinese dogmatism had its own Chinese characteristics. These were expressed in warfare and in the question of the rich peasants. Because the number of rich peasants was very small we decided in principle to leave them alone, and to make concessions to them. But the 'Leftists' did not agree. They advocated 'giving the rich peasants bad land, and giving the landlords no land'. As a result the landlords had nothing to eat, and some of them fled to the mountains and formed bandit guerrilla bands. On the question of the bourgeoisie they advocated overthrowing them completely, destroying them not only politically but also economically, thereby confusing the democratic revolution with the socialist revolution. They made no analysis of imperialism, considering it all to be one uniform indivisible block supporting the Kuomintang.

In the period following the liberation of the whole country (from 1950 to 1957), dogmatism made its appearance both in economic and in cultural and educational work. A certain amount of dogmatism was imported in military work, but basic principles were upheld, and you still could not say that our military work was dogmatic. In economic work dogmatism primarily manifested itself in heavy industry, planning, banking and statistics, especially in heavy industry and planning. Since we didn't understand these

things and had absolutely no experience, all we could do in our ignorance was to import foreign methods. Our statistical work was practically a copy of Soviet work; in the educational field copying was also pretty bad, for example, the system of a maximum mark of five in the schools, the uniform five years of primary school,^[7] etc. We did not even study our own experience of education in the Liberated Areas. The same applied to our public health work, with the result that I couldn't have eggs or chicken soup for three years because an article appeared in the Soviet Union which said that one shouldn't eat them. Later they said one could eat them. It didn't matter whether the article was correct or not, the Chinese listened all the same and respectfully obeyed. In short, the Soviet Union was tops. In commerce it was less so, because there was more contact and exchange of documents with the Centre. There was also less dogmatism in light industry. The socialist revolution and the cooperativization of agriculture was not influenced by dogmatism because the Centre had a direct grasp of them. During the past few years the Centre has chiefly grasped the revolution and agriculture, and to a certain extent commerce.

Dogmatism appears under different sets of circumstances, which should be analysed and compared, and reasons for its appearance discovered.

1. We couldn't manage the planning, construction and assembly of heavy industrial plants. We had no experience, China had no experts, the minister was himself an outsider, so we had to copy from foreign countries, and having copied we were unable to distinguish good from bad. Also we had to make use of Soviet experience and Soviet experts to break down the bourgeois ideology of China's old experts. The greater part of Soviet planning was correctly applied to China, but part of it was incorrect. It was imported uncritically.

2. We lacked understanding of the whole economic situation, and understood still less the economic differences between the Soviet Union and China. So all we could do was to follow blindly. Now the situation has changed. Generally speaking, we are now capable of undertaking the planning and construction of large enterprises. In another five years we shall be capable of manufacturing the equipment ourselves. We also have some understanding of Soviet and Chinese conditions.

3. Having cleared away blind faith, we no longer have any spiritual burdens. Buddhas are made several times life-size in order to frighten people. When heroes and warriors appear on the stage they are made to look quite unlike ordinary people. Stalin was that kind of a person. The Chinese people had got so used to being slaves that they seemed to want to go on. When Chinese artists painted pictures of me together with Stalin, they always made me a little bit shorter, thus blindly knuckling under to the moral pressure exerted by the Soviet Union at that time. Marxism-Leninism looks at everyone on equal terms, and all people should be treated as equals. Khrushchev's complete demolition of Stalin at one blow was also a kind of pressure, and the majority of people within the Chinese Party did not agree with it. Others wished to submit to this pressure and do away with the cult of the individual. There are two kinds of cult of the individual. One is correct, such as that of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and the correct side of Stalin. These we ought to revere and

continue to revere for ever. It would not do not to revere them. As they held truth in their hands, why should we not revere them? We believe in truth; truth is the reflection of objective existence. A squad should revere its squad leader, it would be quite wrong not to. Then there is the incorrect kind of cult of the individual in which there is no analysis, simply blind obedience. This is not right. Opposition to the cult of the individual may also have one of two aims: one is opposition to an incorrect cult, and the other is opposition to reverence for others and a desire for reverence for oneself. The question at issue is not whether or not there should be a cult of the individual, but rather whether or not the individual concerned represents the truth. If he does, then he should be revered. If truth is not present, even collective leadership will be no good. Throughout its history, our Party has stressed the combination of the role of the individual with collective leadership. When Stalin was demolished some people applauded for their own personal reasons, that is to say because they wanted others to revere them. Some people opposed Lenin, saying that he was a dictator. Lenin's reply was straightforward: better that I should be a dictator than you! Stalin was very fond of Kao Kang[8] and made him a special present of a motor car. Kao Kang sent Stalin a congratulatory telegram every 15 August. Every province now has examples of this. Is Chiang Hua a dictator, or is Sha Wen-han?[9] This sort of problem has arisen in Kwangtung, Inner Mongolia, Sinkiang, Chinghai, Kansu, Anhwei and Shantung. Don't run away with the idea that the world is at peace. The situation is unstable. You may think you are 'on firm ground', but it will not remain firm. One day the continents will sink, the Pacific Ocean will become dry land, and we'll have to move house. Small earthquakes are a frequent occurrence. The Kao-Jao affair[10] was an earthquake of the eighth degree of magnitude . . .

4. We have forgotten the lessons of historical experience, and do not understand the comparative method, nor the establishment of opposites. As I said yesterday, many of our comrades, when confronted by numerous codes and conventions, do not consider whether there might be alternative formulae, and that they should choose those which are more suited to Chinese conditions, and reject the others. They do not make any analysis, nor use their brains. They do not make comparisons. In the past when we were opposing dogmatism, their journal, the *Bolshevik*, indulged in self-adulation saying that they were one hundred per cent correct. Their method was to attack one point or a few points and not to mention the rest. Their journal *True Words* attacked five big mistakes of the Central Soviet Area, without mentioning one single good point.[11]

In April 1956 I put forward the 'Ten Great Relationships', which made a start in proposing our own line for construction.[12] This was similar to that of the Soviet Union in principle, but had our own content. Among the 'Ten Great Relationships' five are primary: industry and agriculture; the coast and the interior; the Centre and the regions; the state, the collective and the individual; defence construction and economic construction. Expenditure on national defence should be small in peacetime. Administrative expenditure should be small at all times.

When Stalin was criticized in 1956, we were on the one hand happy, but on the other hand apprehensive. It was completely necessary to remove the lid, to break down blind faith, to release the pressure, and to emancipate thought. But we did not agree with

demolishing him at one blow. They do not hang up his picture, but we do. In 1950 I argued with Stalin in Moscow for two months. On the questions of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance, the Chinese Eastern Railway, the joint-stock companies and the border[13] we adopted two attitudes: one was to argue when the other side made proposals we did not agree with, and the other was to accept their proposal if they absolutely insisted. This was out of consideration for the interests of socialism. Then there were the two 'colonies', that is the North-East and Sinkiang, where people of any third country were not allowed to reside.[14] Now this has been rescinded. After the criticism of Stalin, the victims of blind faith had their eyes opened a bit. In order that our comrades recognize that the old ancestor[15] also had his faults, we should apply analysis to him, and not have blind faith in him. We should accept everything good in Soviet experience, and reject what is bad. Now we are a bit more skilful in this, and understand the Soviet Union a bit better, and understand ourselves.

In 1957, in '[On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People](#)', I raised the questions of the simultaneous development of industry and agriculture, of the road to industrialization, cooperativization, birth-control, etc. In that year a big thing happened, that was the nationwide Rectification Movement, the Anti-Rightist Movement, the mass criticism of our work. This was a great stimulus to the people's thinking.

In 1958 we have held three meetings at Hangchow, Nanning and Chengtu.[16] Everyone has expressed a lot of opinions at these meetings, we have done some hard thinking, and summarized our experience of the previous eight years. This was also a great stimulus to thought. A question which emerged at the Nanning Conference was the codes and conventions of the various departments of the State Council. They can be changed and they ought to be changed substantially. One way would be to meet the masses. Another way would be to promote big-character posters. Another question was that of devolution of power to the regions. We have begun to put this into effect. Now centralized power and devolved power exist simultaneously. It was decided at the Third Plenum last year that centralized power and devolved power should exist simultaneously, that power should be centralized where appropriate and devolved where that is appropriate. The devolution of power should, of course, not follow the pattern of bourgeois democracy. Before the advent of socialism bourgeois democracy is progressive, but once socialism has come it is reactionary. In the Soviet Union the Russian nationality comprises fifty per cent of the population, and the national minorities are fifty per cent, while in China the Han nationality is ninety four per cent, while the national minorities are six per cent. So we cannot go in for a union of republics.

The Chinese revolution won victory by acting contrary to Stalin's will. The fake foreign devil [in Lu Hsün's *True Story of Ah Q*] 'did not allow people to make revolution'. But our Seventh Congress advocated going all out to mobilize the masses and to build up all available revolutionary forces in order to establish a new China.[17] During the quarrel with Wang Ming from 1937 to August 1938, we put forward ten great policies, while Wang Ming produced sixty policies.[18] If we had followed Wang Ming's, or in other words Stalin's, methods the Chinese revolution couldn't have succeeded. When our revolution succeeded, Stalin said it was a fake. We did not argue with him, and as soon as

we fought the war to resist America and aid Korea, our revolution became a genuine one [in his eyes]. But when we brought out ‘On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People’ we talked about this question but they didn’t, and what’s more they said we were going in for liberalism, so it seemed that we were not genuine again. When this report of ours was published, the *New York Times* printed it complete, and also carried an article which claimed that China was being ‘liberalized’. It is quite natural for the bourgeoisie to clutch at straws when drowning. But bourgeois politicians are not altogether without discernment. For example when Dulles heard about our report he said he wanted to see it. Within a couple of weeks he had come up with a conclusion: China was bad through and through; the Soviet Union was a little better.[19] But the Soviet Union couldn’t see it, and sent us a memorandum because they feared we were moving to the right. When the Anti-Rightist Movement started, naturally our ‘liberalization’ vanished.

In short, our basic line is universal truth, but details differ. This applies to each country and to each province. There is unity and there are also contradictions. The Soviet Union stresses unity, and doesn’t talk about contradictions, especially the contradiction between the leaders and the led.

(b) Talk of 20 March

I am going to talk about four problems:

1. The mass movement for the improvement of agricultural implements must be extended to every single locality.[20] Its significance is very great, it is a sprout of the technical revolution, it is a great revolutionary movement. Several hundreds of millions of peasants are striving mightily to negate the negative aspect of carrying things on a pole over the shoulder.[21] Whenever they succeed in doing this, they reduce the labour force required to a fraction of what it was before; the economies resulting from the replacement of carrying-poles by mechanization greatly increase labour efficiency, and this, in turn, permits a further step forward in mechanization. This great country of China cannot be completely mechanized; there will always be some corners where mechanization is impracticable. In 1,000 years, 500 years, 100 years, 50 years, there will always be some things which are only partly mechanized — for example, making wooden boats. There are also some handicrafts which may yet survive hundreds of millions of years hence, such as the preparation of food, which will eternally remain a handicraft. Such activities constitute a unity of opposites with mechanization: their natures are different, but they must be combined.

2. Honan has put forward the slogan of carrying out the [grain-production targets of] four [hundred], five [hundred], and eight [hundred catties per mu][22], irrigation, the elimination of the four pests, and the abolition of illiteracy — all in the space of one year. It is possible that some of these things can be achieved, but even if all of them can be achieved, we should not say so in published reports. We should not even print reports

saying that it can all be done in two years, though such reports can be circulated for internal use. It is like land reform: in the beginning, we did not publish reports, but published them only when we could announce that the reform had been partly implemented. If everyone is trying to surpass everyone else, the country may be thrown into confusion [*kao-te t'ien-hsia ta luan*] as a result. The thing is to go ahead and carry it out energetically. Every province should not follow the same wind, as though when they say it can be done in one year in Honan, everyone should do it in one year, and when they say Honan is number one, every other province should strive to be first. That would not be good. There must always be a number one: 'Every three years, there is a *chuang-yüan*; a beauty is scarcely found once in a thousand years.' [23] Let Honan try it for a year, and if Honan achieves miracles, next year every province can launch another drive for a great leap forward — wouldn't that be better?

If, in the space of one year, they carry out the four, five, and eight, and abolish illiteracy, naturally there may be very great shortcomings. At the very least, the work will be crude, and the masses will be overly tense. We should do our work boldly and joyfully, not hesitantly and coldly.

All that is necessary is that the line should be correct — going all out and aiming high to achieve greater, faster, better, and more economical [results][24] (or an even more popular formulation of these phrases) — and then, within the next year, two years, or three to five years, we will carry out the Forty Articles. In that case, we certainly can't be regarded as not having any face, it can't be considered as dishonourable, and perhaps it could even be said to be a bit better than that. As for comparisons, they should be made four times a year. Cooperativization made Chou Hsiao-chou extremely tense.[25] In the transition to higher-stage cooperatives in Szechuan, XXX[26] took it easy and didn't hurry things, so that it was finished only in 1957, and conditions there weren't at all bad. What does it matter if it takes a year longer? It may even be a bit better. On the other hand, it isn't correct either to say that it will certainly take four or five years to complete [these tasks]. The problem is to see what the conditions are, and whether the level of consciousness of the masses has been raised or not. How many years are required will depend on objectively existing circumstances. There are two lines for building socialism: is it better to go about it coldly and deliberately, or boldly and joyfully? If we carry out the Forty Articles in eight or ten years, building socialism will not involve excluding [anyone] from the Party. In forty years, the Soviet Union has been able to produce only such a little bit of food and other stuff. If, in eighteen years, we can equal what they have done in the past forty years, it will naturally be all right, and we should do precisely that. For there are more of us, and the political conditions are different, too: we are livelier, ! and there is more Leninism here. They, on the other hand, have let part of Leninism go by the boards, they are lifeless and without vitality. Lenin's writings of the revolutionary period attacked people very fiercely, but his attacks were justified, he was in tune with the mood of the masses, he had given his heart to the masses.

The speed of construction is a thing that exists objectively. Everything which, objectively and subjectively, is capable of achievement, we must endeavour to achieve by going all out, aiming high, and producing greater, faster, better, and more economical results. But

that which cannot be achieved, we should not try to force ourselves to do. Right now there is a gust of wind, amounting to a force 10 typhoon. We must not impede this publicly, but within our own ranks [*nei-pu*] we must speak clearly, and damp down the atmosphere a little. We must get rid of the empty reports and foolish boasting, we must not compete for reputation, but serve reality. Some of the targets are high, and no measures have been taken to implement them; that is not good. In a word, we must have concrete measures, we must deal in reality. We must deal in abstractions, too — revolutionary romanticism is a good thing — but it is not good if there are no measures [for giving it practical effect].

3. Every two months, each province, city, and autonomous region must hold a meeting to make an investigation and sum up the results, a small meeting of from several people to a dozen or so. Coordinated regions[27] must also hold a meeting every two or three months. The changes in the course of the movement are very great, there must be exchange of information. The aim of the meetings is to coordinate the rhythm of production. While one wave has not yet fallen, another rises in turn; this is the unity of the opposites, fast and slow. Under the general line of going all out and aiming high to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results, a wave-like form of progress is the unity of the opposites, deliberation and haste, the unity of the opposites, toil and dreams. If we have only haste and toil, that is one-sided. To be concerned only with the intensity of labour — that won't do, will it? In all of our work, we must use both deliberation and haste. (For example, the Party secretary in Wuchang *hsien* did not take account of the peasants' sentiments, and wanted them to go on working on the reservoirs on the twenty-ninth day of the twelfth [lunar] month, so half of the civilian workers just took off.) This means also the unity of hard fighting with rest and consolidation. In the past, when we waged war, there had to be an interval between two campaigns for rest and consolidation, bringing our forces up to strength and training the soldiers. We could not keep fighting one battle after another — there is a rhythm in warfare, too. The one hundred per cent 'Bolshevization' carried out in the Central Soviet Area was opposed to rest and consolidation, and advocated: 'Be audacious and resolute, follow up victories and pursue the foe immediately, crush Nanchang.' How could that work?[28] The unity of the op! posites, hard fighting, and rest and consolidation, is a law; moreover, they are transformed into one another. There is nothing which does not undergo such transformation. 'Haste' is transformed into 'deliberation', and 'deliberation' is transformed into 'haste'. 'Toil' is transformed into 'dreams', and 'dreams' are transformed into 'toil'. It is the same with rest and consolidation, and hard fighting. Toil and dreams, deliberation and haste, also have [an element of] identity; rest and consolidation and hard fighting also have an element of identity. Going to bed and getting up is also a unity of opposites. I ask you, for example, who can guarantee that after getting up he will not go to bed? On the contrary: 'He who has been lying down for a long time thinks of getting up.' Going to bed is transformed into getting up, and getting up is transformed into going to bed. Convening a meeting moves towards its opposite, and is transformed into dismissing a meeting. As soon as a meeting is called, it bears within itself factors leading to its own dismissal. We can't meet for 10,000 years here in Chengtu. Wang Hsi-feng says, 'However grandiose the banquet, it must always come to an end.' [29] This is the truth. A statement cannot be rejected because of the speaker; our

judgement must be based on whether it is true or not. After a meeting is dismissed, problems accumulate again, until there is once more a transformation into convening a meeting. We unite, and then after we have carried out our work for a while, ideas diverge, and this is transformed into struggle; divergences arise, and once more there are splits. We can't go on uniting day after day and year after year. As soon as we talk about unity, there is disunity; disunity is unconditional. At the very time we talk of unity, there still remains disunity — ! sp; this is why we have work to do. To talk all the time about monolithic unity, and not to talk about struggle, is not Marxist-Leninist. Unity passes through struggle, only thus can unity be achieved. It is the same within the Party, as regards classes, and among the people. Unity is transformed into struggle, and then there is unity again. We cannot talk of monolithic unity alone, and not talk about struggle, about contradictions. The Soviet Union does not talk about the contradictions between the leaders and the led. If there were no contradictions and no struggle, there would be no world, no progress, no life, there would be nothing at all. To talk all the time about unity is 'a pool of stagnant water'; it can lead to coldness. We must destroy the old basis for unity, pass through a struggle, and unite on a new basis. Which is better — a stagnant pool, or 'the inexhaustible Yangtse comes roaring past'?[30] It's like this with the Party, and it's like this, too, with classes and the people. Unity-struggle-unity: this means we have done our work. Production is transformed into consumption, consumption is transformed into production. Production is carried out for the sake of consumption; production is carried out not merely for the sake of other toilers, the producers themselves are also consumers. If a person doesn't eat, he has no energy at all, and he can't produce. If he eats hot meals, he can do more work. Marx says: production also includes consumption. Production and consumption, construction and destruction, are unities of opposites, they are transformed into one another. The production of the Anshan Iron and Steel Works is done for the sake of consumption; in a few decades, the installations will be replaced. Sowing is transformed into reaping, reaping is transformed into sowing. Sowing consists in consuming seeds; after the seeds are sown, they move towards their opposite! , and are not called seeds, but rice plants, crops; after the crops are harvested, new seeds are once more obtained.

We must cite abundant examples, put forward several dozen or a hundred examples in order to explain the concepts of the unity of opposites and their transformation into one another. Only thus can we correct our ideology and raise our level of understanding. Spring, summer, autumn and winter are also transformed into one another. Elements of spring and summer are contained in autumn and winter. Birth and death are also transformed into one another. Living is transformed into dying, lifeless matter is transformed into living beings. I propose that when people over the age of fifty die, a party should be held to celebrate, for it is inevitable that men should die, this is a natural law.[31] Grain is an annual plant, every year it is born once, and dies once; moreover, the more that dies, the more that is born. To take [another] example, if pigs were not slaughtered, there would be fewer of them all the time; who would feed them?

The *Concise Philosophical Dictionary* makes a specialty of opposing me. It says the transformation of birth into death is metaphysical, and the transformation of war into peace is wrong.[32] In the last analysis, who is right? Let me ask: if living beings do not

result from the transformation of inanimate matter, where do they come from? In the beginning, there was nothing but inorganic matter on earth; organic matter appeared only subsequently. All living substances result from changes in twelve elements such as nitrogen and hydrogen.[33] All living beings result from the transformation of inanimate matter.

Sons are transformed into fathers, fathers are transformed into sons; women are transformed into men, men are transformed into women. Such transformations cannot take place directly, but, after marriage, sons and daughters are born; is this not transformation?

The oppressors and the oppressed are transformed into one another, as in the relations between bourgeoisie and landlords on the one hand, and workers and peasants on the other. Naturally, when we talk about these oppressors, we are referring to the old ruling classes, it is a matter of class dictatorship and not of individual oppressors.

War is transformed into peace, peace is the opposite of war. When there had been no fighting, that was peace; as soon as the 38th Parallel was crossed, that was war, and as soon as the armistice was concluded, that was peace again. Military affairs are politics under particular circumstances, they are the continuation of politics; politics is also a kind of war.

To sum up, quantitative changes are transformed into qualitative changes, and qualitative changes are transformed into quantitative changes. Europe is heavily infested with dogmatism, and the Soviet Union has some shortcomings, but all of this is bound to change, and if we don't do our work well, we can become rigid again. If, at such a time, our industry has become number one in the world, we might grow cocky, and then our thinking might ossify.

The finite is transformed into the infinite, the infinite is transformed into the finite. The dialectics of ancient times was transformed into the metaphysics of the Middle Ages, and the metaphysics of the Middle Ages was transformed into the dialectics of modern times. The universe, too, undergoes transformation, it is not eternal. Capitalism leads to socialism, socialism leads to communism, and communist society must still be transformed, it will also have a beginning and an end, it will certainly be divided into stages,[34] or they will give it another name, it cannot remain constant. If there were only quantitative changes and no qualitative changes, that would go against dialectics. There is nothing in the world that does not arise, develop, and disappear. Monkeys turned into men, mankind arose; in the end, the whole human race will disappear, it may turn into something else, at that time the earth itself will also cease to exist. The earth must certainly be extinguished, the sun too will grow cold — it is already much cooler than it was in ancient times. During the ice age, there was one change in two million years. When the ice came, a large part of all living creatures perished. Beneath the South Pole there is a great deal of coal, so you can see that in ancient times it was very warm there. In Yen-ch'ang *hsien* they have discovered petrified bamboo. (An author of the Sung dynasty said that bamboo grew in Yen-ch'ang in ancient times, but now it can't.)

All things must have a beginning and an end. Only two things are infinite: time and space. The infinite is made up of the finite. All things of whatever kind develop and change step by step.

I have talked about all this in order to extend and enliven our thinking. Whenever the mind becomes rigid, it is very dangerous. We must educate our cadres. The Central, provincial, regional, and hsien-level cadres are very important. Including all the various system,[35] there are several hundred thousand of them. In a word, we must do more thinking, we must not have constantly in mind the classic writings,[36] but we must make use of our brains and enliven our thinking.

4. The line for building socialism is still being created, but we already have the basic ideas. Of the 600 million people of the whole country, and the 12 million Party members, only a minority — only a few millions, I fear — feels that this line is correct. It may be that a great many people still have doubts, or are not aware. For example, when the peasants carried out irrigation, you couldn't say they were doubtful, but when it comes to the line, they are not aware. Or, to take another example, the number of those who really have faith in the campaign to get rid of the four pests has now gradually increased. I myself used to have doubts, and whenever I ran into someone, I would ask: 'Is it really possible or not to get rid of the four pests?' It was the same with cooperativization; so long as we had not demonstrated [its feasibility] there were bound to be doubts. There was also a part of the people who basically mistrusted it, amounting perhaps to a few tens of millions landlords, rich peasants, bourgeois, intellectuals, democratic personages, and even including some from within the labouring people, and a part of our cadres. At present, we have already induced a minority of people to feel that this line is correct. As for ourselves, we recognize that this line is correct, in theory and as demonstrated in practice in some of our work — for example, there is a substantial increase in production, we have had quite a few successes in our work, and the majority of the people feel at ease. Nevertheless, the Forty Articles, and overtaking England in fifteen years, are in the domain of theory. The four, five and eight have, for the most part, not yet been carried out, the industrialization of the whole country has not yet been carried out, overtaking England in fifteen years is still a slogan, the 156 key projects[37] have not yet all been built. There remains a question in my mind about producing, in the course of the second five-year plan, 20 million tons of steel. Is this a good thing, or will it throw everything into confusion? I'm not sure at present, so I want to hold meetings. We'll meet four times a year, and if there are problems, we will make adjustments. The situation after construction has been carried out must be one of the following: excellent, fairly good, not too good, bad, or great disorder [*ta luau*]. It looks as though, if disorder results, it won't be all that great, there will be just a spell of disorder, and then things may well move towards 'order' [*chih*]. The appearance of disorder contains within it some favourable elements, we should not fear disorder. In the course of building up industry in Hungary, disorders occurred, but now things are all right again.

The line has already begun to take shape, it reflects the creations of the masses in their struggles. This is a law. The leading organs have put forward some directives which reflect these creations. So many things we did not foresee. Laws exist objectively, they

cannot be diverted by man's will. For example, in 1955, when the high tide of cooperativization was seething, we did not foresee the emergence of the question of Stalin, of the Hungarian affair, and of the slogan 'Oppose adventurism'.^[38] How will it be next year? What else is likely to happen? What 'ism' will they oppose? Who can predict this? Concrete affairs cannot be foretold.^[39]

At present the reciprocal relations between people are determined by the relationship between three big classes:

The first is [composed of] imperialism, feudalism, bureaucratic capitalism, the rightists and their agents. If we do not carry out a revolution aimed at these, our productive forces will be fettered. The rightists make up two per cent of the bourgeoisie. The great majority of these can in future be changed and transformed — but that's another question.

The second is the national bourgeoisie, by which I mean all [the members of this class] except for the rightists. They are of a divided mind about the new China. They are drawn to us in spite of themselves, and at the same time they want to engage in capitalism. Now that they have passed through rectification, there have been some changes; we may perhaps have the support of two thirds of them. Incidentally, the democratic parties and groups in Peking have called a big meeting for self-criticism, reform, and oath-taking;^[40] such meetings should be held in the whole country.

The third is the left, that is to say the labouring people, the workers, the peasants. (In reality there are four classes — the peasants are a separate class.)

The line has already begun to take shape, but it has yet to be perfected and verified in practice, so we cannot say that it is finally complete. The workers put on airs of extravagance *vis-a-vis* the peasants, and some cadres strive for fame and position — all this is bourgeois thinking. If we do not resolve these problems, we will not do well in production; if we do not sort out these reciprocal relations, how can we do our work well? In the past, we put far too little thought into construction; most of our energy was devoted to making revolution. Mistakes will inevitably be committed. It is impossible not to commit them. The commission of mistakes is a necessary condition for the formation of a correct line. The correct line is formulated with reference to the erroneous line, the two constitute a unity of opposites. The correct line is formed in the struggle with the incorrect line. To say that mistakes can all be avoided, [so that] there are only correct things, and no mistakes, is an anti-Marxist proposition. The problem lies in committing fewer mistakes, and less serious ones. The correct and the erroneous are a unity of opposites, the theory of inevitability is correct. That there should be only correct things, and nothing erroneous, as without precedent in history, it amounts to denying the law of the unity of opposites. It is metaphysical. If there were only men and no women, if women were negated, what would we do then? It is possible to strive for a situation in which very few mistakes are committed. The number of mistakes [should be like] the relation between a giant and a dwarf. It is possible to commit few errors, and we must achieve this. Marx and Lenin achieved it.

(c) Talk of 22 March

‘People do not go to a Buddhist temple for no reason,’ [41] and I have a number of problems on which I would like to exchange views with you. In the play *The Story of the Western Chamber* [42] there is an episode involving the two characters Chang Sheng and Hui Ming. Tiger Sun has surrounded the P’u Chin Monastery and the scholar Chang Sheng wants to get a message through to his friend, the White Horse General, to bring him to the rescue. There is nobody to carry the message and so they hold a mass meeting at which Hui Ming steps forward and volunteers to go. Hui Ming is depicted as a courageous, bold and resolute fellow. I hope that China will have more Hui Mings to develop a movement of ‘great airing of views, great blooming and big-character posters’ [43] among the hundreds of thousands of people at county [*hsien*] committee level and above, in order to criticize the leadership. This will make for a proletarian atmosphere, a communist atmosphere. When the masses give you a good telling-off to vent their feelings, this does not mean that they are going to cut off your head or take away your job. It just means that they are in a lively militant mood, that they have a very good communist style. The way that the masses are now carrying out these struggles is excellent, and we comrades should also promote such a style among ourselves.

Ch’en Po-ta [44] has just written to me. Before this nothing would induce him to run a journal. Now he has made a 180-degree turn and agreed to start one this year. This is fine. Our Party used to have several journals — *Guide, Struggle, Truth*, etc. Although we now have the *People’s Daily* we have no theoretical magazine. We originally made plans for the Centre and Shanghai to publish one each, in order to bring about a direct confrontation of competing views, but now it is proposed that each province should start a separate one. This is very good. In this way our theoretical level can be raised and our thinking enlivened. Each provincial journal should have its own individual characteristics, and whilst each one should base its discussion mainly on the situation in its own province, they may also talk about China as a whole, or about the whole world, the universe — even the sun and the Milky Way.

Comrades working in the provinces will sooner or later come to the Centre. Comrades at the Centre will sooner or later either die or leave the scene. Khrushchev came from a local area. At the local level the class struggle is more acute, closer to natural struggle, closer to the masses. This gives the local comrades an advantage over those at the Centre. Ch’in was a kingdom before it proclaimed itself an empire.

We must improve our style of work, speak with sincerity, take a firm hold of ourselves and possess the spirit to sweep all before us and climb to the highest peak. To do this we must have a thorough understanding of Marxist theory and of the basic contradictions in our work. But at present our comrades have no ambition to be invincible, rather they have a lethargic air about them. This is no good. It exemplifies a slave mentality, like that of Chia Kuei, who had become so used to standing up that he was afraid to sit down. We must respect the classics but we must not follow them blindly. Marxism was itself

created, not copied or lifted straight from books. On this point Stalin was relatively good. The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* says in its conclusion: 'Particular points of Marxist principle which are not in accord with reason[45] may be changed, such as the principle that one country cannot be victorious*.' [*i.e., that socialism cannot first be victorious in one country alone.] Confucian scholars worshipped Confucius so blindly that they dared not use his name K'ung Ch'iu. Li Ho of the T'ang dynasty was, however, quite different. He referred to Emperor Wu of Han by his name Liu Ch'e, or Master Liu, and to the Empress as Mistress Wei.[46]

Once we give in to blind faith our minds become cramped and our thought cannot burst out of its confinement. Unless you have a conquering spirit it is very dangerous to study Marxism-Leninism. Stalin could be said to have had this spirit, though it became somewhat tarnished. The Leninist foundation of his writing on linguistics and economics was relatively correct — basically correct. But there are some issues worth studying, for example the role of the theory of value in the socialist stage. Should we take the amount of time expended in preparing people for labour as a criterion for fixing wages? Under socialism private property still exists, the small group still exists, the family still exists. The family, which emerged in the last period of primitive communism, will in future be abolished. It had a beginning and will come to an end. K'ang Yu-wei perceived this in his book *Universal Harmony*. [47] Historically, the family was a production unit, a consumption unit, a unit for the procreation of the labour force of the next generation, and a unit for the education of children. Nowadays the workers do not regard the family as a unit of production; the peasants in the cooperatives have also largely changed, and peasant families are generally not units of production. They only engage in a certain amount of subsidiary production. As for the families of government workers and members of the armed forces, they produce even less; they have become merely units of consumption, and units for rearing and bringing up labour reserves, while the chief unit of education is the school. In short, the family may in future become something which is unfavourable to the development of production. Under the present system of distribution of 'to each according to his work', the family is still of use. When we reach the stage of the communist relationship of distribution of 'to each according to his need', many of our concepts will change. After maybe a few thousand years, or at the very least several hundred years, the family will disappear. Many of our comrades do not dare to think about these things. They are very narrow-minded. But problems such as the disappearance of classes and parties have already been discussed in the classics. This shows that the approach of Marx and Lenin was lofty, while ours is low.

Professors — we have been afraid of them ever since we came into the towns. We did not despise them, we were terrified of them. When confronted by people with piles of learning we felt that we were good for nothing. For Marxists to fear bourgeois intellectuals, to fear professors while not fearing imperialism, is strange indeed. I believe this attitude is another example of the slave mentality, a relic from the time of 'gratitude for His Majesty's favours'. We must not tolerate it any longer. Naturally we cannot go out tomorrow and beat them up. We have to make contact with them, educate them and make friends with them. They may have studied more natural science than we have, but they do not necessarily know more social science. They may have studied more

Marxism-Leninism but they are incapable of entering into the spirit of it, or really understanding it. Wu Ching-ch'ao[48] read a great deal, but opposed Marxism at every opportunity.

We should not feel ashamed of ourselves. Bernstein, Kautsky, Plekhanov in his late period, all studied Marxism-Leninism much more than we have, yet they were not much good. They transformed the Second International into the servant of the bourgeoisie.

Now the situation has changed, as indicated by Comrade Ch'en Po-ta's speech 'Stress the Present, not the Past', his letter 'To the Chairman', and his communication 'Be prepared to explain to the lower levels'. All of these are very forceful. Yet there are many comrades who are indifferent to the struggle on the ideological front, such as the criticism of Hu Feng, Liang Shu-ming, *The Life of Wu Hsün*, *The Dream of the Red Chamber*, and Ting Ling,[49] etc. Our basic views on the elimination of the bourgeoisie were stated in the resolution of the Second Plenum of the Seventh Central Committee. During the democratic revolution we used to say that the revolution had two stages, and that the first stage was a preparation for the second.[50] We believe in permanent revolution, yet many comrades gave no thought to the timing of the socialist revolution or to what should be done after land reform. They closed their eyes to sprouts[51] of socialism even after such forms had appeared. The mutual-aid teams in Jui-chin[52] and in the anti-Japanese bases were such sprouts.

Wang Ming and Ch'en Tu-hsiu were of the same ilk. Ch'en Tu-hsiu considered that after the bourgeois revolution had succeeded, the bourgeoisie should hold political power, and the socialist revolution should not be launched until the proletariat had been consolidated and enlarged. Hence Ch'en Tu-hsiu was not a Marxist-Leninist but a bourgeois-democratic revolutionary radical. Yet thirty years later there are still people like him. Bad people like Ting Ling and Feng Hsueh-feng and good people like XXX are nothing but bourgeois democrats. They proclaim the 'four great freedoms',[53] assert that peasants are afraid of showing off, thus sharply opposing us. The rich middle peasants in Honan did not want the cadres to see their valuables and feigned poverty. They bought cloth from pedlars when nobody was looking. This was excellent. It meant that the poor and lower-middle peasants were so strong that the rich middle peasants were afraid to show off. It meant that socialism has a great future. But some people did not like it and felt that this fear should be removed. They issued announcements proclaiming the 'four great freedoms', while failing to ask for instructions or even to consult others. Clearly this was defiance of the policies laid down by the Second Plenum. They were not spiritually prepared for socialism, though now they have become convinced and have become activated.

From ancient times the people who have created new schools of thought have always been young people without great learning. Confucius started at the age of twenty-three; and how much learning did Jesus have? Sakyamuni founded Buddhism at the age of nineteen; his learning was only acquired gradually later on. What learning did Sun Yat-sen have in his youth? He only went through higher middle school. Marx was also very young when he first created Dialectical Materialism. His learning was also acquired later

on. He was about thirty when he wrote the *Communist Manifesto*, by which time his school of thought was already established. When he started to write books he was only in his twenties. The people whom he criticized were all learned bourgeois scholars of the time like Ricardo, Adam Smith, Hegel, etc. In history it is always those with little learning who overthrow those with much learning. The things Chang T'ai-yen[54] wrote in his youth were lively and full of the spirit of the democratic revolution. His aim was to overthrow the Manchus. K'ang Yu-wei was the same. Liu Shih-p'ei[55] made his name when he was only twenty and was only thirty when he died. Wang Pi[56] was in his teens when he annotated Lao-tzu and died from mental strain when still in his twenties. Yen Yüan[57] (a sage of the second rank) was only thirty-two when he died. Li Shih-min[58] was in his teens when he rebelled and became commander-in-chief. At twenty-four he ascended the imperial throne. He was neither particularly old nor learned. The question is whether your direction is right or not. Ch'in Shu-pao[59] was also very young. When young people grasp ! a truth they are invincible and old people cannot compete with them. Lo Ch'eng and Wang Po-tang[60] were only in their twenties. When Liang Ch'i-ch'ao[61] was young, he too was invincible, yet when we are faced by professors we become feeble and afraid that their scholarship will show us up.

Once our journals are published, provided that their direction is correct, they will do fine. Lei Hai-tsuag had studied Marxism-Leninism, but he was not as good as us because while we believed in it, the more he read the more right-wing he became. Now we want to run journals and to prevail over the bourgeois intellectuals; we only need to read a dozen or so books and we can beat them. Once we start to run our journals we shall be forced to study the classics, to think about problems, and turn our hands to writing. All this will raise our ideological level. Now a whole pile of publications has come to our attention. If we do not produce our publications people will not be reading books: they will only be discussing abstract matters and not talk about how to be 'red'.

Each province can run a journal and thus set up a kind of confrontation. They can also be responsible for sending articles to the central publication. Six articles a year from each province would be sufficient. Anyway, there should be less than ten. You people go and organize this. This is the way to produce heroes.

Ever since ancient times the people who founded new schools of thought were all young people without too much learning. They had the ability to recognize new things at a glance and, having grasped them, they opened fire on the old fogeys. The old fogeys with learning always opposed them. When Martin Luther founded the Reformation, and Darwin's theories appeared, many people opposed them. The inventor of sleeping-pills was not even a doctor, let alone a famous doctor; he was only a pharmacist. At first the Germans did not take him seriously, but the French welcomed him. That was how sleeping-pills started. I am told that penicillin was invented by a man who worked as a laundryman in a dyers and cleaners. Franklin of America, who discovered electricity, began as a newspaper boy. Later he became biographer, politician and scientist. Gorky only had two years of elementary schooling. Of course some things can be learnt at school; I don't propose to close all the schools. What I mean is that it is not absolutely necessary to attend school. The main thing is whether your direction is correct or not and

whether you come to grips with your studies. Learning has to be grasped. As soon as they had grasped the truth the young founders of new schools embarked on discoveries, scorning the old fogeys. Then those with learning oppressed them. Isn't that what history is like? When we started to make revolution, we were mere twenty-year-old boys, while the rulers of that time, like Yüan Shih-k'ai and Tuan Ch'i-jui[62] were old and experienced. They had more learning, but we had more truth.

I am glad to see how spirited the big-character posters have been recently. Their sharp criticism and lively style have blown away the stale atmosphere. Yet we always walk sedately with measured tread. 'Meeting people we only say three tenths of what we mean, afraid to lay bare our whole heart.' We don't speak sincerely.

Wang He-shou's second article dares to criticize dogmatism. P'eng T'ao's article is also good.[63] It has persuasive power, although it is not sharp enough. It is 'attacking others and elevating oneself', though not in an individualistic way. Rather it attacks incorrect ideas and elevates correct ideas, which is absolutely necessary. (Of course the errors also include his own.) T'eng Tai-yüan's article is also good, but he is deficient in persuasive power. He should explain the reasons for building so many railways, otherwise people will be frightened off. Chang Hsi-jo[64] criticized us for 'craving greatness and success, being impatient for quick results, scorning the past and putting blind faith in the future'.

This is just what the proletariat is like! Any class 'craves greatness and success'. Should we rather 'crave pettiness and failure'? King Yu valued every moment of time. We too must treasure every minute. Confucius said: 'Three days without seeing my lord makes me worried.' He also said: 'I never sit long enough to warm my mat.' Mo-tzu's 'stove was not used long enough to be blackened'. They were both men who were hungry for success and quick results. We too follow this role. Irrigation, rectification, anti-rightism, 600 million people engaged in a great movement. Isn't this 'craving for greatness and success'? In setting average advanced norms for workers, aren't we 'being impatient for quick results'? Unless we despise the old system and the old reactionary productive relationships, what do we think we are doing? If we do not have faith in socialism and communism, what do we think we are doing?

We have made mistakes and we have been subjectivist, but it is correct to 'crave greatness and success, to be impatient for quick results, to despise the past and put blind faith in the future'. Although they oppose me, the spirit of the letters from Tientsin and Nanking is praiseworthy. I think they are good. The one from Tientsin is the better, the one from Nanking being insipid and weak. As for Ch'en Ch'i-t'ung and the other three,[65] apart from Ch'en I who is a rightist, their courage in speaking out is praiseworthy. It is very bad to whisper behind people's backs and not to speak out to their faces. We should have general agreement — at least in principle. We should be able to speak either more sharply or more tactfully, but we must speak out. Sometimes we must be sharp and clear-cut. But in any case, if we take our desire for unity as our starting-point and adopt a helpful attitude, then sharp criticism cannot split the Party, it can only unite the Party. It is very dangerous to leave unsaid things which you want to say. Of course, we must choose our time to speak, and it does not do to ignore strategy. Take, for

example, the three big cases of the Ming dynasty. Those who opposed Wei Chung-hsien paid too little attention to strategy and were themselves eliminated.[66] Among those who fell into disfavour with the emperor at that time, there was a Szechwanese, Yang Shen,[67] who was exiled to Yunnan. Those who spoke the truth in history, such as Pi Kan,[68] Ch'ü Yüan,[69] Chu Yün[70] and Chia I,[71] all failed in their! purpose but they fought for a principle. Those who are afraid to speak out are afraid of being called opportunists, afraid of getting the sack, afraid of being expelled from the Party, afraid of being divorced by their wives (and thus losing face), afraid of being confined to the guardroom, afraid of having their heads chopped off. I feel that as long as you are prepared for these eventualities and are able to see through the vanities of this world, you need be afraid of nothing. If you make no psychological preparation, you will not dare to speak. But should fear of martyrdom seal our lips? We must create an environment in which people will dare to speak out and reveal what is in their hearts. The Report to the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union said: We must create an environment. From the masses' point of view this is correct, and advanced elements should not be afraid of this sort of thing. They should have the spirit of Wang Hsi-feng who said: 'He who is not afraid of the death by a thousand cuts dares to unhorse the emperor.'

We ought to be leading the masses, yet the masses nowadays are more advanced than us. They have the courage to put up big-character posters criticizing us. Of course this is different from Ch'u An-p'ing.[72] In his case it was the enemy cursing us. Today it is criticism among comrades. Some of our comrades' style of work is not good. There are some things they don't dare to say. They only say three-tenths. This is first because they are afraid of being unpopular, second because they are afraid of losing votes. This is a vulgar working style which must be changed, and now we have the possibility of changing it.

In 1956 three things were blown away: the general line of achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results, the promoters of progress, and the Forty Articles. There were three kinds of people with three kinds of reaction: distress, indifference, and delight. A millstone had dropped from their neck and there would be peace in the world. Of those exhibiting these three attitudes the ones in the middle were numerous, while the two extremes were small. In 1956 there were the same three attitudes towards many problems. They were comparatively unanimous on the question of opposing Japan and Chiang Kai-shek and on land reform. But on the question of cooperativization there were these three attitudes. Is this a correct assessment?

This conference has solved a number of questions and reached agreement, and prepared some documents for the Politburo. Its weakness is that there has been relatively little discussion of ideology. Should we devote two or three days to talking about ideology, and say what is on our minds?

The comrades say that this conference is a rectification conference. But we do not talk about ideology or fulfil our pledges. Isn't there a contradiction here? We have neither been carrying out struggles nor identifying rightists, but talking in gentle tones like light

breezes and sweet showers, so that everyone can say what is on his mind. My purpose is to get people to dare to speak out with vigour and invincible force, like Marx or Lu Hsün, freeing themselves from inhibitions. We should make a breakthrough at the level of the local Party secretariat, within groups of about three people. This would create a new atmosphere. When he was eighteen or nineteen, Tsou Jung wrote a book entitled *The Revolutionary Army* which directly denounced the emperor.[73] When Chang T'ai-yen wrote his article refuting K'ang Yu-wei he too was still full of spirit. The older you get the less useful you are. You must not underestimate yourself, but mobilize all your energies. Of course we still need old people: they must also take the helm. Liu Pei of the Three Kingdoms period was no good; this too was a case of an old man taking command. We must break out of the dull atmosphere in the Party.

All the poems which have been published are relics of the past. Why not produce some folk poems? Will every comrade on his return please be responsible for collecting folk poems. Each social stratum, as well as the young people and children, have many folk poems. We should have a go at this. Everyone can be issued with a few sheets of paper to write folk poems on. Those among the labouring people who cannot write can ask others to write for them. We can set a time limit of ten days. We can collect large numbers of old folk songs, and next time publish a collection.

The future of Chinese poetry is folk songs first and the classics second. On this basis we can produce a new poetry. In form it should be in the folk-song style, while in content it should combine the two opposites, realism and romanticism. If you are too realistic you can't write poetry. The new poetry of today is formless. Nobody reads it. Anyway I wouldn't read it, not unless you gave me a hundred dollars. In the field of collecting folk poetry, Peking University has done a lot of work. If we do this job it is possible that we may discover millions and millions of folk poems. This will not involve much work, and they will be much easier to read than the poems of Tu Fu and Li Po.[74]

Notes

[References are given here as provided by the Maoist Documentation Project. They are significantly different in at least one existing edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. VIII. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1.] Ch'en Tu-hsiu (1879-1942) was Secretary-General of the Chinese Communist Party from its foundation in 1921 until August 1927, when he was made the scapegoat for the failure of Stalin's policies. Prior to his conversion to Communism he had been an eloquent advocate of Western democratic and scientific thought as the remedy for China's ills. In recent decades, Chinese Communist authors have acknowledged his contribution to the intellectual revolution of the May Fourth period, but have denied that he ever really accepted or understood Marxism. They characterize him as a bourgeois

radical who had wormed his way into the Party thanks to the ideological confusion prevailing in the early 1920s. Mao himself, talking to Edgar Snow in 1936, dismissed Ch'en Tu-hsiu as bourgeois not only in his ideas, but in his instinctive reactions: 'Ch'en was really frightened of the workers and especially of the armed peasants. Confronted at last with the reality of armed insurrection, he completely lost his senses. He could no longer see clearly what was happening, and his petty-bourgeois instincts betrayed him into panic and defeat.' (*Red Star over China*, enlarged edition, Penguin, 1972, pp. 190-91).

[2.] The official view regarding the errors committed by Mao's rivals during the period 1927-35 had been laid down in the 'Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of our Party' adopted by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in April 1945. The text is included in Volume III of the *Selected Works* (Peking, 1965), pp. 177-220. Since the onset of the Cultural Revolution, the resolution of 1945 has not been considered wholly orthodox, and it no longer appears in the *Selected Works*. As for the three 'left' lines, however, the view put forward by Mao as recently as September 1971 remains basically the same (see below, *Summary of Chairman Mao's Talks with Responsible Comrades at Various Places during his Provincial Tour*). For other statements of the 'Great Leap' period about this question, see *Speech at the Lushan Conference* and *Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Military Affairs Committee and the External Affairs Conference*.

[3.] Abram Deborin (1881-1963), a leading Soviet philosopher who stressed the omnipresence of contradictions and the link between dialectics and the natural sciences, was condemned by Stalin in December 1930 for his 'Menshevizing idealism', and subsequently forced to recant.

[4.] This name is transcribed as 'P'i-k'o-fu', which might be an error for Rykov, though the latter occupied an important position in the Soviet state apparatus rather than in the Comintern. It could also stand for Pieck, or Piatnitsky, who were members of the Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the International in the early 1930s. In any case, Mao's picture of the Comintern leadership is rather approximate, for Bukharin was removed from all work in the International in mid-1929, and Zinoviev had disappeared well before. Regarding the personnel more directly concerned with China, he was better informed. Kuusinen, a member of the Executive Committee and of the Secretariat, was influential in drafting many Comintern directives on China and on the non-European countries generally. Pavel Mif's title was Deputy Head of the Eastern Secretariat, which Mao calls the Eastern Bureau (tungfang pu), but his main responsibility was China. (There does not seem to have been a separate Far Eastern Department, though details regarding the organization of the Comintern are hard to come by. The above information about Mif is from his biography in *Vidnye Sovetskie Kommunisty — Uchastniki Kitaiskoi Revolyutsii* [Moscow: 'Nauka', 1970], p. 92.)

[5.] It is hard to guess who the 'good comrade' referred to here might be. Mao speaks of him as if from personal knowledge, but Mao himself did not go abroad until 1949, and of those representatives of the Comintern who had visited China in the 1920s and 1930s,

there were few with whom he had come in direct contact, and even fewer of whom he had anything good to say. Because of the way 'XXX' is contrasted with Mif, it is just possible that it stands for Kuusinen, who had attacked Mao and the Chinese very rudely in 1964 (see *Marxism and Asia*, pp. 330-35), so that any favourable comment would have been removed, or made anonymous, by the editors of Wan-sui (1969). Perhaps any other Comintern figure, even if known only at second or third hand, would have been imagined by Mao to be more likeable than Pavel Mif, who came to China at the end of 1930 and personally installed as the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party the very 'dogmatists' about whom Mao is complaining here.

[6.] Wang Ming (pseudonym of Ch'en Shao-yü) (1904-74) was the leading figure in the group of 'Returned Students', trained in Moscow, with whom Mao contended for the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party in the 1930s and 1940s. He resided in the Soviet Union from 1957 until his death; during the Cultural Revolution, he published two vitriolic attacks on Mao (see *Talk at the First Plenum of the Ninth Central Committee of the CPC*, note 1).

[7.] Mao would appear to be concerned here rather with the uniform introduction of a system of education ill-adapted to Chinese rural reality than with the precise length of the primary course, which was not necessarily five years in the 1950s. For a detailed discussion of the educational system, including the curriculum and the length of schooling, see below, *Remarks at the Spring Festival*.

[8.] Kao Kang (c. 1902-c. 1954) was one of the leaders in setting up the base in Shensi to which Mao Tse-tung and his comrades retreated after the Long March. In the late 1940s, he emerged as the dominant figure in the North-east Region, where he cumulated all the top Party, government, and army posts. As the leader of China's most highly industrialized area, he played an important role in Peking as well, and in 1952 he became the first Chairman of the State Planning Commission. He was publicly denounced in 1955, and at that time it was stated that he had committed suicide in February 1954. His fall undoubtedly resulted in part from personal rivalries, but it has also been commonly assumed that he was regarded as too close to the Soviets.

[9.] In the mid-1950s, Chiang Hua was First Secretary of the CCP in Chekiang, and Sha Wen-han was governor of the same province. In December 1957, in the context of the 'anti-rightist' campaign which had begun during the summer, Sha was violently attacked for corruption, immorality, and anti-Party activities, and also for his provincial and sectarian viewpoint, and removed from office. Chiang Hua delivered the main report at the meeting held to denounce Sha and other leading Chekiang officials; he also called for more rapid development in industry and agriculture, and referred to a 'leap' in production. Thus, his attitude towards questions of policy was indubitably correct in Mao's eyes. As the previous sentence, 'Every province now has examples of this' linking the relationship between Chiang and Sha to the case of Kao Kang — makes plain, Mao is talking here about two things: the correctness or incorrectness of leadership; and loyalty to the nation as a whole rather than to one's own province or region or to the Soviet Union. The two issues of the tempo of economic development, and of the manner

and extent to which decision-making power should be decentralized, were central to the debates on policy going on in the spring of 1958, on the eve of the formal proclamation of the Great Leap Forward at the Second Session of the Eighth Party Congress in May. As Mao makes plain, they had to be fought out in every province, as well as at the national level.

[10.] The purge of Kao Kang, Jao Shu-shih (c 1901-), First Secretary of the CCP East China Bureau, and seven others in 1955, on the charge of having formed an anti-Party group with the aim of seizing power, was indeed an earthquake — by far the most serious upheaval in the Chinese Communist Party from the Rectification Campaign of 1942-3 to the fall of P'eng Te-huai in 1959.

[11.] The *Bolshevik* and *True Words* (*Shih Hua*) were theoretical organs edited in the early 1930s by the Moscow-trained leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, which often criticized Mao's guerrilla tactics. Since a complete run of *Shih Hua* is not available, it is impossible to say which 'five big mistakes' are referred to here.

[12.] In 1962, Mao put forward a periodization of the history of the Chinese People's Republic which dated the establishment of an independent and creative line for building socialism from 1958, i.e. from the beginning of the Great Leap Forward (*Talk at an Enlarged Central Work Conference*, pp. 176-8). This is complementary rather than contradictory to the statement here; Mao began to sketch out a new policy in 1956, and the process came to fruition in 1958.

[13.] Mao here confirms that, apart from the terms of the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance signed on 14 February 1950, and the thorny question of the Sino-Soviet border, two main issues on which his position clashed with that of Stalin were the arrangements for the control of the Chinese Eastern Railway, and the joint Sino-Soviet stock companies in certain key industries, both of which gave Moscow a degree of economic and political leverage within China all too reminiscent of the old colonial days.

[14.] The supplementary agreement of 27 March 1950 between China and the Soviet Union provided for joint-stock companies to develop oil and non-ferrous metals in Sinkiang. There was no provision such as Mao cites, but it was widely believed at the time to contain secret clauses.

[15.] Here Mao deliberately applies to Stalin the term 'old ancestor' (*lao tsu-tsung*) which was employed in his own youth to designate the Dowager Empress Tz'u-hsi.. Clearly he wishes to suggest that these two individuals (both of whom had at one time stood in authority over him) inspired in him a similar mixture of distaste and grudging respect.

[16.] The Hangchow conference of early January 1958, and the Nanning conference of late January, were attended, like the Chengtu conference at which Mao made this speech, by provincial Party secretaries and some Politburo members; it was at the two January meetings that the [Sixty Articles on Work Methods](#), which constituted the veritable

blueprint for the Great Leap Forward, were drafted. (See the text of this document in CB 892, pp. 1-14).

[17.] The Seventh Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, in April 1945, in fact advocated the establishment of a coalition government with the Kuomintang, as is indicated by the title of Mao Tse-tung's own report on that occasion. ('[On Coalition Government](#)', *Selected Works*, III, pp. 255-320.) It did, however, lay the foundations for an effort on the part of the communists, in the new political context which would grow out of Japan's defeat, to establish themselves as a political (as well as a military) force which would have to be reckoned with. In particular, it marked the formal consecration of the ideological independence and maturity of the Chinese Communist Party by the elevation of 'Mao Tse-tung's Thought' to the status of guide in all the Party's work. (See Liu Shao-ch'i's report on this theme in *Marxism and Asia*, pp. 259-61.)

[18.] The Ten-Point Programme, or Ten Great Policies, of the CCP for Anti-Japanese Resistance and National Salvation put forward on 15 August 1937 laid down a policy line mid-way between the two extremes of excessive sectarianism and abject submission to the Kuomintang. (For the text, see Brandt, Schwartz and Fairbank, *A Documentary History of Chinese Communism*, pp. 242-5.) Wang Ming, who had displayed leftist tendencies in the early 1930s, has been accused since 1945 of rightist and capitulationist errors following his return to China from Moscow in 1937, but I know of no document in sixty points summarizing his views at this time.

[19.] This refers to Dulles's speech of 28 June 1957, two weeks after the New York Times report of 13 June on Mao's February speech.

[20.] For a brief discussion of the problems raised by the effort to improve agricultural implements and techniques in the course of the Great Leap Forward, with extracts from the 'Opinions' regarding agricultural mechanization adopted at the Chengtu meeting, which spell out some of the implications of what Mao is saying in this paragraph, see Jack Gray, 'The Two Roads: Alternative Strategies of Social Change and Economic Growth in China', in *Authority, Participation, and Cultural Change in China*, pp. 139-43.

[21.] The expression chien-t'iao, 'to carry on a pole over the shoulder', is used here both in a literal sense, to evoke images such as the building of dams by the massive use of labour-power, and as a symbol of traditional Chinese ways of doing things in general. In the remainder of this paragraph, Mao sketches out the approach, characteristic of the Great Leap Forward and of his economic thinking ever since, of 'walking on two legs', i.e. of combining modern and traditional methods.

[22.] According to Mao's speech of 13 October 1957 (Wan-sui (1969), p. 141), 'four, five, eight' was used as shorthand for the goals for grain production originally put forward in point 6 of the Twelve-year Programme for Agricultural Development (see p. 93 and note 4 to [Speech at the Supreme State Soviet](#)). This called for yields of 400 catties per mu in areas north of the Yellow river, 500 catties per mu between the Yellow and Huai rivers and 800 catties per mu south of the Huai, to be achieved by the end of 1967.

In October 1957 Mao still accepted this target date. Now, although he does not endorse the extreme optimism of the Honan leadership, he has been carried away by enthusiasm for the emerging 'Great Leap' to such an extent as to suggest that it might well be possible to attain these goals in one third to one half of the period previously stipulated. He adds, however, that even if the original schedule were adhered to, China would still have done far better than the Soviet Union. The targets set in 1956 amounted to two or three times existing yields (see above, p. 92).

[23.] The *chuang-yüan* or 'number one palace graduate' was the highest-ranking successful candidate in the triennial examinations for the *chin-shih* degree (see below, note 18 to *Remarks at the Spring Festival*). True beauty, according to this proverb, is rarer still.

[24.] The 'General Line' for building socialism, symbolized by the four characters *to, k'uai, hao, sheng* (more, faster, better and more economically), had been put forward by Mao in 1956, and has been regarded ever since, both by Mao and by his opponents, as summing up the essence of his approach to economic development. From mid-1956 to mid-1957 it had been seldom mentioned, though not explicitly repudiated; for Mao's resentment at this, see his speech of 22 March 1958, p. 122. In 1958 it burst forth again and became one of the 'Three Red Banners' of the Great Leap.

[25.] Chou Hsiao-chou (c. 1912-) was, at this time, First Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party for Hunan Province, and concurrently Political Commissar of the Hunan Military District. At the Eighth Party Congress in September 1956, he had presented a written speech on the strengthening of agricultural cooperatives. During the year 1958, he played an acting role in Party affairs, but after the Eighth Plenum in December 1958 he dropped from view, and in 1959 he was relieved of his post as provincial secretary, and purged as a member of the 'anti-Party group' headed by P'eng Te-huai (see *Speech at the Lushan Conference* and *Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Military Affairs Committee and the External Affairs Conference*). This would indicate that, like P'eng, he came to have doubts about the communes, but it was not previously known that Mao had been dissatisfied with his attitude at the time of cooperativization in 1955-6.

[26.] This presumably stands for Li Ching-ch'üan (1905-), ranking Party secretary for Szechuan province (in which the city of Chengtu is located) from 1952 to 1965, and by 1958 the leading figure in the Party organization for the whole of South-West China.

At the time when Mao made this speech, his star was definitely on the rise, and in fact Mao's reference, two days later, to Khrushchev as an example of those vigorous elements which come to the Centre from the provinces (see the speech of 22 March 1958, p. 114) may well be meant as a compliment to Li, who was elected to the Politburo in May 1958 at the Second Session of the Eighth Party Congress. Li Ching-ch'üan's name — assuming that it is he who is meant — would have been omitted by the editors of the 1969 volume because he was attacked and removed during the Cultural Revolution. He reappeared at the Tenth Congress in 1973.

[27.] The organization of the Party and of the state administration on a regional basis had been abolished in 1954. Regional Party bureaus were publicly re-established only in the early 1960s, but Mao here confirms that they had already been set up in 1958, in the context of the decentralizing policies of the 'Great Leap'.

[28.] As indicated here, Mao clashed with the Moscow-trained leadership of the Chinese Communist Party in the early 1930s not only on political issues, but on military tactics. For his own criticism of previous errors in this domain, see '[Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War](#)', *Selected Works*, I, pp. 179-249.

[29.] This remark was actually made by a minor character in Chapter 26 of the *Dream of the Red Chamber*; Wang Hsi-feng said the same thing, in different words, in Chapter 13 (*The Story of the Stone*, pp. 257, 509).

[30.] I have not been able to find the source of this quotation.

[31.] For a more extended discussion of why the death of older people is a cause for rejoicing, which reveals the roots of this attitude on Mao's part in the Chinese tradition, see below *Talk on Questions of Philosophy*, p. 227, and note 40.

[32.] This dictionary (Chien-ming che-hsüeh tz'u-tien) is, in fact, a Chinese translation, first published in 1940, and reprinted in 1949 and 1951 by the San-lien Shu-tien in Peking, of a Soviet reference work, the *Kratkii Filosojskii Slovar*, by Rozental and Yudin, which had appeared in Moscow in 1939. I have not been able to find in it the statements quoted by Mao, but he was no doubt correct in his judgement that the Soviet understanding of dialectics in the late 1930s was different from his.

[33.] Because of the way numbers are written in Chinese, the figure 'twelve' in this sentence could easily be a typographical error for 'ninety-two'. If Mao really meant to say 'twelve', I am unable to identify the source from which he could have taken this theory.

[34.] Wan-sui (1969) has here 'classes' (chieh-chi) instead of 'stages' (chieh-tuan), but this appears to be a typographical error, for Wen-hsüan has 'stages', which makes better sense and is in accord with similar statements in some of Mao's other writings, for example in *Talk on Questions of Philosophy*, p. 228.

[35.] The term translated here as 'system' (hsi-t'ung) is that commonly used in Chinese communist parlance to refer to one organization or apparatus among many; by 'all the various systems', Mao means the Party apparatus, the state bureaucracy, the PLA, etc.

[36.] This refers, of course, to the Marxist-Leninist classics, not to the Confucian canon.

[37.] The 156 key industrial projects scheduled to be built during the first five-year plan, 1953-7, with Soviet aid.

[38.] The 'emergence of the question of Stalin' refers, of course to Khrushchev's secret speech of February 1956; the slogan 'oppose adventurism' was the rallying-cry of those who, in 1956-7, opposed Mao's economic policies. (See below, p. 138, his comments on this group, which apparently included many top leaders in the Party.)

[39.] The meaning here is obviously that Marxism lays down only general historical tendencies, not the precise sequence of events.

[40.] In the autumn of 1957, during the anti-rightist campaign, ceremonies were held in schools and elsewhere, at which participants swore to give their hearts to the Party.

[41.] i.e., it is not like some other places of worship where one goes every Sunday out of habit.

[42.] A celebrated thirteenth-century drama.

[43.] ta ming, ta fang, ta-tzu-pao. The first two phrases (sometimes translated 'great blooming and contending') summarize the slogan of the 'Hundred Flowers' campaign of 1956-7: 'Let a hundred schools of thought contend, let a hundred flowers bloom.' Big-character posters, or wall newspapers, which reached their utmost development during the Cultural Revolution, have long been familiar in China; Mao wrote one as a student at the time of the 1911 revolution.

[44.] Ch'en Po-ta (1904-). Once the leading interpreter of Mao Tse-tung's thought, and Mao's former political secretary, Ch'en rose to high eminence when he became the head of the 'Cultural Revolution Group' under the Central Committee in 1966. He disappeared from the political scene in 1970, in the course of the purge of the 'ultra-leftists'. Whatever his precise role in the events of the Cultural Revolution, he had indeed distinguished himself by his enthusiasm for the 'Paris Commune' model, which Mao repudiated in February 1967. (See the Introduction, and *Talks at Three Meetings with Comrades Chang Ch'un-ch'iao and Yao Wen-yuan.*)

[45.] In fact, this passage refers to the abandonment of conclusions which are 'antiquated' or no longer 'correspond to historical conditions'. *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, (Moscow, 1954), pp. 553-4.

[46.] Emperors in traditional China were referred to by their dynastic titles; their names were taboo to such an extent that even the characters composing them could not be used in other contexts.

[47.] Ta t'ung or 'great harmony' is a very ancient utopian vision which has continued to inspire many Chinese thinkers down to the present day. (See, for example, Mao Tse-tung's '[On the People's Democratic Dictatorship](#)', *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, p. 412.) The work on this theme by K'ang Yu-wei, the intellectual leader of the reformers of 1898, has been translated by Laurence Thompson under the title, *Ta T'ung Shu: The One-World Philosophy of Kang Yu-wei* (Allen & Unwin, 1958).

[48.] Wu Ching-ch'ao, a disciple of Hu Shih and a contributor to his magazine Tu-li p'ing-lun, was a Kuomintang civil servant in the 1930s and 1940s.

[49.] The literary critic Hu Feng, the philosopher Liang Shu-ming, the interpretation of the *Dream of the Red Chamber* by Yü P'ing-po, and the novelist Ting Ling all came under attack in the period 1953-5. (For a general account of the context see Merle Goldman, *Literary Dissent in Communist China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), Chapters 6 and 7.) Mao himself was directly involved in several of these campaigns, especially in that against Hu Feng; he also wrote an anonymous editorial in 1951 attacking the film, *The Life of Wu Hsün*. (This campaign is also discussed by Mrs Goldman, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-93.) In 1967, in the course of the Cultural Revolution, Mao's comments on two of these themes were published among the 'Five Militant Documents on Art and Literature', translated in *Peking Review*, No. 23, 1967, pp. 5-8.

[50.] See the extract from Mao's speech of 7 May 1937, in S. Schram, *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung* (Penguin, 1969), p. 226-8.

[51.] The use of the term 'sprouts' ('meng-ya') here echoes the controversy which took place in the 1950s about 'sprouts of capitalism under the Ming dynasty', i.e. as to whether elements of a new social system were developing in the 'feudal' society of China at that time, before the impact of the West.

[52.] Capital of the Chinese Soviet Republic in 1931-4. The 'mutual aid teams', which were formed both at that time and during the Yen-an period, as well as in the early 1950s, represented the lowest stage in the development of agricultural cooperatives.

[53.] Mao defines these below on p. 216. As can be grasped from the context, they relate to policies for encouraging the pursuit of individual economic interest at the expense of the collective economy.

[54.] Chang T'ai-yen (also known as Chang Ping-lin) was an influential intellectual of the early twentieth century, politically radical but conservative in cultural and literary matters.

[55.] Liu Shih-p'ei (1880-1919) was a scholar active in the revolutionary movement prior to 1911. Thereafter, he became a conservative and an advocate of restoration.

[56.] As his dates indicate, Wang Pi (A.D. 226-49) did indeed die early, after leaving commentaries on Lao-tzu and on the Book of Changes.

[57.] Yen Yüan (Yen Hsi-chai) was one of the Ming loyalist philosophers who refused to bow to the Manchus when they conquered China in the early seventeenth century. They had great influence on Mao's generation, and on Mao in particular; Yen is mentioned in Mao's first published article, which appeared in 1917 (*The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, pp. 24, 155).

[58.] Li Shih-min (597-649) overthrew the Sui dynasty and placed his father on the throne as the first T'ang emperor in 618. He was, in fact, slightly older than Mao indicates when, in 626, he became emperor himself with the dynastic title T'ai-tsung.

[59.] Ch'in Ch'iung, also known as Ch'in Shu-pao (6th-7th century A D.), distinguished himself as a military commander under both the Sui and the T'ang dynasties.

[60.] Lo Ch'eng and Wang Po-tang were political adventurers of the late Sui dynasty (early 7th century), who made their mark at a very early age.

[61.] Disciple of K'ang Yu-wei, perhaps the most influential polemicist among the Reformers of 1898; Mao read him while an adolescent.

[62.] Yüan Shih-k'ai, a high official who helped Tz'u-hsi to repress the Reform Movement of 1898, betrayed his imperial masters to become President of the Republic in 1912; he died in 1916 after an abortive attempt to restore the monarchy with himself as emperor. Tuan Ch'i-jui, one of his lieutenants, played an important role during the early years of the 'warlord era', which opened with Yüan's death.

[63.] Wang He-shou (c. 1908-) and P'eng T'ao (1913-61) were respectively Minister of Metallurgical Industry and Minister of Chemical Industry at this time. It is not certain what articles Mao is referring to.

[64.] Chang Hsi-jo (c. 1889-), a political scientist educated at Columbia University in New York and at the London School of Economics, where he studied under Harold Laski, was Minister of Education until February 1958, when he became chairman of the Commission for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. A non-communist, he made the criticisms to which Mao is referring on 15 May 1957, at a forum called by the United Front Department.

[65.] Ch'en Ch'i-t'ung, Vice-Director of the Cultural Section of the General Political Department of the People's Liberation Army, together with three other senior army political workers, published an article in People's Daily on 7 January 1957, at a time when the scope of the 'Hundred Flowers' campaign was a subject of dispute within the leadership, some members of which opposed Mao's policy of 'opening wide' the floodgates to criticism from outside the Party. (Ch'en I is a homonym of the late Foreign Minister.)

[66.] Wei Chung-hsien (d. 1627), a self-made eunuch who enjoyed the favour of the emperor Hsi Tsung, was the real ruler of China until the death of his protector. He was notorious for the cruelty with which he disposed of his opponents.

[67.] Yang Shen (1488-1529), who came first in the palace examination in 1511, was exiled in 1524 when he wept so loudly to indicate his disapproval of two proposed appointments to the Han-lin academy as to be heard all over the palace.

[68.] Pi Kan (twelfth century B.C.) remonstrated with the tyrannical last ruler of the Shang dynasty upon his excesses, and was disembowelled before the Emperor as a result.

[69.] Ch'ü Yüan (340-278 B.C.), one of China's greatest poets, is celebrated not only for his literary talents, but for drowning himself in despair when, his advice having been neglected, the state of Ch'u, of which he had formerly been a leading minister, came to ruin. For a selection of his poems, see *Li Sao and Other Poems of Chu Yuan* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1955), with an introductory sketch by Kuo Mo-jo.

[70.] Chu Yün (first century A.D.) had a chequered career; his life was in fact spared by the Emperor in his most celebrated adventure.

[71.] Chia I (second century B.C.) became a member of the Imperial Academy at such an early age that he aroused great jealousy, and was finally exiled. In his article of 1917 on physical education, Mao cited his example to make a different point: that too much study at an early age was destructive to health. See my complete French translation of this text, *Mao Ze-dong: Une Etude de l'éducation physique* (Paris: Mouton, 1962), p. 46.

[72.] Ch'u An-p'ing, editor of the Kuang-ming jih-pao, organ of the China Democratic League, took the lead in criticisms of the Party in April 1957, when the 'blooming and contending' was in full flood. He came under sharp attack in June 1957. See *Literary Dissent in Communist China*, pp. 192, 198, 205-6.

[73.] See John Lust's translation, Tsou Jung: *The Revolutionary Army*, a Chinese Nationalist Tract of 1903 (Paris: Mouton, 1968). This pamphlet was extremely influential at the time, and Mao certainly read it as an adolescent.

[74.] The two most famous poets of China's literary golden age during the T'ang dynasty. For a recent appreciation of their work see the extracts from Kuo Mo-jo's book on the subject in *Chinese Literature*, No. 4, 1972, pp. 61-94.

National Minorities

March 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

The Mongols and Han should co-operate closely and have faith in Marxism. All our minority nations should trust each other, no matter what nationalities they are. They must see on which side truth lies. Marx himself was a Jew, Stalin belonged to a minority nation; and Chiang Kai-shek is a Han, a bad one, whom we strongly oppose. We must not insist that only people of a given province take charge of the administration of that province. The place of origin of a man is irrelevant — northerner or southerner, this

national minority or that minority, [they are all the same]. The questions are whether they have communism and how much. This point should be explained clearly to our national minorities.

To begin with, the Han was not a big race, but a mixture of a great number of races. The Han people have conquered many minority nations in history and driven them to the highlands. [We] must take a historical view of our nationality question and find out that we either depend on minority nationalism or on communism. Of course we depend on communism. We need our regions but not regionalism.

Speech At The Hankow Conference

April 6, 1958

[SOURCE: 'Long Live Mao Zedong Thought,' a Red Guard Publication.]

What is the situation of the class struggle in the transition period?

There probably won't be more than a few more rounds in the struggle between the two roads. We must have a strategy, cooling off for a while and then letting loose. Without such cooling off and letting loose, it won't flare up. As I mentioned at the Ch'eng-tu Conference, there are four classes in China: two exploiting and two working classes. The first exploiting class consists of imperialism, feudalism, bureaucratic capitalism, Koumintang remnants, and 300,000 rightists. The landlords have split up, some having reformed and others not yet. The unreformed landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and rightists are firmly against communism. They are the current Chiang Kai-shek and Kuomintang, and they constitute the hostile class, such as Chang Po-chun[1]. The rightists in the party are the same, including those leaning toward the right, currently classified as intermediates who have not yet made a move toward the right. Those who have been discovered but not yet classified, or not yet discovered, also belong to this class. The grand total of this class probably constitute five per cent of the population, or 30 million, which is a reasonable estimate. It is a hostile class and needs reform. Struggle and getting hold of them are required. If 70 per cent of them are split up, it will be a big victory. They must be activated, turning passive strength into active. If 10 per cent of them are reformed, it will be a success. After a few years, when they demonstrate a sincere change of heart and become genuinely reformed, their exploiting class hat may be removed. The right may turn into the left or middle-roaders; the left may also turn into the right, such as Kautsky. The second exploiting class consists of the national bourgeoisie and its intellectuals, plus a part of the upper level petit bourgeoisie, such as Liu Shao-t'ang, Ch'en Po-hua, and the rural well-to-do middle peasants. They belong to the bourgeoisie in essence. Most of the national bourgeoisie and its intellectuals are middle-roaders. They are exploiters, but different from the first exploiting class. They are opposed, and yet not opposed, to communism. They are a

vacillating class. They are opposed to communism, but not firmly committed, and they are different from Chiang Kai-shek. They bend with the wind. There was a capitalist in Hankow. From Hankow to Peking, he made a living by relying on the slogan "Support the Communist Party; Support Government Representatives" and would not say one word more. Actually his thinking did not change much. Had we not firmly resisted when the rightists attacked last year, and had Nazism appeared in China and the rightists gained power, these people would surge upward and they wouldn't have hesitated to knock down the Communist Party. They are two-minded about the Communist Party, wavering between for and against, while the rightists have no intention of supporting the Communist Party. After the struggle for all of this past year, these people are changing their political thinking, but they are still half-hearted. Last year most of them were without direction. However, after the big blooming and big contending, the victory of the rural and urban rectification campaign, and the great leap forward in production, they had to change by force of the situation. Whether it can be considered as 30 and 70 per cent, I hope everyone will give it consideration. A situation is man-made. Men form crowds, and the majority overwhelms the minority. The great Yangtze River Bridge, industrialization, and so on, can be classified as part of the situation. The second exploiting class is relatively civilized, and we can handle it with civilized methods, adopting the formula of criticism, which is different from the method of the anti-rightist struggle. Towards the rightists we resort to a method rather coercive in essence, for no other purpose than to make them notorious. Our policies are also different towards the two exploiting classes. We rally the second while isolating and knocking down the first. In other words, we rally the middle-roads and isolate the rightists.

Though the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and rightists number as many as 30 million, they are scattered in the country, surrounded and isolated. They would never have imagined the holding of a rightist congress; it would be equivalent to an imperial favor and amnesty. All big cities (cities with a population of 300,000 or more) should hold such a congress, with speeches by major responsible comrades, and the speeches should be intensive and penetrating. There should first be lectures and then rallying. The lecture should be cold and bleak and the rallying wild and enthusiastic, pointing out the future and giving them hope. Similar to Old Woman Liu entering the Ta-kuan Garden to borrow money, Sister Feng was unscrupulous. Some people say that she would be an able statesman in peace time and cunning politician in times of unrest.

There are two working classes, the workers and the peasants. In the past, their mind was not at one, and they were not clear about the ideology and their mutual relations. They worked and farmed under the leadership of our party, and we did not properly handle the problem of their mutual relations. Generally speaking, the work style of our cadres is fundamentally different from that of the Kuomintang, but some of them are more or less the same. Similar to the overlord toward the common citizen, or the slave master toward the slave, they convince by force instead of persuasion. One woman cadre in the Hunan Hospital usurped a lavatory and forbade anyone else from using it. The bad work style of certain cadres is almost the same as the Kuomintang, and a few individuals even surpass it. Hence, the workers and peasants regard them as the Kuomintang. For this reason, the

world philosophy of the workers and peasants did not change, and they struggled for the “five big items.” They are afraid to express themselves for fear of being rectified, forced to “wear small shoes,” and given a hard time. Who would have the nerve to display “big character posters?” Since the big blooming, big contending, big rectifying, and big reforming, there has been a great change in such relations. The workers criticized themselves for their struggle for the “five big items”, and their work attitude improved. The bath workers declared against their own wage increase. Immediately upon becoming a cadre, a store worker in Wu-han turned arrogant toward the store clerks. It was the work style of the Kuomintang. Once they changed their overlord style, the cadres of Hung-an County became one with the masses and a transformation occurred in their relations. The ownership system, mutual relations, and distribution relations are the three issues in production relations. When we tackle the middle, it is to tackle the mutual relations. Our rectification is to solve the mutual relations issue. Certain individuals among the Communist Party members learned the style of the slave master in society and school. Liu chieh-mei learned it in society. Let us rectify the mutual relations, the relations between the party and political work groups and the workers in the plant, between the cadres and members in the cooperative, between the party and political personnel of all levels and the lower echelons, between the cadres and the masses, between the principal and teachers and the students. In other words, the internal contradictions in the people should be solved by persuasion, not by coercion. By so doing, the cover is lifted, and the people feel comfortable, mentally liberated, and will have the courage to write big character posters. It is Leninism, not opportunism. Lenin died too young. His writings, especially his books written in the revolutionary period, should be carefully studied. His reasoning is vivid and lively and he bares his heart to the people in his sincerity, without any hedging. The same holds true even in his struggle against the enemy. Comrade Stalin had a slight overlord flavor. Educated in a missionary school, he was not so good in dialectics, nor materialism. He was divorced from reality and did not handle successfully the mutual relations. He was relatively rigid. In the past, the relations between the Soviet Union and us were those between father and son, cat and mouse, and the thinking was inflexible. Now, it is somewhat better. Our democratic tradition has a long history. Promoting democracy at our base, with neither money, grain, weapons, nor outside aid, we had no choice but to rely on the people. The party had to become one with the people, the troops with the masses, and the officers with the soldiers. To handle such relations successfully, we had to resort to the three main rules of discipline and eight points for attentions[2]. We treated the people with equality, abolished physical punishment among the troops, repealed the death penalty for deserters, constantly taught and struggled, and educated the new soldiers after each battle. Therefore, though there was some overlord attitude, we also learned some democratic work style. It was tempered in the long and arduous struggle. Yet even now, there are still some who do not subscribe to the method of persuasion toward the people. Some people in Tsinan, for instance, said that the tendency in the spring of 1957 was toward the right, and that they approved of the summer situation but not the spring situation. In fact, the summer situation was not so commendable either. As mentioned in the article on the summer situation[3], if democracy can be practiced in the troops, why can't it be practiced in the people? One can see that this problem has not been solved. After rectification last year, the bumper harvest this year especially, and the (fundamental or preliminary) transformation of our

backwardness with three more years of hard struggle, the people will understand and become convinced. But we must still perform work, write articles, and use reasoning to convince. In view of the situation of the class struggle in the transition, I feel that there will be five percent of germs (hostile class). The middle road faction may also deteriorate. They have criticisms in their mind. Temporarily they are keeping quiet, but they will express themselves in the future. We must remember that the struggle is protracted, repetitious, and complex. Nevertheless, the fundamental battle of the class struggle has been fought, and a victory has been basically won. Hundreds of million have risen. The rightists are isolated. The 300,000 rightists have become notorious and are without capital. The national bourgeoisie has also become notorious, and the same with the three-evils and five evils elements[4]. Two titles are conferred on the intellectuals: bourgeois intellectuals and in! tellectuals without bearing. Leadership figures have appeared in their leftist and rightist factions. The heroes are among the leftists, and they are of us. Those making mistakes in the future will also be among the leftists, because the leftists have capital. Any carelessness will lead to mistakes. XXX, for instance, was a member of the political bureau for 40 years, but he divorced himself from the masses and did not set foot in one plant or one rural village. His good point had been visiting everywhere in the field, and he was known as a traveler. I feel that being a traveler has its benefits. When we were engaged in guerrilla warfare in the past, we were travelers, travelling for decades. Now we are still travelling from the south to the north and we still want to remain travelers. Under the present provisions, those in the central government and the provincial levels must spend four months a year travelling, and a longer period for those in the regions and counties. We must think of the ways and means to chase them out of the front door and turn them into travelers.

Just how is the class struggle in the transition period? We must expect repetitions. There will be repetitions in the class struggle. If a momentous event should happen in the world, if a major problem appears in China, or if there is a world war or severe famine, the rightists may revolt, and the middle-roaders may rise up to resist us. Nevertheless, the fundamental battle has been fought and the situation is good, but we must be prepared for the bad.

In sum, the cadres are learning Marxism. To learn Marxism, we must break down superstition. We must not feel that only foreigners can succeed in learning. There is nothing unusual about foreigners. The foreigners think of us as foreigners also, and those on the moon regard us as gods. I believe we can succeed in learning. Four things are needed: a guiding ideology, state wealth, successors, and grain. We must have mental preparation. Bad things will occur. There may be incidents in the provinces, involving 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 people. We must break down superstition, believing in, yet disbelieving in, the scientists. Since ancient times, the children have always excelled the parents, the students the teachers, the young the old, and the spectators the performers. Whenever a problem is discussed, we must also discuss ideology. Some comrades always talk about mathematics. It is not good to leave ideology out. We must not follow the example of the Soviet academicians who give no attention to the internal contradictions among the people.

The Monkey King disregarded the laws and the heavens[5]. Why don't we all emulate him? His anti-dogmatism was demonstrated in his courage to do whatever he wanted. Chu Pa-chieh represented liberalism, but he had a touch of revisionism in him also, because he was always threatening to quit. Of course it was not a good party, it was the Second International. Monk T'ang was equivalent to Bernstein.

The people's and party congresses at the provincial level and above should publish big character posters. There are many in our party who are doubtful of the internal contradictions among the people. Such internal contradictions include those between the exploiters and exploited, those among the workers, peasants, and the Communist Party, and those between the leaders and the led. All contradictions are internal contradictions among the people, except those with the rightists and counter revolutionaries. Failure to visit the plants or the farms and bad work styles are internal contradictions among the people. Like the Yangtze River roaring down 10,000 *li*, the big character posters will wash away the dregs in the mind of many people.

How can we catch the snake if we don't let it come out? We must let the scoundrels appear and put on performances and talk nonsense in the newspapers. Let them express and feel pleased with themselves, so that the people can see them clearly and understand them. Our method is to force and capture, and to struggle against and capture. Capturing in the city and struggling in the village make it easy to do things. We issued directives at the beginning of the rectification movement, but such directives were distributed to a small minority, the majority remaining ignorant of them. We wanted to see whether the lower echelon cadres and party members used their brains and we wanted to know their attitude.

We were forced by the situation into technical revolution. The appearance of the XX issue and imperialism were also due to the force of the situation. Things are forced to appear by the presence of opposites. (When Hung-niang was beaten, she enumerated many good principles.) Many things in the world make their appearance due to the force of the situation. When we study a problem we must control the material with a viewpoint and activate the affair at hand with politics. When discussing work appearances, we must not inundate it like a pouring rain, but must go into the details like a fine rain. How can there be a level when only numbers are discussed, without politics? Politics and numbers are the relations between the officers and soldiers, and politics is the commander. Let us hold a newspaper meeting this year. We are not afraid to activate the masses. Activating the masses is the true Marxist-Leninist work style. Lenin went to the villages and the plants in order to associate with the people, and he was vigorously opposed to bureaucraticism.

In rectification we must clarify the line between the enemy and ourselves. The People's Government practices democracy toward the people and dictatorship over the enemy. Rectification requires attacking from both the inside and the outside, but the line between the enemy and ourselves must be clarified, dictatorship enforced over the enemy, and persuasion practiced toward the people. Rectification and anti-rightism have the essence of another power seizure in many areas and units. A class includes many strata within it,

and the problems are complex. There is the distinction between the middle and the poor among the peasants, and between the new and the old among the workers. The relationship between the upper and lower levels is also an internal contradiction among the people. The contradictions between the rightists and the people are the conflicts between the enemy and ourselves. After rectification and anti-rightism, the political root is settled, and the cadres and the masses have gained experience and clarified the two types of contradictions.

A rightist faction in a county in Chekiang attempted to become active. As it did not have the support of the masses, it failed.

Notes

[1.] Chung Po-chun; see [note 1, p 10](#) of this volume.

[2.] For three main rules of discipline and eight points for attention see S.W., [Vol. IV. pp 155-156](#).

[3.] See comrade Mao's article '[The Situation In the Summer of 1957](#)' S.W., Vol. V, pp 473-482.

[4.] The three evils are corruption, waste and bureaucracy. The five evils are, bribery, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing of economic information.

[5.] Sun Wu-kung is the Monkey King in the Chinese novel Hsi Yu chi (Pilgrimage the West) written in the 16th century.

Introducing A Co-operative

April 15, 1958

The article "A Co-operative That Transformed Itself in Two Years of Bitter Struggle"[1] is worth reading. The communist spirit is growing apace throughout the country. The political consciousness of the broad masses is rising rapidly. The backward sections among them are exerting themselves to catch up with the advanced, which demonstrates that the socialist revolution in our country is forging ahead in the economic field (in those places where the relations of production have not yet been completely transformed) and in the political, ideological, technical and cultural fields. Judging from this, it will

probably take less time than previously estimated for our industry and agriculture to catch up with that of the capitalist powers. In addition to the leadership of the Party, a decisive factor is our population of 600 million. More people mean a greater ferment of ideas, more enthusiasm and more energy. Never before have the masses of the people been so inspired, so militant and so daring as at present. The former exploiting classes have been completely swamped in the boundless ocean of the working people and must change, even if unwillingly. Undoubtedly there are people who will never change, who would prefer to keep their thinking ossified down to the Day of Judgment, but that does not matter very much. All decadent ideology and other incongruous parts of the super-structure are crumbling as the days go by. To clear away the rubbish completely will still take some time, but there is no doubt of their inevitable and total collapse. Apart from their other characteristics, the outstanding thing about China's 600 million people is that they are "poor and blank". This may seem a bad thing, but in reality it is a good thing. Poverty gives rise to the desire for change, the desire for action and the desire for revolution. On a blank sheet of paper free from any mark, the freshest and most beautiful characters can be written, the freshest and most beautiful pictures can be painted. The big-character poster^[2] is a very useful new weapon, which can be used in the cities and the rural areas, in factories, co-operatives, shops, government institutions, schools, army units and streets — in short, wherever the masses are to be found. It has already been widely used and should always be used. A poem written by Kung Tzu-chen^[3] of the Ching Dynasty reads:

Only in wind and thunder can the country show its vitality;

Alas, the ten thousand horses are all muted!

O Heaven! Bestir yourself, I beseech you,

And send down men of all the talents.

Big-character posters have dispelled the dullness in which "ten thousand horses are all muted". Now I wish to recommend one co-operative to the comrades in the more than 700,000 co-operatives in the countryside and to the comrades in the cities. Situated in Fenghiu County, Honan Province, and called the Yingchu Co-operative, it provides us with much food for deep thought. Do the Chinese working people still retain any of their past slavish features? None at all; they have become the masters. The working people on the 9,600,000 square kilometers of the People's Republic of China have really begun to be the rulers of our land.

[1.] This article introduces the Yingchu Agricultural Producers' Co-operative in Fengchiu County, Honan Province. It is situated on low-lying land where water-logging has often been disastrous, and before liberation the people there lived in poverty and hardship. After liberation their life improved and in 1955 the co-operative was formed. In its first two years, it suffered a succession of serious floods. Relying on their own strength and putting their collective wisdom to work, the cadres and members of the co-operative waged a bitter struggle against natural disasters. In the short space of two years the co-operative basically freed itself from drought and flood and drastically changed its appearance by building extensive water conservancy works, bringing dry land under irrigation and converting alkaline land into paddy fields.

[2.] The Tatsepao, or big-character poster, is a powerful new weapon, a means of criticism and self-criticism which was created by the masses during the rectification movement; at the same time it is used to expose and attack the enemy. It is also a powerful weapon for conducting debate and education in accordance with the broadest mass democracy. People write down their views, suggestions or exposures and criticisms of others in big characters on large sheets of paper and put them up in conspicuous places for people to read.

[3.] Kung Tzu-chen (1792-1841) of Jenho (now Hangchow), Chekiang Province, was a progressive thinker and writer of the Ching Dynasty. He wrote this poem on worshipping the gods at Chenkiang on his way back to Hangchow from Peking in 1839.

[Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung](#)

Speeches At The Second Session Of The Eighth Party Congress

May 8-23, 1958

[SOURCE: 'Long Live Mao Zedong Thought,' a Red Guard Publication.]

The First Speech May 8, 1958

Let us discuss the breaking down of superstition. Didn't a comrade mention it just a while ago? Some of our comrades have many fears. Some are afraid of being college professors, but they have gradually lost or reduced their fear after the rectification. Some have already accepted letters of employment as professors. I read in the newspapers that comrade K'o Ch'ing-shih accepted the professorship at Fu-tan university. It was a manifestation of fearlessness. Others are preparing to serve as college professors. The above concerns the fear of being bourgeois professors. Is there also the fear of being proletarian professors? I think there is. For instance, there is the fear of Marx. He lived in

a very tall building, and one had to climb many flights of stairs to reach him, something unattainable in a lifetime. As I mentioned at the Ch'eng-tu conference, do not be afraid, because Marx was also a human being, with two eyes, two hands, and one brain, not much different from us, except that he had a lot of Marxism in his mind. He wrote many books for us to read. We do not have to read all of them. Is Comrade X X X here? (Answer: Here.) Have you finished reading them? If you have finished reading them, then you have ascended the stairs. I have not finished reading them; therefore I am still downstairs. As we have not finished reading his books, we all belong downstairs, but do not be afraid. It is not necessary to read all of Marx's books. Reading some of the fundamental things will be sufficient, but what we have done has surpassed Marx. What Lenin said and did surpassed Marx in many aspects. Marx did not undertake the October Revolution, but Lenin did; therefore, Lenin surpassed Marx in the practical aspect. At that time, he had the conditions of the time. Marx never undertook China's great revolution; therefore, our practice also surpassed Marx. Principles are created in practice. Marx did not succeed in his revolution, but we did. When such revolutionary practice is reflected in ideology, it becomes theory.

Our theoretical level is not high. It is not high now, but we must not be afraid. As long as we exert ourselves, we will go forward. Stairs can be made, and so can elevators. We must not belittle ourselves or hold ourselves in contempt. As I have often said to some comrades, China was oppressed by imperialism for over 100 years and the people were intimidated by the propaganda of obedience to foreigners and foreign countries spread by imperialism; they were afraid of everything. Feudalism propagandized obedience to Confucius, making us feel inferior. We were inferior in the face of Confucius. Since the Opium War^[1], we have been inferior in the face of foreigners, and we were afraid of them. Before that we were afraid of Confucius. Old Tung did you not once obey Confucius? What was the reason? At that time, the saying was "rejecting the Sage is violating the law." Opposing the Sage was violating the constitution. In regard to the foreigners, I am inferior to them; in regard to Confucius, I am inferior to him. What kind of reasoning is this? I once asked some comrades around me whether we lived in heaven or on earth. They all shook their head and said that we lived on earth. I said no, we live in heaven. When we look at the stars from the earth, they are in heaven. But if there are people in the stars, when they look at us, wouldn't they think that we are in heaven? Therefore I say that we live in heaven while also on earth at the same time. The Chinese like the gods. I asked them whether we were gods. They answered no. I said wrong. The gods live in heaven. We live on earth, but also in heaven; so, why shouldn't we be considered gods also? If there were people in the stars, wouldn't they also consider us as gods? My third question was whether the Chinese were also foreigners? They said no, only the foreigners were foreigners. I said wrong, the Chinese were also foreigners, because when we consider the people of foreign countries as foreigners, wouldn't they also consider us as foreigners? It explains the superstitious ideas on this point.

There is a kind of microbes which are called germs. Though small in size, from a certain standpoint, they are more powerful than men. They have no superstition and are full of energy. They strive for the upper reaches and for greater, faster, better, and more economical results. They are not afraid of heaven or earth. They do not respect anyone. If

they want to eat people, they will crawl into them regardless of who you are. Even if you should weigh 80 kilograms, they can destroy you. No one counts as far as they are concerned. Isn't their fearless spirit much stronger than certain people?

Since ancient times, whenever the scholars or inventors created a new school of thought, they have always started young, possessed not much learning, and were scorned and oppressed. Not until later did they grow into adults and become learned. Are all the people like this? Is it a universal law? We cannot be completely sure, and it requires investigation and study. However, one can say that the majority are like that. Why did they become inventors, scholars, or heroes? They succeeded because their bearing was correct. Regardless of the amount of learning, if the bearing is wrong, it is of no use. "Man dreads fame and a hog dreads fat." The famous people are often the most backward, most fearful, and most lacking in creativity. Why? Because they have already attained fame. They have seniority and position, and are no longer oppressed. Being busy, they do not study any more. Of course, we cannot discredit all famous people. There are exceptions. Instances of young people knocking down the old people, or the uneducated knocking down the highly educated, are numerous.

There was a man named Kan Lo in the Kingdom of Ch'in during China's Warring States period. He was probably the grandson of Kan Mao. He became prime minister at the age of 12. He was truly a "red scarf." When his grandfather Kan Mao did not know what to do, he did. He solved a major problem in the Kingdom of Chao.

Chia I in the Han Dynasty was sought by Emperor Wen when the former was only 17 years old and was promoted three times in one day. Later on he was exiled to Ch'ang-sha. There he wrote two poems entitled "Mourning Ch'u Yuan" and "The Enormous Bird." Returning to the court, he wrote two books entitled *The Strategy to Maintain Peace and The Faults of the Ch'in Dynasty*. I think he was also an expert on the history of Ch'in and Han. Is Comrade Fan Wen-lan here? Am I correct? Please look into it. Chia I wrote dozens of books and what we have today are the two poems and two treatises discussed above. At the time of his death he was only 33 years of age.

Liu Pang of the Han Dynasty was older. Hsiang Yu launched an uprising at age 24 and became a feudal prince five years later. Subsequently, he conferred on himself the title of the King of Ch'u. He died at age 32. He was very young when he said his famous farewell to his queen. Now he wears a beard in the opera. I think it is wrong. He should be portrayed only as a young man.

Han Hsin was also scorned. During his youth, he suffered the insult of being forced to crawl between someone's legs.

Confucius had no position in his youth. He worked as a bugler and drummer and served as the master of ceremony at funerals. Later on he taught. Although he became a government official and once served as the chief of the judicial department in the Kingdom of Lu, it was only for a short time. The Kingdom of Lu had a population of only a few hundred thousand, not any bigger than one of our counties. Confucius'

position as chief of the judicial department was only equivalent to a section chief in our county government. He also served as a minor official in charge of money, equivalent to an accountant in our agricultural cooperative, but he acquired much skill.

Yen Yuan was a disciple of Confucius. He could be considered as a second grade sage. He died at age 32.

Shakyamuni created Buddhism in his youth, while still in his teens or possibly 20. He belonged to an oppressed race in India at that time.

Hung Niang in the *Western Chambers* was a famous figure, known to everyone[2]. She was a young slave girl, but she was just and brave. She had the courage to break through the conventions and render aid to Ts'ui Ying-ying and Scholar Chang. What she did at that time was illegal and in violation of the marriage law. The old mistress gave her a sound beating, but she would not capitulate. Instead, she reprimanded the old mistress. Was the old mistress or Hung Niang better educated? Which one was creative? Which one was an inventor?

Hsun Kuan-niang (of Lin-yin County, Honan) of the North and South Dynasties was a 13-year-old girl, with an educational level of first year middle school at the most. When she and her father were trapped in Hsiang-yang, she had the courage to lead several dozen men to break through the enemy line and get help from Ch'ang-sha. How capable she was!

Poet Li Ho in the T'ang Dynasty died at age 27.

Li Shih-min, the first emperor of the T'ang Dynasty, was only 18 when he launched an uprising and only 26 when he became emperor. Both Li Ho and Li Shih-min were of aristocratic origin.

Lo Shih-hsin of Tung-li-ch'eng at the end of T'ang Dynasty started an uprising at age 24. He fought battles at age 14 and was very brave. Tu Fu-wei (of Chang-ch'iu, Shantung) became a general at age 16.

Wang Po, the author of the poem entitled "T'eng-wang-ko" and one of the four eminent at the beginning of T'ang Dynasty, was also a young man. At the time of his death, he was only 29.

Yueh Fei, the famous general in-the Sung Dynasty, was only 38 when he died.

Comrade Fan Wen-lan, am I right? You are a historian. Please correct me if I am wrong.

Marx did not create Marxism during his adulthood or old age, but in his youth. He was only 29 when he wrote the *Communist Manifesto*.

Lenin was only 32 years old when he founded Bolshevism in 1903.

Both Chou Yu and K'ung Ming were young men. K'ung Ming served as the military chief of staff at age 27. Sun Wu's original commanding general Ch'eng P'u was an old man, but when Sun Wu attacked Ts'ao Ts'ao, he used Chou Yu as the commanding general, ranking him above Ch'eng P'u. The latter resented it, but Chou Yu won the battle. Chou Yu died at age 36. Huang Kai, who came from Li-ling, Hunan, established merits in the same battle. I felt honoured for his deeds as we came from the same place.

Wang Pi of the Ch'in Dynasty wrote annotations to *Chuang-tzu* and *I-chang*. He was a philosopher at age 18. His grandfather was Wang Su. He died at age 24.

The inventor of the sleeping pill was not an expert. It is reported that he was in charge of drugs in a small pharmacy. I read about it in a pamphlet. He almost lost his life when he experimented on the sleeping pill. After he succeeded in his experiments, the French Government did not approve of him and accused him of violating the law. The Germans invited him over, held a celebration in his honour and published his books.

The inventor of penicillin was a dyer. When his daughter fell sick, he had no money to send her to hospital. So, he scooped up a handful of dirt from the vat and mixed it with something. The daughter recovered after taking the mixture. Later on, after experimenting, penicillin was discovered.

Darwin, the great inventor, was also a young man. He was religious in his early days and was also scorned by others. He studied biology and traveled everywhere, North and South America and Asia, but he did not get to Shanghai.

Recently Hu Shih^[3] returned to Taiwan and ran the Academy of Science. Two American inventors, Li Cheng-tao and Yang Chen-ning, were included among the members. These two men are also young.

Hao Chien-hsiu, a national people's congress delegate, created an advanced spinning method when she was only 18.

Nieh Erh, the great musician who wrote the national anthem, is also a young man.

No-cha, the son of Heavenly King Li Chin, was also a young man. But he was very talented!

King Lan-ling of the North and South Dynasties was also a young man. He was skilled in battle and very brave. There is a song which eulogizes him entitled "The Song of King Lan-ling Entering the Battle." I hear that this song is in Japan.

Many outstanding cadres in the townships and communes are young people. In general, there are many capable young men.

My purpose in citing so many examples is to show that the young people must surpass the old and the less educated can excel the more educated. Do not be intimidated by

famous people and scholars. We must be courageous in thinking, speaking and doing. We must not be afraid to think, speak, or do. We must liberate ourselves from the condition of having our hands and feet tied.

The initiative and creativity of the laboring people have always been abundant. In the past, they were held in restraint under the old system. Now they have been liberated and have begun to produce results.

Our method is to lift the lid, break down superstition and let the initiative and creativity of the laboring people explode.

In the past, many people felt that to develop industry was something too high to attain and very mysterious. They said: "it is not easy to achieve industrialization!" In general, there was a big superstition in regard to industry.

Neither do I understand industry. I know nothing about it, yet I do not believe that it is unattainable. I discussed the subject with several persons in charge of industry. It seems to be incomprehensible at the beginning, but becomes comprehensible after a few years of study. There's nothing much to it! I think that in 10 years or so our country will become an industrial nation. We must not consider industrialization as something so serious. We must first hold it in contempt and then give it serious attention.

"Make the high mountain bow its head; make the river yield the way." It is an excellent sentence. When we ask the high mountain to bow its head, it has to do so! When we ask the river to yield the way, it must yield!

Is such a hypothesis groundless? No, we are not insane; we are pragmatists; we are Marxists seeking truth from facts.

We do not want big nation chauvinism. It means ugly and evil behaviour and low class interest.

Chia Kuei is a character in the play entitled *Fa-men Temple*. He served under Liu Chin. The latter was a court eunuch in the Ming Dynasty, but actually the "prime minister", possessed great powers. One time Liu Chin asked Chia Kuei to take a seat. Chia Kuei said: "I am used to standing; I do not dare to sit." It was a slavish behaviour. The Chinese people served as slaves to imperialism for a long time. It is inevitable that a tail from this slavish behavior is carried over to the present. This tail must be chopped off; the work style of Chia Kuei must be knocked down.

There are two kinds of modesty One is ordinary modesty and the other is modesty compatible with reality.

The dogmatists copy from foreign countries. This is excessive modesty. Why do they not use their brains in whatever they do? In China's classical poetry, there is a kind, which is

imitation classical poetry. It is excessive modesty Without any creative style of their own, they have to imitate others.

The revisionists are also guilty of excessive modesty. Tito, for instance, does nothing but copy from Eduard Bernstein and borrow from his bourgeois mentors.

When a proletariat copies from the proletariat of another country, it is dogmatism, copying the bad as well as the good. This is not good. One must copy, but what one should copy is the spirit, the essence, not the superficial. The nine common outlines of Moscow (said to be five outlines in *Re-discussion*, but there are nine in the Moscow Declaration), for instance, are things in common among the nations and not one can be left out. The universal truth must be combined with China's concrete reality. If not combined, it will be copying, and excessive modesty. Anything which is not a universal truth cannot be copied as is. Even things domestic must not be copied without modification. At the time of the land reform, the Central [Government] did not stress the experience of any one particular area. It was for fear of copying. This issue must be given attention in the current work.

The revisionists are influenced by the bourgeoisie; they copy the bourgeoisie. Tito's copying Eduard Bernstein is one example.

We must study Lenin and be courageous in hoisting the red flag, the redder the better. We must be courageous in advocating something new and establishing something different. There are two kinds of advocating something new and establishing something different: Hoisting the red flag is proper; hoisting the white flag is improper. Lenin advocated something new and established something different for the Second International and it was proper for him to hoist another red flag. The red flag has to be hoisted in any case. If you fail to do so, the bourgeoisie will hoist the white flag. Rather than permitting the bourgeoisie to hoist the flag, it is better for our proletariat to do so. We must be courageous in hoisting the flag, leave no room [for the bourgeoisie]. We must uproot and discard the flags hoisted by the bourgeoisie. We must be courageous in hoisting and uprooting.

Lenin once said: "Progressive Asia and backward Europe." It was the truth. Even now it is still thus. We are progressive; Western Europe is backward.

We regard with contempt the bourgeoisie, the gods and God, but we must not belittle small nations or our own comrades.

When we become a modernized, industrialized and highly cultured great power 15 years hence, we may possibly become too cocky and raise our tail sky high. We must not be afraid. Let us make it clear now. When a dog raises his tail, he doesn't necessarily indicate that he is ready to fight. He can be off with a splash of cold water. Sometimes we also need to have cold water splashed on us.

Improper self-confidence, mediocre self-confidence and false self-confidence are all not permissible. Modesty without a scientific foundation is not true modesty. True modesty must be compatible with reality. For example, when we tell the foreigners that China is still an agricultural nation and its industrial construction is just beginning . . . , it is reality, but the foreigners will find us modest. Modesty must be compatible with reality. Some kind of modesty is less than reality, or excessive modesty. Generally speaking, it has to be compatible with reality.

This view is similar to Lu Hsun's satire. Lu Hsun said: Depicting true things with a well tempered or slightly exaggerated pen is satire.

I was happy to read a recent article by Comrade Fan Wen-lan. It was straight talk. Many facts cited in the article prove that respecting the modern and belittling the ancient is a Chinese tradition. He quoted Ssu-ma Ch'ien^[4], Ssu-ma Kuang . . . but it is regrettable that he did not quote Ch'in-Shih-huang. He was an expert in respecting the modern and belittling the ancient. Of course I do not like to quote him either. (Comrade Lin Piao interrupts: "Ch'in-shih-huang burned the books and buried the scholars alive".) What did he amount to? He only buried alive 460 scholars, while we buried 46,000. In our suppression of the counter-revolutionaries, did we not kill some counter-revolutionary intellectuals? I once debated with the democratic people: You accuse us of acting like Ch'in-shih-huang, but you are wrong; we surpass him 100 times. You berate us for imitating Ch'in-shih-huang in enforcing dictatorship. We admit them all. What is regrettable is that you did not say enough. We have had to say it for you. (Laughter.)

Things will always march toward the opposite side.

The dialectics of Greece, the metaphysics of the Middle Ages, the Restoration. . . . It is the negation of negation.

It is also true in China. The hundred scholars expressing themselves in the time of the Warring States was dialectics. The classics of the feudal era were metaphysics. Now dialectics is being promoted.

Am I right? Comrade Fan Wen-lan, you are familiar with such things.

I feel that after 15 years we will become cocky and big nation chauvinism may appear. We are not afraid of the appearance of big nation chauvinism. Should we stop struggling for the construction of a socialist power just because we are afraid of big nation chauvinism? Even if it should appear, it will march toward the opposite direction and something correct will replace it. What is there to fear? In a socialist nation, it is impossible for all the people to become big nation chauvinists. Lenin's dialectics, Stalin's partial metaphysics and today's dialectics are also the negation of negation.

Stalin was not completely a metaphysicist. He understood dialectics, but not very thoroughly.

The creativity of the people exists objectively. It is important to set up an opposite. Opposites exist objectively. With regard to the rightists, for example, we let them express themselves. We do so purposely, our goal is to set up the opposite. After rectifying the rightists, some comrades overlooked rectification and reform. Thus, we stressed the big character posters and the double antis, thus setting up the opposite. After publishing 100 million big character posters, they were forced to reform.

When we say setting up the opposite, it does not mean setting up something not in objective existence. The so-called opposite can only be set up when it is in objective existence. What is not in objective existence cannot be set up.

I have finished my speech. The subject matter is breaking down superstition. Do not be afraid of being professors or of Marx.

The Second Speech

May 17 1958

1. The International Situation

There are many troubles in the capitalist world. We have less in our world. We are firmly united. Yugoslavia is not in our camp; it doesn't count. We did not exclude it. It does not want to join us. The situation of the 12 nations in our camp is very good. It has always been good. There hasn't been any bad day. But at times there are dark clouds in the sky. Some people feel that we are not capable while others are. We say that we are capable. I listed 10 pieces of evidence at the Moscow conference^[5] to prove that we have always been capable. When Chiang Kai-shek was in Nanking and we in Yen-an, which one was capable? At that time Yen-an had only 7,000 people, including the suburbs. Nanking is very big. Big cities like Nanking and Shanghai were all in Chiang Kai-shek's hands. He had millions of troops while we had only several hundred thousand guerrillas. It has always been the case for the small to defeat the big and for the weak to conquer the strong. The small and the weak have vigor, while the big and the strong do not. The general situation is very good. We need not talk about Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek and U.S. imperialism. We have always regarded U.S. imperialism as a paper tiger. Pity there is only one U.S. imperialism; even if there were 10 of them, it would not bother us. It will perish sooner or later.

The Japanese in Peking apologized to me for attacking us. I said: you did a good deed. Precisely because of your invasion and occupation of more than half of China we were able to unite, lead the people of the entire nation to chase you away and come to Peking. When we were in Yen-an, we wondered when we would be able to see the operas of Mei Lan-fang and Ch'eng Yan-ch'iu. Some thought they would never have a chance in their lifetime. However, we did get to see the operas. The revolutionary situation has been developing rapidly. In seven years, the entire party united and overthrew Chiang Kai-

shek. Now we want to unite and undertake construction. The “Seventh Party Congress” had a program[6]. This congress was also a congress of unity, a congress of victory. It also had a common program. The entire party unanimously formulated a general line for the building of socialism, which also serves as the general line of the people of the entire country. The situation at home is one of unity in the party and among the people.

The international scene is troubled with much disorder. There are internal squabbles in the imperialist camp. The world is not at peace. There are troubles in France, Algeria, Latin America, Indonesia and Lebanon. All the troubles are in the capitalist world. But they all concern us. Anything that is adverse to imperialism is advantageous to us. Imperialism is squabbling within itself; it is suppressing Indonesia, Lebanon and Latin America and fighting over Algeria. (I shall not repeat the details. I refer you to the materials.) Generally speaking, sometimes the situation seems to be bad, dark clouds in the sky. At such times we must be far-sighted. We must not be confused by the temporary darkness and feel that things are wrong with us and with the world and that we will have bad luck. There is no such thing! In the past, our worst period was the Long March[7], blocked in front and pursued from behind and our troops, our land and our party were reduced, with only one of our ten fingers left. Overcoming these difficulties tempered us. Later on, new opportunities appeared and we again developed ourselves. Our one finger grew into ten. We developed all the way to the founding of the People’s Republic of China and gained a national victory. The very first page of the first chapter of the Soviet Communist Party History discussed the dialectics of growing from small to big. The Soviet communists developed from a cell organized by a few individuals into a great party leading the nation. They had not even a single rifle. Yet, first the Czar and then the Kerensky Government, both fully armed numbered among their enemies. Which one was stronger, the fully armed or the one without a rifle? I say that the latter was stronger. Who conquered whom at the end? The condition of our party was similar to it. In 1921 our party was founded, consisting of only a few dozen members. Chou Fu-hai of the First Party Congress was a “good comrade” (sound o! f laughter) and Ch’en Kung-po another “good comrade” (sound of laughter)[8]. Ch’en Tu-hsiu did not come to the meeting, but because of his prestige, he was elected the secretary general. But he was unfit. He subscribed to Bernstein-ism. He was a radical and willing to promote a democratic revolution, but he did not understand the socialist revolution or the theory of the continuous revolution; therefore, he made mistakes. Let us recall our party history and see how much difficulties we have encountered! There was the Long March and there was also the period from the Third to the Fourth Plenum [of the Sixth Central Committee?][9]. The Fourth Plenum was held in Shanghai and there were very few people left. It was life or death. The party was splitting.

At the time of the Long March of 25,000 li, the party was also splitting. After splitting, it united again. Chang Kuo-t’ao took off and unity was restored. Subsequently in Yen-an, Chiang Kai-shek and the Japanese surrounded us, cutting us into more than 10 bases. Under such a difficult situation, was Yen-an or Nanking stronger? Were we or was Chiang Kai-shek stronger? Now it has been proven that we were stronger, for how else would we be holding a meeting in Huai-jen Hall? Why did he flee to Taiwan? Who was the victor?

2. The Domestic Situation

China is an important component of international society. When we discuss the international situation, we must discuss China. China is the proof that the laboring people, the oppressed, have vigor. Currently, socialism has many allies. The national independence movement of Asia, Africa and Latin America is our ally. They are the rear areas of imperialism and we have allies there. Lenin said: Progressive Asia and backward Europe.” England, France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium and Portugal in Europe are all backward; the U.S. is also backward. Are they progressive or are we? Stalin understood this point. In June 1949, when Comrade XXX led our party delegation to the Soviet Union and Stalin toasted China at a banquet for surpassing the Soviet Union in the future, Comrade XXX said: “I cannot drink this toast. You are the teacher and we the pupil. When we catch up with you, you will have progressed even further.” Stalin replied: “Incorrect. If the pupil cannot surpass the teacher, he is not a good pupil. You must drink this toast.” After a deadlock of 20 minutes, Comrade XXX finally drank the toast. When the teacher teaches the pupil, the latter will be undeserving if he does not catch up with the former. The incident indicated that not just Lenin, but even Stalin saw the East as progressive. When the teacher is eminent, the pupil is outstanding. We must not be arrogant and cocky, nor must we feel inferior, considering ourselves worthless without cause. We must break down superstition and place ourselves in the proper level. We should be courageous in thinking, speaking, and doing, with Marxism-Leninism as the foundation. Tito has courage in thinking, speaking, and doing, but his foundation is imperialism and capitalism, not Marxism-Leninism. Our foundation is Marxism-Leninism; therefore, we are correct, and we will not get into trouble when we think, speak, and do with courage.

Let us discuss the domestic problem. The peasant alliance remains to be the domestic problem. China’s revolution has always been the issue of this alliance. Without it, the working class could not have gained liberation; it would not be able to build a powerful nation. Prior to the liberation, China’s working class numbered only four million (excluding handicraft). Now there are 12 million, or three times as many. When we include the family members, the number is only around 40 million, while the peasant population reaches over 500 million. Therefore, China’s problem has always been the problem of the peasant alliance. Some comrades are not very clear about this, not even after having worked in the rural village for decades. Why did we make anti-adventurist mistakes in 1956? The major cause rested with the problem of the peasant alliance. The thinking and feelings of the peasants were not thoroughly understood; therefore, there was no basis and, the moment there was a storm, vacillation could easily occur. In 1956 we published a book on the rural socialist high tide, including material from 190 cooperatives in the provinces and regions:[\[10\]](#) Each province contributed several articles except Tibet. In fact, we did not need that many. Just the material of the Wang Kuo-fan Cooperative, Tsun-hua County, Hopeh Province, would have been enough[\[11\]](#). Then, there was the case of a poor cooperative in central Hopeh. All the middle peasants fled, leaving only three poor peasant households, but these three families held on. They

pointed out the direction of the 500 million peasants. Each and every province had many cooperatives with production increases. The increases ranged one to several folds. Do you still refuse to believe it? The 40 articles of agriculture will definitely be realized. Can you still refuse to believe it? I feel that they can be realized. In 1955, 1956 and the first half of 1957, the number of disbelievers was considerably big and there were many tide-watchers in all levels including the Central. At present, XXX are talking about settling accounts after the fall. They look only for the negative elements, not the positive. When a few cadres are overheard to say that the rural village is not so good, three or four individuals would whisper into one another's ears that the cooperative is not so good, the future looks bleak, the peasants do not have enough to eat, there is no output increase nor reserve grain, etc. When the family writes for money, they will always exaggerate, making life sound harder than it is and complaining about the lack of grain, oil and fabric, for otherwise you will not remit. You must analyze all these. Is it true that there is no grain, oil, or fabric? Comrade K' o Ch'ing-shih[12] told me about the statistics of Kiangsu Province. In 1955, 30 percent of the cadres of the county, district and township levels made loud protests, complained about the "hardships" on behalf of the peasants and objected to the excessive "control" in the "unified" purchasing and selling. What kind of people were those cadres? They were all well-to-do middle peasants, or formerly poor and lower-middle peasants who had become well-to-do middle peasants. The so-called hardships of the peasants were the hardship of the well-to-do middle peasants. The well-to-do middle peasants wanted to hoard their grain instead of surrendering it and they wanted to promote capitalism. Therefore, they squawked about the hardships of the peasants. The lower levels squawked, but did someone in the regional, provincial, or central level complain also? Was there anyone who was not more or less influenced by his family in the home village? The question is the standpoint you take in looking at a problem. Do you take the standpoint of the working class and poor and lower-middle peasants, or do you take that of the well-to-do middle peasants?

Now it is a little better. The rural areas have made a great leap forward. After the rectification, the anti-rightist movement, cadre participation in labor and worker participation in a part of the management, the urban and rural political atmosphere has changed. One can say that the agricultural "pessimism" and "hopelessness", and the lack of confidence in realizing the "40 articles" have been swept clean. However, some of the "tide watchers" and "fall account settlers" have not been swept clean. Therefore, attention must be given to this work. The XXX report suggested guarding against fancy words without substance, surface without depth and generalization without detail. The suggestion was made by Kiangsu. What they mean is to see one's own defects. Among the 10 fingers, nine of them are bright and the remaining one in darkness. "Fancy" means flowery, blooming without bearing fruit. In regard to "generalization without detail", Chang Fei[13] gave attention to the details even though he dealt in generalization. We want to be Chang Fei and give attention to the details. We must not bloom without bearing fruit or give attention to the general while ignoring the details, for otherwise we may not attain our quota in the fall. Comrades of all occupations, professions and units must pay attention, regardless of their type of work, whether industry, agriculture, commerce, culture and education, or writing novels.

The domestic situation is very good and the future looks bright. In the past, thinking was not unified. There was no confidence in achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results. Industry, agriculture and communication are concerned with these results. The basic issue is agriculture, the issue of the 40 articles. Now confidence has increased because of the great leap forward in agricultural production. The agricultural leap forward creates a pressure on industry and causes it to catch up, leaping forward together and motivating the entire work. A proposal was made at the Nan-ning Conference. The provinces should make plans on just how long it would take, five, seven, or so many years, for the value of industrial production to catch up with or surpass that of agricultural production. In only three months after the proposal, industries at the local provincial, county and township levels flourished. Now this is understood by many comrades. In the second half of 1956 some of the Central comrades did not understand it very clearly. After 1956 and the first half of 1957, the problem has been solved. Comrade Chou En-lai's report at the People's Congress in June of last year was very good, declaring war on the bourgeoisie with the posture of the proletarian warrior. That article should be read over again. At that time, the problem was truly solved, but profound understanding did not come until later.

Now the Center has decided that its responsible comrades must go into the field for four months out of the year to do detailed work, visit plants and cooperatives, settle among the masses and familiarize themselves with the conditions of the people. Settling roots is to settle one's roots among the people. I thank the first secretary of Ch'ang-ko County, Honan Province, for his report. It is very good. (I have re-read it). He reports on turning the soil over deeply in the entire 1.12 million mou of land once a year to a depth of 1.5 ch'ih. in order to attain the output of 900 catties per mou. This brings up a new problem. Can all the counties do it? Since Ch'ang-ko County can do it, do you mean to say that the other counties cannot? If it can't be done once every year or every two years, what about every three years? I feel once every five years should be possible. The second five-year plan of Ch'ang-ko County calls for turning over once all the soil in the county. If you do not have good tools, then use those similar to Ch'ang-ko County and follow their method. If you have no method for the second five-year plan, then follow their method. Maybe there are still other methods. Their method is as follows: First pile the surface ripe soil on one side. Then apply fertilizer on the raw soil. Turn over the raw soil with shovels and mix it with the fertilizer. After breaking up the clods, leave the fertilizer mixed soil where it is. Then start with the next row and move the ripe soil of the second row on the raw soil of the first row. Continue to do the same row by row. Thus, the top soil remains on top. This is a big invention. One deep soil turn-over results in an output increase of 100 percent, or at least 90 percent. Soil is the first consideration for production increase. Water, fertilizer, soil improvement, seeds and close planting should be considered as another item. Close planting must be rational. In Kwangtung, each mou is divided into 30,000 "to" 1; in each "to" is planted three rice seedlings, each seedling produces three sprouts, bearing 27 ears of grain and each ear averages 60 [kernels of] grain, totalling 16.2 million [kernels of] grain. 20,000 [kernels of] grain equal one catty and one mou produces 810 catties. Isn't this the way to compute the 800-catty per mou output? The same computation can be used for wheat, corn, spiked-millet, kaoliang and soybeans in the North. Close planting is the full utilization of air and sunshine. Currently are we not

in the process of eliminating waste? Then we must also eliminate the waste of air and sunshine. Sunshine works hard everyday and yet you do not utilize it! When absorbed by plants, the carbon dioxide in the air turns into carbohydrates which become matters needed by plants by means of photosynthesis. Carbohydrates are carbon dioxide plus sunshine. Grain is the storehouse of heat. The structure of each grain is similar to a miniature reservoir. I am going too far afield. Mainly I want to discuss settling one's roots and contacting the people, such as visiting a few cooperatives and plants, a few units in the troops, a few schools in education and a few stores in commerce. There is no need to contact too many. Anyway, a few units in each occupation and profession should be studied in detail before one can have a profound impression. One must respect materialist dialectics. Materialism is the most important. Why? The words philosophy, epistemology and methodology are one and the same. Where does man's thinking come from? Does it come with one's birth, or after observation and practice? Man's thinking is not endowed by nature, but consists of concepts formed through the reflection of external matters. Deductions and judgments only become possible after the preliminary formation of concepts, such as dog, man, child, tree, horse, rock, etc. If a three-year old child is asked whether his mother is a human being or a dog, he will be able to reply that she is a human being, not a dog. This is the judgment of the child. Mother is an individual, while human being is general, yet there is an identity between the two. It is the unity of opposites between the individual and the general. It is dialectics. Thus, a three-year old child understands the unity of contradictions and dialectics. Our thinking can only be formed through the stimulation of our senses by the objective world. It is formed from objective practice. Where do concepts come from? They come from the objective world. The current concept of greater, faster, better and more economical results has been formed only through the accumulation of many experiences, including those of China, of the Soviet Union, of our base and of several years of construction. The phrase "go all out and strive for the upper reaches" is also indispensable. We cannot do without it. Without energy, or sufficient energy, it is hard for an individual, a group of people, or a party, to do anything successfully. Naturally we want to strive for the upstream, all the way up to Szechuan, not the lower stream, which is Kiangsu. This is illustrating the issue with natural geography. We must keep pace with the advanced.

Our comrades must associate with the masses, truly understand their feelings and impress our mind with their thinking and emotions. If our mind is not deeply impressed with the feelings of the masses, it becomes easy to waver. If our mind is thus deeply impressed, even if we should run into problems in our work, we will be able to handle them. In the past we often encountered difficulties in battles. Sometimes we couldn't find a solution even by midnight. But, after sleeping over it, we would have the solution the next day. Difficulties appear constantly. Sun Yat-sen said that he accumulated 40 years of experience. We have accumulated decades of experience. We well know that, whenever we encounter a difficult problem, we can solve it by consulting with the masses, sleeping over it and holding a meeting. Currently, do we not have problems, or difficulties? Do not be frightened by temporary darkness. We constantly have two elements: Light and dark. Now the northern part of Hopeh has no rainfall. Do you think the comrades of Hopeh are not worried? They produced four billion catties last year and are planning for eight billion this year. Even if there should be drought, the output will be increased to five or six

billion cattiest The domestic situation is pretty good. Do not be afraid of any darkness. There are two sides: Light and dark. The comrades who made mistakes understood the matter in June of last year. There are still many “tide watchers” and “fall account settlers”, but it doesn’t matter. Let us explain the reasons more frequently and convince them by persuasion. Let us set forth the domestic situation and carry out an education.

3. Elimination of the Four Pests

Let us discuss the elimination of the four pests. Is it good to eliminate the four pests? I find it very interesting. According to *Reference News*, the Indians are also interested and they also wish to eliminate pests. They have the pest of monkeys which eat up a lot of grain. No one dares to touch them because they are considered sacred.

We do not propose the slogans “cadres decide everything” or “technology decides everything,” or the slogan “communism is the Soviet Union plus electrification.” But does it mean we do not want electrification? We want electrification just the same and even more urgently. The first two slogans were Stalin’s way and rather one-sided. If “technology decides everything,” then what about politics? If “cadres decide everything”, then what about the masses? Dialectics is missing here. Stalin sometimes understood dialectics and sometimes not. I mentioned this at the Moscow Conference.

Our slogan is: A little more, a little faster, a little better and a little more economical. I think our slogan is a little more intelligent. We should be more intelligent, because the pupil should be better than the teacher. Green comes from blue, but it excels blue. The late-comer should be on top. I feel our communism may arrive in advance of schedule.

There must be tenseness and relaxation when we do something. To be constantly tense is no good. One must be both tense and relaxed. Excessive exhaustion is no good. Honan is extensively promoting red and expert schools. It is very good. But everyone is too tired. Some people dozed off in class. The teachers are also too tired, but they dared not doze off. Excessive exhaustion is not good. There must be a few days of rest. We must be both tense and relaxed, with both democracy and centralization. This principle applies everywhere.

We must struggle against the “tide watchers” and “fall account settlers.” But the goal of such struggle is to rally them, not to exclude them from revolution. What hurt Ah Q most was, not being permitted to engage in the revolution. One must refrain from criticizing without helping the wrongdoers to correct their mistakes. Whether it is in struggling against or helping others, one must have good intentions. It is not good to be without good intentions. It would merely be knocking you down so that I could get on top. Should we have more people or less people? More people are better. We must activate all positive elements.

Dialectics should develop in China. We are not concerned about other places; we are concerned about China. What we do are more compatible with dialectics and with Lenin, but not very compatible with Stalin. Stalin said that the socialist society's production relations completely conformed to the development of the production force; he negated contradictions. Before his death, he wrote an article to negate himself. He stated that complete conformity did not indicate the absence of contradictions and that improper handling could develop into antagonistic contradictions. One couldn't say that he lacked dialectics. He had some. While there were superstition and one-sidedness, his method did succeed in building socialism, defeating the enemy, producing 50 million tons of steel, possibly 55 million tons this year and in putting three satellites in orbit. His was one kind of method. Can we find another method? The purpose is to promote socialism and Marxism-Leninism. Take the class struggle as an example. We have adopted Lenin's method, not Stalin's. When discussing the socialist economy, Stalin said the post-revolutionary reform was a peaceful reform proceeding from the top to the bottom levels. He did not undertake the class struggle from the bottom to the top, but introduced peaceful land reform in Eastern Europe and North Korea, without struggling against the landowners or the rightists, only proceeding from the top to the bottom and struggling against the capitalists. We proceed from the top to the bottom, but we also add the class struggle from the bottom to the top, settling the roots and linking together. We struggled against the bourgeoisie in the "five-evils movement."[\[14\]](#) Now we are promoting construction and the mass movement. We require some things from the top to the bottom, such as government directives and orders, regulations and systems, but the masses must undertake a large number of things. We are! opposed to favoritism and peaceful land reform. We call the method of Eastern Europe and North Korea favoritism. Peaceful land reform, without class struggle and without struggling against the landowners and capitalists, is of the wrong line and will produce harmful results.

Why is the speed of our construction faster than the Soviet Union? Because our conditions are different. We have 600 million people. We follow the road traveled by the Soviet Union; we have its technical aid. Therefore, we should develop faster than the Soviet Union. We expand the tradition of the October Revolution and the mass line of Lenin and rely on the masses, on the poor peasants in the rural areas, except that Lenin did not say this.

Yesterday a comrade said that one couldn't go wrong if one followed a certain individual. By "a certain individual," he meant me. This statement needs modification. One should follow and yet not follow. An individual is sometimes right and sometimes wrong. Follow him when he is right and do not follow him when he is wrong. One must not follow without discrimination. We follow Marx and Lenin and we follow Stalin in some places. We follow whoever has the truth in his hands. Even if he should be a manure carrier or street sweeper, as long as he has the truth, he should be followed. Our cooperativization is for the poor and lower-middle peasants. We advocate the concept of greater, faster, better and more economical results because it came from the masses. We look for the advanced and the good among the plants, rural villages, stores, schools, troops. . . . Wherever truth is, we follow. Do not follow any particular individual. It is

dangerous to follow an individual without discrimination. One must have independent thinking.

Our comrades are often not clear about the principle of the 10 fingers. The moment there is trouble, they forget that there are 10 fingers. The internal contradictions among the laboring people and the mistakes made by them are always the issue of the nine fingers and the one finger.

Our comrades who have committed mistakes are also like them. I am not talking about XXX. The statements of XXX, XXX XX and XXX are very good. Why was XXX not discussed in Anhwei's statement? Chekiang said too little about XXX. You must share what you have for everyone's edification. Why didn't you? The trouble with those individuals is not a question of nine fingers and one finger. XXX has 10 blackened fingers; XXX has nine blackened fingers, leaving only one clean. What I am talking about now are those who waver in times of mighty storms. With them it is the question of nine fingers and one finger. Now it is clear. They are different from those with nine or 10 blackened fingers. We must rally and protect them. We must firmly protect the positive elements of all levels. They might have made mistakes, but they are positive. They are afraid of expressing themselves freely and being unable to make a graceful exit. Given firm protection, they will. Their mistakes are only 10 percent. We must firmly protect such cadres in the rectification. The issue of protecting the cadres was discussed in the documents of the Tsingtao Conference^[15]. It was discussed even before that. The internal contradictions among the laboring people are generally the relations between the nine fingers and one finger, with individual exceptions. Among the bourgeois middle-of-the-roaders, the problem is five fingers and five fingers (five fingers of capitalism and five of socialism) with the middle-middle, six and four with the middle-left and six to seven blackened fingers with the middle-right. The brains of the bourgeois intellectuals cannot be cleansed all at once, but require several repetitions. The bourgeoisie may still make trouble, not big ones, but possible small ones. . . . Storms may appear in the bourgeoisie. In the face of typhoons of the 12th grade, some of our comrades will waver. With the experience of last year and the tempering undergone by! the party, we will be able to ignore the storms and remain steady in our boat. Our boat was not overturned in the mighty storms of last year. Some say that the editorial entitled "Why Is This?" was premature. It was not premature. If postponed, some leftists might have rotted away. Actually, over 100,000 rightists were found among elementary school teachers after December of last year, constituting one-third of the 300,000 rightists in the nation. They dared to launch reckless attacks. Do you mean to say that Chang and Lo would not attack any more after being classified as rightists? They will just the same. As soon as the temperature is suitable, reaching 37 or 38 degrees, those rascals will emerge.

Do not forget the issue of the nine fingers and one finger. The anti-adventurist case of 1956 was a result of forgetting this issue and failing to look at problems concretely. This lesson must be learned.

4. Preparation for the Final Disaster

I now wish to discuss the gloomy side of things. We must prepare for major disasters. With thousands of li of bare earth, great droughts and great floods are possible. We must also prepare for major wars. What should we do if the war maniacs drop atom bombs? Let them drop the atom bomb! The possibility is there as long as the warmongers exist. We must also prepare for troubles in the party — splits. There will be no splits if we handle it right, but it is limited to certain situations and one cannot say that splits are impossible. Was there not a split in the Soviet Union? . . .

Between war and peace, the possibility of peace is greater. Currently the possibility of peace is greater than in the past. The strength of the socialist camp is greater than the past and the possibility of peace is greater than at the time of World War II. The Soviet Union is powerful and the national independence movement is our strong ally. The Western nations are not stable. The working class, a part of the bourgeoisie and the American people do not want war; therefore, the possibility of peace is greater than that of war. Nevertheless, there is also the possibility of war. There are the maniacs and imperialism wants to extricate itself from economic crises. The duration of atomic warfare today will be short, three instead of four years. We must be prepared. What should be done if war really comes? I want to discuss this problem. If there is war, we will fight. Let imperialism be swept clean and we will start construction again. Thereafter there will not be any more world war. Since a world war is possible, we must prepare for it. We must not spend our time napping. Do not be alarmed either if there should be war. It would merely mean getting people killed and we've seen people killed in war. Eliminating half of the population occurred several times in China's history. The 50 million population in the time of Emperor Wu in the Han Dynasty was reduced to 10 million by the time of the Three Kingdoms, the two Chin Dynasties and the North and South Dynasties. The war lasted for decades and intermittently for several hundred years, from the Three Kingdoms to the North and South Dynasties. The T'ang Dynasty began with a population of 20 million and did not reach 50 million until Emperor Hsuan. And Lu-shan staged a revolt and the country was divided into many states. It was not reunited until the Sung Dynasty, some 100 or 200 years later, with a population of just over 10 million. I once discussed this with XXX. I maintained that modern weapons were not as powerful as the big sword of C! hina's Kuan Yun-Ch'ang, but he did not agree with me. Not very many people were killed in the two World Wars, 10 million in the first and 20 million in the second, but we had 40 million killed in one war. So, how destructive were the big swords! We have no experience in atomic war. So, how many will be killed cannot be known. The best outcome may be that only half of the population is left and the second best may be only one-third. When 900 million are left out of 2.9 billion, several five-year plans can be developed for the total elimination of capitalism and for permanent peace. It is not a bad thing.

If the party should split, there would be chaos for a time. If there are people who do not consider the overall situation, like XXX and Kao Kang, the party will split and imbalance will appear, though balance will return finally. When imbalances move in opposite directions, the result is balance. It is even more important for the members of the Central

Committee to consider the overall-situation. Whoever failing to do so will fall. . . . Did those disregarding the over-all situation and clamoring for splits have a good ending? Chang Kuo-t'ao clamored for splits, but what did he get out of it? Clamoring for and promoting splits are wrong. Only one kind of split is permissible: During the Second International, Germany's Social Democratic Party voted for the imperialist war and Lenin broke with them. We must make legitimate struggles and fight for the majority. We must not promote splits and ignore the over-all situation.

We wish to activate the strength of the 600 million people. We want to work on even the rightists, assimilate them and get seven out of 10 to reform. After their reform is completed in eight or 10 years, they will take our side. After their rightist cap is taken off, if they promote rightism again, they will be made to wear it again.

The Third Speech May 20, 1958

1. I will discuss again the breaking down of superstition. The First Ministry of Machine Building issued a pamphlet containing the biographies of 41 inventors. Seven of them were engineers, with social position and the remainder came from poor families, or were workers or peasants. Watt was a worker. The pamphlet began with the 18th century and covered over 100 years. Regardless of the period, it is beneficial to the breaking down of superstition. It will help us break down superstition and discard our inferiority complex. The agricultural, forestry, water conservation, political-legal, cultural-education and public health units should follow suit and collect such material.

2. I will discuss again the issue of taking the attitude of the common laborer. This issue is very important. It is important because some people feel that they are first in the world, look down on others, do not treat others as equals, rely on their qualifications to make a living, especially the high level officials and do not take the attitude of the common laborer. If this problem can be tackled by the majority, things will be easy to do. In the past many bureaucrats did not take the attitude of the common laborer. "I have authority over you." Relying on these words to conduct business, they blocked the development of creativity. Such things must be eliminated. The bureaucratic air must be swept aside in the majority of the people. Whoever has the truth will be obeyed, be he a manure carrier, coal miner, street sweeper, or a poor peasant. No matter how high the official position, if truth is not in his hands, there is no reason to obey him. When the majority get rid of their bureaucratic air, the minority will become isolated and will not dare to make trouble. One should say that bureaucratic air is a sort of low class interest, not high class, not of the communist spirit. On the contrary, appearing with the attitude of the common laborer is high class interest. By so doing, the big nation chauvinism, which we condemn, will be prevented. If the majority of the party members especially the leadership cadres are modest (scientific modesty), chauvinism can be prevented and even if it should appear, we do not need to worry.

3. The non-professional leading the professional is a general rule. One cannot almost say that only the non-professional can lead the professional. Last year the rightists brought up this question and created a lot of trouble. They claimed that the non-professional could not lead the professional.

Can one say that only the non-professional can lead the professional? On this issue, we are in a passive position. In the past, the newspapers were not systematic in criticizing the rightists over this issue and their discussions not penetrating. Why do we say that the non-professional leading the professional is a general rule? Because everyone is a professional and a non-professional. There are 10,000 fields in the world and 10,000 sciences and technologies, but a person is only expert in one. Take the famous Peking Opera star Mei Lan-fang for instance. He can only play the female role. The female role is further subdivided into five different types and he can only do one of them. Then there are still many other roles, such as old man, young man. . . . A person can only master one profession out of the 10,000. Thus we say that everyone is a professional and everyone can become a professional. But everyone is also a non-professional, because he cannot master the remaining 9,999 professions. If a person can master two or three, or four or five professions, he will be amazing. If a person can master the 18 military arts, similar to Hsueh Jen-kuei, there are still 9,982 things which he doesn't know. There are more non-professional than professionals. So, isn't it true that everyone is also a non-professional? In leadership work, besides the leader's own field, he must have some knowledge of other fields and become familiar with a few of them. Common sense is necessary. Those in party work, for example, must be familiar with industry and agriculture. But it is impossible to be expert in them. I can ride in an airplane, but I cannot fly one. The middle school has a few science courses; the college has more. Many things are a result of spare-time pursuits. Take Sun Yat-sen, for example. At the beginning he was not respected. He was a minor physician and undertook the revolution at 20 years of age. It was not legitimate. As a physician he was a professional and politics was his sideline. Subsequently, concentrating on the revolution, politics became his main field. He no longer practiced medicine, which became his sideline. He even gave up medicine and became a non-professional. But he could be in control of the physicians. Politicians handle the mutual relations among men; they promote the mass line. We must study this issue carefully, because many engineers and scientists do not respect us and many among us do not respect ourselves, arbitrarily insisting on the difficulty of non-professionals leading professionals. We must have the ways and means to refute them. I say that the non-professionals leading the professionals is a general rule. Mei Lan-fang, for example, cannot serve as the president; he can only sing operas.

4. One must hoist the red flag and determine the wind direction. The red flag is our five-star red flag. What flag should one hoist? The red flag or the white flag? Flags have to be hoisted everywhere in the world, from the North Pole to the South Pole, wherever there are inhabitants. If it isn't the red flag, it is the white flag, or maybe even gray flag. If it isn't the proletarian flag, it is the bourgeois flag. What flag did the organizations, schools and plants hoist in May and June of last year? Both sides fought. Currently what kind of flag is still hoisted by a few backward plants, or workshops in the plants, cooperatives, schools, military units and organizations or parts of them? If it isn't the white flag, it is

the gray flag. We should visit the backward places and activate the masses to hoist the red flag.

Mediocre modesty is failure to hoist the red flag. Failure to hoist the red flag is a low class orientation and false modesty. Such modesty should be criticized. There is a sort of social public opinion which encourages a sort of work style: Do not come forward fearlessly; do not think, speak and do courageously. This is an influence of *Ju-lin Wai-shih*. To hoist the flag, one must sharpen one's sense of smell, learn the wind direction and determine what wind is blowing. If it is not the east wind prevailing over the west wind, then it is the west wind prevailing over the east wind. These were the words of Lin Tai-yu of Soochow. There will always be parties and factions in the world and the people in society will always be divided into left, middle and right, some in an advanced position, others in the middle or backward positions. The current task is for the advanced elements to fight for those in the middle and make them shift to the left and hoist the red flag. The white flag hoisted by the rightists is the flag of the bourgeoisie. The flag of the middle is gray or white. According to Liu-Chih of the T'ang Dynasty, to write history, one must have talent, learning and understanding. Understanding does not indicate knowledge it indicates a knowledge of the wind direction. We must give special attention and be expert in determining the wind direction and possess the power to make distinctions. This is extremely important. Even though some people may be very talented and learned, they may be slow in distinguishing wind direction. Stalin stressed foresight. Foresight is to distinguish wind direction and foresee a gale when there is only a breeze. It is not good to stand on the observation deck and see nothing. The lack of foresight is not seeing what is already there. Such condition affords the rightists an opportunity. If you don't see them, they will come.

Do not be afraid of hoisting the red flag. Wherever it should be hoisted, hurry up and hoist it. It should be hoisted in each and every hilltop and rural settlement. It should be hoisted in each and every party committee, organization, military unit, plant and cooperative. Wherever there is no red flag, it should be hoisted. Currently there are many places without the red flag. They are not evenly advanced. Some of them become backward again right after hoisting the red flag-and the flag is no longer red. Constant change is also a natural condition. If the flag turns color, it should be replaced.

There are red and white happy events. Last time I discussed the handling of possible disasters, mainly war and party splits. There are big, medium and small disasters. What I discussed were the big ones: war and splits.

The Chinese people consider weddings as red happy events and funerals white happy events. I find them very rational. The Chinese know dialectics. Weddings will produce children. A child is split out of the body of the mother. It is a sudden change, a happy event. One individual is split into two or three, or even 10, like the aircraft carrier.

The common people find the deaths, changes and occurrences of new matters happy events. When a person dies, a memorial meeting is held. While the bereaved weep in mourning, they feel it is also a happy event. Actually, it is. Just imagine if Confucius

were still living and here at this meeting in Huai-jen Hall, he would be over 2,000 years old and it wouldn't be so good! If one subscribes to dialectics and yet disapproves of death, it will be metaphysics. Disasters are social phenomena, natural phenomena. Sudden changes are the most fundamental law of the universe. Birth is a sudden change; so is death. In the several decades from birth to death, it is a gradual change. If Chiang Kai-shek should die, we would clap our hands in joy. If Dulles should die, none of us would shed a tear. This is because the death of matters of the old society is a good thing, hoped for by everyone. While the birth of new things is good, their death is naturally not good. The failure of Russia's 1905 revolution and the loss of our base in the South were equivalent to the seedlings destroyed by hailstorm and downpour. It is naturally not good. And the problem of replacing the destroyed seedlings arises. We communists hope for changes. The so-called leap forward means a change from the past. . . Sudden change is better than quantitative change. But without quantitative change, there can be no sudden changes. Quantitative change is indispensable and negating it will lead to adventurism. The destruction of balance constitutes leaping forward and such destruction is better than balance. Imbalance and headache are good things. The First Ministry of Machine Building, the Ministry of Metallurgy and the Ministry of Geology, for example, are experiencing a hard time and receiving pressure from all sides. Therefore, they must develop extensively, which is a good thing. Balance, quantitative change and unity are temporary and relative. Imbalance, sudden changes and disunity are absolute and permanent. Many disunities have been overcome and changed to unity. Unification is proposed because of disunity. There is unity in one person, but disunity occurs when there are two persons. Our party has 12 million members, with all kinds of backgrounds. Meetings must be held often in order to unite them. Therefore, we talk about unity every year, because there is disunity every year. Each person has his own way of thinking and the levels of the party members differ. Therefore, meetings must be held. The standing delegates made a correct draft. In the past we did not have the systems of holding a delegates' congress every year; we held other kinds of meetings. Now we hold a congress every year. As our ideas are different, we can, at a meeting, adopt the more rational ideas, make resolutions, publish a report and reach unanimity in the whole nation. The participation of some local and county secretaries makes our meeting even more successful. They have many good ideas.

Not only must we talk about unity every year, but must do so everyday, because there are splits everyday. Fission of the cells, metabolism — if the old cells do not die, it will be detrimental to the development of the child. Metabolism means discarding the old and bringing in the new. In the Yangtze River, the wave behind pushes the wave ahead. All matters change. Currently there are 102 chemical elements. At the beginning there weren't so many, but they increased through changes. Several hundred million years later, possibly there will be over 200 elements instead of 102. Matters always change and convert toward their opposite. Among our 12 million party members and everyday there are those leaving the party, every day there are struggles, and everyday there are those undergoing criticism. In Hupeh there were a brother and a sister competing in big character posters. The brother was an old hand and had the bureaucratic style. The truth, however, was in the hands of the sister. In the end the brother lost and the sister won. In Chekiang, a father and his son argued about close planting. The son was for it, but not the

father. In the end the father lost and the son won. It is a general law. The father and brother always run a considerable risk, but it does not matter much. They only have to admit their defeat to the son and sister. One must take the attitude of the common laborer, in order to avoid risks.

We must prevent possible big disasters, such as world war, or party splits. Our party underwent four splits, involving Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Lo Chang-lung, Chang Kuo-t'ao and Kao Kang[16]. They set up their own Central Committees and collapsed. Wang Ming appeared in a legal way with his "leftist" line three times. We adopted toward him the attitude of curing the illness to save the patient and rallied him by means of criticism. New splits may occur. As long as there is a party, splits are possible. They are possible even 100 years from now. Our method is unity-criticism-unity, punishing as a deterrent and curing the illness to save the patient.

Maybe this way of talking is making everyone uncomfortable, but I can only be comfortable after speaking my mind. Do not be superstitious. By talking about it, everyone will be mentally prepared. Isn't Yugoslavia promoting a split? There is also America's Foster. In the past we had Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Lo Chang-lung, Chang Kuo-t'ao and Kao Kang promoting splits. Recently we had Li Feng, Sha Wen-han, Li Shih-ning, Sun Tso-pin, Ch'en Tsai-li. . . . also promoting splits. Peking's political-legal system collapsed; the cultural-art system collapsed even more. What is bad about such collapses? There are always splits in the world. It is merely metabolism! Every year there are splits and every month there are splits, like the death of cells. There is unity every year and every month, like the growth of cells. The First, Second and Third Internationals all underwent the process of birth, development and death. The Information Bureau is no longer in existence. Now we can use the form of the Moscow Conference to replace it. By agreement of 12 nations, the Soviet Union serves as the convener and calls a meeting whenever necessary.

There are two kinds of opposites.

One includes things already in existence in society. The rightists, for example are in existence to start with; but whether to bring them out or not is a policy issue. We are determined to bring them out, set them up as opposites, launch the laboring people to debate and compete with them and knock them down. There are many rightists among the elementary school teachers, numbering 100,000 among the 300,000 rightists. The 300,000 rightist opposites exist and bringing them out to educate our 600 million people is beneficial to us.

The other includes what is not in existence in nature. It has some material conditions. To build a dam, for example, we can use artificial means to set up an opposite. The water level is raised to make it flow and produce a fall, resulting in power generation and shipping. Building a plant also involves setting up opposites. The An-shan Steel Mill was built by the Japanese. The Ch'ang-ch'un Motor Vehicle Plant is new, an opposite established artificially. What is absent in nature can be manufactured by man, but there

must be a material foundation. The satellite in orbit is man-made. It can be placed in orbit when the law is found.

We are optimists. We are not afraid of splits, as they are natural phenomena. . . . The splits of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Lo Chang-lung, Chang Kuo-t'ao and Kao Kang were helpful to us. The two Wang Ming lines and the three "leftists" lines during the civil war period taught our party a lesson. All these opposites had their benefits. Naturally, it is not necessary to create Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Kao Kang, etc., artificially. They will emerge when the climate is favorable. There is nothing to fear. We will overcome them.

Optimism is our main outlook. We also have worries. Can we not worry when the rightists emerge? I am somewhat worried. If we worry, then we must think of a way. We must give attention to leadership skill. With good leadership, a split will turn from something bad into something good. If it is foreseen, it may not come at all, like weeding. We will have no fear if 20,000 or 30,000 of our party members among the 12 million possess a higher consciousness. Higher consciousness means foresight. What is there to fear? Fear will do no good. We do not want to fight a world war, but if we have to, we are not afraid either.

Punishment as a deterrent, curing the illness to save the patient, we must permit the wrongdoers to correct themselves, such as P'an XX. Currently we are very united. Nothing is happening. Both the central and the local governments are very good. The anti-adventurist matters have been clarified and we have reached a new unity on a new foundation. Let us elaborate a little: We are optimists. We want to make everyone conscious and ready.

Among workers, peasants, soldiers, students, merchants and ideology, it is good for Heilungkiang to place ideology first, letting the abstract lead the concrete, politics lead the professions and the red lead the expert. Thus, the order becomes ideology, workers, peasants, soldiers, students and merchants. Stalin's two slogans lack dialectics. If technology decides everything, what about politics? If cadres decide everything, what about the masses? Lenin said it well: The Soviet plus electrification equals communism. The Soviet is politics and electrification, technology. The combination of politics and technology creates communism. Politics and technology are the unity of opposites. Their wedding will produce a son.

The Fourth Speech May 23, 1958

Our congress has been successful. We have worked conscientiously and have formulated our general line. Conscientiousness is most important in whatever one does. As long as one is conscientious, one will find a way regardless of the difficulties. China's population is the largest in the world and its land vast. The people have been liberated, the bourgeois democratic revolution has succeeded, the socialist revolution has achieved basic victory and construction has developed greatly. These accomplishments have enabled us to see

into our future. In the past it was not very clear. We did not know when we would extricate ourselves from the passive and backward situation. In the past we commanded no prestige or respect in the world. Dulles does not think much of us. It is not compatible with our position, but he does have his reasons. Though we have a large population, we have not yet demonstrated our strength. One day when we catch up with Great Britain and the U.S., Dulles will respect us and acknowledge our existence as a nation. Our policy is that we will not invite him as a guest, but if he should knock on our door, we would entertain him. Things were not very clear in the past several years, even as recent as the year before the last. There were still those opposing the general line and many doubted the policy of greater, faster, better and more economical results. This was inevitable, because it existed objectively. Many people doubted or opposed the building of socialism with better . . . and more economical results. Some people could see the point, while others could not. Those who could not see the point must undergo some tortuosity. After a period of time, more people saw the point. The road is always tortuous; there will be twists and turns in the future. The congress adopted the general line to go all out, aim high and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results. But it has to be proved in objective practice. Some of it has been proved in the past. The past three years were like a saddle, high at both ends and low in the middle. The year before the last was high, last year low and this year high again. With such changes, the congress this time is successful. It reflected the people's sentiments, demands and stamina in building socialism with greater, faster, better and more economical results. Such results were not very evident at the time of the third plenum [of the 8th central committee] in November 1956 but began to manifest themselves from the time of the third plenum in September 1957.

In the winter of 1956, two events were unexpected — the international antagonism toward Stalin and the Poland and Hungary incidents. An anti-Soviet and anti-communist high tide appeared in the world, affecting the whole world and our party. Domestically, we did not expect the resistance against adventurism or the international incidents. As was mentioned at the Ch'eng-tu Conference, all the comrades present here should pay attention to twists and turns that may still occur in the future. I hope all the provincial committees will study the situation and be ready. As I mentioned the last time, there is the possibility of war and there is the possibility of splits, but it doesn't matter if we can foresee them. Everyone must study this matter. All provinces must further study the possibilities of war, splits. . . . because we will not be afraid if they are expected. Not that there is a war now, but there is the possibility. There are maniacs in the world. As discussed at the Moscow Conference, we must be prepared against the maniacs. Should there be war, they will be finished. Wisdom belongs to us. There may be trouble, but unjust forces will always be condemned and the just forces will always win, but we must foresee what's coming. The party must also ponder. More than half of the provincial, municipal and autonomous regional committees had problems, no committee was overthrown, nor all the problems were overcome. They were numerous. Various regional, county and branch committees have more or less had some problems. It is a normal phenomenon of the class struggle. Some of the mistakes were made by good people, such as misunderstanding the greater, better, faster and more economical policy, others were a result of bad people infiltrating the party. XXX was a good man making mistakes. . . .

Ting Ling was a bad individual concealed in the party. She has long ago revolted against the party.

I wish to discuss the problem of whom to follow. Whom should one follow first of all? First of all, one should learn from the people and follow them. The people have so much energy, better and faster qualities, many inventions and creations; they have first class cooperatives producing 1,000-2,000 catty per mou and above-norm industrial production. In general, there are all types of talented people in industry, agriculture, commerce, culture and education, military affairs and in the ideological and theoretical fields. There are so many experiences reported at this congress! I wouldn't have been able to do that! You talk better than I do. You have correctly reflected the people's demands, thinking and feelings. A more perfect system is formulated on the basis of correct reflections, such as the resolutions and reports of this congress. It was not like this before. It has taken eight years, especially the first-year plan and the 1956 great developments, for this change to come about. The year 1957 was like the low section of the saddle. The inspirations of the third plenum in 1957 gave the party and the people a clearer direction. After the effort of the entire party, we had the great leap forward of the recent half year, from last winter to this spring. The Hang-chou, Nan-ning and Ch'eng-tu conferences laid the groundwork for this congress and drafted summaries and resolutions. The 60 articles were undertaken, but they have not been completed. They are to be revised. But the general idea has been formed. They will be revised a few months later. Therefore, we follow the people first and later on the people follow us. Theory first comes from practice, and later on it is used to guide practice. The unity of theory and practice is Marxism. There was no Marxism to start with. It came to the people's mind from their practice in class struggle. It was first reflected in the minds of the forerunners, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The reflection of the objective law in the subjective ! world resulted in a theoretical summary, which was developed into theories by them to serve as our models. If political errors are to be avoided, then we must use theory to guide practice, but theory must originate from practice. Apart from objective practice, it will be impossible to form theory. No reality can be formed behind closed doors. The general line formulated at the congress is not the result of any spur of the moment ideas of certain individuals. Regardless of one's position, authority and fame, if one does not go into the field and associate with the people, or contact the cadres who are close to the people and the positive elements in the people, if one does not contact or associate with the people for six months, one will know nothing and become impoverished. Therefore, the provision that everyone must spend four months out of the year in the field is necessary. One must go into the field and associate with the people, with the cadres who are close to the people and with the positive elements in the people, clarify their thinking, action and hardships and summarize them.

The slogan "go all out, aim high" is very good. It reflects the people's energy. "Go all out" is better than just "go out." There is an element of quantity in truth. The people's energy has long been stimulated. The question is whether it is adequate. It should be at least 60-70 percent stimulated, but 80-90 percent or 100-percent is best. Therefore, "go all out" is a better term. Energy can be of different levels. "Go all out" is a new phrase. "Aim high" is not new. We have had it before. . . .

“Go all out, aim high and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results” are not easily understood by foreigners. They don’t seem to make sense, as there are no subjects. I had thought of adding the phrase “activating all positive elements” as the subject, but now I feel it’s all right not to have it. The 600 million people are the subject. The word “energy” is the energy of the absolute majority of the 600 million, except Chang Po-chun, Lo Lung-chi, Chang Nai-ch’i, XX, etc. The energy of those individuals may not be great.

Hoist the red flag and find the wind direction. If you do not hoist the flag, others will. On a big mountain or small hill, on the field, hoist it wherever there is no flag and uproot the white flag wherever it is found. The gray ones must also be uprooted. The gray ones are no good; they must be uprooted. The yellow flag is also bad. Yellow trade unions are equivalent to white flags. On any big mountain, any small hill, the red flag must be hoisted after debates.

The wind direction discussed last time does not mean policy direction. Wind direction means whether it is east wind or west wind. The “anti-adventurist” wind, for example, began to blow in June 1956. At that time we already had the 10 major relationships, greater and better results and promotion meetings. No clear resolution was made at the enlarged conference of the Political Bureau in mid-April participated by provincial and municipal committee secretaries. It was a gentlemen’s agreement, approved by everyone, but unlike the clear resolutions and reports of this congress. The second plenum held in November 1956 did not issue a clear-cut resolution, but only a report stressing practice economy in various measures. The blast of the wind was not checked, but it was a bad thing turning into a blessing, allowing us to make comparisons. This was mentioned in Nan-ning and Ch’eng-tu. Our comrades have made many good statements at this congress. . . . Tito specialized in being disappointed. His energy belongs to that side. The Moscow Declaration is the strength of our side. The Yugoslavia program checks the ambition of the proletariat and encourages the arrogance of the enemy.

We must pay attention to the wind direction hereafter. When a gale blows, houses and people are knowled down. Therefore, it is easy to recognize. But a light breeze is hard to discern. It is worthwhile to read Sung Yu’a poetry on the wind. He said there were two kinds of wind: The wind of the aristocrat and the wind of the poor (“the wind of the great kings” and “the wind of the common men”). There are small, medium and big winds. Sung Yu said: “The wind is born on the ground, rises from the tip of the water weed, permeates the streams and roars. . . .” Then it is hard to tell the difference.

Notes

[1.] Opium War: “For many decades, beginning with the end of the 18th century, Britain exported an increasing quantity of opium to China. This traffic not only subjected the

Chinese people to drugging but also plundered China of her silver. It a roused fierce opposition in China. In 1840, under the pretext of safeguarding its trade with China, Britain launched armed aggression against her. The Chinese troops led by Lin Tse-hsu put up resistance and the people in Canton spontaneously organized the “Quell-the-British Corps”, which dealt serious blows to the British forces of aggression. In 1842, however, the corrupt Ching regime signed the Treaty of Nanking with Britain. This treaty provided for the payment of indemnities and the cession of Hongkong to Britain and stipulated that Shanghai, Foochow, Amoy, Ningpo and Canton were to be opened to British trade and that tariff rates of British goods imported into China were to be jointly fixed by China and Britain.

[2.] A celebrated 13th century drama.

[3.] Hu Shih, who was formerly a university professor, university president and ambassador of the Kuomintang government to the United State, is a well-known apologist for U.S. imperialism among Chinese bourgeois intellectuals.

[4.] Ssu-ma Chien (145-90 B.C.) was China’s first great historian, who compiled *Shih-chi* (Historical Records) relating the history of China from the origins to his own day.

[5.] Moscow conference: A reference to the meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist Countries held in Moscow, November 14-16, 1957.

[6.] The Seventh Party Congress of the CPC was held in Yanan between April 23 and June 11, 1945. The congress laid down the Party line: go all out mobilize the masses, expand the people’s forces and, under the leadership of our Party, defeat the Japanese aggressors, liberate the Chinese people and build a new-democratic China. It adopted a Party Constitution designating Mao Zedong Thought, which integrates the Marxist-Leninist theories with the practice of the Chinese revolution, as the guideline for all Party work. This congress witnessed unprecedented Party unity ideologically, politically and organizationally.

[7.] The Long March of 25,000 li (12,500 kilometres) was made by the Red Army from Kiangsi Province to northern Shensi Province. In October 1934 the First, Third and Fifth Army Groups of the Chinese Workers’ and Peasants’ Red Army (that is, the First Front Army of the Red Army, also known as the Central Red Army) set out from Changting and Ninghua in Western Fukien and from Juichin, Yutu and other places in southern Kiangsi and started a major strategic movement. In traversing the eleven provinces of Fukien, Kiangsi, Kwangtung, Hunan Kwangsi, Kweichow, Szechuan, Yunnan, Sikang, Kansu and Shensi crossing perpetually snow capped mountains and trackless grasslands, sustaining untold hardships and frustrating the enemy’s repeated encirclements, pursuits, obstructions and interceptions, the Red Army covered 25,000 li (12,500 kilometers) on this march: and finally arrived triumphantly at the revolutionary base area in northern Shensi in October 1935.

[8.] Ch'en Kung-po (1892-1946) left the Chinese Communist Party shortly after its foundation and joined the Kuomintang, becoming a close associate of Wang Ching-wei. He participated in Wang's Japanese-sponsored puppet government during the period 1939-45 and was executed for treason in 1946. Chou Fo-hai also collaborated with the Japanese.

[9.] i.e., the period of Li Li-san and Wang Ming lines — See [note 5 on p.61](#) of this volume.

[10.] A reference to the book *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside* which was published in 1955.

[11.] The Wan Kuo-fan cooperative was once known as “paupers co-op” because its twenty three poor peasant households owned only “three legs” of a donkey. They were woefully short of means of production. Instead of asking for state loans, the cooperative organized its members to go into the mountains some thirty li away to collect firewood which they sold to pay for means of production. So the co-operative members said that they “made the mountains yield” a substantial amount of the means of production. In this connection also see comrade Mao's “Editors Notes from *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside*”. Item 1 and 28 pp. 242-244, pp. 265-266 S.W. Vol. V.

[12.] Ko Ching-shih (1902-65) a member of the Political Bureau.

[13.] Chang Fei, one of the heroes of the Romance of the Three Kingdoms, a celebrated Chinese novel.

[14.] The movement against “five evils” was the struggle against bribery, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing economic information, started at the beginning of 1952 among owners of private industrial and commercial enterprises.

[15.] The Tsingtao conference was held in July 1957.

[16.] For Chen Tu-shiu see [note 2, on p 60](#) of this Volume. Lo Chang-lung, (1901-49) was a founding member of the CPC. In 1931 he was expelled at the Fourth plenum. There after he joined hands with Ho meng-hsiong in setting up a rival CC. He latter became a Trotskyist.

Speech At The Conference Of Heads Of Delegations To The Second Session Of The 8th Party Congress

May 18 1958

Let us write the brief biographies of all types of scientific and technological inventors in the past 300 years, giving their age, origin and background and see whether they were all without much education. Each occupation and profession should undertake the biographies of those in its own field.

Scientist Hua Lo-keng was a middle school student.

Tsiol'kovsky who succeeded in making the man-made satellite in the Soviet Union was an unknown middle school teacher. He was mainly a mathematics teacher and the satellite was his sideline. Gradually he became an expert.

Naturally the U.S. also has inventors, but it is not Dulles. Just who they are is unknown.

Education and age are not prerequisites for a person to be an inventor. As long as he had the correct direction and the courage to dream, he can become an inventor at age 20 or 30. Too much education will not help.

The whole world couldn't find a way to control the white ant, but a young student in Kwangtung who only attended junior middle school found a way.

K'a Ho (Ho Shih of the *Ho-shih Jade*) of the Kingdom of Ch'u in ancient China found an uncut jade in Chat Mountain. He offered it to King Li and got his left shin cut off. He then offered it to King Wu and got his right shin cut off. When King Wen ascended the throne, he carried the uncut jade to the bottom of Ching mountain and had it cut by a lapidiary before the jade was appreciated. It was the same piece of jade referred to in the saying "returning the jade intact to Chao."

Watt was a worker.

Franklin was a shepherd.

The three-way alliance, the leadership, technicians and old peasants (old workers) are required in cultivating experimental farms.

In general, what I want to prove by my information is one point: Isn't it true that the lowly are the most intelligent and the elite the most ignorant when it comes to robbing the cocky high level intellectuals of their capital? There should be less servility and more self-respect. The workers, peasants, old cadres and low level intellectuals should be encouraged in their self-confidence and creativity.

I once asked some people: Are we in heaven? Are we considered gods? Are we foreigners? They answered in the negative. They were superstitious.

In my speeches, I discussed; 1) breaking down superstition, 2) international and domestic situations and 3) disasters.

Generally speaking, the international situation is bright, but war is also possible.

The domestic situation is the issue of the relationship with the 500 million peasants. The peasants are our allies. If they are not rallied, there will be no politics; if no attention is given to their problems, mistakes will occur. With them as our allies, we will win. Lenin also stressed the workers' and peasants' democratic dictatorship — arousing the consciousness of the rural semi-proletariat to take part in uninterrupted revolution. Some people felt that, since it took 80 years to develop capitalism, socialism could only be introduced when the workers became more numerous and the peasants conscious of themselves. But practice proved that it did not require several decades to advance from democratic revolution to socialism. The Soviet Union's February Revolution proved Lenin was correct.

China is even more different. We have several decades of experience in the democratic revolutionary base. After the liberation, the peasants' morale was high. The rural semi-proletariat numbered 350 million. A considerable number of people in China's Communist Party do not understand the importance of the peasant issue and that is where mistakes will occur. Those who do not believe in greater, faster, better and more economical results primarily have no confidence in the 40 articles in agriculture. They do not believe that agriculture can be developed relatively fast.

Why do we talk about the 10 major relationships? They constitute the basic viewpoint. It is for the purpose of comparison with the Soviet Union. Besides the Soviet method, is it possible to find another method which is even faster and better than the Soviet Union and the European nations? The road of China's industrialization includes the simultaneous promotion of the large, medium and small [enterprises] and of industry and agriculture. We do not say that we are competing with the Soviet Union, but actually we are vying with the teacher. We have two parents: the Kuomintang society and the October Revolution. We follow Lenin in the mass line and the class struggle. We want to eliminate the bourgeoisie thoroughly including its ideology, but without confiscating the property and destroying the people of the bourgeoisie. Stalin did not promote the mass line. He played favoritism and was too excessive in the class struggle.

The domestic situation is mainly the issue of the peasantry.

Irrigation, fertilizer, soil improvement, seeds, close planting and deep plowing — the method of Chang-ko County is a model.

I feel that heavy industry, metallurgy, machinery, coal, chemistry, and foreign trade should be discussed. I would rather delay the closing of the meeting for one day.

Of the 26 provinces, municipalities, and regions, 13 of them have problems. There is confusion in the political and legal systems and in the literary and art circles throughout the country. Two types of people cause the problems: rightists and right opportunists. Those making the mistake of the line will be permitted to participate in the revolution. As for P'an Han-nien[1], Ku Ta-ts'un, and Feng Pai-chu, it is better not to discipline them at this meeting. It is correct to propose disciplining, but not disciplining is also right.

Several documents should be printed, including the statements of Wang Ming and K'u Hsi-ning and the letters of a branch secretary in Tientsin and the party committee secretary of Nanking University (to the Chairman).

The branch secretary of Tientsin was very good. He did not give in. As not very many people were informed in the past, whether to let loose or not, it was impossible to keep pace at that time. A branch in Tsinghua University deteriorated. It is a rare opportunity for a party purge.

The annotations to *Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside* should be printed. It is correct to say that the ownership system has been basically solved, but the mutual relationship between the political and ideological fronts have not yet been solved. It was a little too optimistic to predict that the socialist revolution had gained a basic victory. I did not expect such a big revolution. As for China's bourgeoisie, I predict there will still be struggles, long term struggles, to eliminate the deep-rooted influence of the bourgeoisie and its intellectuals. A socialist revolution involving a battle on the political and ideological fronts is inevitable; another one is necessary after a basic solution to the ownership system has been found. This time, I did not expect the revolution will be fundamentally over in a few months, nor did I expect that the rectification would be implemented ahead of schedule. The rectification was forced on us by circumstances, and the struggle against the bourgeoisie was inevitable. But the resistance against "adventurism" also accelerated the rightists' attack. I consciously used the rightists to carry out the rectification. Turn it loose first before thinking of a method; struggle a few rounds and see. The Tsingtao Conference printed some material. A student of Hua-tung normal college was very firm, asking "What will happen if the Communist Party collapses?"

The above is about the peasant issue. Urban population is 15 percent of the total and rural population 85 percent. Some of the comrades have spent several decades in the rural areas but they remain untouched by the peasants' feelings and cannot understand them. When one cannot understand the masses, one will not see the good things. Have the likes of P'an Han-nien never worked in the rural areas? If so, they have not been influenced. The workers number 12 million, or 40 million if the family members are included;

therefore, their number is far smaller than the peasants. The well-to-do peasants who do not follow us number several ten millions. After the great leap forward, possibly 50 percent of them will be against socialism and 20 percent will maintain their [present] position.

What are your opinions on the election?

It is not good to be without horns on the head, but too many is not good either. A cow should have two horns, four would be too many. If we elect a group of alternate committee members, there will be a balance; to have a few more alternates is no problem.

Among the workers, peasants, and soldiers, there are several hundred million peasants. The “Trotsky factions”^[2] has always scoffed at us for peasant-ism, and imperialism calls ours a peasant revolution. China’s working class cannot sit firm without the peasants. Since Lenin also stressed the peasant problem, did he also advocate peasant-ism? I asked our European comrades; What about you? In Europe, besides the farm workers, conflict between the landowner peasants (many with their own farm machinery) and socialism is great. In my conversations with the comrades of South America and India the issue of rallying the peasants was also discussed. I asked them to study a rural village, clarify the class relations, and analyze matter in minute detail. Being backward has its advantages.

The great leap forward should not be pushed too urgently. The students of red and expert schools dozed off in class. This won’t do at all. The two “encirclement and suppression” campaigns in Kiangsu involved five battles in two sleepless weeks, but it was only a short-term surprise attack. We must not push too hard.

How are the cooperative areas? It is the negation of a negation.

After one day’s rest at the conclusion of the congress, there will be two days of meetings, attended by one delegate from each province and a certain number from the Central Committee.

A meeting will be held again on 5 August. You have two whole months to handle your work in industry, commerce, culture- education, and military matters. Fall farm production must be prepared and arranged now.

The whole people including five-year old children must be mobilized to eliminate the four pests.

All the provinces where there are problems in the party must issue a statement. The statement will be discussed if there is time, or printed if there is no time. The statements at this meeting will be collected and printed for our own comment and comparison. There are many good and rich experiences.

The commerce work of Hsin-hui County, Kwangtung, is well handled. An on-the-spot meeting should be held there.

Ch'ang-ko County should be emulated in deep plowing. If it cannot be done once a year, it certainly can be done once three, four, or five years. The production increase is 100 percent.

We are not afraid of a population of 800 million or one billion. American reporters say that, after 100 years, the Chinese population will constitute 50 percent of the world population. By that time, our cultural level will be high. When all the people are college educated, they will naturally practice birth control. China's topography is good, with oceans in the east and mountains in the west.

China has its own language. The pronunciation of the words "communism" and "imperialism" is basically the same in Russian and English, but ours is completely different. Ever since *Ch'in-Shih-huang*, the Chinese people have never respected the foreigners, calling them barbarians. By the end of the Ch'ing Dynasty, when the foreigners attacked and entered China, the Chinese were frightened, became slaves and felt inferior. Arrogant before, now we are too humble. Let us have the negation of a negation.

With 11 million tons of steel next year and 17 million tons the year after, the world will be shaken. If we can reach 40 million tons in five years, we may possibly catch up with Great Britain in seven years. Add another eight years and we will catch up with the U.S.

The Central Committee holds four meetings a year, with one party congress. The provinces hold six meetings, with two big check-ups on the results and four small-scale meetings.

When I see the peasants concealing production, I am very happy. If you have more, I also have more. What the peasants have is equivalent to ours.

The task of reforestation should be undertaken in local areas. Bamboo must be extensively developed. Bamboo is not native to the North. We don't know when it will grow there.

Notes

[1.] Pan Han-nien, a former Comintern representative, was vice Mayor of Shanghai from 1949 until 1955.

[2.] Originally an anti-Leninist faction in the Russian working-class movement, the Trotskyite group later degenerated into a downright counter-revolutionary gang. In his report to the plenary session of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B.) in 1937, Comrade Stalin explained the course this group of renegades had run as follows:

In the past, seven or eight years ago, Trotskyism was one of such political trends in the working class, an anti-Leninist trend, it is true and therefore profoundly mistaken, but nevertheless a political trend. . . . Present-day Trotskyism is not a political trend in the working class, but a gang without principle and without ideas, of wreckers and diversionists, intelligence service agents, spies, murderers, a gang of sworn enemies of the working class, working in the pay of the intelligence services of foreign states.

After the of the Chinese revolution in 1927, a small number of Trotskyites appeared in China, too. Ganging up with Chen Tu-hsiu and other renegades, they formed a small counter-revolutionary clique in 1929 and spread such counter-revolutionary propaganda as that the Kuomintang had already completed the bourgeois-democratic revolution and they became a dirty imperialist and Kuomintang instrument against the people. The Chinese Trotskyites shamelessly joined the Kuomintang secret service. After the September 18th Incident, to fulfil the order given by the criminal renegade Trotsky “not to impede the occupation of China by imperial Japan”, they began collaborating with Japanese secret agents, received subsidies from them and engaged in all kinds of activities facilitating Japanese aggression.

Speech At The Group Leaders' Forum Of The Enlarged Meeting Of The Military Affairs Committee

June 28, 1958

(Excerpts)

This has been a good conference. Some comrades' speeches were very good. [XXX asked the Chairman especially to read the speeches of nine comrades. The Chairman read the speeches of Comrades Chang Tsung-hsün and Liu Ya-lou.[1]] Comrade Chang Tsung-hsün's speech was very good. I agree with it. He wrote it under pressure from the fourth-grade cadres conference of the Military Training Headquarters. This proves that when you compel people, they can write good stuff. There is just one point I don't agree with. Chang Tsung-hsün says that the reason he made mistakes was that he had not studied Mao Tse-tung's writings properly. This is not correct. He should have said that it was primarily because his Marxist-Leninist level was not high enough. Comrade Ya-lou's speech is also pretty good. This illustrates the point that the army comrades' level is high and that they can write. The best thing would be to organize some of the comrades at army and divisional level to speak and write because they are the people who do the practical work, and they have contact with the lower echelons. The stuff they write can achieve unity of theory and practice. The content of conferences should be rich and varied and should introduce advanced experience in the work. In our articles and

speeches we should not criticize the Soviet Union. Dogmatism is a problem in our own study; it is not just a question of whether the Soviet Union is advanced or not.

From the beginning there has existed in our army a struggle between two lines in military construction. We had a struggle at the Kut'ien Conference,[2] but we were unable to convince the comrades who held incorrect ideas. Some comrades still adhere to their incorrect line right up to today. Comrade Hsiao K'e[3] was not only guilty of dogmatism, but had a warlord mentality marked by bourgeois ideology, dogmatism and feudal ideology.

In wartime it will not do to implement orders according to Soviet army regulations. It is better for us to have our own regulations. I don't know how much Marxism-Leninism there is in the Military Academy and the Military Training Command. Marxism-Leninism should be a guide for action, yet they use it as a dogma for recitation. If Marx and Lenin were still alive, they would certainly criticize these comrades as being dogmatic. Today the dogmatists advocate copying the Soviet Union. Whom, I would like to know, did the Soviet Union copy in the past? In the resolutions of the Eighth Congress there is a passage dealing with the problem of technological reform. From the point of view of present conditions this is inappropriate because it over-emphasizes Soviet aid. It is very necessary to win Soviet aid, but the most important thing is self-reliance. If we over-emphasize Soviet aid, the question I would like to ask is, on whom did the Soviet Union depend for aid in the past?

The Great Leap Forward in industry and agriculture has destroyed blind faith. We can catch up with Britain in – years, and in from – to – years catch up with America. Next year our steel output will reach from – to – tens of thousands of tons. It is reported that the north-east will produce – tens of thousands of tons by 1962. This is all the result of rectification. The Nanning Conference and the Chengtu Conference broke down blind faith, liberated our thinking and resulted in the Great Leap Forward in industry. Yet we have been training armies for over eight years and have not produced even one book of combat regulations. Now we must gather together some comrades who have rich experience in work and combat to produce a book of combat regulations of our own. Some people mentioned that when the Soviet comrade advisers saw that we were not copying theirs, they made adverse comments and were displeased. We might ask these Soviet comrades: Do you copy Chinese regulations? If they say they don't, then we will say: If you don't copy ours, we won't copy yours.

Why is it that XX hasn't performed well since the victory of the revolution? Apart from the fact that he has not made a sufficiently deep appraisal of his experience in the former period and learned the historical lessons, the reasons are: first, he has blindly accepted old things and old dogmas; second, he has put blind faith in foreign dogmas and in the Soviet Union; third, he has blind faith in himself. He has been very active, hard-working and conscientious, but his direction was haywire and he was not strong enough on politics. The main aim of this conference is to overthrow the slave mentality and to bury dogmatism; also to use the methods of rectification, with a great airing of views and great blooming, to break down blind faith, raise our ideological level, absorb the lessons of

experience and, above all, to educate the whole Party and whole army and to unite the whole Party and whole army. Therefore during the conference we can criticize people by name. But I would suggest that when we are formulating resolutions, we only need to distinguish between right and wrong and clarify problems. We do not have to put in the names of those comrades who have made mistakes. After all, in the resolutions of the Kut'ien Conference no names were mentioned.

With X it is mainly a case of blind faith in foreigners. He has an inferiority complex. He hasn't been able to rid himself of this blind faith. He doesn't regard our own experience as of primary importance. Nowadays even a cooperative has to summarize its experience, otherwise it would lag behind. The five cooperatives of Hsinchou in Hupei Province did pretty well, Mach'eng was not so good. But Hsinchou paid no attention to summarizing its experience. Mach'eng sent people round to Hsinchou to study their experience so that they could summarize and extend their own work. In the end the work in Mach'eng went into the lead. When the army went into battle in the past, did it not summarize the experience of its various units, re-train them, and then go into battle again? In all our work we must pay attention to the summing up of our good experience in order to publicize it.

The Soviet Union defeated the intervention of fourteen imperialist countries. That was a long time ago. The Soviet Union has had the experience of the Second World War. We defeated Chiang Kai-shek, Japanese imperialism, American imperialism. We have rich experience, more than the Soviet Union. We should not regard our own experience as worthless. This is wrong. (Chief Lin^[4] interjected: 'Our experience is very rich. We must not throw gold away as though it were yellow dust.') We must think of our experience as of primary importance, while studying other people's advanced experience. We must also study the conditions of enemy countries and of friendly countries. In the past we did study conditions in enemy and friendly countries as well as our own. We translated American and Japanese things. In future wars in the East, America won't get anywhere without depending on Japan, so we must make a thorough study of Japanese conditions. We must study the Soviet army's experience. Weapons technology is continually developing and evolving. Therefore in studying the Soviet army's technical experience, we must do so from the standpoint of development. In the past the Russians were very much afraid of Napoleon because he led his army to Moscow. In the end the Russians defeated him and so the Russians often boasted that they were more formidable than Napoleon. Nowadays the stuff produced by the Soviet military advisers (combat plans and ways of thinking) all deal with the offensive and are all concerned with victory. They have no defensive material and do not provide for defeat. This does not conform with real situations. Some people say that summing up the Resist America, Aid Korea War constitutes empiricism, but we know that the Korean War was a big war in which we defeated America and obtained valuable experience. This experience must be summed up. As for their calling us empiricists, well, we can say to them: Your stuff ! about the Soviet Union in the Second World War is also empiricism.

The errors committed by Comrade Hsiao K'e are serious ones. In the past we had no chance to convene such a big conference. Now that we have that chance we can dig out the roots of dogmatism.

As regards learning from the Soviet Union, for internal use we say 'study critically'. In speaking publicly, in order to avoid misunderstanding, it would be better to put it: 'Study the advanced experience of the Soviet Union analytically and selectively.' It is most important that in studying the advanced experience of the Soviet Union, we should combine it with our own independent creative achievements. The universal truth of Marxism must be combined with Chinese practice. We must not eat pre-cooked food. If we do we shall be defeated. We must clarify this point with our Soviet comrades. We have learned from the Soviet Union in the past, we are still learning today, and we shall learn in the future. Nevertheless our study must be combined with our own concrete conditions. We must say to them: We learn from you, from whom then did you learn? Why cannot we create something of our own? Moreover there have recently been changes among Soviet experts. Changes took place after the Twentieth Congress and the Zhukhov incident. (Chief Ch'en [vice-premier Ch'en I] interjected: 'Soviet comrades who have returned home said that when they came, they brought their experiences with them; now they are returning they are taking our experiences back.')

This shows that the situation of the Great Leap Forward inspired not only us in China, but also our Soviet comrades. (Chief Lin said: 'In political matters, such as Party leadership and in political work, our army has a fine tradition of its own. Our Party's Marxist-Leninist level is very high, not to speak of the Chairman's. The Chairman has said that our editorials are at a higher level than those of Pravda. When it comes to the superstructure, in military science, in problems of strategy, we have our own fully developed system. Lenin died too early. He did not have time to attend to this question. Stalin had no developed system. We do not have to learn from the Soviet Union. As regards tactics, we can ! learn half and leave half. Their tactics are questionable both ideologically and as regards their attitude to the masses. The half we learn would consist of the use of naval and air forces and the coordination of the services. As for the half we don't learn, such as tactical thinking, we have Chairman Mao's so we don't need to learn theirs. We should study technology and science and also the organization of modern warfare, but we should use the methodology of the mass line to study it. We should take advantage of the fact that our generation is still alive to organize a group of cadres to put together our own system properly, and to pass it on.')

That's the way.

Li Shih-min, Ts'ao Ts'ao[5] etc., all knew how to fight wars. China's past has quite a lot to offer. Comrade K'ai Feng[6] said that the *Sun-tzu ping-fa*[7] contained no Marxism, but when we asked him whether he had read it he could not answer. Obviously it is quite wrong to make categorical statements without having read it. (Chief Lin interjected: '*Sun-tzu ping-fa* does contain both materialism and dialectics. It is a collective work. The authors included Sun-tzu, Sun Pin, Ts'ao Tstao, Tu Yü, etc.')

The elimination of blind faith was brought up at the Chengtu Conference. It has progressed very rapidly in the last four months. Since the second session of the Eighth Congress it has further developed in every domain throughout the country. For example,

Anshan, which originally planned to produce – tens of thousands of tons of steel, has now revised its target and next year will reach an output of from – to – tens of thousands of tons. They have also gone in for the combination of large, small and medium plants and of native and foreign methods. According to a letter from Comrade XXX in the north-east, in the second five-year plan the north-east can reach an output of – tens of thousands of tons. If we have steel and modernized industry, then we can easily develop a modernized defence industry. I am in favour of producing more light weapons so that we can arm a mass militia. (Chief Lin interjected: ‘The militia is very important.’) In the past others have looked down on us. The main reason for this was that we were short of food, steel and machines. Now we have produced some things for all to see.

Notes

[References are given here as provided by the Maoist Documentation Project. They are significantly different in at least one existing edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. VIII. — *Transcriber, MIA*.]

[1.] Chang Tsung-hsün (c. 1898-), who had participated in the Autumn Harvest Uprising organized by Mao Tse-tung in 1927, and accompanied him to the first base on the Chingkangshan, was in 1958 a Deputy Chief of Staff of the PLA. Liu Ya-lou (1910-65) was then commander of the PLA Air Force; he had long been closely associated with Lin Piao.

[2.] At the conference of Communist Party organizations in the Red Army, held at Kut’ien in Fukien Province in December 1929, Mao presented a resolution on political and organizational problems in the army which has been regarded ever since as the classic statement of his views on these matters.

[3.] Hsiao K’e (1909-), a veteran of the Nanchang Uprising and of the Chingkangshan, was director of the PLA General Training Department in early 1958. Shortly thereafter, he was shunted into a subordinate post as Vice-Minister of State Farms and Land Reclamation, and his thirty-year military career came to an end.

[4.] The title given to Lin Piao here, ‘Chief’ (tsung), an abbreviation for ‘Commander-in-Chief’ (tsung ssu-ling), does not correspond to any precise function, since he did not replace P’eng Te-huai as Minister of Defence until September 1959. This term is frequently used loosely in Chinese writings to designate a high-ranking officer; prior to 1954, both Lin, and Ch’en I, to whom the same title is given later in this speech, had been commanders, respectively, of the Fourth and Third Field Army.

[5.] Ts’ao Ts’ao (155-220), known posthumously as Emperor Wu of the Wei dynasty, was an outstanding statesman and military leader of the period of the Three Kingdoms.

For Mao's attitude towards him, see *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, pp. 162, 166.

[6.] K'ai Feng (1907-55), also known as Ho K'ai-feng, was a member of the 'Returned Student' faction in the 1930s. It was therefore natural that Mao should charge him with lack of knowledge of Chinese culture, and of respect for things Chinese.

[7.] Sun-tzu, who flourished about 500 B.C., is undoubtedly, with Clausewitz, one of the two most celebrated military writers in world history. His *Art of War* has been most recently translated by General Samuel B. Griffith (Oxford University Press, 1963), who also includes a selection of the commentaries by Ts'ao Ts'ao, Tu Yü and others, which this text, like all other classical Chinese writings, has accumulated over the centuries. It is to these that Lin Piao is referring in calling it a 'collective work'.

Communes Are Better

August 9, 1958

[SOURCE: Extracted from the account of Mao's inspection tour in Shantung on 9 August 1958, as reported in *People's Daily*, 13, August, 1958]

Chairman Mao emphasized particularly that arrangements for all types of work must be the subject of vigorous and uninhibited debate by the masses. He said that if plans and directions were not debated by the masses, the ideas would be yours [i.e., those of the cadres]. After such debates, the masses themselves became the masters, and were naturally prepared to work more energetically. Chairman Mao emphasized once more that the leading cadres must go frequently to the lower levels to have a look, to aid the basic-level cadres in summing up their experience, and to give guidance on the spot. When T'an Ch'i-lung (Shantung provincial secretary) reported that Pei-yuan *hsiang* in Li-ch'en *hsien* was preparing to set up large [collective] farms, Chairman Mao said: 'It is better to set up people's communes. Their advantage lies in the fact that they combine industry, agriculture, commerce, education and military affairs. This is convenient for leadership.'

Speech At The Supreme State Conference

(Excerpts)

September 8, 1958

U.S. imperialism invaded China's territory of Taiwan and has occupied it for the past nine years. A short while ago it sent its armed forces to invade and occupy Lebanon. The United States has set up hundreds of military bases in many countries all over the world. China's territory of Taiwan, Lebanon and all military bases of the United States on foreign soil are so many nooses round the neck of U.S. imperialism. The nooses have been fashioned by the Americans themselves and by nobody else, and it is they themselves who have put these nooses round their own necks, handing the ends of the ropes to the Chinese people, the peoples of the Arab countries and all the peoples of the world who love peace and oppose aggression. The longer the U.S. aggressors remain in those places, the tighter the nooses round their necks will become.

* * * * *

If the U.S. monopoly capitalist groups persist in pushing their policies of aggression and war, the day is bound to come when they will be hanged by the people of the whole world. The same fate awaits the accomplices of the United States.

Interview With A Hsinhua News Agency Correspondent

September 29, 1958

Imperialism will not last long because it always does evil things. It persists in grooming and supporting reactionaries in all countries who are against the people, it has forcibly seized many colonies and semi-colonies and many military bases, and it threatens the peace with atomic war. Thus, forced by imperialism to do so, more than 90 per cent of the people of the world are rising or will rise up in struggle against it. Yet imperialism is still alive, still running amuck in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the West, imperialism is still oppressing the people at home. This situation must change. It is the task of the people of the whole world to put an end to the aggression and oppression perpetrated by imperialism, and chiefly by U.S. imperialism.

It is my opinion that the international situation has now reached a new turning point. There are two winds in the world today, the East Wind and the West Wind. There is a Chinese saying, "Either the East Wind prevails over the West Wind or the West Wind prevails over the East Wind." I believe it is characteristic of the situation today that the East Wind is prevailing over the West Wind. That is to say, the forces of socialism have become overwhelmingly superior to the forces of imperialism.

The Masses Can Do Anything

September 29, 1958

[SOURCE: Extracted from a statement to a reporter of the *Hsin Hua Agency*, on 29 September 1958, following a tour of the country.]

During this trip, I have witnessed the tremendous energy of the masses. On this foundation it is possible to accomplish any task whatsoever. We must first complete the tasks on the iron and steel fronts. In these sectors, the masses have already been mobilized. Nevertheless, in the country as a whole, there are a few places, a few enterprises, where the work of mobilizing the masses has still not been properly carried out, where mass meetings have not been held and where the tasks, the reasons for them, and the methods have still not been made perfectly clear to the masses or discussed by the masses. There are still a few comrades who are unwilling to undertake a large-scale mass movement in the industrial sphere. They call the mass movement on the industrial front 'irregular' and disparage it as 'a rural style of work' and 'a guerrilla habit'. This is obviously incorrect.

However, while devoting ourselves to iron and steel production on a large scale, we must not sacrifice agriculture. . . The 1959 task in agriculture is to achieve a leap forward even greater than that of 1958. Consequently, we must organize the industrial and agricultural labour force effectively and extend the system of people's communes throughout the whole country. . . .

Instructions

June-September 1958

Atom Bombs. June 1958

Let us work on atom bombs and nuclear bombs. Ten years, I think, should be quite enough.

At the University of Tientsin. August 13, 1958

In future, schools should have factories and factories schools.

Teachers should do manual work. It will not do to move only their lips and not their hands.

Colleges should grasp three things: party committee leadership, mass line, and the coordination of education and production.

At the University of Wuhan. September 12, 1958.

It is a good thing that the students themselves spontaneously ask for part-time study and part-time work; this is a logical result of the campaign to build workshops at schools. More permissions should be given to this kind of request and also active encouragement and support. In school reform, notice must be paid to the development of the activism of the broad teaching staff and students and to the gathering together of the wisdom of the masses.

At the Hupei Iron and Steel Works. September, 1958.

Large-scale enterprises like the Wuhan Iron and Steel Works should be gradually built up as industrial complexes. In addition to a wide range of iron and steel products, machinery, chemical products, and building materials may be attempted.

. . . In such a large-scale industrial complex, there must also be some affiliated agriculture, commerce, education, and military service.

On Huan Hsiang's Comment On The Disintegration Of The Western World

November 25, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Huan Hsiang's theory is correct. The Western World is disintegrating. Currently it is in the process of breaking up, though not yet completely. But is heading in that direction. Final disintegration is inevitable. The transitional period may last quite a while; it will not happen overnight. The so-called Western unity is an empty term. There is unity; Dulles is striving for it, but it has to be under U.S. control. Under the atomic bomb, the big and small partners must rally around the U.S., pay tribute, and prostrate themselves as

inferiors. This is the so-called unity of the Americans. Such a situation will inevitably head toward the opposite of unity, to disintegration. Comrades, under today's situation, to whom does the world belong?!

A Letter To Chou Shih-chao

November 25, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Dear Tun-yuan

I received your letter of 17 October and was happy to read it.

When undertaking a new duty, one must not choose the light and shun the heavy, but must choose the heavy and scorn the light. The ancients said: The virtuous and the able: it is impossible to combine the two into one. I feel that the two can be combined into one in you. Years and months, days and hours, you feel that your ability is not up to par. Actually, the reasons are first, you do not know yourself, and secondly, you do not understand objective matters. Those returned overseas students and big professors, with their confused personal relationships and complicated psychology, hold you in contempt, not in so many words, but by innuendoes. All these are common occurrences in society which almost everyone has to experience. Beyond this there is one's own lack of political-economic experience and the fear when confronted with decisions. These are good; they are all facts and understandable. I feel that [your] intelligence and honesty are adequate to resolve all difficulties. It seems that I have discussed this point with you before. Intelligence means asking many questions and thinking a lot; honesty entails seeking the truth through facts. Practicing them constantly and regularly will make one more successful. Your courage seems to have greatly increased. After not having seen a person for three days, one must look at him with new eyes. My rambling is merely to add some oil and put in a dash of vinegar.

“Covering 80,000 *li* a day when sitting on the ground.” Chiang Chu-ju was wrong in his statement. There is a numerical basis. The diameter of the earth is approximately 12,500 kilometers. Multiplied by 3.1416, it becomes 40,000 kilometers, or 80,000 *li*. This is the mileage of the earth's revolution (one day's time). One must pay to ride a train, ship, or bus. It is called traveling. But no fare is required (no purchase of a ticket required) when sitting on the earth and covering 80,000 *li*. Is this traveling?! One is constrained by customs and habits, and one's superstition is not eliminated. It is nothing but daily life, yet many people find it odd. Patrolling the skies, our solar system (including, the earth) threads back and forth in the Silver River [Milky Way] every day and every hour. What is the Silver River? It is without limit; “1,000” merely indicates infinity. Mankind merely “patrols” in a river, but what he sees is infinite. The Herd-boy, the men of Chin,

schistosomiasis, dropsy, commonly known as bloat, the dynasties of Chou, Ch'in and Han — all are recorded in books many times. The Herd-boy Star is naturally concerned about his fellow villagers. One must ask the god of Plagues how things are. The Ursa Major, commonly known as the Herd-boy (do I remember it wrong?) belongs to the Silver River system. Please convey my explanations to Chu-ju. Any dissent can be argued. As I may not be in Peking in November we probably will not see each other.

Speech At The First Chengchow Conference

November 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Before the realization of the system of ownership by all the people in the rural area, the peasants remained peasants, and there was a certain dual nature when they walked the socialist path. We can only guide them step by step to divorce themselves from relatively small collective ownership and more toward the system of ownership by all the people via the relatively large collective ownership system, but we cannot ask them to complete the process in one stroke — just as before when we could only guide them step by step to give up the private ownership system in favor of the collective ownership system.

On The Question Of Whether Imperialism And All Reactionaries Are Real Tigers

December 1, 1958

[SOURCE: *Peking Review*, Nos. 37 & 38, September 13, 1977]

Here I should like to answer the question of whether imperialism and all reactionaries are real tigers. The answer is that they are at once real tigers and paper tigers, they are in the process of being changed from real into paper tigers. Change means transformation. Real tigers are transformed into paper tigers, into their opposite. This is true of all things, and not just social phenomena. I answered this question several years ago: Despise the enemy strategically and take full account of him tactically. But why take full account of him if

he is not a real tiger? Apparently there are still people around who do not get the point, so we must do some more explaining.

Just as there is not a single thing in the world without a dual nature (this is the law of the unity of opposites), so imperialism and all reactionaries have a dual nature — they are at the same time real tigers and paper tigers. In the past, before they won state power and for some time afterwards, the slave-owning class, the feudal landlord class and the bourgeoisie were vigorous, revolutionary and progressive; they were real tigers. But with the lapse of time, because their opposites — the slave class, the peasant class and the proletariat — gradually grew in strength and struggled against them ever more fiercely, these ruling classes changed step by step into the reverse, changed into reactionaries, changed into backward people, changed into paper tigers. And eventually they were overthrown, or will be overthrown, by the people. The reactionary, backward, decaying classes retained this dual nature even in the face of the people's final decisive struggle against them. On the one hand, they were real tigers; they devoured people, devoured people by the millions and tens of millions. The cause of the people's struggle went through times of difficulty and hardship, and along the path there were many twists and turns. The destruction of the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism in China took the Chinese people more than a hundred years and cost them tens of millions of lives before victory in 1949. Look! Weren't they living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers? But on the other hand, they eventually changed into paper tigers, dead tigers, bean-curd tigers. These are historical facts. Haven't people seen or heard about these facts? There have been thousands and tens of thousands of them! Thousands and tens of thousands! Hence, imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are — paper tigers. On this we should build our strategic thinking. But they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers, they can devour people. On this we should build our tactical thinking. This holds true of the struggle against nature as well as against the class enemy. Both the 12-year 40-article programme for agricultural development and the 12-year programme for the development of science which we published in 1956 proceed from this basic concept of Marxism, the concept of the unity of opposites, that is, the concept of the dual nature of the development of the universe, the concept of the dual nature of the development of things, the concept that a thing invariably manifests itself in a process and that every process without exception has a dual nature. On the one hand, we should take these struggles lightly, they are easy to handle, they are not much of a problem, there is nothing to worry about, and we shall certainly achieve success and be victorious. On the other hand, we should take them seriously, they are not so easy to handle, they present quite a problem and must not be treated casually, and we cannot be victorious without hard work and arduous struggle. Fear and fearlessness fall under the law of the unity of opposites. There is no such thing in this world as an absolutely fearless person, a carefree type without a single worry. Worry attends men from their birth. Students are worried about exams and children about their parents' partiality for their brothers or sisters. Besides, there are numerous adversities and calamities, infirmities and diseases, running a fever of 41 degrees and other mishaps, as expressed in the saying, "In nature there are unexpected storms and in life unpredictable vicissitudes," and so on and so forth. The difficulties we encounter in class struggle and the struggle against nature are far greater in number. But

except for cowards and the opportunist gentlemen, most people, and primarily the proletariat and the Communists, invariably put optimism and contempt for! difficulties first. And only then do they take full account of things, of every piece of work, of scientific research, analyse each contradictory aspect of things, dig into them and come to understand the laws of motion of nature and society. It will then be possible to grasp these laws and become relatively free to apply them to successively solving the problems facing us, to handling contradictions and accomplishing our tasks so that hard going can be transformed into easy going, real tigers into paper tigers, the lower stage of a revolution into its higher stage, the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, socialist ownership by the collective into socialist ownership by the whole people, socialist ownership by the whole people into communist ownership by the whole people, an annual production of several million tons of steel into one of tens of millions of tons or even several hundred million tons of steel, and an output of over a hundred catties or several hundred catties of grain per *mou* into one of several thousand or even tens of thousands of catties of grain per *mou*. Comrades, it is our task to bring about these transformations. Comrades, possibility and reality are two things and they are two opposites of a single unity. Spurious possibility and genuine possibility are again two things and two opposites of a single unity. We should keep our heads cool and our heads hot, which are also two opposites of a single unity. Soaring enthusiasm means hotheadedness and scientific analysis cool-headedness. Some people in our country are a bit too hotheaded at present. They are in no mood to allow a cooling off period, unwilling to make an analysis and all for hotheadedness. Comrades, such an attitude is not good for people in positions of leadership and they may trip and fall. These persons should make a point of cooling off their heads. Some others prefer cool-headedness to hotheadedness. They do not like some of the things that are going on and cannot keep pace with them.! Those who take a wait-and-see attitude and those who want to eventually settle accounts with their opponents belong to this category. In regard to these people, we must gradually make their heads hotter.

Talks With Directors Of Various Cooperative Areas

November, December 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

1. Speech of November 30, 1958

No matter what the undertaking, the central and the local governments must coordinate the strips and the pieces. This is a rule of democratic centralism and the mass line method; otherwise it will not be successful. Is cold water being thrown on Li Fu-ch'un^[1] this time? Plans must be positive and reliable, on a stable foundation. Encouragement is

required. The people's enthusiasm must not be checked, and the lessons of 1956 must be learned. In the local area, there is also the relationship between pieces and strips. The first secretary is the piece and the divisions of labor secretaries the strips. They must also coordinate. The first secretary must coordinate with the industrial secretary. The enthusiasm at the Peitai-ho Conference was for 30 million tons, of which 10 million was subjectivism. One does not know the difficulties of a thing without experiencing it. (Premier's interruption: Definitely not mysterious; by no means simple. XX: The various areas may give further consideration to the iron and steel quotas. A little reduction will not affect the state plan. Steel, power, and communication should follow the second plan; other quotas the first plan.)

The Plenary Session of the Central Committee will be held on the 6th and 7th. Should the outline of the matter be discussed? We should follow the plan for a while and see what happens. We will decide by 1 July next year. Originally there was no plan for increased grain output, but after a few meetings, it was brought up. The "Eight-point Charter" for agriculture deals only with things on the ground, not in the sky (sunshine and air can not be controlled). The sky and the earth are the unity of opposites. Voluminous words are not required when it comes to good things. Lao-tzu wrote only a little over 5,000 words in his lifetime. Industry is different from agriculture. In industry, many factors affect one another through their mutual relationships. To develop steel, we must develop coal, electricity, etc. There can be no missing link. In agriculture, there are fewer factors affecting one another. There is the three-way alliance of the party, the masses, and the technicians. Experimental fields and high yields constitute a big liberation of mankind and mankind's comprehension of nature. The three-three system has broken down many insurance coefficients. It is better to write it in. We must make the time more flexible and do some more revisions. In the majority of the areas in the nation, each person has about one *mou*.

The people's commune should be discussed for two more days and the revisions completed. Many issues have been brought up to this time. Whether people's communes should be established in the city has been answered. They will be established. In regard to the question of the militia and the family, Dulles accuses us of slave labor and the destruction of the family. Capitalism has long destroyed the family. For the sake of money, father disowns son. Now our society takes care of the old. "Take care of our old and thereby other people's old; take care of our young and thereby other people's young." The wage disparity is rather great, around four fold or more. The peasants have the tendency toward egalitarianism, but there should not be too big a gap, nor should there be no difference. The wage disparity in the Soviet Union is too great. We cannot follow suit. In the future, what will a small wage amount to? What does 15 yuan amount to? It should be 30 to 45 yuan. When everyone's wage is raised to several tens of yuan, there won't be any difference. This is in regard to the rural areas. The disparities in the city may be a little more, which is necessary. In the city, the wages of Huang Yen-p'ei^[2], Mei Lan-fang^[3], and the professors should not be cut. In the future, when social products become more abundant and the low wages are raised and get closer to the high wages, we will be entering communism. In regard to "to each according to his labor" and "to each according to his need", how do we equalize? It goes from low to high.

Let us spend a half day to discuss the question of work style. Currently, the main problems are coercion and false reporting. Tsao-yang Country did not eliminate illiteracy, yet it reported wiping out illiteracy. In coercion, there are two types of people: One type consists of alien class elements and the other idiots. Just how many are there practicing coercion and issuing orders? One per cent, five per cent, ten per cent? In December this year or January next year, all areas must hold a party congress to discuss the question of work style.

Two major questions arose in the latter half of this year; one is the people's communes, the other is taking steel as the key link. Everyone is a little tense; regulations are now being formulated to ease everybody's mind. The document on people's communes was prepared at the Chengchow Conference. Plans for the meeting were carefully made. The East China [Bureau] is deteriorating. In the past such conditions were unthought of. It has coal, but it is not being shipped out.

In regard to the 1959 farm output, the grain output this year is 750 billion catties; next year there will be an increase of 300 billion catties, reaching 1,050 billion catties and averaging over 1,500 catties per capita. With three years of hard struggle, we will reach 2,000 catties per capita. There should also be some tuber crops. This year let us practice the policy of reporting less than the amount and make some allowances. Cotton output this year is reported as 67 million piculs. Next year there will be 100 million piculs. Just how much is the grain output? Has it been doubled more or less? Probably it is better to record a 90 percent increase. On the question of food to eat, should no allowances be made, or should some allowances be made? Next spring will there be areas where the people cannot get three meals a day? Kwangtung issued an order to have three meals a day. The people of Shangung say that they are now eating thin pancakes. What will they do next spring? At present we cannot determine just how much grain we have. Should we eat less now and more later? All areas should discuss it.

In the international situation, Khrushchev held a press conference and did some manipulation on the Berlin issue. If you do not let go, then I will. Khrushchev also knows how to create a tense situation. Let us also create some tension, so that the West will ask us not to do so. Let the West fear tension, because it will be to our advantage. After the publication of the official report of the Sino-Soviet conference, Taiwan held an emergency meeting. But the Taiwan issue was not discussed at all at the conference. The holding of the four-power summit meeting was cancelled reportedly because of China's influence, but actually it was not mentioned at the conference either. It is safe to travel a long distance? Stalin's nerves were not sound and never went anywhere before. All kinds of information has proven that imperialism has adopted a defensive posture, not an offensive one. In his statement of the 18th, Dulles said: "If you communists promote the people's commune, then do not go beyond that sphere. If you mind your own affairs and do not interfere in things beyond yourselves, we will feel at ease. You do not bother me; I do not bother you." Dulles says that we promote slave labor and totalitarianism, and that we have excessive reserve. He says that reserve is that which is left after deducting wages from total income. He calls such as reserve capital. Colonialism – nationalism – communism is Lenin's formula. Read Dulles' statement of the 18th carefully. He admits

our large reserve and organizational strength. Philosophically he cannot beat us. His words are low-toned. He does not mention the brink of war or strength and position. He is relatively systematic. He is America's helmsman. The English are sly and cunning. The Americans are relatively short-tempered. The English constantly make strategic and tactical moves. Dulles discusses the five big issues in the world: nationalism, bipolarism, atomic energy, outer space, and communism. He is a thinking man. To read his statements, one must study it word by word and resort to the English dictionary. At the World Order Study Conference, 37 million religious disciples issued a letter urging the recognition of China. Dulles says that churches can only decide on ethical principles, but cannot get involved in the details.

Are the eight viewpoints discussed at the Pei-tai-ho Conference intelligent? Yes. The North Atlantic Treaty is an attack on nationalism and domestic communism (the emphasis in to attack the intermediate zone, Asia, Africa, and Latin America) and defense against the socialist camp, unless another Hungarian Incident occurs. However, in our propaganda it is another matter; we must still claim that it is an attack. We must not be hoodwinked by our own propaganda. Lippmann wrote an article saying that it was not an attack, but he could not convince the Soviet people. Who is more afraid of whom? Lippmann advocates building up India to resist us. It seems that they are afraid of us, afraid that we will fight for leadership in Asia and Africa, afraid of our economic high tide. Tension, in the final analysis, is advantageous to us. De Gaulle made his appearance. He would have to appear anyway. His appearance is detrimental to the French proletariat. It is better for the U.S. army to withdraw from the Middle East sooner or is it better later? Only a little over a month and they are all gone, indicating that they have withdrawn. It was good for Taiwan to fire artillery shots, for otherwise the militia could not have been organized so quickly. The boycott, joining the UN, peace, war, and the atomic bomb issue: to whom are they more beneficial? It is better to be afraid or better not to be afraid? Make up one's mind: to not be afraid is better. Discuss the matter together and one will not fear ghosts. Dulles likes war. Being criticized is a false appearance, not the true essence. Dulles is the true helmsman. The provincial committees must appoint special persons to read *Reference Materials*.

Khrushchev is too cautious, too unbalanced. He is lame in one leg. He does not walk with both legs. For their livelihood, the people get 200 rubles, slightly higher than us. Soviet heavy industry is too big and too centralized, disregarding the local areas. It stresses administration and lacks the mass line.

The meeting this time is rather long and rather relaxed. Mainly two documents have been concentrated on. Many people inside and outside the party still fail to understand the paper tiger issue. Some people say that, since it is a paper tiger, why don't we attack Taiwan; why should we advocate catching up with and surpassing Great Britain? I wrote a short article to explain this issue. It is both real and false. The temporary appearance is real, but in the long run it is made of paper. We have always maintained that we must give it serious attention tactically but regard it with contempt strategically. This holds true in the struggle against nature as well as in the class struggle. Eliminating the four

pests, wiping out illiteracy, reforestation and [wiping out] schistosomiasis; they cannot be realized in one year, but require several years.

2. Speech of December 12, 1958

1. Regarding the Official Report. The West may possibly fall apart. It looks as if it will, but one cannot be sure. The European continental block is to deal with Great Britain and the U.S., but its internal conflicts are many. There are conflicts between Germany and France, and also between Great Britain and the U.S. They unite together and struggle against each other simultaneously. Stalin predicted war within capitalism. We have long ago said so. In our article written in 1946, we discovered the buffer zones between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The struggle for the buffer zones is the major aspect. Why fight the Soviet Union instead of the buffer zones? Under the name of anti-communism, they promote the policy of aggression. If the buffer zones are attacked, it will create resistance by the buffer zones, and with the vastness of the buffer zones, they cannot come over. This includes the U.S., France, Germany, and Italy. Asia, Africa, and Latin America are their rear areas. There are troubles in Europe, Asia, and Africa. So, how can the U.S. come out and fight the Soviet Union?

The object of exploitation is man. Only by exploiting man can the earth be exploited. Only with man can there be soil; only with soil can there be wealth. If man is killed; what's the use of occupying soil? I don't see the reason for the atom bomb. Conventional weapons are still the thing. We think that as long as the atom bomb is not dropped, Germany, France, and Italy will acquiesce, and many nations will not fear the U.S. Can there be a treaty whereby there is mutual agreement not to use the atom bomb? With the existence of monopolistic capital, it is impossible not to have war. This is because of the lack of raw materials and markets.

The assessment of the international situation in the Official Report: Imperialism will definitely disintegrate, and there will be war within itself. Nixon says: To promote economic competition, India must be built up. How can India be built up? A pessimistic atmosphere covers the West; ours is a joyous one. The term "disintegrating" must be weighed. It is the truth, but once it is said, will it alert them? But then there is no other way. The U.S. wants to force liberal elements into Taiwan. There is tension in Iraq. A large number of counter-revolutionaries were arrested in the past few days, but the outcome has not been decided. Mainly, the U.S., Great Britain, Turkey, and Iran are forming a conspiracy. (Why did Khadjamu disband the labor union? I wonder why Iraq's intelligence is so efficient?)

2. The three documents have been drafted. In regard to the resignation issue, there has to be an "idol".^[4] A class must have a class leader. The Central Committee must have first secretary. Without the atom as the nucleus, there would not be rain. Rather than chaos after death, it is better to have chaos now, while the persons is there. It will be impossible to be without a nucleus. There must be consolidation. After a while, an "idol" emerges,

and it becomes relatively difficult to eliminate [him]. This is a psychological condition of long standing. In the future, my duties may increase or decrease, be elevated or lowered. Actually, I am only serving as half a chairman, without charge of daily affairs.

In regard to the 1959 plan, let's work on it for a couple of months first. We will meet again in the middle of February.

How are the people's communes? The provincial and municipal committee secretaries meeting will be held on 1 February, either in Peking, or Ch'eng-to or Shanghai.

Hong Kong newspapers berated Chiang Kai-shek for "hastily bidding farewell to the ancestral shrine and fleeing to Taiwan."

The People's Congress will be held on 15 March.

At the 1 February meeting, besides examining the two resolutions, it is necessary to reorganize the state structure. The People's Congress report must be prepared, and the education issue discussed. We need more internal directives for the people's communes.

Has the people's commune violated the constitution? The issue of integrating politics and the commune, for example, was not passed by the People's Congress, nor is it in the constitution. Many parts of the constitution are obsolete, but it cannot be revised now. After surpassing the U.S., we will formulate a written constitution. Now we are imitating the U.S.; what we have is an unwritten constitution. The U.S. has an unwritten constitution; it is put together article by article.

To enter communism, 15 years, 20 years, or an even longer period is required. To accomplish the socialist system of ownership by all the people may take at least three or four years, during the second five-year plan, or as long as five or six years, during the third five-year plan.

3. The people's commune document must be further revised here and there and reconsidered. Three days, including the 15th, 16th, and 17th, will be spent on the revision. On the 18th the Official Report will be published and the issue of the Chairman's resignation announced. The resolution on the people's commune will be published on the 19th.

If there are more questions on the issue of the Chairman's resignation a telephonic conference may be held again for clarification.

4. I made a mistake at the Pei-tai-ho Conference. Concentrating on the 10.7 million tons of steel, the people's commune, and the bombardment of Quemoy, I did not think of other things. The Pei-tai-ho Conference resolution must now be revised. I was enthusiastic at that time, and failed to combine revolutionary fervor and the practical spirit. The two were combined at the Wu-ch'ang Conference. The resolution must be

revised. Walk on both legs, with Russia's revolutionary fervor and America's practical spirit.

Ch'en Chieng-ming is colluding with a county tax bureau chief in Tung-chiang. Select one of them as the bureau chief, and then change in two months.

It still boils down to two sentences: "The important and the unimportant, the urgent and the non-essential; they must be put in perspective. Self-reliance [depends on] small indigenous groups." Horizontally on top is "political supremacy."

A meeting must be held in the afternoon. Announcements must be issued. Dictatorship is required. The provincial committee secretaries must know what to do. [China] is after all backward. Since we were already backward, what difference does it make to remain so for a few more years? The provincial committee secretaries must consider all angles and give consideration to the whole situation. The idea of the whole country as one chessboard must be combined with local enthusiasm. When there are still conflicts, the national interest must come first. Giving consideration to the whole is the supreme ethic, and having it, one will not suffer a loss. Anyone not giving consideration to the whole will suffer a loss. Yang I-ch'en did not give consideration to the whole situation but attempted to take advantage of the occasion and knock down Chou and Ch'en. All those wishing to do such things are merely picking up a rock only to drop it on their own foot. There are those who give consideration to the whole situation. All those failing to give consideration to the whole situation in history did not come to a good end, such as Yang I-ch'en, Kao Kang and Lo Chang-lung.

Be prepared to suffer a wrong and give consideration to the whole situation. How much Marxism-Leninism did Yang I-ch'en possess? Not one iota.

Some provinces are extremely poor. It does not matter if they remain poor for another few decades, but actually they will not remain poor for that long.

Sacrifice ourselves and help others. Hung-niang stood outside at night and was beaten. What was it for?

Notes

[1.] Li Fu-ch'un (1899-), a Hunanese, has been a long-time close associate of Mao Tse-tung. He worked with Mao at the Peasant Movement Training Institute in 1925-6, and is married to Ts'ai Ch'ang, the sister of Mao's best friend, Ts'ai Ho-sen. He has been Chairman of the State Planning Commission since 1954.

[2.] Huang Yan-pei, see note 2, p 19 of this volume. [Correction: [note 19, p 12](#) of this volume. – *Transcriber, MIA*]

[3.] Mei Lan-fang (1894-1961) was one of the most famous and celebrated actors of Peking Opera.

[4.] A reference to comrade Mao's proposal that he will step down from the Chairmanship of the PRC.

Speech At The Sixth Plenum Of The Eighth Central Committee

December 19, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

These are merely opinions, not conclusions. The resolutions will be the conclusions of the meeting.

1. The appearance of the people's commune. The appearance of the people's commune was not foreseen at the Ch'eng-tu Conference in April and the Party Congress in May. Actually it had already appeared in Honan in April, but remained undiscovered through May, June, and July. It was not discovered until August. A resolution was formed at the Pei-tai-ho Conference. It was a momentous event. A form to build socialism was found, facilitating the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the people and from socialist ownership by the people to the communist ownership by the people, making [life] easier for the workers, peasants, merchants, students, and soldiers, and rendering possible many undertakings on a large scale and by many people. We once said that we must be prepared for unlucky happenings. Nothing can be more unlucky than war or a split in the party. But there are also unexpected good things. We did not expect the formation of the people's commune in April, and the resolution was not made until August. The framework was erected throughout the country in four months. Now the organization must be consolidated.

2. The issue of safeguarding labor fervor. Cadres make mistakes mostly by practicing coercion, telling lies, and making false reports, reporting either more or less than the actual figures. It is not very serious to report less for more, but it is very serious to report more for less. Reporting 100 catties as 50 does not matter, but reporting 50 catties as 100 is serious. The main trouble is the lack of concern over the people's livelihood and giving attention only to production. How should it be remedied? Those making mistakes constitute a minority among the cadres. In regard to those making mistakes, 90 percent or more of them should be handled by means of patient persuasion, once, twice ... without

punishment, only self-criticism. Let us all discuss this matter. My individual opinion cannot be considered as a conclusion. Cadres at the county, district, and township levels seriously violating law and disobeying discipline and isolating themselves from the people constitute approximately 1-5 percent of their total, and that's about all. Conditions vary in different areas. Some distinctions must be made. Those who have isolated themselves from the people should be punished. The people do not like them. If we do not refrain from punishing the more than 90 percent of the cadres who have committed mistakes, we will be unable to protect the cadres and we will be checking the enthusiasm of the laborers as well as the cadres. In regard to those who have seriously violated the law and disobeyed discipline, if we do not discuss their cases, make some distinctions, and mete out punishment accordingly, we will also damage the people's enthusiasm. Some especially serious cases will be handled as criminal cases. In general, individual cases must be analyzed to determine which ones are class dissenters and which are not. However, in extreme cases, such as beating people, swearing at people, detaining people, or tying people up, they must be punished. Hupeh Province already dismissed the first secretary of a county committee. When the drought was very severe, he did not fight it but reported that he had. Anyway, punishment should be given to the minimum number of offenders while education should be given to the maximum. By so doing, the enthusiasm of the cadres and laborers will be safeguarded. As for those among the people who have committed mistakes, the policy should be the same.

3. The issue of "basically transforming the entire country after three years of hard struggle". Is this slogan appropriate? Can it be done in three years? This slogan was first introduced by a Honan comrade. We adopted it at the Nan-ning Conference. It was aimed at the rural areas at that time. Subsequently, we don't know when, it was expanded into "transforming the entire country after three years of hard struggle." Tseng Hsi-sheng^[1] wanted to convince me. He showed me maps of three river networks and maintained that the rural areas could be basically transformed. Maybe it is possible to accomplish this in the rural areas, but as for the entire country, I feel that further consideration is required. It is possible that within three years, we may be able to produce 30 to 40 million tons of steel annually. When a large nation of 650 million population produces 30-40 million tons of steel, how could it be called a basic transformation? I feel this standard has been set too low. Otherwise, we would not have to strive for further improvement. What would we call it when our production reaches 50, 60, 100, or 200 million tons annually? I feel that great improvements are yet to come! Therefore, we cannot speak of basically transforming the country in three years. By 1962 steel production may reach 50 or 60 million tons a year. By that time it may be said that we have basically transformed the entire country. We will then have reached the standards in Britain and America of today. By that time should we still refrain from speaking about basically transforming the entire country? Transforming a nation of over 600 million at such a speed seems incredible. What should we call it? It should be discussed, because the newspapers are already vigorously propagandizing it. Maybe we can strive for basic transformation in five years and thorough transformation in 10-15 years. What is the best? I hope our comrades will think about it. ! Maybe we can call it basic transformation when Great Britain is surpassed and complete transformation when the U.S. is surpassed. When we force ourselves to surpass others, we will become exhausted. It is better to take it a little easier.

If we do not require these many years and surpass them in three or four years, then what should we do? If it can be realized in advance, it's all right! The sooner we achieve our goal in advance of plans, the sooner we will get the results. I don't believe that will be a loss! Tseng Hsi-sheng has an idea which is nothing but "opportunism." Last winter and this spring, Anhwei began to undertake 800 million cubic meters of earth and stone work in water conservation. Subsequently it was doubled to 1.6 billion. Eight hundred million was opportunism; 1.6 billion was Marxism-Leninism. In a short time, it was increased to 3.2 billion, and 1.6 billion looked like "opportunism." Later on it was increased to 6.4 billion. When we set the time for the transformation a little longer, we are not being anything but "opportunists." Such opportunism is very interesting and I am willing to practice it. Marx appreciated such opportunism. He would not have criticized me.

4. Certain disputes inside and outside the party. There are all kinds of opinions concerning the people's communes inside and outside the party. Hundreds of thousands or millions, of cadres are discussing it. Many questions have not been cleared up. Each man has his own opinion, and 10 men have 10 opinions. There is no general or intensive analysis. There are also some opinions in the international society which holds several viewpoints. One is that there is too much haste; that their great determination and high revolutionary fervor are extremely valuable, but they have not made any historical, situational, or international analysis; that enthusiasm is their good point but haste their defect; that it is premature to announce the transition to ownership by the people and the entry into communism in two or three years. The resolution this time is aimed mainly at this viewpoint. In other words, don't be in too great a haste, for it won't do any good. With this resolution, after this resolution, after a period of weeks, months, they will come to this realization through practice and debate. There will always be "leftists," but there is no need to worry about them. As long as the majority of the cadres are united in their thinking, it can be handled easily. Possibly a few cadres who are good comrades and loyal to the party and the country may believe we are being too hasty. They are not tide watchers, or account settlers. They are not on the opposite side. They are concerned, concerned that we may fail. They are good people. This resolution may possibly convince them, because we are not in that much of a haste. The resolution is aimed mainly at the hasty people, it is also a reply to the tide watchers and account settlers. They do not have good intentions. They do not realize the urgent demand of the current situation or that the opportunity is ripe.

There are two transitions. How can they be achieved? This question came up in the past two months. It is good that this question has come up. We have the answer for it. It was not solved at the Ch'eng-tu Conference. But some preparations were made at the Chengchow Conference and were completed a month later. Communism is divided into two stages. More than a 100 years have passed since Marx, 40 years since Lenin's October Revolution, 30 since our party started building a base, and nine since the national victory. Therefore, this question is not premature, and the conditions for an answer have ripened. Currently, there are many opinions inside and outside the country concerning this question. Dulles is also expressing his opinion. He says that we practice slave labor and destroy the family; that the great speed of our construction is a result of our excessive exploitation and the accumulation of a large reserve; that they are slow because there is

less exploitation [of the U.S. people]. The intermediate strata, the proletariat, and the communists are also voicing their opinions. The proletariat of all nations and the comrades of foreign countries are defending us. Their basis is the Pei-tai-ho Conference and newspaper information. If we do not give an answer, there will be much confusion and an anarchic situation may develop. Everyone will be for himself. The provinces and regions will not be able to control the counties and the counties will not be able to control the communes. it will be like a reinless horse. Therefore, we must oppose haste on the one hand and answer this question on the other.

5. The study of political economy. In the next few months, please study Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism, Textbook on Political Economy* (third edition), and *Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin on the Communist Society*. All provinces should spend a few months on organization. Studying economic theories in conjunction with reality has a great theoretical and practical significance for the cause of our undertakings at the present time. I made this suggestion at the Chengchow Conference and wrote a letter suggesting it for everyone's consideration.

6. The study of dialectics. At the time of the Chengchow Conference, a comrade, I don't remember who it was, introduced the saying "big collective; small freedom." This is a good saying. If it had been "big freedom; small collective." it would have pleased Dulles, Huang Yen-p'ei and Jung I-jen.

We must take hold of both production and livelihood problems. "Walking on both legs" is a theory of the unity of opposites and within the realm of dialectics. Marx's theory on the unity of opposites made great progress in China in 1958 which, under the premise of preferential development of heavy industry, included the simultaneous promotion of industry and agriculture, of heavy and light industries, of central and local industries, of large, medium, and small enterprises, of small plants using indigenous methods and large plants using foreign methods, of native and foreign methods, and simultaneous development in other fields. Then there are also the management systems — centralized leadership by the Central Government, and management by levels in the local areas. From the Central Government, province, region, counties, all the way down to the production team, some authority is conferred. It serves no good purpose for them to be completely without authority. These concepts are already firmly established in our party. This is good. Both indigenous methods and modern methods are simultaneously promoted. There are plants using both Chinese and modern methods. Were not Chinese methods used at T'ang-shan and Huang-shih-kang? Are there also small plants using foreign methods? There are. There are also plants using both foreign and native methods. In general, it is very complex. Some of these [combinations] are considered wrong and may not be practiced in some nations of the socialist camp. We permit them; we consider them proper here. Is it better to permit them or not to permit them? We have to wait a few years and see. However, for a nation like ours which is extremely poor, it is all right to use some indigenous methods to build small plants. It will be too monotonous to concentrate only on big projects. Agriculture is also full of complexities. We have high, medium, and low yields at the same time. The "three-three system" of cultivation was created ! by the people and adopted at the Pei-tai-ho Conference. In this system, the land

available for cultivation is divided into three parts; one for growing food, one for afforestation, and one is to be left fallow. This may be the direction of the agricultural revolution. The "eight-character code" was also introduced. They are, water for irrigation, fertilizer, soil improvement, seeds, close planting, crop protection, farm tool reform, and field management. Man needs water to drink; so do plants.

In regards to the socialist system, two kinds of ownership exist simultaneously in the socialist stage. They are opposites, and also united. They are the unity of opposites. Collective ownership contains the nucleus of the socialist ownership by the people. Its basic essence is collective ownership, but it also contains the element of the communist ownership by all the people. Yu Chin said recently that it is all right for the collective ownership in China to contain the elements of communism. A capitalist society does not allow the socialist form of production. But in nations under the leadership of the communist party, it is proper to allow the elements of communism to grow. Stalin did not solve this problem. He polarized the collective ownership, the socialist ownership by all the people, and the communist ownership by all the people. This is wrong.

Can these be called the development of dialectics?

"Big collective, small freedom" was proposed at the Chengchow Conference. Now, it is "grasping revolution and grasping livelihood problems." These are the expansion of dialectics. The Wu-ch'ang conference resolved that we must "seek the truth from facts." We must be hot and cold at the same time when we do our planning. We must not only proceed with determination, but also earnestly engage in scientific analysis. Of course, this resolution alone will not solve all our problems. I think it is better to delay its announcement. We should issue only an official report, then publish the resolution next March at the People's Congress. This is in accord with our great ambition and determination. It will avoid certain impractical ideas that emerged from the 1958 great leap forward. It will be given a firmer basis and a better scientific analysis. As for steel production, I had once favored producing 30 million tons next year. I have also had some second thoughts after Wu-ch'ang. In the past I thought of 100 or 120 million tons in 1962. At that time I was only concerned with the question of demand. I was worried over the problem of who would be using this steel, but did not think of the problem of whether it is possible. Later on I considered this problem. One is capacity and the other is need. Producing 10.7 million tons this year has been exhausting; therefore, capacity becomes a question. To produce 30 million tons next year, 60 million tons the year after, and 120 million tons in 1962 is not possible or realistic. Now, we should shorten the time and plan for 18 to 20 million tons. Can this be exceeded? Let us wait until next year and see. 22 to 23 million tons may be possible. It may be exceeded when there is extra capacity. Now our goal should be small. We should not set it too high and leave a margin of safety. We should let the people surpass our plans in practice. This also is a problem of dialectics. Practice includes the effort of our leading cadres and the practice of the people. When the goal is set low but raised higher in practice, it is not opportunism. The growth from 11 million to 20 million tons is about a 100-percent increase. There has never been such "opportunism" in the world since ancient times. Here, it must also be linked with internationalism, with the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, and with the entire

world working class and international unity. On this subject we must not struggle to be first. Currently, some counties are always struggling to be first; they want to enter communism first. In fact, An-shan Iron and Steel, Fu-shun, Liaoning, Shanghai, and Tientsin should be the first to enter communism. It would not look right for China to enter communism ahead of the Soviet Union. Whether this is possible is also a question. The Soviet Union has 1.5 million scientists, several million higher intellectuals, and 500,000 engineers, more numerous than the U.S. It has 55 million tons of steel, but we have only this little bit. Its reserve strength is great and cadres numerous, while we have just begun. Therefore, capacity is a question. The seven-year plan proposed by Khrushchev is a preparation to enter communism. The proposed two systems of ownership will gradually become one. This is good. But one is “impractical” and the other “impossible.” Even if it is possible for us to be the first, we should not do so. The October Revolution was Lenin’s cause. Are we not emulating Lenin? So, what’s the need of hurrying? It would be only for the purpose of seeking credit from Marx. If we rush, we may possibly commit errors in international matters. We must give attention to dialectics and mutual benefits. Dialectics has made great developments and this is one of them.

7. The 15-year program brought out at the Chengchow Conference. This time we have laid aside the 15-year program brought out at the Chengchow Conference. There is no basis to determine whether it is needed and whether it is possible. We not only lack sufficient basis, but also preliminary basis. The experiences of the Soviet Union and the U.S. do not provide a basis for us to do that much. Is it possible? Even if it is possible, customers cannot be found. Therefore, the program will not be set firmly for the time being. We can bring it out every winter and discuss it. Such long-range plans will not be made next year, the year after next, or three years hence. Probably a long-range plan can be formulated by 1962, but not earlier. The party and the people have been promoting industry for several years, and they may have some idea about the questions of capability and need. Some comrades are probably disappointed that it was laid aside and not discussed at this conference.

8. Military work in 1958. Military work developed considerably in 1958, including the all-out rectification, the officers joining the soldiers in the units, the participation in production, and militia building. Ever since the rectification conference in Peking in June, all levels have also been holding rectification conferences. By now they have probably been completed. Training cannot be disregarded. If everyone is assigned to conduct rectification, production, steel refining, commune building, or water conservation, it won’t work either. Troops are, after all, troops, and training is a constant task.

9. Change in the education system. Implementing the system of combining education and labor production is a momentous matter. Naturally, some problems have cropped up. Some students, for example, do not want to study, but find labor production more interesting. If many of them do not want to study, then it becomes a problem. When it becomes a problem, a meeting will be held. After the meeting they will study again.

10. The question of two possibilities. There are always two opposing sides in a thing. Will the dining hall, nurseries, and communes be consolidated? It seems that they will be, but we must also be prepared for some collapses. Consolidation and collapse are two possibilities which exist simultaneously. If we are not prepared, there may be a big collapse. Consolidation and collapse are two opposites. Our resolution is for the purpose of consolidation. Without a few collapses, there will not be consolidation. For example, if a few infants die in the nurseries or a few oldsters die in the happiness halls, what would be the superiority of such institutions? If cold rice is served in the dining halls, or if there is only rice and nothing else, a group of them will also collapse. To feel that not one should collapse is not practical. Collapse due to bad handling is rational. Generally speaking, collapses are partial and temporary, not permanent. The general tendency is development and consolidation. Our party also has two possibilities: consolidation and split. In Shanghai one Central Committee split into two Central Committees; in the Long March, we split with Chang Kuo-t'ao; the Kao-Jao Incident was a partial split. Partial splits are normal. Since last year, splits occurred within the leadership group in half of the provinces in the nation. Take the human body for instance. Everyday hair and skin are coming off. It is the death of a part of the cells. From infancy on, a part of the cells will die. It benefits growth. Without such destruction, man cannot exist. It would have been impossible if men did not die since the time of Confucius. Death has benefits; fertilizer is created. You say you don't want to become fertilizer, but actually you will. You must be mentally prepared. Partial splits occur everyday. There will always be splits and destruction. The absence of splits is detrimental to development. Destruction in entirety is also a historical inevitability. As a whole, the party and the state, serving as the tools of the class struggle, will also perish. But before the completion of its historical mission, we must consolidate it. We do not hope for splits, but we must be prepared. Without preparation, there will be splits. With preparation, we will avoid big splits. Large and medium splits are temporary. The Hungary Incident was a large split; the Kao-Jao and Molotov Incidents are medium ones. Changes are occurring in each and every party branch. Some are dismissed while others join; some work successfully while others make mistakes. It is impossible for changes never to occur. Lenin constantly said: "A nation always has two possibilities: success or destruction." Our people's Republic of China also has two possibilities: continue to succeed, or become destroyed. Lenin did not conceal the possibility of destruction. China also has two possibilities, and we must recognize them. We are not in possession of the atom bomb. Should there be a war, running away is the best of the 36 stratagems. If Peking, Shanghai, and Wu-han are occupied, we will resort to guerrilla warfare. We will regress one or two decades and return to the Yanan era. Meanwhile, we must actively make preparations, vigorously promoting iron and steel, machinery, and railways, striving for several ten million tons of steel output in three or four years, establishing an industrial foundation, and becoming more consolidated than today. Currently our prestige in the world is high, resulting from such big events as the bombardment of Quemoy, the people's commune, and the 10.7 million tons of steel output. I feel that, though our prestige is high, our strength is not superior. We are still "poor and blank", we have no weapons in our hands, and we have not accomplished anything. Now we have some weapons, but our nation is actually weak. Politically ours is a strong nation, but militarily and economically we are a weak nation. Therefore, the mission confronting us is to change from weakness to strength. Can the

transformation be accomplished after three years of hard struggle? I am afraid not. Three years of hard struggle can only produce partial changes, not fundamental transformation. If we take four more years, making it a total of seven, it will be better, and the name will correspond with the substance. Now our prestige is very high but our strength very small. This point must be clearly recognized. Currently, the foreigners do a lot of bragging, and many newspapers have nothing but exaggerations. We must not let such bragging turn our head. Actually, there is only 9 million tons of good grade steel; milling it into steel material will result in only 70 percent, or a little over 6 million tons. We must not deceive ourselves. The volume of grain is great. After discounting in all areas, the amount is 860 billion catties. We say 730 billion catties, or a little more than double. We do not count the 110 billion catties. When it is there and we do not count it, it is not a loss, because it is there. We are only afraid that it is not there. Whether it's there has not been verified. All of you present here have not verified it. Let us consider it as 860 billion catties, but one-fourth belongs to the potato family. The estimate must include the unhappy side. We might as well make it clear. We should hold a meeting in the provinces, regions, and counties and spread the unpropitious things. What's wrong with that? We don't like to hear others talking about them, but I shall talk about unpropitious things everywhere, such as the collapse of public dining halls and communes, party splits, isolation from the masses, U.S. occupation, destruction of the nation, guerrilla warfare. We follow a Marxist law. No matter what, all such unpropitious things are only temporary and partial. The point has been proved by the many failures in our history. The Hungary incident, the Long March, the 300,000 troops reduced to 20,000, the 300,000 party members dwindling to several tens of thousands ! — these were all temporary and partial. The destruction of the bourgeoisie and imperialism will be permanent. The setbacks, failures, and destruction of socialism are temporary, and it does not take long for us to recover. Even total failure is also temporary, and there will be recovery. After the big failure of 1927, we picked up the gun again. "Heaven has unexpected winds and clouds; man has misfortunes and good luck at any moment". We must be prepared. "It is rare for a man to live three score and ten." Death is inevitable. One cannot live 10,000 years. One must be prepared at all times. All my words are depressing. Every man dies. The individuals will always die, but mankind will always continue to live. Both possibilities must be discussed; there is no harm in it. If one must die, one dies. As for socialism, I would like to devote myself to it for few more years. After surpassing the U.S., we can go and report to Marx. Our several old comrades are not afraid to die. I am not willing to die, but strive to live on. But if I must die, then let it be so. There is still some "Ah Q" flavor, but then if there is no "Ah Q" flavor at all, it won't be easy to live.

11. The issue of my resignation as the Chairman of the Republic. A formal resolution must be made this time, and I hope my comrades will agree, I ask that within three days, the provinces hold a telephonic conference to notify the regions, counties, and people's communes. The official report will be published three days later, so that the lower levels will not find it a total surprise. Things are really odd in this world! One can go up but not come down. I expect that a part of the people will agree and another part disagree. People do not understand, saying that while everyone is so full of energy in doing things, I am withdrawing from the frontlines. It must be clearly explained. This is not true. I am not withdrawing. I want to surpass the U.S. before I go to see Marx!

12. International situation. There has been great developments this year. The enemy is in disarray, more and more so. We are getting better, better and better everyday. Everyday the newspapers confirm this point. The truly discouraged is imperialism. They are rotting, becoming disorderly, full of conflicts, splitting apart, experiencing a bad time. Their good days are over. Their goods days were before they turned into imperialism, when they had only capitalism. Our situation will improve day by day. Of course, we must also expect long term, tortuous, and complex struggles, and the possibility of war. There are those who want to take risks. The most reactionary is the monopolistic bourgeoisie, while the majority of the people do not want war.

Notes

[1.] Tseng Hsi-sheng (c 1905-) a graduate of Whampoa who participated in the Long March, was elected to the Central Committee in 1956. He was also First Secretary of the CPC for Anhwei province, from 1952 to 1960, and in that capacity he showed himself a strong supporter of the Great Leap Forward.

Reply To Article “Tsinghua University Physics Teaching And Research Group Inclines Toward The ‘Left’ Rather Than Right In Handling Teachers”

December 22, 1958

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

I suggest printing and distributing the article to the party committees, general branches, and branch committees of all universities, special schools, and scientific research organs for their perusal. There should be a discussion to correct the main orientation and strive to make as many professors, lecturers, assistants, and research personnel as possible serve proletarian education and culture and science. What do you think? It should also be distributed to the party committees and general branches of literary and art organizations, newspapers, periodicals, and publishing organs for their study and discussion. Please consider and decide.

Appendix

Tsinghua University Physics Teaching and Research Group Inclines toward the 'Left' Rather Than Right in Handling Teachers.

Recently the party general branch of the Tsinghua University Public Teaching and Research Group inspected the work of the Physics Teaching and Research Group Branch and organized the party members to discuss its policy toward intellectuals. The following problems were uncovered in the discussion:

1. It is felt that the intellectuals are the objects of revolution in the socialist revolution period, and even more so when entering communism, because the absolute majority of them are bourgeois intellectuals and belong to the exploiting class. Even league member assistant professors are considered the objects of revolution.
2. It is felt that, to start from the interest of the working class, the class line should be followed, but not the mass line, as it is not suitable in the school. To clarify the dividing lines, they incline toward the "left." They feel that "bringing out the role of old teachers" will confuse the class line and relax the struggle.
3. It is felt that all high level intellectuals are fundamentally opposed to the party's education policy, that they set up a formation to attack us; that we must counter-attack. All the objects of the united front are retrogressive. To have them here is for the purpose of setting up opposites.
4. It is felt that party prestige and mass consciousness have been raised and that the time has arrived for replacement by party members. As the work load is heavy now, performing united front work will impede the great leap forward. The leaders of all organizations should be replaced by party members.

As a result of such wrong ideas, they adopted some wrong methods in their work. The director of the teaching and research office, Liu Shao-t'ang (medium left), had always made a relatively good showing, yet the branch felt that he could only serve as a negative example. He was asked to compile the teaching outline together with several backward assistants. Meanwhile, the party and league members compiled another outline behind his back and prepared to compete with him. Liu manifested extreme enthusiasm, finishing the task by working through the night. No fault could be found with it. Yet the party members laid his outline aside and handed the outline compiled by the party and league members to the masses for discussion.

During the socialist and communist education movement, the party and league members declared at the small group meetings: "If we do not promote communism now, it is a withdrawal in face of the bourgeoisie. The principal rejects salary reduction; it is a compromise with the high level intellectuals. If they are [politically] conscious, they should voluntarily cut their salary. If these people still do no reform, they should be sent to the old age home!"

All the work of the teaching and research group was handled by the party branch, without consulting the group chairman. The party general branch wanted to stimulate the enthusiasm of all the teachers. but the branch could not see the point. It felt that if the prestige of these people was not knocked down, it would not be able to stimulate the enthusiasm of the party and league members. When the party general branch proposed motivating the masses to summarize the experiences in implementing the education policy, the branch was also reluctant, saying: "Why is it necessary to summarize experiences in company with the objects of revolution?"

The Tsinghua University party commission recently corrected such erroneous methods.

Speech At Conference Of Provincial And Municipal Committee Secretaries

February 2, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

In regard to matters in a high tide, some people may have doubts. This is not odd. Doubts will occur year after year. There are two kinds of people: One kind consists of those who have good intentions and who are concerned; another kind consists of hostile elements, such as Lo Lung-chi[1] and the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bad elements. A distinction must be made. When others doubt or make detrimental remarks, we must not consider it as something bad, but instead, pay attention and analyze. There will always be defects. It is not strange for some people to have doubts. In fact, it is beneficial.

There has been an air of cutting back for two months. Now it is 1 February. We must go all out. The general line cannot be changed. It is still to go all out, aim high and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results. We must exert out utmost efforts. . . . go all out, strive for the upper reaches, not the middle reaches, nor the lower reaches. There was some cutting back in November and December. The people needed a rest. It is nothing unusual to relax a little, but we must exert efforts again.

After one year's effort, a great leap forward situation has unfolded. Is this something temporary? Will there be a leap forward every year for the next several years? With a nation like ours, large population, vast area, and resources, and the Soviet Union's experience, it is possible. The U.S. can also be considered as a great leap forward, first in the world for over 100 years. It is capitalist. Now it is no longer progressing. Be it a great, medium, or small leap forward, we probably will leap forward. If not a great leap forward, we will make a small leap forward. Most likely it will be a great leap forward every year. Is a great leap forward situation unfolding? I hope you will all think it over

whether we will have great, medium, or small leaps forward in the future. I am inclined toward leaping forward.

The so-called work method is dialectics. There must be planned and proportionate development, and subjective activity. When discussing the defects of last year, some people dwell on the defects. With dozens of defects in their mind, they fail to see any achievement at all. It is the question of nine fingers and one finger. Is it metaphysics or dialectics? Metaphysics has several characteristics. First, looking at problems in an isolated and one-sided manner: instead of regarding the world as a single entity and with the parts mutually linked, it regards it as disconnected, like sand. Second, looking at problems superficially. Instead of looking at problems from their essence, it regards them in their external form only, ignoring the contents. Third, looking at problems statically: it does not regard problems from their development, failing to see the contents through the forms, or the essence through the superficial. The "*Internal Reference*" of the New China News Agency must be read, but it isn't good to read it too much either. The report on the Peking University problem in 1957, for example, indicated that the rightists were making a reckless attack and creating a terrible situation. Ch'en Po-ta went there to see for himself, and found that it wasn't that bad at all. Or, take the speech of Lin Hsi-ling: the first day it was marvellous, the second day the number of people refuting him increased, and by the third day, he was rebutted. What is written in the "*Internal Reference*" is history. It must be read, but it must not be over-read. If one believes everything in books, it is better not to read books at all. When King Wu chastised Chou, blood flew so profusely that it floated pestles. Mencius refused to believe it. Now when we say books we mean newspapers and periodicals, and "*Internal Reference*" is one of them. We cannot believe everything in them. When we listen, we must listen to both sides. Regardless of the number ! of defects we have, when it comes right down to it, it is a question of nine fingers and one finger. Several hundred millions of laboring people and several millions or tens of millions of cadres cannot be doing only bad things. This I believe. It would be unimaginable for all the leading cadres present here to be engaged in bad things everyday after dinner. As it was mentioned in Wu-ch'ang, those doing bad things in the counties, communes, and production brigades constitute at most one to five percent. In regard to the high and medium-level cadres, whether they are present here or not, they all want to do good; there cannot be too many wanting to do bad things. As for those with good intentions but doing something bad, a distinction must be made. The tragedy of Stalin was that he wanted to do good deeds but ended up doing bad deeds. Subjective matters can only produce an effect in objective practice.

We must praise this method taking one big stride forward and propagandizing it: We must have key points, yet also walk on both legs. The raw material industry, for example, is a key point at present. It should be increased somewhat, while the processing industry should be reduced slightly. It is correct to increase investments XX billions, XX million U.S. dollars, for X tons of rolled steel in order to promote light and chemical industries. This method must be propagandized, discussed, and developed. As economic work is very complicated, with the factors mutually serving as cause and effect, improper handling will produce a chain reaction. We must delve into it, investigate and study, and uncover, expose, and solve the problems. Without delving, we will only hit the skin, not

the blood vessel. We might as well be fearless, delve in, and expose. Short of fully exposing the contradictions, it will be impossible to solve them. Problems are contradictions. Many a time when a thing is said to be without problem, actually there are problems. We must discover, understand, and solve problems. The “Three Attacks on Chu-chia Chuan” in *Water Margin* began with a visit to the village by Shih Hsiu.[2] Once this problem was solved, another one was solved. After winning the battle and breaking up the three villages, Chu-chia Chuang was isolated. The third problem was ignorance of the internal conditions of Chu-chia Chuang. Men were sent in to surrender to the enemy in order to attack from the outside with cooperation from the inside. This is a good tick. Why not resort to it? In the past we always surveyed the conditions for a battle, and victories were won when the conditions became ripe. Now, in promoting construction and fighting nature, we must also investigate and study. We had no experience in construction. The first secretaries of the provinces and myself did not begin to tackle it until the latter half of last year. In the past we mainly tackled agriculture, but not industry. Is agriculture actually placed on a solid foundation? XX catties of grain, XX piculs of cotton, hemp, oil, large cattle, small domestic fowl — are their quota on a solid foundation? Or are they exaggerations? Can they be fulfilled? One must not resort to false reporting in order to get through. The proper method is to surpass the norm. XX catties of grain is to be produced, but only XX catties to be reported, because otherwise it will be difficult next year. The year before last we started early, last year was just right; this year we began a little late. Was there deep plowing? According to the newspapers, fertilization was handled fairly well. How is the fertilizer situation in Honan? How are we doing in regard to water conservation, fertilizer, and soil improvement? In water conservation we strive for 30 billion cubic meters of earthwork. I am concerned over fertilizers this year. Dropsy in humans is due to lack of meat and vegetables. When the crops get no fertilizer, they also suffer from dropsy. Therefore, we must vigorously promote native chemical fertilizer, bacterial fertilizer, compost, green fertilizer, smoked fertilizer, human waste, and animal waste. Centering on these main items, we must work concretely. The wheat crop requires additional fertilizing, watering, and cultivating. Cultivation will temporarily sever the capillaries and reduce water evaporation. In regard to the XXX billion catties of grain undertaken for this year, the order of soil improvement, fertilizer, irrigation, seeds, close planting, crop protection, field management, and farm tool reform should be followed. Soil is at the center. When there is soil, there is grain. When water is available, soil improvement should be placed first. Next is fertilizer, and irrigation comes third. But no revision should be made for the time being. I hear that the labor required for fertilization is about half of the farm labor. Tool reform is very important. Every people’s commune should set up a farm tool plant. It should be organized according to local conditions, and not fizzle out after a flourishing start. A special farm tool research institute and a school should be set up to collect, study, design, and trial manufacture farm tools. (Chekiang has weather and soil research organs, but nothing for farm tool research.) Is manual labor required to dig so many cubic meters of earth and apply so much fertilizer? We must have machinery. “Collecting and cutting” should read “cutting and collecting.” How can manual labor take care of cutting, transporting, threshing, and collecting, without any machinery?!

There are two other problems I wish to discuss. Some criticize us for not having leapt forward. The tone of 30 percent of the well-to-do middle peasants is similar to the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and rightists. The democratic people may hold opinions in their mind, but they don't express them aloud. I talked about this problem at the Wu-ch'ang Conference. Five percent among us violate the law and disobey discipline. As for those loyal to the party and the state, they cannot be included in the one to five percent. The labor enthusiasm of the cadres and laboring people must be protected. Distinction must also be made even among those within the five percent. According to circumstances, education should be conducted to correct their mistakes. It is not good to exaggerate the problems. This experience must be reviewed every year. Like the Buddhist monks chanting scripture, it is repeated everyday. This is the question of the relationship between the individual and the general, between the large and small parts, and between the partial and the whole. Our party has decades of experience. If a small mistake by a basically good individual is exaggerated it can make him look all bad. Lenin said: These words were originally correct, but their essence was changed when uttered slightly in excess. Currently, there are some people with good intentions, but their method is wrong and they cannot distinguish the relationship between the part and the whole. Thus, dozens of defects are listed against them, and there is not one thing right with them. We must take heed of this point. In the process of commune reorganization, the people must be permitted to point out the defects. Self-criticism comes first, and correction is required. Thereafter, clarify the fact that the defects are the relationship between one and nine fingers. When analyzing and handling problems, the question of one or two or three fingers must be clarified. Of course, I am talking about the majority. ! A small number of individuals are very bad, a big mess, but the majority must correct their mistakes. Enthusiasm must be protected, for otherwise people will be afraid to take responsibilities. As for those individuals who have truly committed errors of line, it is not one finger, but nine fingers, rotting, and they are the exceptions. Conclusions must be just right, for otherwise mistakes will be made. Those feeling a strong hostility toward the people should be punished, but of course not necessarily each and everyone should be executed. Some people in the rural areas beat up people by the hundreds, and it will not be good not to punish them, because it will affect the people. However, regarding the over 95 percent of cadres, they must be protected. Our party has decades of experience in this problem. Take Lo Chang-lung^[3] for instance. Currently this man is a professor in Wu-han. I know him well. He was vigorously opposed to the central committee, finding nothing right with it, feeling that only he was correct, and establishing his own central committee. As a result, he picked up a rock only to drop it on his own foot. Then there was the Li Li-san line. He also insisted that everyone else was wrong except him and negated everything. It was the same with the Wang Ming line. They all considered themselves 100 percent Bolshevik and others inveterate right opportunists and narrow empiricists. There was also the Chang Kuo-t'ao line. He also set up his own central committee, wrote plays and songs to overthrow Mao, Chou, Chang and Po, and considered himself a follower of Leninism and the International line. As a result, he destroyed himself, fled to Hong Kong, and sent his son to the Sun Yat-sen University, showing that he was not a Leninist. The second Wang Ming line was the same. He presented six big outlines, with a tremendous flourish, basically negated everything of the central committee, and misled many people. It was

not the problem of one individual; he represented many unstable elements in the petit bourgeoisie. Wang Ming appealed to the foreign countries and brought three criminal charges against Mao: resisting the international line; forcing 80 percent of the people to examine themselves in the rectification movement; promoting sectarianism. During the Wu-Ch'ang Conference, Wang Ming sent a letter. He sounded somewhat better than before and announced his resignation. Kao-Jao's anti-party clique went to the extreme. They were too excessive. They opposed X and Chou, with X as the key point. They declared that there were two centers, two blocs. They had their own outline, misled some people, negated everything, attacked one part while forgetting the rest, exaggerated one point into the whole, and destroyed themselves as a result. There are many secondary matters which I have not mentioned, and they are not included here. Historically there were the Ch'en Tu-hsiu line, the Lo Chang-lung line, the Wang Ming line twice, the Chang Kuo-t'ao line, the Kao-Jao anti-party clique. . . These big incidents were different from the 1955 and 1956 resistance against rash advances in degree and nature. . . Whether in China or foreign countries, one cannot negate everything. All those negating everything will end up negating themselves, destroying themselves. But as for Chiang Kai-shek, we can negate everything. However, which one is better to serve as the president in Taiwan, Chiang Kai-shek, Hu Shih, or Ch'en Ch'eng? Chiang Kai-shek is still better. But in places of international activity, when he is there, we won't go. As for serving as president, he still is better. Finally, the U.S. may possibly not want Taiwan and consider it a cancer on its body. We will then take advantage of the situation. As long as this gourd is hung on our waist, there will be a way. There will be changes in 10 years, 20 years. Give it some rice to eat, give it some troops, and let it handle special duties, and Sun Yat-sen-ism. In regard to anything in history which should not be negated, appropriate assessments must be made. One should not negate everything. The result of negating all is self-destruction. I have discussed this part of history when we were criticizing defects. It is to instruct our comrades with history.

At the Nan-ning Conference, the relationship between one and nine fingers was brought out. When a problem is illustrated, it becomes easier to understand. It is to explain to the cadres the question of whether to give consideration to the general situation or not to do so. It is the problem of the relationship between the big situation and the small, between the part and the whole.

In regard to the problem of planned and proportionate development of the national economy, I am not very clear, and study is required. Just how does the subjective conform to objective rules? Lenin mentioned the union of Russia's revolutionary fervor and America's practical spirit. In the union of theory and practice, theory is the spirit, and spirit reflects substance, something, which approaches the practical. The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete practice of China's revolution are combined. The universal and the concrete are the union of opposites. Objective law is reflected differently in the various nations as a result of different historical conditions. We must study, understand, master, and become familiar with objective rules. Stalin discussed this issue a lot, but he did not follow through. He did not abide by the ratio. Russia's industry was big and its agriculture small. He stressed the big and scorned the small. We are now doing it differently. From 1956 we began to create the dual development and leap

forward of industry (including communication and transportation) and agriculture, and we began to find the way for planned and proportionate development. After cooperativization in 1955, the people's enthusiasm rose, and we began to find economic development hopeful and opposed conservatism. Failing to exert oneself to do something which can be done by exertion is called conservatism. But one must not attempt something which cannot be done. If one persists, it is called subjectivism. When the subjective reflects the objective, it becomes subjective activity, not subjectivism. There are two kinds of subjective activity: one kind is divorced from practice and it is subjectivism; the other conforms with objective law, and it is subjectivism compatible with practice. Anything violating objective law will suffer a setback. There is some lack of coordination, for example, in supplementary foods and daily use articles. If not taken hold of, it will be dangerous.

The Japanese say that we stress hands rather than population. We have so many people who can work. The 1953 great leap forward might be basically suitable. As for concrete figures, whether a little more or a little less, that is something else. But it proves: that a great leap forward is possible. There can be a great leap forward every year, whether it means 10 million tons of steel more or 10 million tons less. The Soviet Union had a steel output increase of 4 million tons, which was unprecedented in history. The year before the increase was only 3 million tons. In the 20 years from 1921 to 1940, the increase was only 14 million tons; the increase in the 13 years after the war was 37 million tons; thereafter there was an increase of 5 million tons per year. We are different from them. We undertake the large, medium, and small, doing several things at the same time. We have the mass line, "two participations, one reform and three combinations," and the alliance of the party with the masses. Meanwhile, our geographical and climatic conditions are good, and we have a population of 680 million. Therefore, it was possible for us to launch a great leap forward in 1958. May be we can compare it to hog raising. The bone structure is formed in the first four months. 1958 was the K'e-lang hog: It had [a good] bone structure, but not much flesh. It was still not fat, and had to be fed. Currently, our great leap forward is to build the bone structure.

We began with the "10 Major Relations" proposed in 1955, continued with the 1958 New Year editorial entitled "Go All Out; Strive for the Upper Reaches," two excellent phrases which developed into the general line at the Ch'eng-tu Conference. It is correct when we look at it now. Is extra effort necessary? Should it be exerted? Should we strive for the upper reaches? Or the middle reaches, or the lower reaches? Do we want greater and faster? Do we want better and more economical (quality)? The first two sentences concern man's mental attitude, or subjective activity; the latter sentence concerns material.

Naturally we have defects and mistakes. Tackling one side and overlooking another, causing waste in labor, the tense situation of supplementary foods, the still unsolved light industrial raw material problem (diversified operations), the lack of adjustment in transportation, undertaking too many projects in capital construction — all these are our defects and errors. Like a child playing with fire, without experience, knowing pain only after getting burned. In economic construction, like a child without experience, we

declared war on the earth, unfamiliar with the strategy or tactics. We must frankly admit such defects and errors. Some people tried to comfort me by asking whether the Ch'eng-tu Conference did not propose the combination of labor and leisure and the advance of production in waves? But no concrete timetable was proposed, which was not good. Then, tackling production without tackling living would definitely result in tens of thousands of dropsy cases. Only when one person received one ounce of vegetable in Peking was attention aroused. The objective reality, planning, and ratios are only recognized in the midst of practice and struggle. We developed a K'e-lang hog in 1958, but we are still without a fat hog. We have found the way (great leap forward) in the process of practice. Possibly the four big targets of the Wu-ch'ang Conference are close to reality, but they are only on paper, not a reality. Grain is not yet in our hands, and there is only one month of iron and steel and coal (production not very good). With more effort it may become a reality. After the conference this time, by exerting more effort, the problems in all aspects may become better resolved. With experience, it will be better than 1958. All items of work and the people's livelihood will improve somewhat. Hindsight turns into foresight. There is waste in manpower, lack of attention to the inadequacy of supplementary foods in big cities, insufficient attention to some segments of light industry, and insufficient attention to diversified operations and transportation. One kind is lack of attention and the other insufficient attention, resulting in inadequate supply and partial maladjustment. The failure to come to a conclusion on these problems now becomes one problem, and I hope the standing committee of the provincial committees will study it. . .

. Generally speaking, whether our plans, targets and editorials are suitable or not, we are always seeking experience through practice. Even if not completed, it is only because of insufficient experience and too much bragging. I approve of writing poetry in the newspapers. There should be optimism even if not completed, because lessons can be learned. . . If we have no experience, let us try one more year, next year. After struggling hard for three years, our experience will increase. If anything is not suitable, we will correct it. Let the world curse us. Our general line cannot be changed. It won't do to build socialism by "reducing our efforts, striving for the lower reaches, and less-slow-inferior-waste." We must always go all out, strive for the upper reaches, and achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results. What is greater and what is faster? These must be determined in practice. Now we propose to build a great socialist nation with modern industry, modern agriculture, and modern science and culture in 15 years. If impossible, then take a little more time! Just what is planned and proportionate development? We have just begun to come in contact with this problem. I hope our comrades will study it.

Notes

[1.] Lo Lung-chi (1896-1965), a political scientist educated at the London School of Economics and Columbia University, was a leading member of the China Democratic

League. He was Minister of Timber from 1956-8. One of the Chief Rightist who attacked the Party during 1957-58.

[2.] *Water Margin*, a traditional Chinese novel.

[3.] Lo Chang-lung. See [note 16, p. 111](#) of this volume.

Talk At Symposium Of Hsin, Lo, Hsu And Hsin Local Committees

February 21, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Just what is the nature of the people's commune? Is it commune ownership or brigade ownership? There are poor and rich brigades, poor and rich villages. When you were in the agricultural producer cooperatives, what method of distribution did you use? Were there discrepancies then? Were the contributions all the same then? It is mainly differences in resources, conditions, administration and history which result in differences of output and the divergence of rich and poor brigades, rich and poor villages. The agricultural producer cooperatives used to use the method of labor and production contracts, with incentives for the best producers. Was there equalization, then, in the agricultural producer cooperatives? The Soviet Union's 55 million tons of steel and our over ten million tons of steel cannot be equalized because that would be appropriating others' labor without reimbursement. This is permissible towards landlords and capitalists, and in the past we did appropriate property without compensation from the landlords and capitalists, because they had not labored for it — it was the people's, the peasants'. So the proposals at the time to return the land to its proper owners, to return Anshan Steel to its proper owners, were not expropriation. We act differently towards the national bourgeoisie, because they are friends, and with them we adopt a policy of purchase. The property of the national bourgeoisie was clearly produced by the working class and is not the capitalists'; but because they are friends we still adopt a purchase policy, making use of them in uniting the intellectuals and letting them redeem the property that they got by exploitation of the workers. Now it would be unreasonable to use equalization on the poor and rich brigades and the poor and rich villages; it would be banditry, piracy. It would amount to writing out receipts and IOU's for everything down to tables, chairs and benches, with a promise to pay for them in ten ye! ars.

In the past the advanced cooperatives lived better or worse according to how much they had. Work points embody the difference in the results of the labor of different people, and labor and production contracts embody the differences between brigades and between villages, but we did not remember this experience. This problem arose because

we did not remember our experience with food allocation in 1956, in the first year of the advanced cooperative movement. Old women blocked the way and wouldn't let the food be taken, and this problem is reappearing now in the first year of the communes. At this point it is well worth considering just what methods to use. This year we will proclaim some policies, to be carried out by both rich and poor, aimed at helping the poor and raising China to the level of the Soviet Union. In the future after the dictatorship of the proletariat is established in the nations of the West, we won't be able to chop off some of what the Western nations have to supplement the Asian and African nations, the Asian and African nations will have to raise themselves. Investments in the Asian and African nations of course ought not be confiscated, but we won't be able to go to Europe and set up machinery. This is to say that at the Soviet Union's present level of development it cannot give things to us gratis, because the Soviet Union has workers and with workers you have to pay wages, with machinery you have to take care of depreciation; so how would it be possible to chop off some of what the Soviet Union has and give it to us? It will be necessary to have an equal-value exchange. (During the discussions on the report it was stated that some people were afraid of the commercial departments buying up their pigs. So they turned the pigs loose on the land and let them run off and some people hid them in the cotton.) I approve of this method. (In the discussion on the report it was stated that in some places not all the peanuts could be collected, but when they used a percentage allotment system, in some places the peanuts were all collected in a single night.) The method of percentage allotment should be adopted. I approve of doing everything possible, eating them up or letting them run off. This practice is not particularism; this is the fruit of their labor. If we are anti-particularistic and collect by force we make matters worse. Now this really is expropriation without compensation and if you call it particularism you are applying the term incorrectly. This is a question of ownership. At present a part of the ownership is by the commune. but the main ownership is by the brigades. If the commune expands its accumulation a little every year, then after seven or eight years commune ownership will take shape.

On 8 January a party committee meeting was held in Hopeh and they wanted to get unity of thought, absolute unity and they adopted a resolution; but by the last third of the month they felt that there were things wrong with it and the provincial committee members hastily changed their minds. In the last third of the month they had a telephone conference, but after the conference there were some area committees and some county committees that did not understand and some communes did not understand. At present in ownership the production brigades are really eight or nine fingers and communes are one or two fingers, or three at most. Accumulation cannot exceed 18 percent and taxes cannot exceed 7 percent, so together they cannot exceed 25 percent, or one-fourth; production expenses are 20 percent and the distribution to the masses 55 percent. There is some concealment at lower levels, so that in reality they don't distribute more than 30 percent. Everybody wants to accumulate more and carry on some industry and this is well-intentioned. Stalin followed this kind of policy in the 30 years from the founding of the state until 1953, Stalin never solved this problem. He carried out a collectivization and a mechanization. In the Czarist era there was no collectivization and no mechanization. They collectivized, but didn't mechanize. Then they mechanized, but in the year he died the output was the same as in the Czarist era and if XXXX had not

changed the policy, the situation would have become increasingly grave. If we do not change our policy now, we will make Stalin's mistake.

Now when we talk about production brigades, the brigades are the communes! At present the commune is really a federalistic government. The commune's power cannot be very great; the commune should have control over public grain and over accumulation, but distribution of products should rest with the brigades. (In the discussion for the report it was stated that the commune did too much; for one thing it had too many investments and for another it did too much requisitioning of the labor force.) This policy should be changed. We used to just talk about the relationship between individual, collective and state, but now this is just half of the chess-board; and the several hundred million peasants are a greater half of the chess-board; it won't do to simply carry on state accumulation and commune accumulation. We used to say, "If the people don't have enough then how can the ruler have enough?" At present the "people" are the communes and the "ruler" is the state. Stalin's actions of 30 years were a matter of walking on one leg. If we are contributing 70 percent to the state, the masses only get 30 percent, just as with the landlords. Of course we are essentially different from the landlords: if we accumulate a little more it is for construction and the construction in turn is for the benefit of the people. This point needs to be analyzed and to be made clear, that the desire for rapid industrialization is well-intentioned, but though I say it is well-intentioned it is not a good idea. The way that we differ from the landlords is that we are not aiming at getting rich. At the moment we have not made this clear; at the Sixth Plenum of the Eighth Central Committee we didn't make it clear. We merely talked about distribution according to work and about production responsibility, but we did not tell how to distribute according to work and we didn't clarify the collective ownership system. Now the distribution program needs to be changed. ! Commune ownership has to be arrived at by a process, because what we have now is basically brigade ownership. There are only these two. The peasants don't have to worry about their land, because the provincial and local party committees and the Central Committee can't take it away, what they are disputing about is products and the labor force. When we say that land is under collective ownership, within that we ought to draft a document stating that in fact it is under brigade ownership. If land, tools and means of production plus human labor and the commune only come to 25 percent, don't you think that's too little? Our present opposition to particularism has brought about a tense situation that is growing tenser. Really, 15 percent kept back ought to be made legal. The state's and commune's accumulation of 25 percent and production costs of 20 percent and the mass distribution of 55 percent, form a fixed proportion, but as production develops year by year the absolute numbers will increase. The practice of taking away their cabbage and pigs and not giving them a cent must be changed.

In addition, let's discuss how to run industry. At present, industry is taking up too much capital and labor and conflicts are arising. All conflicts involving human strength and material and financial means ought to be adjusted. You couldn't handle all that many schools at once either. Everything has to be done gradually for instance would it be possible to get rid of the four pests all at once? Forestation has to be done gradually, illiteracy has to be eliminated gradually, schools have to be set up group by group and at

different times. If the finance and trade organization recovers all the loans, then it ought to give them all back now; more recently there is the compromise suggestion that they give back half. This is carrying a stone only to drop it on one's own foot; if you've recovered all the original loans they don't have any money to pay wages and so they still need loans to pay wages. We will have to start by making announcements to calm people down. There will have to be regulations covering transfers. We will also have to look into the matter of distribution. We should be aware that the collective ownership of the people's communes would take shape gradually. We have passed through four periods: in the mutual aid teams there was only a little collective ownership: in the early stage cooperatives collective ownership had increased — it could be called semi-collective ownership; as for the advanced cooperatives, you could say there was 70 percent collective ownership. At this time equalization won't do; if the accumulation is great the people will oppose it and it won't be "one chessboard" at all. The true "one chessboard" consists of first, the peasants, second, the communes and third, the state. In this way the peasants will be won over to us and will in turn develop a concern for the state. When this happens, will we be likely to have trouble collecting things? I am speaking from the point of view of! the peasants and supporting "particularism." Because at the moment we have brigade ownership, it will be several years before we can put commune ownership into practice. We must pay attention to the fact that everything must be arrived at through a process. We must recognize that we have partial commune ownership, but basically we have brigade ownership and the communes are a foster-father put in mid-course. When there are differences between food-production brigades, then there should be differences in wages as well. Hope is fixed on top and flexible below, so we can adopt this method and call it "fixed [work] grades, flexible evaluation [of work points], remuneration according to labor."

Speech At Cheng-chow

February 27, 1959

In 1958 we achieved great successes on every front. On the ideological and political front, the industrial front, the agricultural front, the communications and transport front, the commercial front, the cultural and educational front, the national defence front, as well as in other areas, no matter where, it was the same in all. Especially remarkable was the fact that there was a magnificent leap forward in the area of industrial and agricultural production. In 1958 people's communes were established everywhere throughout the rural areas of the entire nation.

The establishment of the people's communes has enlarged the original system of collective ownership of the means of production and raised it to a higher level and, moreover, it begins to embody certain elements of the system of ownership by the whole people. The scale of the people's communes is much larger than that of the agricultural producers' cooperatives and, moreover, has put into operation the unity of workers,

peasants, merchants, students and soldiers and of agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, subsidiary productive activities and fish culture. This has given a powerful push to the development of agricultural production and the entire rural economy. . . .

In a new and historically unprecedented social movement that involves several hundred million people and for which previous experience is lacking, like the setting up of the people's communes, both the people and their leaders can only acquire experience step by step, from their practice and step by step deepen their knowledge of the essence of things, expose the contradictions within things, solve these contradictions and affirm the achievements and overcome the shortcomings of their work. Anyone who says that a broad social movement can be completely without shortcomings is nothing but a dreamer, or a tide-watcher, or an account-settler, or simply a hostile element. As for the relationship between our achievements and defects, it is, just as we have often said, like the relationship between nine of the ten fingers and the one remaining finger. There are some people who doubt or deny the achievements of the Great Leap Forward of 1958 and doubt or deny the superiority of the people's commune. This kind of viewpoint is completely mistaken. . . .

Now I'm going to talk a little bit about the problems of the people's communes. I think that there is a contradiction in the people's communes, a contradiction that should be said to be quite serious, which has not yet been recognized by many comrades. Its nature has not been revealed and thus it has not been solved. And I think that this contradiction must be resolved quickly and that only then will the situation be favorable to mobilizing the still greater enthusiasm of the broad masses of people, only then will it be favorable to improving our relationship with basic-level cadres, which is essentially the relationship between the *hsien* party committee or the people's commune party committee and the basic-level cadres. In the final analysis what kind of contradiction is this? As everybody can see, there exists at present in our relationship with the peasants a rather tense state of affairs in some matters. The outstanding phenomenon in this regard is the fact that the state's task of purchasing agricultural products, such as food grains, cotton, edible oils and so on after the bumper harvest of 1958, is to date still partly uncompleted. Furthermore, throughout the entire country (except in a small number of disaster areas) there has appeared almost everywhere the practice of the peasants' "concealing production and dividing it among themselves" and great unrest about food grains, edible oils, pork and vegetables being "insufficient." The large scale of the unrest clearly surpasses that of both the 1953 and the 1955 periods of unrest over food. . . . I think that we should look for the answer to the problem mainly in the area of what we know about the ownership system in the rural people's commune and the policies we have adopted.

Should the system of ownership in the rural people's commune go through a process of development? Or should the commune, as soon as it is set up, immediately have a complete system of ownership by the commune and can it immediately eliminate ownership by the production brigade. . . (which generally corresponds to the former higher-level agricultural producers' cooperative)? Even now there are a good many people who still don't recognize that the system of ownership by the commune must go through a process of development. Within the commune there needs to be a process of

transition from ownership by a small collective, the production brigade, to ownership by a large collective, the commune and this process requires a period of several years before it can be completed. They mistakenly believe that as soon as the people's commune is set up, the means of production, the manpower and the products of each production brigade can all be directly controlled by the leadership organs of the commune. They mistake socialism for communism, they mistake distribution according to labor for distribution according to need and they mistake collective ownership for ownership by the whole people. In many places they deny the law of value and deny the necessity for exchange at equal value. Thus, within the confines of the commune they carry out the levelling of the poor and the rich and equal distribution. They have transferred the ownership of some of the property of the production team upward without compensation; in the area of banking, they have recalled all loans in a good many rural areas, too. What is known as "equalization, transferring and recalling loans" has given rise to great fear and anxiety among the broad masses of peasants. So this is a most fundamental problem in our present relationship with the peasants. . .

Before the system of ownership by the whole people in the countryside has been put into effect, peasants are still always peasants and on the path of socialism they still always have a definite dual character. We can only lead the peasants step by step to divorce themselves from the system of ownership by a relatively small collective and move, by way of the system of ownership by a relatively large collective, toward ownership by the whole people. We cannot demand that they complete this process all at once, just as in the past we could only lead the peasants step by step to divorce themselves from the system of ownership by individuals and move toward the system of ownership by the collective. To move from an incomplete system of ownership by the commune to a complete, unitary system of ownership by the commune is a process of raising the comparatively poor production brigades to the level of production of the comparatively rich production teams. It is also a process of expanding the commune's capital accumulation, developing the commune's industry, accomplishing agricultural mechanization and electrification and accomplishing the industrialization of the commune and the industrialization of the nation. The things owned directly by the commune at the present time are still not many, such as commune-run enterprises, commune-run undertakings, the common fund and the welfare fund controlled by the commune, etc. Although this is the case, our great, glorious and brilliant hope also lies right here. Because the commune can draw its capital accumulation from the production brigades year by year and it can increase its capital accumulation from the profits of the commune-run enterprises and add to this the state's investment, its development will not be very slow, but rather will be very rapid.

With regard to the question of state investment, I propose that within seven years the state invest in the communes between several billion and more than ten billion *yuan* to help the communes develop industry and help the poor production brigades develop their production. I believe that it won't be very long before the poor communes and poor brigades will be able to catch up with the rich communes and rich brigades and develop tremendously. Once the communes have acquired great economic power, we will be able to put into effect a complete system of ownership by the commune and can also proceed

to put into effect the system of ownership by the whole people besides. As for time, about two five-year plans are needed. Hurrying won't do. . . This is also precisely what the Pei-tai-ho Resolution said, that it will take three or four years, or five or six years, or even a bit longer. After that, we will go through several more developmental stages and in fifteen or twenty years or a bit longer, the socialist commune will develop into the communist commune. . . .

We must first investigate and correct two tendencies of our own, namely the tendency toward egalitarianism and the tendency toward excessive concentration. By the tendency toward egalitarianism I mean the tendency to deny that there should be differences in income among the various production brigades and various individuals. And to deny such differences is to deny the socialist principles of "to each according to his labor" and "the more work, the more reward." By the tendency to excessive concentration I mean the tendency to deny the system of ownership by the production brigade, and to deny the rightful authority of the production brigade, and to arbitrarily transfer the property of the production brigade upward to the commune. At the same time, a good many communes and *hsien* have extracted too much capital accumulation from the production brigades and, moreover, the administrative expenditures of the communes include a great deal of waste. (For example, there are some large communes that have as many as a thousand or more working personnel who eat without doing any labor and there are even cultural work teams which are divorced from production altogether.) The two above-mentioned tendencies both incorporate the kind of thinking that denies the law of value and denies exchange at equal value. . . .

At the time of the unified decision on distribution, the commune should recognize that there are reasonable differences in income between one production brigade and another and between one commune member and another and that there should be differences in food and wages between poor production brigades and rich production brigades. When it comes to wages, we should act on the principle of "fixed grades and flexible assessment." The commune should implement a down-ward transfer of authority, a three-level system of accounting and, moreover, use the accounting of the production brigade as the basis. Between the commune and the production brigade and between production brigades we should carry out exchange at equal value

After the communes were set up in the autumn of 1958, for a while there blew up a "communist wind." It consisted mainly of three elements: the first was the levelling of the poor and the rich brigades, the second was that capital accumulation by the commune was too great and the commune's demand for labor without compensation was too great and the third was the "communization" of all kinds of "property." This so-called "communization" of all kinds of "property" included all kinds of different situations. Some of it was things that should have belonged to the commune, like the greater part of the private plots, some of it should simply have been borrowed by the commune, like some of the buildings, tables, chairs, benches and stools needed for the commune's public undertakings and the knives, cooking pots, bowls and chopsticks needed for the dining hall. Some were things that belonged to the commune when they should not have, like chickens, ducks and some of the pigs, which belonged to communes without being paid

for. . . . The phenomenon of uncompensated takeover of the fruits of other people's labor is something we do not permit. Just take a look at our history. The only things we took without compensation were the means of production of Japanese, German and Italian imperialism, of feudalism and bureaucratic-capitalism and some of the landlords' houses, food and other means of livelihood. . . .

In addition to the tendencies to egalitarianism and excessive concentration, at present there are also very irrational aspects to the allocation of the rural labor force. These are, specifically, that the labor force used in agriculture (including agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, subsidiary production and fish culture) is generally too small, while too many personnel are used in industry, the service industries and administration. The latter three types of personnel must be reduced. . . .

We must simultaneously take into consideration and do unified planning for, our work in making arrangements for these three areas: the livelihood of the people, the commune's accumulation of capital and satisfying the needs of the state. Only in this way can it be said that we have truly succeeded in doing things as if the affairs of the entire nation were a single game of chess. Otherwise, the so-called chess game is actually only half a chess game, or it is an incomplete chess game. Generally speaking, the accumulation of the commune in 1958 was a little in excess. Therefore each area should fix an appropriate limit, on the basis of concrete conditions, for the commune's accumulation in 1959 and should announce this to the people in order to set people's minds at ease and increase the broad masses' enthusiasm for production.

Intra Party Correspondence

March 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Comrades First Secretaries of provincial, municipal, and special district party committees:

The Central Committee has scheduled an enlarged meeting of the Political Bureau to be held in Shanghai on 25 March. All of you must attend the meeting. The conference of cadres from six levels to be held by the provincial, municipal, and special district party committees in the spirit of the Chengchow Conference (*Ed note*: that is, the second conference held in Chengchow in March of 1959), and which has the discussion of people's communes as its major theme, will require approximately 10 days. Therefore the meeting should be convened immediately. For example, the Hupeh provincial party committee has scheduled a meeting to be held on 11 March. Any delays would not be to our interest. If the period of time for the meeting were too short, there definitely would not be enough time to bring up, analyze, and discuss various problems, and their

resolution would not be fitting and thorough. In other words it will be shallow and superficial. The conferences held by the various provinces, municipalities, and special districts should pass resolutions on the question of administrative system for people's communes and on problems of concrete policies. The first secretary should make a summing-up speech in order to explain in depth, and thoroughly, the principal contradictions and various policy problems presently facing the people's communes. These two documents should be issued immediately to lower levels so that they will have a clear and precise base [for action]. And it will require time to formulate ideas and draw up the drafts for these two documents. If the conference were to convene on 11 March, it could possibly last until 20 or 22 March before it could be concluded. Then the first secretaries would be able to get away and come to Shanghai for the meeting on 25 March. There would be more leeway and time would not be too pressing this way. The conference of cadres from six levels in Honan Province will be concluded by 10 March. The final drafts on the resolutions and the summation! speech can be completed by 9 March. The Central Committee will have these documents brought to you by plane before 14 March for your reference. The next step for Honan province is to hold the conference of cadres from four levels in the counties for the purpose of conveying to them the guidelines set for the by the conference of cadres from six levels in the province, and for discussing concrete ways to implement these guidelines by the various counties, communes, and production teams. Those attending the county conference of cadres from four levels are to be composed of; (1) several persons from the county level; (2) several persons from the commune level; (3) one or two persons from each brigade at the production brigade level; and (4) one person from each team at the production team level. In addition, a certain number of observers and auditors should also attend the conference. In all there will be at least 1,000 or 2,000 persons at most in attendance. The meeting is to be in session 7-10 days. The various counties in Honan Province have scheduled the convening of this meeting beginning on 13 or 14 March and ending before 23 or 24 March. There will be a week left in the month of March reserved for the communes, production brigades and production teams to hold their meetings. In brief, it will be possible to basically clear up and resolve in March the mass of confused thinking and conflicting contradictions on the commune problems. Beginning with April, the entire party and all the people can, with one mind, unfold this year's big leap-forward. I hope the various provinces, municipalities, and special districts will carry it out accordingly. Like that of Hupeh Province, if the conference of cadres from six levels in various provinces, municipalities, and special districts can be held on 11 and March and brought to a conclusion before 20 or 22 March, then the conference of cadres from four levels in the counties can be concluded by the end of March, and the discussions by communes and production! teams before 10 April. That means they will be only 10 days or so late in comparison with Honan Province. Some comrades may feel that this is too pressing, leaving them no time for preparations and that the conference should be delayed. I don't think this should be done. Since we already have clear guidelines, we should speedily gather together the cadres from six levels and issue these to them at once. In three or four days the major contradictions will be thrashed out, and thus, it will be possible to win the support of the majority. By taking the initiative we will take the wind out of the observers and the auditors. Of course, some people will not be able to reach an understanding and will berate us for going backwards. Because of this these people will lose some sleep

over it and will not be able to eat well for a few days. But, after that, they will be able to come around to an understanding. In short, delay will be detrimental, speed is essential. Some preparatory work can be done, firstly, by quietly bringing understanding to the people at district and county levels. Complete understanding is not mandatory, and three days will be enough to achieve this. From 4-10 March there will be six or seven days available for preparations. Is that not enough? It is more than enough. Delay, on the other hand, is not advantageous.

The foregoing is my suggestion. It is entirely up to you to determine whether or not it is acceptable to you in the light of conditions in your areas.

Mao Tse-tung

0400 hours, 9 March 1959

At Chengchow

* * *

Comrades First Secretaries of provincial, municipal and special district party committees:

I have been in Wu-ch'ang for five days now. I have read the materials on the conference of cadres from six levels in Hupeh Province. At the same time, I have received materials from some provinces, municipalities, and special districts. From these materials, I have found that there is a question that needs to be discussed with you. The documents of Honan province have already been delivered to you, and these documents called for the setting up of production brigades as basic accounting and distribution units of the people's communes. While I was in Chengchow, I received the articles adopted by the Hupeh provincial committee on 8 March concerning the administrative system of people's communes and the problem of food grains. These articles called for the: "resolute establishment of the original higher stage cooperative, that is, the present production team, as the basic accounting unit. Former higher stage cooperatives that had been divided into several production teams should merge immediately to form the basic accounting unit, and they must not be separated again. A few of the former very small higher stage cooperatives with generally similar economic conditions that have already merged to form a production team may be set up as a basic accounting unit as long as the cadres and the members of the commune are willing. The commune party committee can then investigate and decide, and report it to the county party committee for approval." After my arrival in Wuchang, I had comrade Chou Hsiao-chou[1] come here and, together with comrade Wang Jen-chung[2], we discussed this for a while. I asked Hsiao-chou, do you agree with the Honan method or the Hupeh method? He said that they agreed with the Honan method, that is, with the production brigade (administrative area)

as the basic accounting unit. Because, in their area, a production brigade has administrative control of only six production teams and, generally, these six production teams were formed from three original higher stage cooperatives with one cooperative splitting into two production teams. Afterward, I again received the 31 March report from Kwangtung Province. They advocated the three fixes and five grades. The first of the three fixes is the fixing of the basic accounting unit, "without exception, the original higher stage cooperatives (formerly, Kwangtung Province had 3,000 higher stage cooperatives averaging 320 households in each cooperative) are to be the basis. Some cooperatives which were equivalent to the present production team (or brigade) and some which had been divided into two or three production teams after the forming of the communes can merge immediately to form a new production team for the purpose of using it as a basic accounting unit. If the former higher stage cooperatives are too small and a hamlet has several of these cooperatives, they may also merge, with the approval of the masses, to form a basic accounting unit of the commune. Although some of these cooperatives are not in the same hamlet, they do not vary greatly in their economic conditions." From these we find that Honan and Hunan Province are both advocating the production brigade (administrative area) as the basic accounting unit and Hupeh and Kwangtung Provinces are upholding the production team, i.e., the original higher stage cooperatives, as the basic accounting unit. Which one of these two is better? Could both be implemented? According to Comrade Wang Jen-chung, the Hupeh conference discussed precisely this question during the past few days. The struggle of viewpoints between the two factions has been fierce. Generally speaking, the majority of the county party committees, commune party committees and production brigades (administrative areas) wanted the production brigade as the basic accounting unit, whereas, an absolute majority of the production teams (i.e., the original higher stage cooperatives) and party branch secretaries maintained the position of wanting the production teams as the basic accounting units. I feel that this question has very important bearings. It bears on the direct interests of basic unit cadres consisting of more than 30 million production teams and production group leaders and of several hundred million peasants. We must have the earnest approval from the basic units' cadres before adopting the method of Honan and Hupeh Provinces. If these cadres feel they could barely cope with it, we would rather select the production teams (i.e., the former higher stage cooperatives) to be the basic accounting units so that the cadres will not become separated from the masses. It is very dangerous for them to become divorced from the masses at this time, for it could very well prevent the attainment of production targets for this year. Honan Province has already made its decision, but the comrades of the provincial party committee are still asked to solicit the views of basic level cadres at the county's conference of cadres from four levels which is being held currently. If they agree with the decision of the provincial party committee, then implement it accordingly. Otherwise, it will be helpful to make some changes. The "tui as the foundation" stated in the "Minutes of the Chengchow Conferences" is meant to be the production team, i.e., the original higher stage cooperative and not the production brigade (administrative area). In short, work must be done in accordance with the wishes of the masses. No matter what the method is, it will be workable only if it meets with the requirements of the masses. Otherwise, it will not work in the long run. Please reflect and decide on what you will do.

Mao Tse-tung

15 March 1959

At Wu-ch'ang

* * *

Comrades First Secretaries of provincial, municipal and special district party committees:

This is a matter concerning the conferences to be held by the counties and communes.

The conference of cadres from six levels in various provinces, municipalities and special districts will soon be concluded. Should the 4-level or 5-level cadres conferences of the counties be held? My suggestion is that they should and they should be held on a massive scale. The only thing is that they should not be reported in the newspapers. The counties in Honan Province are now holding the conferences of cadres from four levels. The conferences are very lively and most beneficial. Responsible comrades at the provincial level in Honan Province are directly leading several counties and guiding these counties with their own experience. Hupeh, Kwangtung and Kiangsu Provinces have all made arrangements for the counties throughout their provinces to hold these conferences. The party committee of Chiangyin County in Kiangsu Province has made arrangements for a conference of 10,000 people. There are two counties in Honan Province holding meetings with 10,000 people and a majority of the other counties are having meetings of 4,000 – 5,000 people. I suggest that the counties hold conferences of cadres from five levels, namely at the county, the commune party committee, the production brigade (or administrative area), the production team (i.e., former higher stage cooperative) and production squad (production group, also called work group) level. Each level must send representatives to attend these conferences. In this way, all production squad leaders of the communes, party branch secretaries of administrative areas, production brigade leaders and a number of cadres from the commune level will attend the conferences. There must be people with confused thinking, observers and auditors attending the meeting. The best is to keep their ratio at 10 to one. You can also find a few activists from among the commune members to attend the meeting. Make arrangements so that all these people will be able to hear the speech made by the first secretary of the county party committee, because the speech at this level is higher than those by the first secretaries of the commune party committees. Later, launch discussions, placing no blame on anyone who dares to speak out and allowing the vigorous airing of views. In a few days, unify their thinking. At the conference, the three types of confrontations must be made to cross swords: one type of confrontations is the crossing of swords between basic level cadres and their higher levels (the commune and the county); another type of confrontation is to pit those with confused thinking against those who have gained

understanding; and yet another type of confrontation is to have positive characters who account for 90 percent of the people to go against the observers and auditors (many of those who have been regarded by the people as observers and auditors are, in fact, not such persons, but have been mistakenly identified by the people as such), who account for 10 percent. Three or four days will be enough for the debates. Follow that and allow three or four days for discussions to resolve concrete problems. Seven or eight days will be more than sufficient enough for these purposes. The conference of cadres from five levels in the counties will be even more lively and spirited than the conference of cadres from six levels in the province. The secretaries of the commune and county party committees must be informed on how to carry out their work. During the conference, make a special effort to get these comrades together and chat with them so that they will gain some experience from the sharp lessons of becoming temporarily divorced from the masses, because they had put into practice certain improper measures, generated the "communist wind," and practiced indiscriminate expropriation of property and funds over the past few months. Henceforth, they should be good at thinking through problems and carrying out work. In this way they will be integrated with the masses. Besides the discussions on the management of the three-level ownership systems of communes, administrative areas (i.e., production brigades) and production teams (formerly the higher stage cooperatives) and three-level accounting system, the question of part ownership system of production squads (production groups or work groups) should also be discussed. This question was brought out by Wang Jen-chung, Tao Lo-chia and several other comrades. I consider this to be reasonable and worthy of discussion. By the latter part of March, the county conferences will be concluded, and in April we can dispense with the representatives' meeting of the communes and busy ourselves with production. In the meanwhile we can hold small meetings and resolve some concrete problems. Let the production teams hold party members' meetings in their leisure time and follow that up with mass meetings, thus bringing about discussions joined in by all the people. It will be possible to hold mass discussions, because by then several hundred people will have attended conferences in the counties and the problems will have been thoroughly discussed. Some counties in Hupeh province have already carried out such discussions. In May, three days are to be set aside by all the communes in the county (three days will be more than enough) for convening the first representatives' meeting of commune members. The representatives should include men and women, the old and the young and the positive and negative elements (excluding landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bad elements, but including well-to-do middle peasants). They are to discuss some problems and elect commune administrative committees. It is suggested the such representatives' meetings should be held four times a year, with each meeting lasting one or two days and at most, three days. The first secretary of the commune should master his ability to preside over this kind of meeting. Our comrades of the commune party committees must constantly concern themselves with the interests of the masses. They must always bear in mind that their own policies and measures must be in accord with the current level of consciousness of the masses and with their immediate and pressing needs. Anything that goes counter to these two conditions will not do and will invariably fail. Both the county and district party committees should give attention to strengthening the leadership of the communes. They must send comrades who are politically strong to help communes weak in this respect. District party

committees should give attention to dispatching personnel to assist county party committees comparatively weaker in leadership. The county and communes both must give attention to strengthening the backbone leadership of production teams (generally meaning the former higher stage cooperatives) which are to be the basic accounting units. The above is presented only as a suggestion. Please think it over and decide on how it could be handled in a more satisfactory manner and implement it with speed. When the county convenes a meeting, the communes and all levels below them should leave people behind to direct production. Perhaps a rotational attendance of the meeting could set up in order not to neglect farm work.

Mao Tse-tung

0700 hours, 17 March 1959

At Wu-ch'ang

* * *

To the members of various party central committee departments, to the secretaries of various party committees, party branches and to the secretaries of various municipal, provincial and autonomous region party committees.

The materials from several counties in Shanghai are worth reading.

In the suburban areas, the factories and mining enterprises, communications and transportation enterprises, financial and trade enterprises and education and other enterprises must definitely solicit the opinions of basic level cadres (party branch secretaries, workshop foremen and work-section chiefs) and activists from among the masses in matters concerning the formulation and implementation of major policies. An overwhelming majority of these people must be made to attend meetings and air their views. Only thus can opposite views be established, contradictions exposed, the truth uncovered and the movement unfolded. Please firmly bear in mind that we must not believe too much the statements made by such people as general branch secretaries, secretaries of factories and mines party committees, responsible persons of organizations under the municipal government and secretaries of party groups and the comrades among bureau and department chiefs at the Central Government level. Many of these people have become almost completely divorced from the masses and are acting arbitrarily. They feign compliance with, or entirely ignore instructions from higher levels if these instructions do not suit them. On many issues they only believe in themselves and do not trust the masses. They do not care about the mass line. In light of this, we must henceforth annually convene two conferences of cadres from five, six, or seven levels. Each conference is to be held for 10 days. The higher echelons and the basic levels will

attack the middle level on both flanks. Only by so doing can erroneous views held by the middle-level cadres be rectified and flexibility restored to their stubborn thinking and only thus will it be possible for them to make improvements. Otherwise it will be utterly hopeless for them. If we listen to them long enough, we will be assimilated into their ranks. We will commit errors and become benighted with regard to existing state of affairs and communication between top and bottom or vice versa will ! break down. This is an extremely dangerous situation. It will be very much to our interest to hold such conferences twice a year. It will enable us to understand the situation and remedy errors. Although we are talking about the problems of urban areas here, it is the same for rural areas, too. I have already discussed this generally in my previous correspondence.

Mao Tse-tung

29 March 1959

Notes

[1.] Chou Hsiao-chou, see [note 23, p 63](#) of this volume.

[2.] Wang Jen-chung (c.1906-) became first secretary of the Hupei Party organization in 1954; he actively supported the Great Leap and was often in Mao's company when the Chairman visited Wuhan in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Comment On T'ao Lu-Ch'ieh's Report On The Five-Level Cadre Conference

March 30, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

The saying that "old debts are seldom collected" was written into the talks at Chengchow, but it is incorrect and ought to be altered to: "only with old debts can we put into practice the objective law of value"; this law is a great school and only by making use of it can we teach our several tens of millions of cadres and several hundred million people and build our socialism and communism. Otherwise, everything is impossible. For the masses there would be no possibility of venting their indignation; for the cadres, it would mean being destroyed by us. There are innumerable disadvantages and no advantages. If one commune can pay back its original advanced cooperative cash receipts of four million

yuan to the original owners, why cannot others pay them back? Don't act as if "money for charity is hard to part with." It must be recognized that this is money from robbery. Uncompensated appropriation of other people's labor is not permissible.

Intra Party Correspondence

April 29, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Comrades at the provincial, district, county, commune, production brigade and production team levels:

I wish to confer with you on several questions, all of which are on agriculture.

The first question concerns the fixing of production targets. Rice transplanting is being carried out in the south and the north is also engaged in spring cultivation. Fixing production targets must be based on realities. Just do not pay any attention to those stipulations made in the instructions from higher levels. Ignore them and simply concentrate on practical possibilities. For instance, if production per mou was actually only 300 catties last year, it will be very good indeed if production could be increased by 100 or 200 catties. Elevating it up to 800, 1,000 or 1,200 catties and even more is mere bragging and cannot be achieved at all. So what is the use in exaggerating? Again, for example, the achievement will be very great indeed if an increase of 200 or 300 catties can be achieved this year from land producing 500 catties per mou last year. To increase further, generally speaking, is impossible.

The second question concerns close planting. It should not be too thinly spread out, nor planted too closely. Many of the young cadres and some higher level organizations, lacking in experience, doggedly called for close planting only. Some even claimed that the closer the planting, the better it will be. This is incorrect. The older people doubt this and so do the middle-aged. It will be excellent to hold a meeting of these three types of people and arrive at a suitable degree of closeness to be maintained in planting. Since production targets are to be fixed, the question of close planting should be discussed and determined by production teams and production groups. Rigid orders from above regarding the closeness to be maintained are not only useless, but also very harmful. Therefore, we should completely refrain from issuing such rigid orders to those in the lower levels. The provincial party committee may suggest the width to be applied to close planting. This should not be issued as an order, but as a reference for lower levels. Besides, the higher levels should give great care to the study of what degree of closeness would be best. After accumulating some experience, a more scientific stipulation on the degree of closeness to be applied should be drawn up on the basis of differences in climate, differences in localities, differences in the condition of soil, fertilizer, water,

seeds, differences in the crops and differences in the levels of efficiency in field management. And it will be fine if, in a few years, a standard which is both practical and applicable is developed.

The third question concerns economizing on food grains. This problem must be grasped most firmly and food rationed in accordance with the number of people. We should eat more during the busy season and less during the slack season. During the busy season, we should eat solid food, during the slack season, we should eat semi-solid rations mixed with sweet potatoes, green vegetables, melons, beans and taro. This matter must be grasped tightly. Harvesting, storage and consumption (reap, store and eat) must be grasped very, very tightly every year. Furthermore, they must be grasped at the right time, for opportunity knocks only once and time lost can never be recovered. There must be reserve grains. Set aside a little each year and increase reserve grains year by year. After eight or 10 years of struggle, the problem of food production will be solved. In 10 years, there should be no boasting or exaggerating; to do so will be highly dangerous. Keep in mind that ours is a big country with a population of 650 million and eating is a matter of great importance.

The fourth question concerns broader acreage in planting. The plan calling for less planting with higher yields and richer harvests is a long-range one and it is workable. However, this plan cannot be implemented in its entirety or even the greater part of it in 10 years. It should be put into effect step by step in accordance with the conditions in the next 10 years. The greater part of this plan cannot be carried out in the next three years. In the coming three years strive for extensive planting. The guideline for the next few years is the simultaneous implementation of extensive planting with low yields and less planting with richer harvests of high quota, high yield farmland.

The fifth question concerns mechanization. The fundamental way out for agriculture lies in mechanization. Ten years will be needed to achieve this. There will be minor solutions in four years, intermediate ones in seven and major solutions in ten. This year, next year, the year after and the year after, we will be relying mainly on improved farm tools and semi-mechanized farming implements. Every province, every district and every county must establish farm tools research stations and concentrate a group of scientific-technological personnel and experienced carpenters and blacksmiths of the rural areas to gather together all kinds of more advanced farm tools from every province, district and county. They should compare them, experiment with them and improve them. New types of farm implements must be trial-produced. When they are successfully trial-produced, test them out in the fields. If they are found to be truly effective, then they can be mass produced and widely used. When we speak of mechanization, we must also include mechanized manufacturing of chemical fertilizers. It is a matter of great importance to increase chemical fertilizer production year by year.

The sixth question concerns candor. State exactly what production targets can be achieved. When you have exerted all efforts but failed to achieve something, do not force yourself to make false claims of success. State exactly how much you have harvested and refrain from making false statements, which are contrary to facts. There must be honesty

in the measures taken to increase production and to implement the Eight Character Constitution on Agriculture. An honest man has the courage to speak the truth and in the end, it will be beneficial to the people's cause and to himself. People who are fond of making false statements are firstly hurting the people and secondly, themselves. It should be said that many of these false statements were the result of pressure from above. "Exaggeration and pressure from and pledges to" higher levels create difficulties for the lower levels. Therefore we must be vigorous, but we must not make false claims.

Comrades, please study the aforementioned six problems and feel free to set forth differing opinions so as to achieve our objective of searching out the truth. We are still woefully inexperienced in running agricultural and industrial enterprises. Year by year we accumulate experience and in another ten years we will, step by step, come to understand objective necessity. We will then become free to a certain degree. What is freedom? Freedom is the recognition of necessity.

In comparison with the high-sounding talks currently making the rounds what I am saying here is very much low-keyed. The objective is to stir up activism and achieve the target of increased production. If it (production) is not actually as low as I make it out to be and it has achieved a relatively higher target, I will then become a conservative. Thank heavens, if that is so. It will be a great honor indeed.

Mao Tse-tung

April 29, 1959

Talk At Seventh Plenum Of The Eighth Central Committee

April 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

1. Ample planning for satisfactory decisions. In this phrase the emphasis is on "planning." We have to plan a great deal; lack of planning will not do. We should discuss with all sides and oppose insufficient planning and arbitrary decisions. In the past, we often did a great deal of planning with people of the same opinion but little with people of differing opinions; we planned much with the cadres but little with the production personnel. Inadequate discussion and arbitrary decision means that affairs will not be managed well. Planning is fundamental and only with ample planning can we have satisfactory decisions. There are many methods for ample planning, for instance fact-

finding meetings or forums. The goal of planning is deciding and it is undesirable to make arbitrary decisions on the basis of inadequate planning as some comrades do.

2. Make allowances. This is not only a matter of work methods, but a political one as well. When we are arranging work plans we need to make some allowances to give subordinates some initiative. If you don't give subordinates some leeway, you don't leave any leeway for yourself. Making allowances has advantages for both superiors and subordinates. For example, if in a rural area production contract, the target figure is set at 2,000 catties, there is no leeway for subordinates or superiors. In the past when we were waging war we held troops in reserve, but now in managing production we have forgotten that. Economic work cannot be attacked in a haphazard way and production work cannot come to a stop. Allowances must be made in planning work. It is essential to insure the central point; if you lack a central point you lack a policy. We operate in accordance with a policy.

3. Wave-like advance. All movements consist of waves; in natural science there are sound waves and electromagnetic waves. That all movements advance in wave-like fashion is a law of the development of motion; it is objective and does not change in response to human will. In our work we always go from point to area, from small to large and always in wave-like fashion, not as a continuously rising line.

4. Be skilled in observing circumstances. We must constantly be attentive to political circumstances and economic circumstances. By "political circumstances" is meant observing the ideology of all classes, as well as changes in their viewpoints. The secretaries should observe these things and so should individual committee members. Individual committee members should do good collective work as well as good individual work.

5. Decisiveness at the critical moment. Grasp changes in a situation in order to alter plans. The critical moment cannot be allowed to slip by. The time will not return and so we must be decisive at the critical moment, not hesitate and avoid decision. In capital construction, when the scale has over-expanded a little, it will contract a little. We must also act decisively at the crucial moment in dealing with certain bad tendencies in the party.

6. Maintain communication with people. Superiors and subordinates, colleagues and co-workers should maintain communication with each other. The Central Committee and local [committees] should have discussions and maintain communication, as should party committee members with each other and with the secretary. In the past communication decreased and we had to work at maintaining it. Now we are using the device of writing letters; the method is to write one a month. We shouldn't be content to let the secretary take care of things and especially we shouldn't keep information back from the provincial committee.

7. An individual sometimes wins over the majority. This is because truth is sometimes in one person's hands only. Truth is sometimes in the hands of a minority, as when

Marxism was in Marx's hands alone. Lenin said that you have to have the spirit of going against the current. Party committees at every level ought to consider views from many quarters; they ought to listen to the opinion of the majority and also those of the minority and others. There ought to be created within the party an atmosphere of speaking out and of correcting shortcomings. Criticizing is sometimes rather painful, but so long as criticism results in correction it is all right. When people don't dare speak out it is for one of six reasons: fear of admonition, fear of demotion, fear of loss of prestige, fear of dismissal from the party, fear of execution, fear of divorce. It was only after his execution that Yueh Fei became famous. Speaking out should involve no penalty and according to party regulations people are entitled to their own opinions. In the past under the court system I don't know how many people were put to death; but there were still many who braved death to oppose the court.

8. Concentration. Concentration in the secretariat and the standing committee requires that the minority should follow the majority, but within the party there should be created an atmosphere of liberating the spirit and carrying on criticism; criticism is comradely assistance.

Sixteen Articles Concerning Work Methods

May 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Everybody supports the party's general line. The principal political objective last year was to define the general line, but we did not achieve as much as we had anticipated. This concerns our work method. Our central problem today is the work method.

Sixteen articles concerning the work method have been laid down.

1. Be Resourceful and Decisive

Some of our comrades are not very resourceful and unable to make decisions. Resourcefulness involves willingness to listen to assorted opinions from subordinates, secretaries, plant managers, workers and peasants and in particular divergent opinions. Collect and analyze all opinions and then make a judgment.

2. Make Allowances

A common saying has it that one should make allowances for future operation. Maneuverability in work is important. In our operations against Kuomintang forces we assembled troops several times their number in order to crush them and we would not fight any battle without preparations. Socialist construction and planning also need allowances for operation. Both long-term and short-term planning should have such allowances. Our work should exceed our plan. We should make allowances for the masses to exceed a plan. If the target is set too high, it will be difficult to reach, to say nothing about exceeding it. Heads of production teams like to say, "We don't mind a target of 10,000, but we fear a 10,000 to 1 chance of failure." In the past this saying often adversely affected the workers' zeal for work. If we purposely let the masses exceed a production target, they will be encouraged and will work harder. At the same time we should maintain a focus on production for no focus means no policy. It is the same with literature and art work. The performance of a play should allow for reflection and discussion by the audience. If after seeing the first half of the play, you know what is going to happen in the second half, the performance will be a failure. A speaker should likewise leave something unsaid.

3. Proceed in Wave-like Motion

In 1957 we opposed adventurism. As a result, progress took a saddle-like form. In that year we had to lower production targets. Work should proceed in a wave-like motion. This year we have also lowered the production target slightly. The increase has been 40 percent. This year we are determined to produce 16.5 million tons of steel and we are confident that we shall be able to fulfil the quota of coal. Among the agricultural targets, we have to exert greater efforts in the production of grain and cotton. Next year the production figures may be lowered further. In 1961 we will have another great leap forward. Socialist construction should proceed in a wave-like motion. "As heaven waxes, so man's life is prolonged; as spring comes upon the world, so blessing visits the home." We cannot have a high tide everyday. I am not against progress in a wave-like motion but I am against adventurism.

4. Strive for the Greatest Effect

Plan for the greatest effect. Change plans with the change of circumstances. If circumstances have changed, a man's thought had better change accordingly. If not, he will be put in a passive position. Let the brain not be fossilized. Formulate plans according to the amount of materials and the number of people, not according to subjectivity.

5. Be Adept at Observing the Situation

Don't let your brain be fossilized. Be able to assess the political situation, to detect the trend of people's thought and to find out the economic conditions. At the Pei-tai-ho Conference the goal was set high. On my visit to Hopeh and Shantung I discovered that it was not practical. The Sixth CPC Plenum reduced the steel production target to 20 million tons. The Shanghai Conference reduced it further. Thus step by step we put production into full effect.

6. Decide at the Moment

Only by observing the situation can you decide at the crucial moment. Some comrades cannot understand the situation fully. Others can make decisions while they are working, but not properly. Wavering and indecision are bad. A decision must be made with resolution. Don't miss an opportunity, for time, once gone, never returns. The commune problem is very obvious. At what level they should be managed was not made clear last year. After a lapse of time, on 27 January, the problem was thoroughly discussed. I later read the report of Chao Tzu-yang; then in Tientsin I visited Liu Tze-hao; in Shantung Tan Chi-lung and the Lu Hung Pin commune. I discovered the following problem; a slip of paper, a scale, a cap for the dissenter, a bunch of keys, a proclamation and a staircase. Only then did I discover the system of ownership by the team. The last conference settled this problem. Some comrades are very much afraid of their superiors as well as their subordinates. Henceforth let the superiors and subordinates launch a coordinated attack against the middle level.

7. Let There be Some Airing

Work meetings should not be held without an airing. Before any discussion there should be a period of preparation. Some meetings have no subject at all. I have pointed this out no less than a hundred times. No airing is bad. Don't insulate a problem. Don't let people fail to know exactly what the problem is. Before solving a problem there should be full understanding and discussion.

8. Break the Blockade

There should be a point of view in a report. Suggest several alternate measures to solve a problem. Explain your basic situation, different views, the crux of the problem and the actual working conditions. Let there be no blockade.

9. One Man May Win Over the Majority Because He Holds Truth in His Hand

Lenin said that one should have the courage to oppose the trend, have one's independent views and dare to speak out. Some of our comrades fear ill consequences. We should therefore promote the communist character of daring to think and talk, xxx was not afraid of being sliced to pieces, dragged the emperor down from his horse.

10. Look at Problems from the Historical Point of View

Any change of plan should be subjected to a historical process. Last year we had a great leap forward. If it is 20 percent, it is a great leap forward. If it is 30 percent, it is a sustained great leap forward.

11. Write in the Mandarin style, Not Half Literary and Half Colloquial, or Half Classical and Half Modern. Insist Upon the Mandarin Style and Take a Clear-cut stand

The reports of the New China News Agency on the rebellion in Tibet have a clear sequence of events. When we write, we should keep in mind the interest of the party and the nation. Some articles have no persuasive power which shows that the writers have no clear understanding of their own fields of work and neither know nor understand mass psychology. Han Yu, the famous writer of the T'ang dynasty is known for his prose. He was a native of Hsiu-wu Honan. He advocated the adoption of his teachers ideas, but not his wording. He was against following routine and tradition. He insisted that one should have one's own characteristics and style and disregard praise for and criticism of it. P'an Tsung-tz'u's writings of parallel constructions are difficult to read. It seems that he purposely made them difficult to understand.

12. Be Responsible

With power in your hand you can give orders. Bear responsibilities bravely and follow leadership.

13. Liberate Your Thinking

Don't be afraid of demons, nor be shy and timid. Be brave and strong. Some of our comrades are weak in character. Their thinking has not been liberated. They fear rectification. Cadres should have the courage to uphold truth and not follow personages of the feudal period. What are you afraid of? None other than these six things: dismissal

from office, demotion, expulsion from the party, divorce by your wife, imprisonment and decapitation.

14. Concerning Criticism

We are all good comrades. Criticism among comrades is for the purpose of doing work well and seeking efficient work methods. It is unimaginable for one to have no regrets. Criticism and self-criticism are the party's weapons to educate the people. We owe no grievances against each other in our former lives, nor shall we in our after lives. Pains are an incentive to progress.

15. Collective Leadership

The party central committee's meeting is the nucleus. Its decisions should be carried out everywhere.

16. Relationship between Different Departments

Relationships with the industrial departments should be strengthened. Relationship with the three state commissions (State Planning Commission, State Economic Commission and State Capital Construction Commission) and the two ministries (Ministry of Metallurgical Industry and First Ministry of Machine Building) should be close.

(Note: This is not an official document; it is intended for reference only).

Several Important Instructions

June 29, July 2, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

In view of last year's lack of understanding by many leadership comrades and county and commune cadres regarding socialist economic problems and laws of economic development and also in view of the lingering pragmatism in current work, these people should study [these instructions] diligently. Members of central, provincial, municipal and local committees, including secretaries of county committees, should study books on political science and economics. Three books should be compiled by county and

commune cadres. One is to deal with “good people and good events.” It is to be a collection of incidents of people who upheld truth, did not bend with the wind, did good work, did not make false reports, did not exaggerate and strove for the full effect in doing things during the Great Leap Forward last year. A second is to tell about “bad people and bad events.” It is to be a collection of incidents of people who told lies, violated law and discipline or committed serious blunders in their work. A third is to be a systematic compilation of the Central Committee’s directives and documents from last year to date.

* * * * *

How is the internal situation? In general, there have been great accomplishments; there are many problems; but prospects are bright. Basic problems are: 1) Comprehensiveness and balance; 2) the mass line; 3) unified leadership; and 4) emphasis on quality and quantity.

Among these problems comprehensiveness and balance and the mass line are most important. We prefer to produce less but of better quality and greater variety. We need all kinds and all varieties. In agriculture, we need grain, cotton, oils, hemp, silk, tobacco, tea, sugar, vegetables, fruits, insecticides and miscellaneous items; in industries, we also need all types of light and heavy industry products. Last year we concentrated our attention on production from small-sized blast furnaces, neglecting other forms of production. This won’t do.

One of the major lessons from the Great Leap Forward is the lack of balance. When we walk, both legs should move, but we did not do so. In national economy comprehensiveness and balance are a basic problem. Only with comprehensiveness and balance can we have the mass line.

There are three balances:

1. In agriculture, a balance of agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, agricultural sideline production and fishing.
2. In industry, a balance of all departments and all links.
3. A balance between agriculture and industry.

Only when we have accomplished these three balances can we fix the ratios in national economy.

The order we set in our economic planning in the past has been heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. Henceforth we may have to reverse the order. Should it be agriculture, light industry and heavy industry? In other words, we have to do well in agriculture and to change the order of heavy industry, light industry, agriculture, commerce and communications to agriculture, light industry, heavy industry, communications and commerce. In this order we have to first develop means of

production. This in no way contradicts Marxism. Comrade Ch'en Yun said, "We should arrange the markets before we go into capital construction." Many comrades disagreed. But now we realize that comrade Ch'en Yun was right. We have to solve the problems of clothing, food, housing, utilities and travel, first for they concern the stable life of 650 million people. After we have solved these five problems, the people will live comfortably, though there may still be criticisms and blames. This will be advantageous to reconstruction and the state will be able to accumulate its resources.

The masses are demanding the restoration of the three fixed policies: fixed production, fixed purchasing and fixed marketing. They probably will have to be restored. If we have to fix production, purchasing and marketing, what should be the amounts? Can we tax 40 percent of increased production and leave 60 percent with the owners? There should be a reduction of tax in case of disaster and exemption of tax on private plots. These problems should be discussed at the forthcoming conference.

We have to restore the primary market in rural areas and make the production teams a half accounting unit.

* * * * *

Positiveness is of two types. One is the positiveness that strives for full effect and the other is positiveness that moves about blindly. Of the Red Army's three great disciplines two may be universally applicable: "All actions must follow command," which means unified leadership and opposition to anarchism; "Take not a single needle or piece of thread from the masses," which means do not practice equalitarianism and do not transfer material.

Regarding the form of government, there is now some semi-anarchism. We have granted too much of the "four powers" and too soon, causing the present confusion. We should now emphasize unified leadership and centralization of power. Powers granted should be properly retracted. There should be proper control over the lower level. Semi-anarchism should be opposed.

Neither too much inactivity nor too much activity is good. At the moment too much activity should be avoided.

[Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung](#)

Speech At The Lushan Conference

July 23, 1959

Now that you have said so much, let me say something will you? I have taken sleeping-pills three times, but I can't get to sleep.

These are the ideas I want to talk about. I have read the comrades' reports, speeches and documents, and talked to a certain number of them. I feel they have two tendencies and I want to say a few words about them here. One is the tendency to be touchy — with these people it's very much a case of: 'If you touch him he jumps.' Wu Chih-hui used to say that Sun Fo jumped if anyone touched him.[1] So some people feel the pressure; that is, they don't want others to say bad things about them. They don't want to hear bad things, only good things. I advise these comrades to listen. There are three kinds of words, and the mouth has two functions. A person has only one mouth and its duty is firstly, to eat, and secondly, to speak. Ears are for listening with. If someone wants to talk, what can you do about it? The trouble with some comrades is that they don't like listening to bad words. But good words and bad words are all words and they should listen to both kinds. There are three kinds of words: one is correct, the second is basically correct, or not too correct, and the third is basically incorrect, or just plain incorrect. The two extremes are opposites: correct and incorrect are opposites.

We are under combined attack from within and outside the Party. The rightists say: Why was Ch'in Shih Huang overthrown? Because he built the Great Wall. Now that we have built the T'ien An Men[2] we shall collapse; this is what the rightists say. I have not entirely finished reading the criticisms from within the Party. They were expressed in their most concentrated form by the Kiangsi Party School, but they are to be found everywhere. All the speeches of the rightists have been published, and the Kiangsi Party School is their representative within the Party. Some of them are rightists and wavering elements. They do not see the whole picture. But if we do some work on them, they will come round. Some of them have had problems in the past and have been criticized. Moreover they think we are in a mess. An example of this is the material from the Kwangtung Military Region. These things were all expressed outside the conference. Now we shall combine things from within and without the conference. What a pity that the summit of Lushan is so small. We can't invite them all: the Kiangsi Party School, Lo Lung-chi, Ch'en Ming-shu, etc.[3] This is the responsibility of the Kiangsi people. This building is too small!

Whenever they speak they say we are in a mess. This is fine. The more they say we are in a mess the better, and the more we should listen. During the Rectification Movement we invented the phrase, 'Toughen our scalps and bear it.' This is what I have said to some of the comrades, 'Toughen your scalp and bear it.' But how long do we have to bear it? One month, three months, six months, one year, three years, five years, eight years, ten years? Some comrades talk of 'protracted war'. I quite agree. These comrades are in the majority.

Gentlemen, all of you have ears, so listen. They all say we are in a mess. Even if it is hard to listen to it, we must listen to it and welcome it. As soon as you think in this way, it ceases to be unpleasant to the ears. Why should we let the others talk? The reason is that China will not sink down, the sky will not fall. We have done some good things and our

backbones are strong. The majority of comrades need to strengthen their backbones. Why are they not all strong? Just because for a time there were too few vegetables, too few hair-grips, no soap, a lack of balance in the economy and tension in the market, everyone became tense. People became psychologically tense. I did not see any reason for tension, but I was also tense nevertheless; it would be untrue to say I wasn't. In the first part of the night you might be tense, but once you take your sleeping-pills the tension will go away for the rest of the night.

People say that we have become isolated from the masses, yet the masses still support us. I think this was temporary, just for two or three months before and after the Spring Festival. I think that we and the masses are now combining well. There is a bit of petit-bourgeois fanaticism, but not all that much. I agree with the view of our comrades, the problem is that of the commune movement. I went to Suip'ing and discussed the matter in detail for more than two hours. The secretary of the Party Committee of the Cha-ya-shan Commune told me that on the average, during the three months of July, August, and September, 3,000 people a day came for a visit. That makes 30,000 in ten days and 300,000 in three months. I hear that there was an equally large number of visitors at Hsu-shui and Ch'i-li-ying.[4] They came from everywhere except Tibet to have a look. It was like the monk of the T'ang dynasty going in search of the scriptures.[5] These people were all *hsien*, commune, and brigade cadres; there were also provincial and local cadres. Their reasoning was: 'The people in Honan and Hopei have created the truth from experience, they have smashed Roosevelt's "freedom" from want.' How should we look upon such enthusiasm for communism? Shall we call it petit-bourgeois fanaticism? I don't think we can put it that way. It's a matter of wanting to do a bit more, it's nothing else but wanting to do a bit more, a bit faster. Is this analysis appropriate? In these three months, there were three times 300,000 people going to the mountains to burn incense.[6] We must not pour cold water on this kind of broad mass movement. We can only use persuasion and say to them: Comrades, your hearts are in the right place. When tasks are difficult, don't be impatient. Do things step-by-step. When you eat meat you have to do it one mouthful at a time; one bite won't make you a fatty. Lin X eats a catty of meat a day and he's still not fat, even after ten years of it. The ample figures of the Commander-in-Chief[7] and myself were not achieved in a day and a night.

Those cadres are leading several hundreds of millions of people. At least thirty per cent of them are activists, thirty per cent are passive elements including landlords, rich peasants, reactionaries, undesirables, bureaucrats, middle peasants, and some poor peasants, and forty per cent follow the stream. How many people is thirty per cent? 150 million people. They are keen on running communes, communal canteens, large cooperative enterprises. They are very active, very keen to do these things. Do you think that this is petit-bourgeois fanaticism? They are not the petit bourgeoisie, they are poor peasants, lower-middle peasants, proletarians and semi-proletarians. Those who follow the stream are also prepared to do these things. There are just thirty per cent who won't. Now thirty per cent and forty per cent equals seventy per cent — so at one time there were 350 million fanatics. They wanted to do it.

Then during the two months before and after the Spring Festival they became dissatisfied and changed. When the cadres went into the countryside they would no longer talk to them; they gave them only sweet potato gruel to eat and their faces were unsmiling. This has been called 'blowing a communist wind'. We should make an analysis of this. Among these people there are some who are afflicted with petit-bourgeois fanaticism. Who are they? Those who 'blew a communist wind' were primarily *hsien-* and commune-level cadres, especially commune cadres who extorted things from production brigades and teams. This is bad. The masses disliked it. They were resolutely corrected and persuaded. It took about a month during March and April for the wind to be stilled. Those measures which had to be withdrawn were withdrawn, and the accounts between the communes and the brigades were cleared.

This period of over one month of settling accounts and education had its good effects. In a very short time they came to understand that egalitarianism was no good — 'First equalize, second adjust, third withdraw funds'[8] will not do. I hear that the majority have come round and only a minority still hanker after 'communism' and won't give it up. Where else can one find such a school, or intensive training course, which will enable a population of several hundreds of millions as well as several millions of cadres to be educated?

The things must be given back. You cannot say that what is yours is mine and just pick things up and walk off. No such rule has ever existed since ancient times. In another 10,000 years' time people will still not be able to pick things up and walk off. The Red and Green Gang[9] behaved like this, stealing and robbing away in broad daylight, expropriating the fruits of others' labour without recompense, and violating the principle of the exchange of equal values. Sung Chiang's government was called the Hall of Loyalty and Righteousness. He robbed the rich to help the poor and could take what he wanted since he had justice on his side. What they took belonged to the local despots and evil gentry, and so his code of behaviour was acceptable. What Sung Chiang took was 'a birthday tribute'. His action was like our attacks on the local despots. He took their ill-gotten property.[10] 'Ill-gotten gains can be taken with impunity.' What has been extorted from the peasants should be returned to the peasants. It is a long time since we attacked the local despots. When we attacked them, it was quite all right to divide their fields and return them to the people because they too were ill-gotten property. If we 'blow a communist wind' and seize the property of the production brigades and work teams, helping ourselves to their fat pigs and big white cabbages, this is quite wrong. Even when we deal with the assets of imperialist countries we have other methods: requisition, procurement and economic pressure. So how can we expropriate the working people's property? How did we succeed in suppressing this wind within a month? It proves that our Party is great, just and correct. If you don't believe it, I have historical material to prove it. In March, April and May, several million cadres and several hundred million peasants received an education. The situation was explained to them and they thought it out. It was mainly the cadres who had not understood that this kind of wealth was [not] ill-gotten.[11] They could not make the distinction between the two kinds. They had not properly studied political economy. They had not clearly understood the

laws of value, exchange of equal values, and remuneration according to work done. In a few months they were convinced and stopped doing it.

There may not be anyone who understands all this completely. There are some who have understood some of it, perhaps seventy or eighty per cent. If they have not understood the textbooks, let them study them some more. If the top cadres in the communes do not understand a little political economy, this won't do. If people can't read, you can explain it to them and they will understand a certain amount. They do not have to read books; they can be educated by facts. Emperor Wu-ti of Liang had a prime minister called Ch'en Fa-chih. He could not read a single word. When he had to write poems, he recited them and got others to write them down, saying: 'You scholars are not as good as me, who learnt by ear.' Of course I am not opposing the campaign to get rid of illiteracy. Old K'o[12] said that everyone should attend university. I agree. But that would prolong the period of education to fifteen years.

In the Southern and Northern dynasties there was a general called Ts'ao[13] who wrote this poem after a battle:

When I went to war,
My children were sad.
On my return
I was greeted with horns and drums.
I asked someone passing by,
'Knowest thou Huo Ch'u-ping?'

There was also the *Song of Ch'i-lo* by Hu-lü-chin of the Northern dynasties:

By the Ch'i-lo river, below the Yin mountains,
The sky is like a great canopy,
Spanning the plains.
The sky is blue, the wilderness is vast.
When the wind blows,
The grass bends and cattle and sheep appear.

Neither of these poets could read a word.

If an illiterate can become a prime minister, why can't our commune cadres and peasants listen to some political economy? I think they can learn it. If it is explained to them, they can learn some political economy even if they can't read. Explain it to them and they will understand it. In fact they can understand things better than intellectuals. I myself have not read the textbooks, and I have no right to discuss them until I have. We must squeeze out some time; the whole Party should run a study campaign.

Goodness knows how many inspections they have made. Since last year's Chengchow Conference they have gone in for them in a big way. A report had to be made even when a sixth-grade meeting affected a fifth-grade meeting. The people from Peking talked and

talked, but made no impression on them. We made many reports, but you did not get to hear them. I would advise comrades: since people have mouths, let them speak. You must listen to the other person's point of view. I think that at this conference there are some problems which cannot be solved, and some people who will not give up their point of view, so they just procrastinate — one year, two years, three years, five years. It won't do if you can't listen to strange ideas. One should get into the habit of listening. I say we should toughen our scalps and listen. At the worst they will curse three generations of your ancestors. I know it's not easy. When I was a boy, and when I was in middle school, I used to get all steamed up whenever I heard unpleasant things [about myself]. If people don't attack me, I won't attack them. If people attack me, I will certainly attack them. They attack me first, I attack them later. This principle I have never abandoned down to the present time. Now I have learnt to listen, to toughen my scalp and listen for one or two weeks and then counter-attack. I would advise comrades to listen. Whether you agree or not is your business. If you don't agree and if I am wrong, then I will make a self-criticism.

Second, I advise some other comrades not to waver at this crucial time. I have observed that a proportion of comrades are wavering. They too say the Great Leap Forward, the General Line and the people's communes are correct. But when they speak we must note on whose side they stand as regards their ideological tendency, and what is the thrust of their words. This group is in the second category: those who are fundamentally correct, but partly incorrect and a bit unstable. Some people will waver in times of crisis and show a lack of resolution in the great storms of history. There were four lines in our history: the Li Li-san Line, the Wang Ming Line, the Kao-Jao Line, and now the General Line.^[14] These people are not steady: they dance the Yang-ko dance^[15] (the Kuomintang said that we are the Yang-ko dynasty). They are terribly anxious in their desire to make things better for their country. This is good. What is the class background of this? Is it bourgeois or petit bourgeois? I shall not discuss this now; I talked about it at the Nanning Conference, the Chengtu Conference and the Party Congress. As for the people who wavered in 1956-7, we did not put tall hats^[16] on them; we regarded it as a question of ideological method. If we talk about the fanaticism of the petit bourgeoisie, then the opposite of this — the anti-adventurism of that period — is the sad and dismal flatness and pessimism of the bourgeoisie. We are not going to put tall hats on these comrades. They are different from rightists in that they are all engaged in building socialism. It is just that they lack experience. As soon as the wind starts blowing and the grass waves, they become unsteady on their pins and turn anti-adventurist. Yet those who were anti-adventurist at that time have now stood firm. An example is Comrade En-lai. He has a lot of energy. After this lesson I believe that Comrade Ch'en Yün will also stand firm. Strange that the people who criticized En-lai at that time, this time find themselves in his shoes. They are no longer adventurous; they even give the impression of being anti-adventurist. For instance, they say: 'While there is loss, there is also gain.' The fact that they put the word 'gain' second is the result of careful consideration. For example, when it comes to putting on tall hats, this is the wavering of the bourgeoisie; or to fall one step lower, the wavering of the petit bourgeoisie. For the nature of rightists is to be constantly influenced by the bourgeoisie. Under the pressure of the imperialists and the bourgeoisie they have moved to the right.

There are about 700,000 production brigades; if each brigade makes one error, and you wanted to publish all 700,000 errors within a year, how could it be done? Moreover some articles are long and some short; it would take at least a year to publish them all. What would the result be? Our state would collapse and even if the imperialists didn't come, the people would rise up and overthrow us. If the paper you publish prints bad news every day, people will have no heart for their work. It wouldn't take as long as a year; we would perish within a week. To print 700,000 items all about bad things is not proletarian. It is more like a bourgeois country or party, like the political planning department of Chang Po-chün.[17] Of course nobody present is in favour of this. I am exaggerating. But if we do ten things and nine are bad, and they are all published in the press, then we will certainly perish, and will deserve to perish. In that case, I will go to the countryside to lead the peasants to overthrow the government. If those of you in the Liberation Army won't follow me, then I will go and find a Red Army, and organize another Liberation Army. But I think the Liberation Army would follow me.

I would advise some comrades to pay attention to the tendency of what they say. The content of your speech may be basically correct, but parts are not apposite.

If you want others to stand firm, you must first stand firm yourselves. If you want other people not to waver, you must not waver yourself: this is another lesson. As I see it these comrades are not rightists but middle-of-the-roaders. They are not leftists (i.e. leftists without quotation marks). I am talking about tendencies because there are some people who have run into difficulties. They have suffered broken heads and they are anxious. They were unable to stand firm; they wobbled into the middle of the road. The question is whether they are more inclined to the right of the middle or to the left of the middle. We must analyse this. They have gone the same way as those comrades who made mistakes in the second half of 1956 and the first half of 1957. They are not rightists, but they are on the verge of becoming rightists. They are still thirty kilometres away from the rightists. The rightists very much welcomed the trend of what they had to say and it would be surprising if they didn't. These comrades' brinkmanship is rather dangerous. If you don't believe me, wait and see what happens. I am saying these things before a big audience. Some of what I say may hurt people. But if I remained silent now, this would not be in these comrades' interest.

To the subjects which I have raised might be added another one: the question of unity. But I will write a separate piece on it: 'Raise the banner of unity, unity of the people, the nation and the Party.' I am not saying whether this is good or bad for these comrades. Even if it is harmful I must still talk about it. Our Party is a Marxist political party. Those on one side must listen; so must those on the other side. Both sides should listen. Didn't I say I wanted to speak? One should not only speak, but also listen to others. I have not been in a hurry to speak: I have toughened my scalp to endure it. Why don't I go on doing so? I have done it for twenty days already and it's nearly time for the conference to adjourn. We may as well go on to the end of the month. Marshall came up to Lushan eight times.[18] Chou En-lai came up three times. Why shouldn't we come up once? We have every right to do so.

Now about the problem of canteens. Canteens are a good thing and should not be criticized too severely. I am in favour of their active and successful development on the basis of voluntary membership. Grain should go to individual households and any savings should be retained by individuals. If one third of the canteens in the whole country can be maintained, I will be quite content. As soon as I said this, Wu Chih-p'u[19] became quite tense. Don't be afraid. In Honan Province ninety per cent of the canteens are still running. We should try them and see how they go, not abolish them. I am talking on a nationwide scale. In dancing are there not four stages? 'Stand on one side; try it out; dance as hard as you can; do or die.' Does such a saying really exist? I am a rough fellow, not cultured at all. If one-third of the peasants, amounting to 150 million, persevere, then this would be wonderful. My next hope is for a half of them to do so: 250 million. If we can gain experience from such example as Honan, Szechwan, Hunan, Yünnan, Shanghai, we can do it and some of the canteens which have been disbanded can be reformed. We did not invent them; they were created by the masses. They had canteens in Hopei Province in 1956 before the establishment of the communes. In 1958 they were set up very rapidly.

Tseng Hsi-sheng[20] said that canteens liberate labour power. I think that there is another point, which is that they save materials. Without the latter benefit they would not last. Can we do it? We can. My proposal is that the Honan comrades should carry out some mechanization, such as laying on running water, so that the water does not have to be carried. In this way both labour and materials can be saved. It is a good thing that half of them have now been disbanded. Commander-in-chief, I approve of your way of putting it, but I also differ with you. We should not stop disbanding them altogether, but neither should we disband too many. I'm a middle-of-the-roader. Honan, Szechwan, Hupei are all leftists. But a right wing has emerged. The Ch'angli investigation committee of the Chinese Academy of Sciences say that the canteens have no merit at all, attacking them on one particular point and not mentioning any others. They imitate Teng T'u-tzu's 'Ode on Love of Sex'. Teng T'u-tzu attacked Sung Yü on three points: he was handsome, sex-mad, and eloquent.[21] Also he did not like his own wife and was very dangerous. Sung Yü retorted: 'My good looks I owe to my parents, my eloquence is due to my teachers, and it is not true that I am sex-mad. No other place has such beautiful women as the state of Ch'u. Among the beautiful women of Ch'u, the most beautiful are to be found in my own district. And the most beautiful woman of my district is the daughter of my neighbour on the East. If you increased her stature by one inch she would be too tall, and if you decreased it by one inch she would be too short.' ... Teng T'u-tzu was a *tai-fu* which is the equivalent of the head of a ministry today. His 'ministry' was a big one, like the Ministry of Metallurgy, the Ministry of the Coal Industry or the Ministry of Agriculture. The investigation group of the Academy of Sciences attacked only one point and ignored the rest. The way they attacked was to concentrate on such things as pork, hairgrips, etc. Everybody has faults. Even Confucius made mistakes. I have also seen Lenin's handwritten manuscripts which had been altered so much that they looked a real mess. If he had not made mistakes why did he have to correct them? We can have more canteens: after we have experimented with them for one or two years, I reckon that we can make a go of them.

Could the people's communes collapse? Up to now not one has collapsed. We were prepared for the collapse of half of them, and if seventy per cent collapsed there would still be thirty per cent left. If they must collapse, let them. If they are not well run they are sure to collapse. The Communist Party aims to run things well, to run the communes well, to run all enterprises well, to run agriculture, industry, commerce, communications, transport, and culture and education well.

Many things have happened which we could not possibly predict beforehand. Hasn't it been said that the Party does not concern itself with Party affairs? Now the planning organs do not concern themselves with planning: for some time they have not been concerning themselves with it. The planning organs are not confined to the Planning Commission; they also include other ministries as well as local governments. The local organs can be forgiven if for a time they did not concern themselves with the overall balance of the economy. But the Planning Commission and the central ministries have been in existence for ten years, and suddenly at Peitaiho they decided not to concern themselves with it. They called it a directive on planning, but it was tantamount to doing away with planning altogether. By doing away with planning I mean that they dispensed with overall balances and simply made no estimates of how much coal, iron and transport would be needed. Coal and iron cannot walk by themselves; they need vehicles to transport them. This I did not foresee. I and XX and the Premier did not concern ourselves with this point. You could say that we were ignorant of it. I ought not to make excuses, but I shall too, because I am not the head of the Planning Commission. Before August of last year my main energies were concentrated on revolution. I am a complete outsider when it comes to economic construction, and I understand nothing about industrial planning. At the West Tower [In the Chung-nan-hai, Peking.] I said: 'Don't write about [my] wise leadership, I do not control a thing so how can you talk about wisdom?' But comrades, in 1958 and 1959 the main responsibility was mine, and you should take me to task. In the past the responsibility was other people's — En-lai, XX — but now you should blame me because there are heaps of things I didn't attend to. Shall the person who invented burial puppets be deprived of descendants?[22] Shall I be deprived of descendants too (one son was killed, one went mad)?[23] Who was responsible for the idea of the mass smelting of steel? K'o Ch'ing-shih or me? I say it was me. I had a talk with K'o Ch'ing-shih and spoke of six million tons. Afterwards I sought out people to talk about it: XXX also said it was possible. In June I talked about 10,700,000 tons. Then we went ahead and did it. It was published in the Peitaiho communique; XX put forward some ideas and believed that it would be all right. With this, we rushed into a great catastrophe, and ninety million people went into battle. As I said, the person who invented burial puppets should have neither sons nor grandsons. Small native-type blast furnaces were built ... I read a lot of discussion reports; everyone said it could be done. Provided that we came to grips with the problem and worked really hard, we could raise the quality, reduce cost, lower the sulphur content, and produce really good iron. The Communist Party has a method which it calls 'coming to grips' with something. The Communist Party and Chiang Kai-shek have both got two hands. The Communist Party's hands are communist hands. When they grip things they pick them up. We must take a grip on steel and iron as well as staple crops, cotton, oil, hemp, silk, tea, sugar and vegetables; also tobacco, fruit and condiments. There are twelve items

in agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, subsidiary crops and fisheries, which must be grasped and which must achieve overall balance. Conditions vary in different localities. There cannot be a single model for every county. At Chikungshan in Hupi they grow bamboo in the mountains. It would be very wrong for them only to tend the crops and neglect the bamboos. There are places where tea and sugar will not grow. Things must be grown according to local conditions. Didn't the Soviet Union make them ! grow pigs in Moslem areas? Ridiculous.

There is an article on industrial planning which is quite well written. As for the Party not concerning itself with Party affairs, the Planning Commission not looking after planning or drawing up overall balances, what have they been doing? They were not in the least worried about things. The Premier was worried, but they weren't. If someone is not worried and they have no energy or enthusiasm, they will not do anything properly. Some people in criticizing Comrade Li Fu-ch'un, head of the Planning Commission, say: 'His foot wants to move, but he hesitates; his mouth wants to speak, but he stammers.' But don't be like Li K'uei;^[24] impetuosity is no good either. Lenin was full of enthusiasm, which the masses liked. If people want to speak but can only stammer, it is because they have a lot of worries. During the first half of the month people had a lot of worries. Now these worries have all come out into the open. If you have anything to say, say it and it will all be written down in the minutes. Spoken evidence has to be written down. If you have things to say, then say them. If you find faults in me, then you should correct me. Don't be afraid if your shoes pinch. I said at the Chengtu Conference that one should not fear the guardroom. One should not even be afraid of execution or expulsion from the Party. If a communist and senior cadre has so many inhibitions it is because he is afraid of saying the wrong thing and being corrected. This is what is called, 'The wise man looks after number one!' Disease enters through the mouth and trouble comes out through the mouth. If I cause trouble today, two kinds of people will not like it: one is the touchy ones and the other those whose direction is open to question. If you don't agree with me then argue back. I don't agree with the idea that the Chairman cannot be contradicted. Anyway the fact is that you have been contradicting me one! after the other, though not by name. The ideas of the Kiangsi Party School and of the Intermediate Party School both contradict mine. When I said that the inventor of burial puppets should have no descendants, I was referring first to the target of smelting 10,700,00 tons of steel, which resulted in ninety million people going into battle and the expenditure of — dollars of People's Currency. 'The gain did not compensate for the loss.' This was my suggestion and my resolution. Next I was referring to the people's communes. I do not claim to have invented the people's communes, only to have proposed them. The Peitaiho Resolution was drafted according to my suggestion. At that time, it was as though I had found a treasure in the regulations of the Cha-ya-shan [Commune]. When I was in Shantung a reporter asked me: 'Are the people's communes good?' I said: 'They are good,' and he published it in a newspaper. There was a spot of petit-bourgeois fanaticism there, too. In future reporters should keep away.

I have committed two crimes, one of which is calling for 10,700,000 tons of steel and the mass smelting of steel. If you agreed with this, you should share some of the blame. But since I was the inventor of burial puppets, I cannot pass on the blame: the main

responsibility is mine. As for the people's communes, the whole world opposed them; the Soviet Union opposed them. There is also the General Line. Whether it has any substance or not, you can share some of the responsibility for this. The proof is to be seen in its implementation in industry and agriculture. As for the other big guns, other people should also take some of the responsibility. Boss T'an[25], you have fired a lot of big shots, but your shooting was inaccurate, you had a rush of blood to the head and did not take enough care. You communized too quickly. It was talked about first in Honan, then accounts of it spread rapidly in Kiangsu and Chekiang. If you are careless in your speech, you will not keep control of things. You must be more cautious. Your strength is that you are energetic and willing to take responsibility; much better than those who are sad and dismal. But when you fire big guns on important questions, you should take care. I have also fired three big shots: the people's communes, the steel smelting, and the General Line. P'eng Te-huai said that he was a coarse fellow with no refinement. I am like Chang Fei who, though rough, had a certain delicacy.[26] About the people's communes, I said that they were a system of collective ownership. I said that for the transition to be completed from collective ownership to communist ownership by the whole people, two five-year plans was too short a period. Maybe it will take twenty five-year plans!

If you want to talk about haste, Marx also made many mistakes. Every day he hoped that a European revolution would arrive, but it did not arrive. There were many ups and downs and it had still not arrived when he died. It only arrived in Lenin's time. Wasn't this a case of impatience? Wasn't this petit-bourgeois fanaticism? (XX interjected: 'Lenin said that conditions were ripe for world revolution, but it did not come.') Marx at first opposed the Paris Commune, while Zinoviev opposed the October Revolution. Zinoviev was put to death later. Should Marx also have been killed? When the Paris Commune rose up he supported it, although he reckoned that it would fail. When he realized that it was the first proletarian dictatorship, he thought it would be a good thing even if it only lasted three months. If we assess it from an economic point of view, it was not worthwhile. We also had our Canton Commune,[27] but the Great Revolution failed. Will our present work also fail, like what happened in 1927? Or will it be like the 25,000 li Long March, when most of our bases were lost and the Soviet areas were reduced to one tenth of their former size? No, it will not be like these. Have we failed this time? All the comrades present say there have been gains; it is not a complete failure. Is it mainly a failure? No, it's only a partial failure. We have paid a high price. A lot of 'communist wind' has blown past, but the people of the whole country have learned a lesson.

I have spoken twice at Chengchow on the question of Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism*. But these were only speeches. Now we must study it in depth, otherwise we cannot develop and consolidate our cause.[28]

When talking of responsibility, XXX and XXX both have some responsibility, as does XXX of the Ministry of Agriculture. But the one with the most responsibility is me. Old K'o, does any responsibility rest on you for your invention? (Old K'o said: 'Yes.') Was it lighter than mine? Yours is a question of ideology, mine of 10,700,000 tons and ninety million people going into battle. The chaos caused was on a grand scale and I take

responsibility. Comrades, you must all analyse your own responsibility. If you have to shit, shit! If you have to fart, fart! You will feel much better for it.

Notes

[References are given here as provided by the Maoist Documentation Project. They are significantly different in at least one existing edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. VIII. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1.] Wu Chih-hui (1864-1954) was a leading figure in the anarchist movement at the beginning of this century, and perhaps the most famous Chinese eccentric of modern times. Sun Fo (also known as Sun K'o) was Sun Yat-sen's son, an insignificant politician.

[2.] Mao is obviously referring here to the 'Great Hall of the People' and other edifices built during the Great Leap Forward, flanking the square in front of the T'ien An Men (Gate of Heavenly Peace), not to the gate itself, which dates from Ming times and was rebuilt in its present form in 1651.

[3.] Lo Lung-chi (1896-1965), a political scientist educated at the London School of Economics and Columbia University, was a leading member of the China Democratic League. He was Minister of Timber from 1956-8, when he was removed after being denounced for over-zealous criticism of the Party during the Hundred Flowers of 1957. Ch'en Ming-shu (1890-1965), a leader of the Kuomintang faction which chose to collaborate with the Communists after 1949, was also criticized in 1957.

[4.] The Cha-ya-shan Commune (also known as the Wei-hsing or 'Sputnik' Commune) in Suip'ing hsien, Honan Province, was one of the first communes set up on an experimental basis in the early summer of 1958; its draft regulations, adopted on 7 August 1958, served as a document for study throughout the country following the decision of the Central Committee at a meeting in Peitaiho on 29 August 1958. (For the Peitaiho resolution, and the Cha-yashan regulations, see *Communist China 1955-1959* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962], pp. 454-6, 463-70.)

Ch'i-li-ying Commune in Hsin-hsiang hsien, Honan, and communes in Hsü-shui hsien, Hopei, were also among the earliest models, set up in the summer of 1958.

[5.] i.e., the Chinese monk who, in the seventh century, brought Buddhist scriptures from India.

[6.] Mao says below (p. 145) that he himself felt, in the summer of 1958, as though he had 'found a treasure' in the regulations of the Cha-ya-shan Commune. Here he suggests

that visitors came to the three model communes in the same reverent spirit as Buddhists burning candles on the mountains at dawn.

[7.] Chu Te, who occupied this position most of the time from the union between his forces and Mao's in 1928 until 1954.

[8.] A slogan prevalent among the peasantry in the summer of 1958, reflecting their understanding of communism as sharing wealth, rather than collective organization for production.

[9.] The Shanghai underworld in the 1920s was dominated by gangs which had grown out of secret societies with names such as this.

[10.] Sung Chiang was the leader of the outlaw heroes of the novel *Water Margin*, translated by Pearl Buck under the title *All Men are Brothers* (New York: John Day, 1968). The incident of the birthday tribute occurs in Chapters 14-16; this episode is translated in Cyril Birch (Ed.) *Anthology of Chinese Literature* (Penguin, 1967), pp. 448-84. For a similar comparison between the ideals of the Communist Party and those of traditional defenders of the underdog, see Mao's appeal of 1936 to the secret society called the Ko Lao Hui: *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, pp. 260-61.

[11.] The Chinese text here says 'that this kind of wealth was ill-gotten'. This must be a misprint, since Mao is criticizing leftist errors of confiscating things that ought not to have been confiscated, and is making the cadres responsible for these excesses.

[12.] K'o Ch'ing-shih (1902-65), a member of the Politburo, was then Mayor of Shanghai, and head of the Shanghai Party organization, as well as being First Secretary of the Eastern Bureau.

[13.] Ts'ao (457-508) [i.e., Ts'ao Ching-tsung of the Southern Liang dynasty], who had originally distinguished himself by his prowess as a hunter, helped to establish the Liang dynasty in 502. In the poem, he identifies himself with Huo Ch'ü-ping, a general of Han Wu Ti who distinguished himself against the Huns.

[14.] As already indicated (see above, *Talks at the Chengtu Conference* (a), note 2), the official viewpoint at the time of this speech regarding lines in the 1930s is given in the 'Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of Our Party', adopted on 20 April 1945, in *Selected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 177-225. The 'Li Li-san Line' of 1930, and the 'Left Opportunist Line' promoted by Wang Ming and the other representatives of the 'Returned Student Faction' in the years 1931-5 are discussed both there and in the many Western accounts of this period. The Kao-Jao Line is discussed in Mao's speech of 10 March 1958 (*Talks at the Chengtu Conference* (a) and notes 8 and 10 to that text) [and comrade Mao's "[Speeches At The National Conference Of The Communist Party Of China](#)", S.W. Vol. V, pp 154-171]. The juxtaposition of these three deviationist lines with the General Line of building socialism 'more, faster, better, and more economically', put forward by Mao in 1956 and with which he continued to identify himself, is slightly odd.

[15.] Folk songs and dances adapted to carry a political message, widely promoted in the Yen-an base area beginning in 1942.

[16.] The custom of parading people in dunce caps in order to humiliate them has a long history in China; its modern manifestations extend from the activities of the Hunan peasants, chronicled by Mao in 1927, to the Cultural Revolution.

[17.] Chang Po-chün, Minister of Communications and leader of the China Democratic League, criticized the Chinese Communist Party severely in the spring of 1957, and then recanted in July. His case thus paralleled that of the editor of his party's newspaper, Ch'u An-p'ing (see note 72 to [Talks at the Chengtu Conference](#)). He was removed as minister in early 1958.

[18.] General George C. Marshall organized a number of meetings on Lushan while US mediator in China in 1946-7.

[19.] Wu Chih-p'u (c. 1906), at this time First Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party for Honan province, who had taken the lead in establishing communes in the summer of 1958. For the background to Mao's remarks here, see his discussion of the role of Honan as the vanguard of social change in his speech of 20 March 1958 ([Talks at the Chengtu Conference](#) (b), pp. 104-5). He was demoted in 1961 for 'adventurism'.

[20.] Tseng Hsi-sheng (c. 1905-), a graduate of Whampoa who participated in the Long March, was elected to the Central Committee in 1956. He was also First Secretary of the CCP for Anhwei province, from 1952 to 1960, and in that capacity he showed himself a strong supporter of the Great Leap Forward. He faded from the political scene in the early 1960s.

[21.] Teng T'u-tzu, a high official of the state of Ch'u, offended in this way Sung Yü, a nephew of the famous poet Ch'ü Yüan, who attacked him in return (fourth century B.C.).

[22.] A quotation from Book 1, Part A, Ch. 4 of Mencius (p. 52 of D.C. Lau's translation) referring to the practice of burying wooden figures with the dead so they might be their servants in the hereafter. According to another passage from the classics (Li Chi, IV, 19), Confucius regarded this custom as inhuman because it suggested metaphorically the idea of burying actual human beings for the same purpose. In subsequent Chinese usage the expression 'he who first made burial puppets' has come to designate the author of any diabolical invention, or more generally the bringer of misfortune.

[23.] The two referred to are Mao's sons by his first wife, Yang K'ai-hui. The eldest, Mao An-ying, born in 1922, was killed in 1950 in Korea. The younger, Mao An-ch'in, was left with a 'bourgeois' family following his mother's execution in 1930, and was so mistreated, according to Red Guard sources, that his mind was affected.

[24.] A good-hearted but exceedingly short-tempered figure in Water Margin, whose personality is conjured up by his nickname, 'Black Whirlwind'.

[25.] T'an Chen-lin (1902-), Politburo member and the Party's top agricultural spokesman in 1958, had espoused radical policies in the countryside at the time of the Great Leap Forward. He was made a vice-premier of the State Council in April 1959, and was regarded as a spokesman for Mao Tse-tung.

[26.] P'eng Te-huai (1898-) Minister of Defence, who launched a sharp attack on the Great Leap policies at the Lushan meetings. In his 'Letter of Opinion', dated 14 July 1959, P'eng had excused his frankness by saying that he was a simple fellow like Chang Fei (one of the heroes of the Romance of the Three Kingdoms), but shared only Chang's roughness, not his subtlety. Mao's remark echoing this sentence is an obvious warning to his adversaries that he possesses both a subtle tactical sense, and the firmness (or harshness) to act as circumstances may require.

[27.] The abortive uprising in Canton in December 1927. On December 11, 1927, the workers and revolutionary soldiers of Canton united to stage an uprising, and set up the people's political power. They fought fiercely against the counter-revolutionary forces, which were directly supported by imperialism, but failed because the disparity in strength was too great.

[28.] Mao himself shortly produced some comments on Stalin's last work, as well as a much more detailed analysis of the Soviet manual on political economy published after Stalin's death. See his (undated) remarks on Stalin's 1952 essay, followed by notes (dated 1960) on the Soviet textbook in *Wan-sui* (1967), pp. 156-66 and 167-247. Another version of the latter, dated 1961-2, appears in *Wan-sui* (1969), pp. 319-99.

Talk At The 8th Plenary Session Of The CPC 8th Central Committee

August 2, 1959

[SOURCE: This document, published in a Red Guard Publication, bears the title of "*Talk at the 8th Plenary Session of CPC 8th Central Committee*," on the above date. It is a very short piece. It might be that Mao gave a short talk on the occasion; or, it might be an excerpt from his talk.]

1. The Question of Revising the Targets

The 6th Plenary Session of the Central Committee held at Wuhan[1] decided on the targets for this year. At the 7th Plenary Session held in Shanghai[2] there were proposals to revise the targets. The Majority did not agree. It seems that any revision cannot be thorough. At present, we still have five months to go. When the revision has been made, we can put through the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. The high targets are a Buddhist idol, which we set up for our own worship. Now, we have to break them, break the impractical targets for steel, coal, gram, cotton, etc.

2. The Question Concerning the Lines

Some comrades begin to have doubt: Have we been correct or not? Before they came up the Lushan Mountain, they did not understand clearly. After they came up, some people asked for democracy, asked for freedom, and said that they did not dare to speak, and there was pressure. At that time, I was confused, and could not understand what democracy they were talking about. In the first half of the month, a kind of Meetings of Immortals[3] were held. The situation was not tense. They said that there was no freedom. They tried to attack the general line and break it down. They said that they wanted to have freedom, the freedom of breaking down the general line, and the freedom of speech to criticize the general line. The tense situation of their demand was mainly on criticizing last year, also criticizing the work of this year. They said that in last year all the work had been done badly. Since the first Chengchow Meeting in November last year, we have rectified the wind of communism, and rectified such "Leftists" tendencies as "equalitarianism, harmony and deduction of money" They could not see the work in these months, and were dissatisfied. They demanded to hold a new discussion; otherwise, they thought that it was the suppression of democracy. They thought that it was not enough to hold the enlarged conference of the Political Bureau, which they thought not democratic. Now, democracy in meetings seems a major theme; we might make preparations for holding the National Party Congress in spring next year. If the situation requires, it may be held in September or October this year. Did we not demand great democracy and the blooming and contending and mass debate in 1957?[4] The Lushan Meeting has been going on for one month already. Comrades who have just arrived do not know what it is all about. At first, group meetings will be held for nine days, then the general meeting ! is to be held, and finally resolutions are to be made.

The procedure of the meeting to be adopted should be one which all will have approved, by proceeding from the wish of unity. The unity of the Plenary Session of the CPC Central Committee is connected with the destiny of China's socialism. As far as we are concerned, we should be united. At present, there is a tendency toward a split. Last year, at the 8th National Party Congress, I said that the only two dangers were, the world war and the split of our Party. At that time there was no clear sign of a split. Now there is such sign. The method of unity proceeds from the wish for unity, through criticism and self-criticism and attains the goal of unity on a new basis. For comrades who have committed mistakes, the policy of "learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones" and "curing the illness to save the patient" should be adopted. The comrades who have

committed mistakes should be given a chance, and should be allowed to correct their mistakes and make further revolution. Don't imitate the old gentleman Mr. Chao in *The True Story of Ah Q*, who forbade Ah Q to make revolution. We should watch and help comrades who have committed mistakes. It is not good to watch only without giving them help, and refuse to do the work. We are opposed to mistakes. Poison is not eatable. We cannot appreciate the bad smell of mistakes. Criticism and struggle should make them come nearer to us and make shortcomings and mistakes leave us as far as possible. We should make analyses on comrades who have committed mistakes. There cannot be more than two possibilities. One is that correction is not possible. I said that we should watch, I mean to watch whether or not it is possible to correct. I said that we should help, I mean to help them to make correction. Some comrades followed others to the other side for the time being. Through criticism and persuasion, plus the change of the objective conditions, many comrades again turned back to us and left these people. The Li Li-san line! and the Wang Ming line were rectified at the Tsunyi Meeting. Afterwards, through a period of 10 years till the 7th National Party Congress, there has been four years of rectification. It was necessary to go through this period of 10 years. To rectify mistakes, one has to go through several stages. You cannot force anybody to rectify his mistakes at one stroke. Marx said: "The double character of commodity is recognized through its exchange several hundred and thousand times." Lo-fu^[5] did not admit his mistake of line at the beginning. At the time of the 7th National Party Congress, through struggles Lo-fu admitted his mistake of line. Through these struggles, Wang Ming had not changed himself, nor had Lo-fu. He relapsed into his old illness, and is still having malaria.^[6] Whenever there was a chance, it would come back. Most of our comrades have corrected themselves. As far as the mistake of line is concerned, historical events have proved that it can be corrected. We must have this faith. Those who cannot correct themselves have been very few. Therefore, it can be seen that the policy of "curing the illness to save the patient" is effective. We must have the kind heart to help them. We have sympathy for the person, but not for his mistake. His mistake is a poison, which must be deeply detested and thoroughly rejected. However, we should not use methods of Wu Sung, Lu chih-sheng and Li Kuei^[7]. They were very determined and might have joined the Communist Party. Their shortcoming was that they did not understand strategy, and did not know how to do political work. We should adopt methods of putting forward the facts and explaining the truth, such as the big debate, the big character poster, the "medium-size-character poster" and the brief Bulletin of Lushan Meeting.

After I came up the Lushan Mountain, I made three remarks: "Our achievement is great. There are quite a lot of problems. The future is bright." Later, quite a lot of problems did come up. They are problems of the Rightist opportunism launching a frantic attack against the Party. There is no more wind of communism blowing. There are no more equalitarianism, harmony and drawing out money. There is also no more pompous exaggeration. At present, the problem is not to oppose the "Left", but to oppose the Right. It is a problem of the Rightist opportunism frantically attacking the Party, attacking the 600 million people, and attacking the vigorous socialist movement. At present, there are people who propose that the more down-to-earth the better. After we have opposed the "Left" inclination for several months, it is natural that a Rightist tendency would come up. There were truly shortcomings and mistakes; but these have

been corrected. They are still making demands for correction. Clinging to these things, they attack the general line, and try to lead the general line astray.

Notes

[1.] The 6th plenary session was held from November 28 to December 10, 1958, during which it was announced that Mao Tse-tung would be a candidate of the Chairmanship of the State no more.

[2.] 7th plenary session was held in April 1959.

[3.] Meetings of Immortals is a peculiar term used by Chinese to mean meetings without rigid agenda or control, i.e., informal meetings.

[4.] i.e., during the ‘Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend’ campaign period.

[5.] Lo-fu is an alias of Chang Wen-tien, who had been General Secretary of CPC Central Committee after Tsunyi Meeting in January 1935, and was a Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs from April 1954 to September 1959.

[6.] Please see the succeeding article “[Letter to Chang Wen-Tien](#)”.

[7.] Three warriors in the novel *Heroes of the Marshes*, all famous for their hot temper.

Letter To Chang Wen-tien

[Excerpt]

August 2, 1959

[SOURCE: Red Guard Publication.]

.....

... Confusion. It’s like drawing water from a well by means of 15 buckets, seven of them coming up and the other eight going down. [You] are being tied up by others and can’t get free. You are getting the consequences of your own doings. Whom can you blame? In my opinion, you have relapsed into your old illness. You haven’t got rid of the original

germs of your old and old disease of malaria. Now you are having spells of cold and fever again. A scholar of former days composed a poem on malaria as follows: “When the spell of cold comes, one feels as if sleeping on the ice. When the spell of fever comes, one feels as if sitting in a cooking steamer. When pain comes, one feels that one’s scalp is cracking. When one trembles, one has to grind one’s teeth. It hurts so much, it hurts so much. Really one passes the difficult time of winter and summer back and forth.” Comrade, is not like this? If so, then that is fine. One like you needs to go through a serious illness. In the *Literary Selections of Chao Ming*, Vol. 34, Mei Sheng’s “*Chi Fa*” [1] says in its last part; “This is also an important saying and wonderful truth in the world. My prince, wouldn’t you want to hear it? Then, the Prince arose from the bed and said: ‘After I have heard what the sage scholar said, I have perspired, and my illness is entirely gone.’ ” Your illness is similar to that of this prince of the Chu Kingdom. If you are interested in, you may read Mei Sheng’s “*Chi Fa*”. Indeed, it’s a wonderful literary piece. You have entirely forgotten the important saying and wonderful truth of Marxism. Therefore, you joined the Military Club, truly a combination of men of civil and military services. What is to be done now? Comrade, I would like to give you a piece of advice: “Thoroughly rectify yourself.” Thanks to your courtesy in calling! me over the telephone several times and saying that you wished to come to my place to talk to me. I am willing to talk with you but I am busy these days. You’ll have to wait for some other day. I have written this letter first to give you a piece of my sincere thought.

Mao Tse-tung

August 2, 1959

Notes

[1] “Chi Fa” is the title of Mei Sheng’s article, meaning literally “seven shots” or “seven utterances”. See Mao’s exposition of this article in “Concerning Mei Sheng’s Chi Fa”, pp 232-234 of this volume.

Comment On A Report: “The Tao-chu Production Brigade Of Tan-ling Commune In Pingchiang County, Hunan, Abolished Scores Of Mess-halls And Then Restored Them Again”

August 5, 1959

Print and circulate this document among the comrades. It is very worthwhile to read. The scores of mess-halls of a production brigade were disbanded at a stroke; then, after a while, they were restored again. The lesson to learn from them is: We should never bow our heads in the face of any difficulty. Things such as the people's commune and the collective mess-hall have their profound economic origin. They should not be blown away by a gust of wind. It is also not possible. Certain mess-hall may be blown away by a gust of wind. However, there will always be some people, even a majority of the people, who will run them again. They will run them again after a few days, or after scores of days, or after several months, or after a still longer time. In short, the wind will blow them back again. Sun Chung-shan[1] said: "There must be the thing following the heavenly truth, answering people's sentiments, conforming to the world trend, and agreeing with human needs which men of foresight and vision will carry out with determination, it will definitely not fail." This statement is correct. Our great leap forward and people's commune belong to this category. There have been difficulties. Mistakes will certainly be committed. However, they can be overcome and corrected. The pessimistic trend of thought corrodes the Party and the people. It is a very bad trend of thought which runs counter to the will of the proletariat and poor people, and goes against Marxism-Leninism.

Mao Tse-tung

August 5, 1959

Notes

[1.] Dr. Sun Yat-sen

Comment On Two Reports: "The Situation Of Wang-kuo-fan Commune Has Always Been Very Good" And "Who Are The People Engaged In Idle Talks Now In The Countryside"

August 6, 1959

Print and circulate these two articles among the comrades. The comrades of Party committees of all provinces, municipalities and districts are requested to print and circulate the report on Wang-kuo-fan Commune among all Party committees of people's communes with necessary introductory notes. All Party committees of communes are requested to study it and see what experiences from it can be adopted by them. In my opinion, all of them can be adopted: First, run the commune with diligence and frugality; second, raise more pigs (except Moslems who keep no pigs); third, breed more big

animals; fourth, increase the number of big farm tools; fifth, mess-hall operation; sixth, do work on a solid ground by seeking truth from facts; and seventh consult with the masses on anything and persist in the mass line. All these are very good. I believe that in every special district there must be one or several communes which are well run as the Wang-kuo-fan Commune. You are requested to try carefully to find them out. When you have found them, you are to study them, write articles for publication and publicize their experiences. This article on "Who Are the People Engaged in Idle Talks Now in the Countryside" is also worthwhile to read. They are connected with those who are now engaged in idle talking at Lushan.

Mao Tse-tung

August 6, 1959

Comment On A Report On Secretary Chang Kai-fan Of Secretariat Of CPC Anhwei Provincial Committee Giving Order To Abolish Mess-Halls In Wu-Wei County

August 10, 1959

Print and circulate it among the comrades. There are right opportunists in the Central Committee, that is, those comrades in the Military Club. There are also right opportunists at the provincial level, such as Secretary Chang Kai-fan of the Secretariat of the Anhwei Provincial Party Committee. I suspect that these people are opportunists who have sneaked into the Party. During the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, they maintain the bourgeois stand and try to undermine proletarian dictatorship, split the Communist Party, organize factions within the Party, spread their influence, disintegrate the vanguards of the proletariat, and establish their opportunist party. A clear evidence is the fact that the main components of this clique were originally important members of Kao Kang's clique of conspirators and renegades. During the period of the bourgeois democratic revolution, they gladly took part in it, and did have some revolutionary spirit. Yet on the method of revolution, they often made mistakes. They had no spiritual preparation for the socialist revolution. When the socialist revolution came, they began to feel uncomfortable. They very early joined the anti-Party clique of Kao Kang, which tried to attain its reactionary goal by means of conspiracy. Now, the remnants of the Kao Kang's clique, who evaded the dragnet, are again trying to make trouble. They are impatient and anxious for a showdown. It will be beneficial to both the Party and to such people for them to be exposed quickly. So long as they are willing to wash their brains, there is still the possibility to win them over, because they possess the duplicity of being reactionary and revolutionary. At present, they have their anti-socialist program in opposition to the great leap forward and the people's commune. To save them, it is necessary to completely expose them among the broad cadres so that their market will be made to shrink smaller and smaller. The policy of curing the illness to save the patient must be carried out. The method of putting forward facts and explaining the truth must

be employed. They should also be given the chance to make revolution and to work. Criticism should be strict, but treatment may be lenient.

Mao Tse-tung

August 10, (1959).

Comment On The Report On Liaoning Province Carrying Out CPC Central Committee'S Directive To Oppose Right-Deviation

[Excerpt]

August 12, 1959

Print and circulate it among all provinces and municipalities. How is the situation in the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions? Have they already made the same arrangements as the Liaoning province in opposing right-deviation and going all out? What are their results? It seems that all the places have right-deviationist sentiments, rightist ideas and rightist activities in existence and growing. They are different in degrees, In some localities, the right opportunists are present with their sentiments of making frantic attacks against the Party. It is necessary to make analyses in accordance with the concrete conditions in order to put down this evil wind and wicked influence. Liaoning province has done it quickly in proper steps and with remarkable results. They gained the initiative and forced the right opportunists to the passive position. This experience is worthwhile to ...

Concerning Mei Sheng's “*Chi Fa*”[\[1\]](#)

August 16, 1959

This article has been printed and circulated earlier, and is worthwhile to read. It is a descendant of the ancient *sau* style of writing poems, but also had some creative development. The *sau* style had its democratic color, belonged to the romantic school, and threw a dagger of criticism at the corrupt rulers. Among the poets of this school, Chu Yuan was by far the most prominent; Sung Yu, Ching Cha, Chia Yi and Mei Sheng were a little inferior but had their delightful points. Look at the atmosphere of “*Chi Fa*”, is there not plenty of the color of criticism? “The Prince of Chu Kingdom was ill, a visitor from Wu Kingdom went to enquire after his health.” From the start, he denounced the decadent upper ruling class: “Well, to travel in a sedan-chair or a carriage is to atrophy you limbs. To live in a magnificent and cool palace is the medium of cold and fever. To keep beautiful girls with white teeth and crescent eyebrows is to destroy your sexual

health. To take rich foods is to get ulcers for your stomach.” These words are truths good for ten thousand years. At present, our country being under the leadership of the Communist Party, all the intellectuals and working personnel of the Party, the government and the army must do some labor, including walking, swimming, mountain climbing and calisthenic exercises, as Pavlov said, not to mention going to the countryside to participate in such still more concrete labor as farming. In short, we must exert our efforts and oppose right-deviation. Mei Sheng directly attacked Chu Prince: “Now Your Highness have a sallow complexion and weak limbs, stiff muscles and drained veins, and languid and thin hands and feet. You have girls from Yueh waiting on before you, and concubines from Chi following behind you, playing around and feasting all the time, and indulging in pleasures in hidden chambers. This is to take poisons deliberately and to play with the claws of ferocious beasts. Your illness has a ! very deep and long origin; and you have constantly indulged in this. Even if you get the best physician and the best surgeon in the world, what can they do for you?” What Mei Sheng said is somewhat like our method of shouting aloud to comrades who have committed mistakes: “You are extremely seriously ill. You’ll die if not cured.” Then, the patient will be unable to sleep for several days, or several weeks, or several months. He is worried. In this way, there will be some hope. For illness such as right or “left” opportunism has its historical and social sources. “Your illness has a very deep and long origin; and you have constantly indulged in this.” The method of cure is what we call “criticism”. The visitor said: “Your Highness need no medicine or any treatment, but can be cured by some important saying and wonderful truth. Do you not like to hear?” This saying and truth constitute the main theme of the article. The first paragraph of the article is a prologue. The following seven paragraphs deal with affairs which were not proper but attractive and new. They show the negative side of the author’s main theme. The writing is fine. The paragraph on “watching Great Waves at Kuang-ling” attains its climax of literary art. The ninth paragraph is its conclusion, coming back to the important saying and wonderful truth. Then, the Prince was elated, “began to perspire and suddenly recovered from his illness.” The method of persuasion was used, not the method of pressure. The method of putting forward facts and explaining the truth was immediately effective. It is somewhat like our “leninet treatment.” The first and last two paragraphs are the main theme, which must be read. If you have no interest, you may omit reading the other paragraphs. We should invite Engels, Kautsky, Plekhanov, Stalin, Li Ta-chao, Lu Hsun, Chu Chiu-pai and others to “explain the essential details of the world and truth! s of all things,” to explain the necessity of leaping forward and the reasons for the commune. They should also talk about the extreme importance of putting politics in command. Let Marx “make his survey” and Lenin “make his calculation.” There can never be any failure. I read this article in my boyhood, but have not touched it for more than 40 years. Recently, I suddenly had an inkling so I took it out for a look, and it seemed as if meeting an old friend. With my sincerity of a country-folk who offers basking as a tribute, I wish to offer this to my comrades. What Mei Sheng represented was the lower stratum of the landlord class, which had a line of striving upstream and exerting efforts. Of course, this was about the upper and lower strata of the feudal class, and not about the two antagonistic classes of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the socialist society. Our line of striving upstream and exerting efforts represents the will of the revolutionary proletariat and the hundreds of millions of laboring peasants. Those whom Mei Sheng attacked were people

of the despondent, pessimistic, degenerated and rightist upper ruling class. Now we also have this kind of people. Mei Sheng was a native of Huai-yin in Han Dynasty. He was a literary official in the service of Liu Pi, King of Wu, during the reign of Emperor Han Wen Ti. He wrote this article for the nobles of Kingdom Wu to read. Later, the literary style of “*Chi*” flourished, but none of the writings is good. *The Literary Selections of Chao Ming* includes Tsao Chih’s “*Chi Chi*” (“Seven Addresses”), and Chang Hsieh’s “*Chi Ming*” (“Seven Commands”) which contained words to summon hermits for the ruling class, and with the tune in opposition to those of Chu, Sung, Chia and Mei. They are all quite insipid.

Mao Tse-tung

August 16, (1959).

Notes

[1.] This is a very interesting article, which Mao Tse-tung wrote and circulated among the participants of the Lushan Meeting on the last day of the conference. This is evidently connected with his letter to Chang wen-tien on August 2, 1959 (35) in which he quoted from Mei Sheng’s “Chi Fa”, See [pp 225-226](#) of this volume.

Why Do Right Opportunists Now Launch An Offensive?

August 16, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Comrades who committed errors of right opportunism did not air their opinions at the Changchow conference last November, nor at the Pei-tai-ho conference on high production targets, nor at the Wu-chang conference last November, nor at the Peking conference last January, nor at the Chengchow conference last February, nor at the Shanghai conference toward the end of last March and the beginning of last April, but they did air them at the Lu-shan conference.

Why didn't they bring up their opinions on those occasions, but did so now? Because what they advocate could not be brought up on those occasions. If they had correct ideas, better than ours, they should have brought them up at the Pei-tai-ho conference. They waited until the Central Committee had solved the problems, or most of the problems, and then brought up their opinions, believing that if they did not bring them up now, they could not very well do so later. They felt that if they did not bring them up now, the situation would have changed for the better a few months from now. Once the opportune time is gone, they will be put in a very unfavorable position. That's why they were anxious to make the move now.

Comment On Chang Wen-tien's Letter

August 18, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Print more than 160 copies and distribute them to our comrades. Send copies by air or regular mail to those who have left. I warmly welcome this letter from Comrade Lo Fu (Chang Wen-Tien)

Mao Tse-tung

18 August 1959

Attachment:

Lo Fu's Farewell Message to Mao Tse-tung on the Morning of 18 August

Comrade Tse-tung:

I have just undergone a major operation, which should be beneficial to my health. I sincerely thank you and other comrades of the Central Committee for your help. I must sever relations with my reactionary self of yesterday. Today, I read your comments on Mei Sheng's essay, "*Ch'i Fa*", on machine guns and other subjects, and was greatly moved.

I did not call on you because I did not receive any notification from you. I descend the hills today. I hope to see you in Peking and to receive more instructions from you.

Chang Wen-t'ien

Forenoon, 18 August

Comment On P'eng Te-huai's Letter Of 9 September

September 9, 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

This document is to be printed and distributed to party organizations at all levels from the Central Committee down to branch headquarters and also to all comrades attending the Peking conference on military and foreign affairs.

I warmly welcome Comrade P'eng Te-huai's letter, believing that his stand and viewpoint are correct and his attitude is sincere. If he thoroughly changes and makes no more major vacillations (minor vacillations are inevitable), he will "instantly become a Buddha," or rather a Marxist. I recommend that all comrades of our party welcome the attitude shown by P'eng Te-huai in this letter. Let us severely criticize the mistakes he has made and at the same time welcome every improvement he has made. We should take this two-sided attitude to help an old comrade who has been with us for 31 years. We should take the same attitude toward all other comrades who have made mistakes but have indicated their intention to amend. We are confident that this policy will be able to influence people and that under certain circumstances people will change, except for certain individuals. I believe that Comrade P'eng Te-huai's suggestion concerning the assignment of work to him in the coming period is basically right. It is a good idea to study for a few years. However, a man advanced in age is not fit for physical labor. It is all right for him to go to factories and rural areas to observe and investigate and to do research work for a period of time every year. The Central Committee will discuss this matter with Comrade P'eng Te-huai and make a proper decision.

Mao Tse-tung

9 September 1959

Appendix:

P'eng Te-huai's Letter

Chairman:

The Eighth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee and the expanded meeting of the Military Commission have thoroughly disclosed and criticized my mistakes and have eliminated the peril of dissension within the party. It gives me the last opportunity to correct my mistakes. I sincerely thank you and other comrades for your patience in educating and helping me. The party's systematic and historical criticism of my mistakes was absolutely necessary. Only by such criticism could I be made to truly realize the extreme danger of my mistakes and thus make it possible to eliminate the bad influence of my mistakes within and without the party. I now fully realize that my bourgeois world outlook and methodology were deep rooted, and my individualism was most serious. I now also realize what big price the party and the people have paid in cultivating me, and that if I had not been exposed and criticized in time, what danger there would be! In the past because of my bourgeois stand, I considered all your well-intentioned and sincere criticisms as blows at me. For this reason in each struggle against the erroneous line I did not receive any education nor any enlightenment. My serious errors were not corrected. I have been unworthy of your teaching and patience with me for the past 30 years. I am filled with indescribable shame and remorse. I have been ungrateful to the party, the people and you. Henceforth I must make a serious effort to thoroughly reflect upon my mistakes and study the theories of Marxism-Leninism in order to reform my own thought and make sure that I won't again do anything detrimental to the party and the people in my old age. I therefore petition the Central Committee to consider permitting me to study after the adjournment of the expanded meeting of the Military Commission or to go to a people's commune in Peking where I may learn and labor so that in the collective life of the working class I may get physical training and thought reform. Whether my proposal is prop! er or not I petition you to consider and favor me with a reply.

Respectfully yours,

P'eng Te-huai

Speech At The Enlarged Session Of The Military Affairs Committee And The External Affairs Conference

September 11, 1959

Comrades! This has been a very good meeting. I think that people who bear malice in their hearts will move towards their own opposites. Those who bear malice in their hearts towards the world class, the world parties, the Party's cause, the class cause and the people's cause will move towards their own opposites. That is to say, their aims cannot be achieved. For instance, when someone wants to reach a certain goal and this goal finally cannot be reached, he suffers a moral defeat and becomes isolated from the

masses. There are, for example, a number of comrades who in my view are not Marxists, and who hitherto have never been Marxists. What are they? They are fellow-travellers of Marxism. If we want to argue this point further there is plenty of material. For example, a lot of material has been published recently — material from the period of the anti-Japanese war, from the period of the Long March, for example about activities tending to sow discord. The material from the period of the war against Japan contained such things as ‘Liberty, Equality and Fraternity’; ‘the anti-Japanese front cannot be divided into left, centre and right’; ‘it is incorrect to make a division into left, centre and right’; ‘what you do not wish done to yourself, do not do to others’. Where class relationships prevail, where there is the proletariat and bourgeoisie, the oppressors and the oppressed, to put forward such principles as this, to say things like ‘when the prince commits a crime the people are implicated’ such a viewpoint cannot be called Marxist: it absolutely cannot be said to be a Marxist viewpoint. It is an anti-Marxist viewpoint which deceives the people, a bourgeois viewpoint. Later on the anti-Party views of Kao, Jao, P’eng, Huang[1] — such as their theory of an ‘army party’ disrupted the proper relationships within the Party, holding that there was a domain here and a domain there. Their views and their behaviour were not those of Marxists. This time much material has come to light about their splitting activities many years before the Lushan Conference as well as about their Lushan Programme. In addition there is much material about the period of the Li Li-san Line. Most of this has been written down. What everybody has been bringing to light is what I have talked about just now. So if we want to argue the point of view which I have just talked about — that they have never been Marxists but only fellow-travellers and that they are merely bourgeois elements and opportunist elements who have infiltrated into our Party — if we are to prove this point and argue it to a conclusion there is plenty of material. I have no intention of doing so now because this would mean writing articles and could give a lot of comrades work to do. So I merely raise it. It is perfectly understandable that bourgeois revolutionaries should enter the Communist Party and that their bourgeois world outlook and standpoint should not have changed. They cannot avoid making mistakes. At crucial times it is impossible for such fellow-travellers not to make mistakes.

The Lushan Conference, this meeting, and the various levels of Party organization throughout the country have all discussed the resolutions of the Eighth Session of the Eighth Plenum and we have made use of this affair to educate the broad masses and enable them to raise their level and become more conscious. This has proved completely that the great majority of people, the great majority of the cadres of the whole Party, say ninety-five per cent, do not agree with them. It also proves that our Party is mature as demonstrated by the comrades’ reaction to their attitude.

Bourgeois elements have infiltrated our Communist Party. Amidst our Party membership there are many bourgeois and petit-bourgeois elements. These should be analysed and divided into two groups. The great majority are good people. They can enter Communism because they are willing to accept Marxism. The minority are probably one, two, three, four or five per cent — this sort of figure — perhaps one per cent, perhaps two per cent, perhaps three per cent, perhaps four per cent, perhaps five per cent. During the past few weeks at provincial level conferences, quite a few high cadres have been exposed as

right-opportunist elements and trouble-makers, whose one fear is that the world should be free of trouble. Whenever there is trouble they are happy. Their principle is: 'If the world is at peace, the four quarters are tranquil and work goes well: they are uncomfortable. As soon as the wind blows and the grass waves, they are happy.' For example if there is not enough pork, not enough vegetables, not enough soap, not enough women's hair-grips, they seize the opportunity to say, 'You have done things badly! They say it is your affair and not theirs. When organizations hold meetings and reach decisions they don't utter a murmur. For instance at the Peitaiho Conference not a murmur, at the Chengchow Conference not a murmur, at the Wuch'ang Conference not a murmur. At the Shanghai Conference they did mumble something but we could not hear them. Then when things happened (when they thought things had happened) then, as you can see, it was all vegetables, pork, grain in a number of areas, soap and even umbrellas. For example there was a shortage of umbrellas in Chekiang and they called it a 'maladjustment of proportions', 'petit-bourgeois fanaticism', etc. It will be very difficult for this small minority of people to enter communism, to become real Marxists. When I say it will be difficult, I don't mean that it would be impossible. As Liu Po-ch'eng said: 'It is necessary to be completely reborn.' Those who were warlords were after all warlords, but what about those who were not warlords, such as Comrade XXX? How could he be counted as a warlord? He was a literary lord, an academic lord. If you are not completely reborn you cannot enter the door of communism.

Five times there have been mistakes of line: the [Li] Li-san Line, the first and second Wang Ming Lines,^[2] the Kao-Jao Line and now this P'eng-Huang-Chang-Chou Line. Some people have made mistakes five times, some have not made mistakes five times. For example comrade XXX was not yet with us at the time of the Li-san Line. As for P'eng and Huang they were attacked at the time of the Li-san Line. This is no coincidence. Regarding the serious nature of the five erroneous lines, on the last two occasions — that is during the Kao-Jao and P'eng-Huang Lines plots were hatched to split the Party. This contravenes Party discipline. A Marxist party must have discipline. They do not know that Lenin said that the party of the proletariat must have discipline, iron discipline. As for these comrades, what kind of discipline do they have? Iron discipline, steel discipline or metal, wood, water, fire and earth discipline, or wooden discipline, or is it bean-curd discipline? Water discipline means no discipline at all. In that case how can we talk of iron discipline? To carry out splitting activities is to break discipline, the purpose and result necessarily being to destroy the proletarian dictatorship and to establish another kind of dictatorship.

The banner of unity is exceedingly important. The Marxist slogan for unity is 'Proletarians of the world unite!' But not them! For them it would seem the fewer the better! They want to have their own clique and to do their own thing, acting against the wishes of the broad masses. At the Lushan Conference I said that they do not mention the slogan of unity because if this slogan were raised they would be unable to carry out their activities. This slogan is not in their interests so they do not dare to mention it. The unity in question even includes people who have made mistakes, who will be helped to correct their mistakes in order to unite with them once again, let alone those who have not made mistakes. But these people wish to destroy them. Their policy is a destructive policy, not

a policy of unity. The banner which they wave is the banner of destruction — the destruction of those who hold opinions differing from their own. They consider that such people are bad. Yet these so-called bad people are really the great majority, more than ninety-five per cent.

If you want unity you must have discipline, in order that our whole nation may build a strong country within the space of a few five-year plans. The present task is for the people of the whole country, together with the whole Party, to build a strong country within the space of a few five-year plans. For this iron discipline is needed, it cannot be done without it, so we must unite. I ask you, how can we achieve this aim otherwise? Is it possible to build a great socialist country within the space of a few five-year plans? In the past we had to make revolution, now we must carry out construction. Is this possible or not? Without discipline nothing is possible. Unity requires discipline. As for the many documents about P'eng Te-huai in the T'aihang Mountains,[3] will comrades please compare Sun Yat-sen's Manifesto of the first National Congress of the Kuomintang with the views expressed by P'eng Te-huai in the T'aihang Mountains at the time of the anti-Japanese war. One was a Kuomintang member, the other a Communist Party member. As regards time, one was written in 1924, the other in 1938, '39 and '40. The communist had retrogressed in comparison with the Kuomintang member. The name of the Kuomintang member was Sun Yat-sen and he wanted to progress. Sun Yatsen was influenced by the Communist Party. Why did he write that piece? Recently I found the text and had a look at it. Sun Yat-sen's Manifesto of the First National Congress of the Kuomintang contained the idea of class-analysis. How could he have the iron discipline of the communists? How could he be in agreement with proletarian discipline? Without speaking the language of the communists, without a common standpoint and common views, discipline cannot be established. I say that P'eng Te-huai is not the equal of Sun Yat-sen. As for Chang Wen-t'ien,[4] he is not Sun Yat-sen's equal either. Sun Yat-sen was revolutionary at that time; these comrades were retrogressing. They wanted to destroy the organization which had already been built up. The slogans which they raised were beneficial to the enemy and detrimental to the class and to the people. There were more views of this kind, for example ...

It is absolutely impermissible to go behind the back of our fatherland to collude with a foreign country. Comrades have held meetings to criticize this affair because they are all in organizations of the Communist Party; they are all Marxists. We cannot allow one group to sabotage another. We cannot allow Chinese Communist Party members to sabotage the party organizations of foreign countries and to provoke one group of people to oppose another group. At the same time we cannot allow people to entertain foreign provocation behind the back of the Centre.

Now I am going to admonish some comrades who have made mistakes. Prepare yourselves to listen to some off-hand remarks. In the past I have admonished others, for example Comrade Lo Ping-hui, who had committed mistakes during that period.[5] He got very angry, and afterwards I exhorted him further, saying 'Don't get angry. You have committed mistakes, so let people talk — let them talk until they have no more to say. The reason they won't have any more to say is that you will have corrected your errors. If

you adopt a friendly attitude towards people, and if you display a spirit of self-criticism towards your own errors, why would others go on talking? They won't talk any more.' You comrades who have committed errors at present, I urge you to prepare to listen to some offhand remarks. As soon as your errors are mentioned, you shouldn't be frightened out of your wits, as though people were going to talk about you for years on end. I can't go on all that long. It depends on how you go about correcting your errors. If you correct them quickly, people will stop talking about you within a few months. If you correct them more slowly, then they'll stop talking about you after a few years. The main thing is to correct your errors, whether it be fast or slowly. You must be sincere with people, and not dissemble. You must be honest, and speak honestly. I appeal to you comrades who have committed mistakes, you must place yourselves on the side of the overwhelming majority, you must cooperate with the overwhelming majority; you must not cooperate only with the minority who share your tastes. If only you can carry out these two points. First, you must be able to listen to remarks, you must prepare to listen, you must stiffen your scalps. When you spoke, I listened; I agreed that what you said was correct! I did indeed commit that error! This fellow Ah Q had some defects, which were manifested in the fact that his head wasn't all that pretty, it was covered with ringworm. Because he couldn't bear to speak of it, others insisted on talking about it, and as soon as they did he would fly into a rage. For example, even when his ringworm scars got bright red he wouldn't speak of it, and if others mentioned brightness, he flew into a rage. The author describes a naive peasant who has not yet awakened to consciousness. Ah Q is a good man, he definitely didn't organize a faction, but he was a man who was not conscious, he couldn't bear to talk about shortcomings. He didn't take the initiative, and because he didn't take the initiative, others wanted to talk about it; as soon as they spoke of it, he flew into a rage, and as soon as he flew into a rage he got into a fight, and when he got into a fight he never won, and then he would say it was [like] a father being beaten by his son. People would say to him: 'Ah Q! If you don't want me to beat you, talk about a father beating his son, and then I won't beat you.' 'All right,' [he would say]. 'It's a father beating his son.' But as soon as the person who was beating him had gone away, he would say it was a son beating his father, and he would once again feel satisfied with himself.

Comrades who have committed mistakes must prepare to listen to some remarks, they must prepare to listen quite a lot. They must be honest and sincere with people, and not lie to people. Another point is that they must stand with the majority. All they have to do is to observe these few points, and I think they can definitely reform. Otherwise, they will not be able to reform. If they aren't prepared to listen to remarks, if they aren't sincere with people, if they tell lies, and if in addition they do not stand with the majority, then it will be very difficult. 'Who save sages and worthies can avoid making mistakes?' In reality, this proverb is not appropriate either, for even the sages made mistakes. 'The faults of the superior man are like the eclipses of the sun and moon. He has his faults, and all men see them; he changes again, and all men look up to him.'^[6] We are not Confucius, but we see that even Confucius made mistakes, so we must conclude that all men without exception make some mistakes, more or fewer, bigger or smaller. It doesn't matter if we make mistakes, we must not let mistakes become a burden to us, we mustn't see them as something extraordinary, we should just go ahead and correct them. 'The

faults of the superior man are like the eclipses of the sun and moon.' It's like when the celestial dog eats the sun and the moon[7] — he makes a mistake, and everyone sees it. When he corrects his mistake, 'all men look up' to him.

We must learn some things, we must study Marxism-Leninism. I am very much in favour of XXX's proposals regarding our tasks in the domain of study. All of us without exception must study. What shall we do if there isn't enough time? If there isn't enough time, we must squeeze in the time. The problem lies in cultivating the habit of study; once we have done this, we will be able to go on studying. I say these things first of all for the benefit of those comrades who have committed errors, but my words are also directed to all of us comrades, including myself. There are many things I haven't studied. I am a person with many shortcomings, I am by no means perfect. Very often, there are times when I don't like myself. I have not mastered all the various domains of Marxist learning. And, for example, I don't know foreign languages well either. I have only just begun recently to study economic work. But, comrades, I study with determination, and I will go on studying until I die; when I die, that will be the end of it! In sum, as long as I am alive I shall study every day. Let us all create an environment of study. I think I can learn a bit too; otherwise, when the time comes for me to see Marx, I shall be in an embarrassing fix. If he asks me a few questions and I am unable to answer, what will I do? He is certainly very interested in all aspects of the Chinese revolution. I'm not very good either in natural science or engineering.

There are so many things to study now, how shall we go about it? Just keep on in the same way, learning a bit, persevering and penetrating a bit deeper. I say that, if you are resolved to do it, you can certainly learn, whether you are young or old. I will give you an example. I really learned to swim well only in 1954; previously I had not mastered it. In 1954, there was an indoor swimming-pool at Tsinghua University. I went there every evening with my bag, changed my clothes, and for three months without interruption I studied the nature of the water. Water doesn't drown people! Water is afraid of people, people aren't afraid of water, of course, there are exceptions, but it should be possible to swim in all kinds of water. This is a major premise. For example, the Yangtse at Wuhan is water, so it's possible to swim in the Yangtse at Wuhan. So I refuted those comrades who opposed my swimming in the Yangtse. I said, 'You haven't studied formal logic.' If it's water, you can swim in it, except in certain conditions: for example, if the water is only an inch deep you can't swim in it; if it's frozen solid you can't swim in it; you can't swim in places where there are sharks, nor where there are whirlpools, as in the three gorges of the Yangtse. Apart from certain circumstances, it should be possible to swim wherever there is water, this is the major premise, the major premise derived from practice. Thus, for example, the Yangtse at Wuhan is water; hence, the conclusion follows that it is possible to swim in the Yangtse at Wuhan. The Milo and Pearl rivers are water, you can swim in them. You can swim in [the sea off] Peitaiho; it's water, isn't it? Wherever there's water, you should be able to swim. This is the major premise; apart from the fact that you can't swim in one inch of water, and you can't swim in water that's at a temperature of over 100 degrees, or in water that's so cold it's frozen, or where there are sharks or whirlpools — apart from these circumstances, all water can be swum in; this is a fact. Do you believe it? If you are resolute, if you only have the will, I am

convinced that all things can be successfully accomplished. I exhort you comrades to study.

Recently, we have seen the great ceremonial hall at the T'ien An Men. It's really quite a thing. Would you all like to go and have a look? (All those present loudly shout: 'Yes!') Get Comrade Wan Li to tell you about it. This chap's name is Wan, isn't it? He should be able to run ten thousand *li* in a day.^[8] It has been only ten months; so many people said they didn't believe it [could be done], the Soviet experts we called in said they didn't believe it. By June of this year, the Soviet experts said it might be possible, and when September came, they expressed great admiration, saying that China really had a Great Leap Forward. 12,000 people, brought from all over the country, [representing] the force, the technical capacity, the human capacity, of all the provinces in the country, taking no Sundays off at all, working three shifts a day, and not working on any piecework wage system; many of them began working eight hours a day, and ended up working twelve hours, without a stop. Did they want to be paid for the extra four hours? They didn't. There were also people who would not stop work as long as [a particular] project was not completed, who did not sleep for two days and nights; they remained at their place of work not for eight hours, or twelve hours, but for forty-eight hours. Did they need material incentives? Did they want a few extra *yüan*? Say one *yüan* for each hour? They didn't want it, these people did not want it. The material incentive remained just the material incentive, it was nothing but those 50 *yüan* of [monthly] wages, just that little bit but they were striving for a common cause. 12,000 staff and workers completed this big piece of work in the space of ten months; this is not merely 'to each according to his work', but it also involved Lenin's great contribution called the 'Communist Saturday #8217;, it included work which was not compensated for.

Comrades, go and have a look ... There is also the Miyün reservoir ... I think the combination of politics in command and material incentives, of political work and the necessary remuneration according to work, is a good thing. We are all resolute, and firm of will. That which people thought could not be successfully completed has in fact been completed; I'm talking about this big auditorium, which a great many people thought could not be completed. Very many people are hurling insults at our Great Leap Forward and people's communes, but they will nevertheless succeed, and indeed have already succeeded, or are going to continue achieving results. For example, we will progress rapidly in iron and steel, in industry, and also in agriculture. Studying is like this too; if only we are resolute, I think we can study well. We need not fear that there will be too much to do, and that the time will be too short, we can fit it in! Let us develop this habit. We must conquer this world, our objective is this world; as for how we should go about our work on the sun, we won't talk about that for the present. As for the moon, Mercury or Venus, and any of the other eight planets apart from the earth, we may investigate them in the future, and visit them if we can get up there. As for our work, our struggles, I think they're still going to be on earth. If we're going to build up a strong country, we must definitely be resolute like this, as we have had to be to build this big auditorium, so many dams, factories, etc. I think this is definitely the way.

Let the whole Party and the whole people unite! Proletarians of the world, unite! We can certainly attain our goal!

Notes

[References are given here as provided by the Maoist Documentation Project. They are significantly different in at least one existing edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. VIII. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1.] Huang K'o-ch'eng (1902-), PLA Chief of Staff from October 1958 to September 1959, was regarded as P'eng Te-huai's principal accomplice and dismissed from office at the same time. The link between the 'P'eng-Huang' (or 'P'eng-Huang-Chang [Wen-t'ien] — Chou [Hsiao-chou]') group and that of Kao and Jao was further elaborated on at the time of the Cultural Revolution. See *Talk at the Central Work Conference*.

[2.] i.e.; the left line of the Russian Returned Students, mentioned above ([Speech at the Lushan Conference, note 14](#)), and Wang Ming's line of the Yen-an period, which was denounced as right opportunist or capitulationist, not stressing sufficiently the independence of the Chinese Communist Party vis-à-vis the Kuomintang.

[3.] For Mao's criticism of P'eng's line in the 1940s, see his 'Letter Criticizing P'eng Te-huai's Talk on Democratic Education', 6 June 1943, in *Chinese Law and Government*, Vol. I, No. 4, Winter 1968-9, pp. 7-9.

[4.] Chang Wen-t'ien (c. 1898-), pseudonym Lo Fu, a member of the 'Returned Student Faction', succeeded Ch'in Pang-hsien (Po Ku) as Secretary-General at the Tsunyi Conference of January 1935. He was Chinese Ambassador to Moscow from 1951 to 1955, and thereafter a vice-minister of Foreign Affairs until his fall in September 1959.

[5.] Lo Ping-hui (1897-1946) was an important military leader from the time he joined the Chinese Communist Party in 1929 until his death. It is not known how he exposed himself to Mao's criticism, but it may have been in connection with his participation in the New Fourth Army Incident of January 1941, in which he commanded a detachment.

[6.] *Analects*, Book XIX, Ch. 21.

[7.] According to Chinese mythology, eclipses occur when the celestial dog eats the sun or the moon.

[8.] Wan Li was Minister of Urban Construction from May 1956 to February 1958, and thus responsible for projects such as this. Subsequently he became a secretary of the

Peking Party Committee and Vice-Mayor of Peking. His name (presumably a pseudonym) means literally 'ten thousand li'; hence Mao's pun.

Intra Party Correspondence

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Comrade X X X:

This item is very good. Please have it published after it has been studied within the New China News Agency. It looks like the hog raising enterprise will develop on a massive scale. Except for the minority nationalities that ban pork, the entire country should carry it out in accordance with the methods used by the Wang Chien Shou People's Commune of Wu Chiao County, Hopei Province. In Wu Chiao County the accumulation of capital was easy, the policy was correct, the drive was strong and development was rapid. Very high enthusiasm is the key to it all. Procrastinating feeling that neither this nor that could be done and that there are layers upon layers of difficulties — these are the world outlook of a coward, a lazy bone. It has none of the driving ambition and strong determination of Marxism-Leninism. These people are a long way from the style of a true communist. I have advised them to think it over carefully and rectify their incorrect world outlook. I suggested that the communist party committees of the provinces, municipalities, autonomous regions, districts, counties and communes, as well as the party organizations of administrative areas, production teams and production squads seriously consider and study the hog-raising enterprises and the raising of cattle, sheep, donkeys, mules, horses, chickens, ducks, rabbits and other enterprises and plan and adopt concrete measures for running such enterprises. I also suggested the establishment of a committee or group on animal husbandry and domestic fowl raising enterprises. This is to consist of three or 5-9 persons. A comrade who is knowledgeable and has the enthusiasm for this kind of work and good at carrying out work is to be the responsible leader of this committee or group. That is to say a strong person should be assigned to provide the leadership. The production of animal fodder should be carried out on a large scale. There are various fine and coarse animal fodder, but it seems that corn is king of them all. This is the way it is being done in the U.S.; and the Soviet Union is also vigorously carrying this out now. In China, the Wu Chiao County of Hopeh province has also begun this and it makes a person very happy to see it. In hog raising, there certainly must be many areas, which are as good as Wu Chiao County. The entire country should unfold this operation on a massive scale. And this matter must be reviewed as equally important as that of raising food grains and elevating corn to staple food. Some suggest elevating hog raising to the leading position among the raising of six types of domestic animals and not in the order of "horse, cattle, sheep, chicken, dog and pig." I raise both hands in approval. For hogs to be in the leading position is perfectly reasonable. The great pedologist and agriculturist, Mr Wei Lien [Verin ?] of the Soviet Union stressed that agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry are interdependent. Each is indispensable to the other and

the three must be placed on the same level of importance. This is entirely correct. We hold that agriculture and forestry are the progenitors in the development of animal husbandry and animal husbandry is the progeny of agriculture and forestry enterprises. After that, animal husbandry becomes the progenitor of agriculture and forestry enterprises (mainly agriculture) and agriculture and forestry become the progenies. This is the principle underlying the balanced and equal positions the three occupy and their interdependence. In the U.S. the planting enterprise is carried out in conjunction with animal husbandry. Our country must also take this route because it is an experience proven to be truly effective. The source of fertilizers in our country is, first of all, from the raising of hogs and big stock animals. If we could achieve the objective ratio of one hog to a person and one hog to a *mou* of land, the major source of fertilizer will then be resolved. This is chemical fertilizer 10 times better than inorganic chemical fertilizer. A ! hog is a small scale, organic chemical fertilizer factory. Furthermore, a hog has meat. It has bristles, skin, and bones, and it has viscera (which can be used as raw materials for manufacturing medicine). So why don't we take advantage of it? Fertilizer is food for plants, plants are food for animals and animals, in turn, are food for humankind. Therefore, from this it can be seen that it is definitely within reason to raise hogs and other stock animals on a big scale. It seems that it will be possible to accomplish this glorious and great mission within one or two five-year plans. Providing agriculture with machinery is the decisive factor in the development, on a huge scale of the three-in-one combination of agriculture, forestry and animal husbandry. The ministry of agricultural machine building [referring to the Eighth Ministry of Machine Building] has been established this year. From all appearances, the mechanization of agriculture is not too far off.

Mao Tse-tung

11 October 1959

Comments On Reply To Comrades A. V. Sanina And V. G. Vinshire

Circa 1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Fundamentally, this is incorrect. The basic standpoint is mistrust of the peasants, distrust of the peasants. Agricultural machines were tightly held, and as a result, the state has the peasants under rigid control. Likewise, the peasants rigidly controlled the state.

From an overall point of view we do not perceive the role played by man. In the two transitions, Stalin was unable to find the means and method. He spoke only on the

relationship of production and did not talk about the superstructure. In China, the rectification movement, the sending down of cadres to lower levels to do manual labor, the two participations and one reform [workers' participation in management and cadres participation in production and the reform of irrational rules and regulations], the elimination of old rules and regulations, for example, are all political problems. They are problems belonging to the superstructure. He talked about economics but said nothing about politics.

It appears that the problems of the transition from the system of collective ownership to the system of ownership by all the people has not been resolved. Let us air it a little and study it.

“All for one, one for all.” This phrase is incorrect. It was not translated properly. Systems are the principal manifestations of the concept of bourgeois rights. A portion of our educational system has been destroyed. The three bad styles of work and the five undesirable airs have also been eliminated. With the production of commodities and the law of value yet to be implemented, it is not possible to expect the elimination of all concepts of bourgeois rights.

With the exception of rights and rich peasants, everyone wants to join the communes. However, success cannot be attained in a single step. The commune must, on one hand, develop production for its own consumption and, on the other hand, develop the production of marketable commodities. Our nation is deficient in commodities. It is a country insufficient in marketable grains. Communes should further develop the production of commodities to improve livelihood. This is the problem our economists avoid discussing. If the production of commodities is not carried out wages cannot be paid. The concept of bourgeois rights must definitely be eliminated. Wages, [preferential] treatment and grades are all wrong. The 1956 wage reform was correct and the concessions made at that time were necessary. There were flaws when it was implemented. The number of grades grew too large. Similar to the relationship of the cat and the mouse, all these must be eliminated.

Attention should be given to the system of communes. A responsible organizational corps is still necessary for it plays an effective role in the deployment of labor forces. The communes' mess must be managed well and the element of nutrition should be given study. It is all right to struggle strenuously for several consecutive days and nights, but be mindful of rest. The adoption of the system of ten hours of work and two hours of study in the rural areas is not exactly the same as in the urban areas. Hot brick beds are still needed in northern Shensi province and the big cities should slow down the pace of setting up communes. Peking will not willingly fall behind.

[Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung](#)

Examples Of Dialectics

(Abstracted Compilation)

1959

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

1. To Understand Analysis is to Understand Dialectics

To understand analysis is to understand dialectics. Lenin said dialectics could be summed up as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. Such being the case, the core of dialectics can be grasped immediately. But it is necessary to explain and develop this doctrine. The unity of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitional, relative and mutually exclusive. On the other hand, the struggle of opposites is absolute, just as development and movement are absolute. Therefore, balance is temporary and can be disrupted and it is our responsibility to acquire balance more steadily with each passing day. As far as a person of ability is concerned, it does not depend upon whether or not he could have prevented the Hungarian and Polish incidents from arising, but upon whether or not after the incidents had arisen he had the ways and means to resolve the problems.

2. Dialectics is to Present Two Methods for Comparison in Everything

The integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and the specific practice of China is materialism. Both are the unity of opposites, which is dialectics. Why insist on arguing? It is simply to avoid discussing dialectics. The Soviet Union has its own way of doing things. The Soviet experiences are one side and China's practice is also one side. This is the unity of opposites. The Soviet Union should pick the good ones from among its experiences and follow them, pick the bad ones and discard them. To isolate the Soviet experiences and not integrate them with the Chinese practice is not to pick the good experiences and follow them. If one publishes a newspaper and argues in the same way as *Pravda*, which is not analytical, he will be like a 3-year-old child, which needs support everywhere, inasmuch as it has lost its independent thinking. In everything, it is necessary to present two methods for comparison. This is dialectics. Otherwise, it will be metaphysics.

3. Dialectics is to Study the Main Trend and the Side Issues, the Essence and the Outward Appearance

Dialectics is to study the main trend and the side issues, the essence and the outward appearance. In contradictions there are principal contradictions and secondary contradictions. In the past, such errors as anti-venturesome advance arose because we did

not grasp the principal contradictions and the essence and tried to solve the secondary contradictions as principal contradictions and because we took the side issues as the main trend and did not grasp the essence. The State Council and the Political Bureau of the Central Committee held meetings and solved many isolated questions, but they did not grasp the essential questions. At this meeting we brought up many questions from the past for consultation and resolution.

4. To Examine a Question It is Necessary to Consider the Essence and the Main Trend

Marxism tells us that to examine a question, it is necessary to consider the essence, the main trend and the line. This is to see whether or not he builds socialism at home, opposes imperialism internationally and works for internationalism within the socialist camp. These three items constitute a line. As members of the Chinese Communist Party, we also are a party, which opposes imperialism and is for socialism and internationalism. So are the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. These aspects manifest the essence of the Marxist-Leninist line. We can make a comparison to see if they are steadfast or not. Take Tito. Is he steadfast? It seems to me that all three items are Lacking in the things that he does. He does not want any part of anti-imperialism. He is always talking about how good American imperialism is and how bad the Soviet Union is.

5. The Unity of Opposites and Mutual Transformation

All provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions should call meetings once every two months to review and sum up their work. They should call small meetings of several persons or a dozen or so persons. In the coordination and cooperation aspect they also can hold a meeting every two or three months. Many changes can occur in a movement and it is all the more necessary to exchange information. The meetings are for the purpose of harmonizing the rhythm of production. Work and production should have rhythm. One wave comes in as another crests. This is the unity of the opposites of high speed and low speed. Wave-like advances under the General Line of going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results is the unity of the opposites of high speed and low speed, as well as the unity of opposites of labor and rest. If there are high speed and labor only, it will be one-sided. If it is labor alone and no rest, then how can it be! In doing anything there has to be a period of high speed and a period of low speed. In fighting a war in the past, there had to be periods of consolidation, replenishment and rest between two campaigns. It would be impossible to fight one campaign after another. In fighting a war there also has to be a tempo. The Central Soviet Area was 100 percent Bolshevized. "It objected to consolidation and advocated resoluteness, fearlessness, firmness and daringness, pressing forward in victory and making a direct attack on Nan-Ch'ang[1]." How is it possible? Hard battle and rest and consolidation are the unity of opposites. This is the law. They also are mutually

transformable. There isn't anything that is not mutually transformable. High speed turns into low speed and low speed turns into high speed. Labor turns into rest and rest turns into labor. Rest and consolidation and hard battle are also like this. Labor and rest and high speed and low speed also have identity. ! Rest and consolidation and hard battle also have identity. Getting out of bed and going to bed are also the unity of opposites. An old saying goes: "He who has slept for a long time thinks of getting up." Sleeping transforms into getting up and getting up transforms into sleeping. Opening a meeting transforms into closing a meeting! Once a meeting is opened, it immediately embraces the factor of closing the meeting. This is just what Wang Hsi-feng[2] meant when she said: "Though awnings were put up for a thousand *li*, there never was a permanent feast." Lin Tai-yu was deeply moved when the feast ended and the guests dispersed. This was metaphysics. It was from ignorance of the objective laws that when there is a gathering there must be separation. Wang Hsi-fang did not try to seek the favor of Lin, but she said: "Though awnings were put up for a thousand *li*, there never was a permanent feast." Nevertheless, that was dialectics. This is the truth. It cannot be decided by man. It should be decided by whether it is the truth or not. After a meeting is closed, problems pile up and transform into opening a meeting. After unity has been implemented for a while, there will be a difference in opinion and it will transform into a struggle. When differences arise, disunity begins anew. It is not possible to have unity every day or every year. When unity is talked about, then there must be disunity. Disunity is unconditional. Sometimes there still is no unity even when unity is talked about. Therefore, it is necessary to do something in order to attain unity. To talk all the time about unity, and never about struggle, is not Marxism. Unity must go through struggle before unity can be attained. This is the same within the ranks of the party, class or people. Unity transforms into struggle and again into unity. One cannot talk about unity alone without talking about struggles and contradictions. The Soviet Uni! on does not talk about contradictions between the leadership and the led. Without contradictions and struggles, there will be no world, no development; no life, no anything. To talk all the time about unity can be likened to a pool of stagnant water. It is dreary. We must break down the old basis of unity, go through struggle and attain unity on a new basis. Which is better, a pool of stagnant water or the endless flow of the streaming waters of the Yangtze River? The party is this way and so are the people and the class. Unity-struggle-unity. Then there will be work to do. Production transforms into consumption and consumption transforms into production. Production is for the sake of consumption. Producers are not merely for the sake of other workers, but they themselves are also consumers. Marx said that production implies consumption. Production and consumption and construction and destruction are the unity of opposites and mutually transformable. The production of the whole country is for the sake of consumption and the renovation of equipment and installations over a few decades. Seeding turns into harvesting and harvesting turns into seeding. Seeding is to use up seeds. After seeds are sown, they will grow into seedlings. If no seeds are sown, there will be no seedlings. After harvesting, new seeds are sown. Life and death are also mutually transformable. Life transforms into death and lifeless things transform into living things. I maintain that henceforth celebrations be held for people who passed away at over 50 years of age. This is because people inevitably will die. It is a natural law. Grains are annual plants. Every year they live once and die once. Moreover, the more they die, the more they grow. If pigs are not slaughtered, they will become fewer and

fewer. Who is going to feed them? The Soviet Union's "Concise Dictionary of Philosophy" takes upon itself to differ with me. It says that the transformation of life and death is metaphysical and that the transformation of war and peace is erroneous. Who is right after all? Please ask if living things are not transformed from lifeless-things, whence do they come? The earth is composed of inorganic matters and organic matters. All living organisms are converted from nitrogen, hydrogen and 10 other elements. Living things invariably are transformed from lifeless things. Sons transform into fathers and fathers transform into sons. Females transform into males and males transform into females. Direct transformation is not possible. But after marriage when sons and daughters are begotten, is that not transformation? The mutual transformation of the oppressed and the oppressor refers to the relationship between landlords and capitalists on the one side and workers and peasants on the other. Of course, by oppressor we mean the ruling class, not the people. We are talking about class dictatorship and not about individual oppressors. War transforms into peace, and peace transforms into war. Peace is the opposite of war. When there is no war, it is peace. When hostilities break out at the 38th Parallel, it is war. Once war stops, it is peace again. Military affairs are a special kind of politics. War is an extension of politics. Politics is also a kind of war. At any rate, quantity transforms into quality and quality transforms into quantity. Dogmatism is intense in Europe. Since the Soviet Union has some shortcomings, transformation is absolutely necessary. Likewise, if we do not make good, we also will transform. If at that time our industry becomes the first in the world, we will possibly be cocky and become rigid in our thinking. Infinite transforms into finite, and finite transforms into infinite. Ancient dialectics transforms into medieval metaphysics and medieval metaphysics transforms into modern dialectics. The universe is transformable. So is society. Capitalism transforms into socialism and then communism. Communism also will transform itself. It also has a beginning and an end. To be sure, it will be divided into stages. Perhaps it will be given another name. It will not be fixed. If there is quantitative change only and no qualitative change, it will act contrarily to dialectics. There is nothing in this world that does not go through emergence, development and extinction. Ape changed into man and man emerged. The ultimate outcome of mankind as a whole is extinction. Man will possibly change into another kind of thing. By then the earth will no longer exist. The sun will have cooled. Even now the heat of the sun has cooled considerably, as compared with ancient times. In the glacial period, changes occurred every 12 million years. When the glaciers came, living things died in great numbers. Under the South Pole there are deposits of coal. Thus it can be seen that it was very hot there in ancient times. In Yen-ch'ang County, fossils were dug out bearing traces of bamboo of the Sung Dynasty. In ancient times, bamboo was grown in Yen-ch'ang. Now it won't grow there.

Things invariably have a beginning and an end. There are only two infinities: time and space. Infinities are composed of finites. All kinds of things develop and change gradually.

To talk about all this is to make us think and enliven our thought. It is very dangerous to immobilize one's brains. Leading cadres and cadres at central, provincial, regional and county levels are all very important. All systems included; there are several hundred

thousand cadres. They have to think more. They should not always read classical works, but rather set their brains into motion so as to enliven their thinking.

6. Correct Line is Formed in the Course of Struggle with Incorrect Line

Mistakes will still be made. It is impossible not to make mistakes. To make mistakes is an indispensable prerequisite to the formation of a correct line. A correct line is spoken of in regard to an incorrect line. The two of them are the unity of opposites. A correct line is formed in the course of struggle with an incorrect line. To say that all mistakes are avoidable and that only accuracy is free of mistakes is a viewpoint which violates Marxism-Leninism. The question is making fewer mistakes or making smaller mistakes. Accuracy and inaccuracy are the unity of opposites. The two-point theory is correct, while the single-point theory is incorrect. Historically, there is no such fact as only accuracy being free of mistakes. It is merely to deny the unity of opposites. This viewpoint is metaphysical. If there were only men and no women, or denied [the existence of] women, what would we do? It is possible to strive for making the least mistakes. Making fewer mistakes can be, and should be, done. Both Marx and Lenin were able to do it.

7. Things will Invariably Head Toward Their Opposites

Things will invariably head toward their opposites. The dialectics of Greece, the metaphysics of the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance. It was a negation of negation. China was also like this. The contention of one hundred schools of thought in the period of Warring States was dialectics and the classical learning of the feudal times was metaphysics. Now we have returned to talking about dialectics, is it not? Comrade Fan Wen-Lan, you are well acquainted with this. The way I look at it is that after 15 years, our tail will definitely be wagging in the air. Of course, because things will head toward their opposites, I cannot but exert my utmost efforts. Even if big-nation chauvinism emerges in the future, it will also head toward its opposite. If there is one correct thing that will substitute for big-nation chauvinism, what is there to fear? It is not possible for all socialist countries to become chauvinistic. Lenin's dialectics Stalin's metaphysics and present-day dialectics. All this is also a negation of negation.

8. There is Tension and There are Relaxation and Consolidation

There is tension and there are relaxation and consolidation. It won't do to have continual tension. There ought to be tension and relaxation. Overworking is no good. Overstraining won't do. Red and expert schools are being organized extensively in Hopeh and Honan provinces. This is very good. But everything is too intense. People doze off in class.

Teachers are also tired, but they don't dare to doze off. We must be both fast and slow. If there were tension without relaxation, even [Emperors] Wen and Wu [of Chou Dynasty] would not have been able to continue for long. If there were relaxation without tension, Wen and Wu also would not have been able to continue for long! Both Emperor Wen and Emperor Wu were saints! But still, they would not have been able to do it. There is tension and there is relaxation. There is unity and there is struggle. It won't do to have unity only and no struggle. We must struggle against the doubting Thomases and those who advocate settling accounts after the fall, but our purpose in so doing is for unity. What Ah Q feels most deeply about is that he has been refused permission to make revolution. It is not good to criticize him persistently and not help him to reform. Firstly, struggle; secondly, assist. We must be good-hearted. It is bad not to have a good heart or to beget an evil desire, which is nothing more than down with you and let me take over. Is it better to have one man too many or one man too few? To have a few more people is better. We must bring all positive factors into play.

9. Transformation of Opposites

China has an advantage. It is poor and blank. This also has a dual character. Being poor means revolution is necessary. It is not good to have only limited knowledge. But it is comparable to a sheet of white paper. One side has been written on. There is not much more writing to be done. The other side has not been written on. It is blank. There is much writing to be done. For after a few decades we will be able to catch up with foreign countries.

10. The Question of Death and Life Struggle

The question of death and life struggle. There has been 10,000 years of death and life struggle. Should death be held in check or not? It won't do to have no deaths. It won't do either to have nothing but deaths. Like the steel quota, the dead guarantee the key point, while the living stay beyond the key point and do not obstruct it. The system of free public care includes both the dead and the living and takes care of everybody. The two aspects of death and life are centralization and decentralization, which unite and have both. Precisely, the system of free public care is the unity of the contradictions between death and life. That is the principle of assuming arbitrary power and decentralizing some of it.

11. Truths and Fallacies are Contradictory; Accuracies Result from Struggles with Inaccuracies

Truth and fallacies are contradictory. Accuracies result from struggles with inaccuracies. Beauty and ugliness are contradictory. If there are no good people, there will be no bad people. If there are no bad people, there will be no good people. If there are no very good people, there will be no very bad people. Fragrant flowers and poisonous weeds. We are not afraid of poisonous weeds. When they have overgrown, everybody will come and dig them out. Truths are developed from struggle with fallacies. In the course of these struggles good people increase in number and bad people decrease. What are poisonous weeds? I once put the question to Bulganin. Over 100 years ago, tomatoes were poisonous weeds in Europe. I have also said that many historical personalities like Jesus Christ, Galileo, Copernicus, Martin Luther and Sun Yat-sen and Communist Parties have been considered by people as poisonous weeds. This class may take something as poisonous weeds, while that class may be convinced that they are fragrant flowers. John Foster Dulles, for example, was a fragrant flower of the American bourgeoisie, but people of the whole world regarded him as a poisonous weed. What is Chiang kai-shek? He was fragrant for a time. During the Great Revolution he was fragrant. During the War of Resistance people shouted, Long live Chiang kai-shek. Generalissimo Chiang is an old friend of mine. All this is the unity of opposites, the struggle of opposites. Only when there is comparison can a distinction be made and development materialize. When there is no comparison, how is it possible to develop and create? Marxism-Leninism has been developed in the course of struggle with the bourgeoisie.

12. Establish Opposites

There are two kinds of established opposites. One kind has originally existed in society. For example, the rightists. Whether we let them loose or not is a question of policy. When we decided to organize a frank airing of views, we let them out to serve as opposites and mobilized the laboring people to debate with them, oppose them and knock them down. There were many rightists among primary school teachers. Of the 300,000 rightists, primary school teachers consisted almost one-half. Opposites did exist in the persons of the 300,000 rightists. We have let them loose so as to educate the people and enable the people to analyze them. The other kind of established opposite does not exist in nature, but it possesses material conditions. For example, after building a dam, we can employ artificial methods to establish opposites so that the level of the water can be raised or lowered to generate power or to sail a boat. Putting a factory into operation is also an artificially established opposite. The An-shan Steel Mill was constructed by the Japanese. The Ch'ang-ch'un Motor Vehicle Plant was new. It is an opposite established by the people. What nature does not have can be built artificially, but there must be a material basis. Satellites are launched into space artificially. They can be sent into space once the laws governing them are found. We are objectivists and are not afraid of secession, because secession is a natural phenomenon. It seems to me that the secession of Vyacheslav M. Molotov was to the advantage of the Soviet Union, the secessionist endeavors of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Lo Chang-lung, Chang Kuo-t'ao and Kao Kang were to our advantage and the Wang Ming line once and again and the "left" deviationist line thrice during the civil war period have educated our Party. These many opposites all have their

advantages. Of course, it is not necessary to create Molotov, Kao Kang or Ch'en Tu-hsiu artificially. As long as there is that certain climate he will emerge. There is nothing to fear, though. We must overcome them. So-called optimism is our principal aspect. We also have our worries. When the rightists emerged, could anybody not have worried? I was a bit worried. It was necessary for me to talk about the art of leadership so as to turn a bad thing into a good thing. If earlier one had the foresight he could have prevented it from occurring or after it had occurred, turned it into a good thing. We will not be afraid if among the 12 million Party members there are 20,000 or 30,000 who possess awareness and foresight. What is there to be afraid of, anyway! It won't do to be afraid! We will strive for not having to fight a world war. But if we have to fight, we will not be afraid. The general policy is: "To take warning from the past in order to be more careful for the future; to treat the illness in order to save the patient." We must allow people who have made mistakes in line to correct those mistakes. Today we are very much united. Everything is calm. All is well in the center and locally. We have now resolved the anti-venturesome advance problem and attained new unity on a new basis.

13. To Establish Opposites is Very Important

The initiative of the masses exists objectively. It is very important to establish opposites. If we allow the rightists to turn loose or speak up, it is according to plan. We do this in order to establish opposites. After the Rectification Campaign, some comrades overlooked rectification and remolding and laid stress on big-character wall newspaper and the 2-anti movement [against waste and conservatism] for the purpose of establishing opposites. So-called opposites can only be established if they are things which exist objectively. Things, which do not exist objectively, cannot be established as opposites.

14. Listen to the Opinions of Opposites

To respect materialist dialectics is to encourage debate. We must listen to the opinions of opposites, raise questions and expose the opposites.

15. Study Questions of Dialectics

I don't know which comrade brought up at the Chengchow Conference the question of "Big Collective and Small Freedom." Anyway, it is very good. If it were "Big Freedom and Small Collective," John Foster Dulles, Huang Yen-p'ei and Jung I-jen would have welcomed it. We have to grasp production and livelihood as well. This is the unity of opposites. To walk on two legs is also the unity of opposites. All this belongs to the domain of dialectics. Karl Marx's theory concerning materialist dialectics made great progress in our country in 1958. For example, under the prerequisite of giving priority to

the development of heavy industry, we have carried out the simultaneous development of industry and agriculture, of heavy industry and light industry, of national industries and local industries, of big, medium and small-sized enterprises, of small indigenous groups and large modern groups and of indigenous and modern methods. Then there is the system of administration — central unified leadership and local level-to-level administration. Authority must be distributed among all places from the central government down through provinces, regions, counties, and communes to production teams. It is not beneficial to give them no authority at all. These several conceptions have been affirmed in our Party and this is very good. Small indigenous groups and large modern groups are also being promoted simultaneously. There still are medium modern groups. Are T'ang-shan and Lien-yun-kang, for example, not medium-sized? Are there small modern groups? Yes, there are. Besides there are modern-indigenous integrated groups. In a word, this is very complicated. Some countries in the socialist camp will consider these things as illegitimate and not permissible. We permit them. In a country such as ours, which is poor in the extreme, it is very well to organize some small indigenous groups! It will be too monotonous to concentrate on organizing large modern groups. In! agriculture, it is also very complicated. There are high yields and low yields. High and low yields exist simultaneously. The policy of “three thirds system” now being implemented extensively in cultivation was a creation of the masses. It was grasped by the Pei-tai-ho Conference, which set forth one-third of the land for growing food stuffs, one-third of the land for lying idle, and one third of the land for growing trees. It is possible that this will be the trend of agricultural development. The Pei-tai-ho Conference also came out with an “Eight-Point Charter for Agriculture” — irrigation, fertilizer, soil improvement, seeds, close planting, crop protection, reform of farm tools and field management. Irrigation means water. Man can't do without water. Likewise plants can't do without water.

With regard to social systems, there are in the socialist stage two kinds of ownership which exist side by side and are the unity of opposites. Collective ownership contains the factors of communist ownership by all the people. Yu-chin recently said that China is correct in presenting the viewpoint that collective ownership contains the communist factors and that the Soviet Union's collective ownership and ownership by all the people also contain the communist factors. Capitalist society does not permit organizing the mode of production of the socialist collective, but the communist factors should be allowed to grow in socialist enterprises under the leadership of communist parties. Stalin was wrong in rendering absolute the three kinds of ownership, namely collective ownership, socialist ownership by all the people and communist ownership by all the people and describing them as distinctly separate. Will the above constitute the development of dialectics or not?

The Chengchow Conference put forth the slogans, “Big Collective and Small Freedom.” and “Grasp Production and Grasp Livelihood.” This is an extension of dialectics. The Wu-ch'ang conference brought up the question of combining enthusiasm with scientific analysis. In mapping out a plan, which can be blowing hot and cold, one needs to have not only great determination and zeal, but also considerable scientific analysis. Of course, it will not be possible for this resolution to resolve all our problems. It seems that it is

better to delay proclamation of this resolution for a while. We will issue only a communiqué for now. Next year, in March, we will make public the resolution at the National People's Congress. In this way it will be consistent with our determination and zeal on the whole. It will avoid certain impractical notions conceived as a result of the Great Leap Forward in 1958. It will be more authoritative and more analytical scientifically. For a time I was in favor of producing 30 million tons of steel next year. Upon arrival in Wu-ch'ang, I thought it was not such a wonderful idea after all. Until then I was worried only about the question of whether there was a need and had not considered the question of whether it was possible. Later, I took the question of possibility into account. This year the output of 10.7 million tons has already been a great strain on us. The production of 30 million tons next year, 60 million tons in the year after that, and 120 million tons in 1962 is a deceptive possibility and not a realistic possibility. Now we should cut down the fixed production quota a bit and not set it so high. We should make some allowance and let the practice of the masses exceed our plan. This is also a question in dialectics. The practice of the masses also includes the efforts of us leading cadres. If we set the quota a little lower and practice raises it, it is not opportunism. After liberation, steel production doubled again and again. In this world, from of old this had never happened. How can it be called opportunism? Here there is an international link. The socialist camp led by the Soviet Union is linked up with the international solidarity of the working class of the whole world. On this question we must not try to be the first in line. Nowadays, some counties are struggling somewhat for precedence. In fact, if we must be the first to enter into communism, it should be the An-shan Steel Mill, Fu-shan, Liaoning Province, Shanghai or Tientsin. It seems shameful for China to be the first to enter into communism. Besides, whether there is a possibility or not is also a question. The scientists of the Soviet Union number 1.5 million, highly qualified intellectuals several million and engineers half a million, all more than the United States. The Soviet Union already has 55 million tons of steel, while we still have only this little tiny bit. Their accumulation is ever growing, while we have just begun to build up. That is why possibility is also a question. Khrushchev has served notice that the Soviet Union prepares to enter into communism 15 years from now and that the two kinds of ownership will be merged into one gradually. This is a very good thing. Even if it is possible for us to be the first to enter into communism, we should not do so. The October Revolution was Lenin's undertaking. Are we not all learning from Lenin? What is the sense of hurrying? It is nothing but an attempt to go to Karl Marx and ask for a reward. If that is the case, we will probably commit a mistake on an international question. This also is a problem. We should talk about mutual benefit. Dialectics has been developed substantially and it immediately involves this problem.

16. It is Necessary to Adopt Dialectical Methods to Treat Our Comrades

In treating our comrades, regardless of who they are, so long as they are not hostile or subversive elements, we should adopt an attitude of unity and dialectical methods instead of metaphysical methods. What is meant by dialectical methods? It means that we must analyze everything and that we must acknowledge that man invariably will make

mistakes and not negate his everything because he has made mistakes. Lenin once said that there is not even one person in the whole world who has not made a mistake. I have committed many mistakes. These mistakes have been useful to me and have educated me. Any one person needs the support of others. "A good fellow still needs three helpers, a bamboo fence still needs three posts." This is a Chinese proverb. Another Chinese proverb has this to say: "Although the water lily is well and good, it still needs green leaves to lend support." You, Khrushchev, although your water lily is well and good, it still needs green leaves to lend support. I, X X X, my water lily isn't well and good, it needs green leaves to give support all the more. We in China have yet another proverb, which goes something like this: "Three cobblers with their wits combined can equal Chu-ko Liang, the master mind[3]." We are dealing with collective leadership. A lone Chu-ko Liang just isn't complete and will always have shortcomings. To me it seems an ill-advised attitude to call oneself omniscient and almighty like God. Therefore, what attitude should we adopt toward comrades who have committed mistakes? We should be analytical and adopt dialectical methods and not metaphysical methods. Our Party had previously bogged down in metaphysics — dogmatism — by completely destroying those people whom it did not like. As time passed, we criticized dogmatism and learned dialectics bit by bit. The basic viewpoint of dialectics is the unity of opposites. After acknowledging this viewpoint, what are we to do with a comrade who has made mistakes? Firstly, we will conduct a struggle to criticize thoroughly and eradicate completely his erroneous ideology. Secondly, we will help him. One, to struggle; two, to help. Starting from this, we will help him to correct his mistakes so that he will have a way out.

It will be different to treat another type of people. People like Tito and China's own Ch'en Tu-hsiu. Toward them there is no way to adopt a helpful attitude, because they are beyond remedy. People like Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek and the Czars are also incorrigible and there is nothing to do but knock them down. This is because, as far as we are concerned, they are not of a dual nature, but of a sole nature. In the final analysis, it is also like this with regard to the imperialist and capitalist systems. In the end, they will certainly be displaced by the socialist system. The same with ideology. We will substitute materialism for idealism and atheism for theism. This is strategically speaking. Tactically, it will be different. It will be necessary to make compromises. In Korea, on the 38th Parallel, did we not make compromises with the Americans? In Vietnam, did [we] not make compromises with the French? In every tactical stage, we must be skilled in conducting struggles and at the same time in making compromises. Now let us go back to the relationship between comrades. I suggest that where there is estrangement between comrades, they should start negotiations. Some people appear to believe that once they enter into communism they will all become saints, with no disagreement and no shortcomings. When one cannot make analysis, that is to say when he is like an iron plate adjusted to uniformity, there is no need for negotiations. It looks as if once we enter into communism, it won't do unless we are 100 percent Marxists. In reality, there are various shades of Marxists. There are 100 percent Marxists, 90 percent Marxists, 70 percent Marxists, 60 percent Marxists, 50 percent Marxists. Some people are only 10 percent or 20 percent Marxists. Can we or can we not hold negotiations within a small circle, say, between two or among several persons? Can we or can we not negotiate, starting from

unity and in the spirit of helpfulness? These of course are not negotiations with the imperialists, but negotiations within the ranks of communist people. This time, are we and 12 other countries conducting negotiations or not? Internationally, are 60 plus parties conducting negotiations or not? They are in fact conducting negotiations. This is to say that under the principle of not prejudicing Marxism-Leninism, we should accept some of the acceptable opinions of others and discard some of the discardable opinions of our own. In this way we will have two hands. With one hand we will struggle against a comrade who has made mistakes and with the other hand we will talk about unity with him. Struggle is for the purpose of standing resolutely for the tenets of Marxism-Leninism. This is one hand. The other hand is to talk about unity. Unity is for the purpose of giving him a way out and making compromises with him. This is called flexibility. The integration of the matter of principle and flexibility is a tenet of Marxism-Leninism. This is the unity of opposites.

No matter what world, particularly a class society, of course, it is always full of contradictions. Some people say that it is possible to “find” contradictions in a socialist society. To me it seems this interpretation is incorrect. One cannot say, “find” contradictions, when the world is full of them. Nowhere do contradictions exist. No person cannot be analyzed. If a person is regarded as unanalyzable, then it is metaphysics. You look at the inside of an atomic bomb. It too is full of contradictions and unities of contradictions. There is the unity of the two opposites of atomic nucleus and electrons. Inside the nucleus there are the opposites of neutrons and protons. Inside a proton there are protons and anti-protons and inside a neutron there are neutrons and anti-neutrons. In a nutshell, the unities of opposites are endless. Concerning the viewpoint of the unity of opposites and dialectics, we have to carry on extensive propaganda. Our dialectics should leave the circle of philosophers and go into the midst of the broad masses. I suggest that we discuss this problem in political bureau meetings and central committee plenary sessions of the communist party of every country and at different levels of local party committees. As a matter of fact, our branch secretary understands dialectics. When he prepares to make his report to the branch congress, he often writes down two points on his small notebook. The first is merits, the second defects, which is one dividing into two. This is a universal phenomenon. This precisely is dialectics.

17. The Relationship Between Right and Wrong

Within the party, or outside the Party, we must distinguish between right and wrong. An important question is how to treat people who have made mistakes. The correct attitude is to allow everybody to make revolution. When he has made a mistake, it is necessary to adopt the general policy of “taking warning from the past in order to be more careful for the future and treating the illness in order to save the patient,” and help him to correct his mistake. “*The True Story of Ah Q*” is a fine piece of writing. I would advise those people who have read it to reread it and those who have not read it to read it carefully. In this story, Lu Hsun wrote about a backward and unconscious peasant who feared most the criticism of others and would quarrel with anyone who criticized him. On his scalp there

were ringworm scars in some places. Ah Q himself did not want to talk about these scars and was afraid that others would talk about them. The more he acted like this, the more people would talk. In the end, Ah Q would be put on the defensive. However, Lu Hsun specially wrote a chapter under the heading, "Barred from the Revolution," in which Magistrate Chao was said to have prevented Ah Q from making revolution. Actually, what Ah Q called a revolution was merely to loot a few things for himself. But Magistrate Chao would not even let him make revolution in this way. As to comrades such as Huang I-feng and Chang Hsiu-yun who have committed mistakes, some people say that we will have to see whether they reform or not. I say that it won't do just to see. We still have to help them to amend. This is to say, firstly, to see and secondly, to help. The ideology of people who have not been "helped" sufficiently cannot be correct. If people make mistakes and you take pleasure in their calamity, then it is sectarianism. This is where Kao Kang had his fall, head over heels. He fabricated things such as a four-man clique and two market stalls. Assuming that these were true, what he should have done was firstly, to see, and secondly, to help. But he was not ready to do that. In the end, he fell down so hard he could not get up again. As far as the revolution is concerned, it is always better to have a few more people. Aside from a handful who persevere in mistakes or have a share in them whenever mistakes are made, the majority of people who have committed errors can be rectified. They are exactly like people who obtained immunity after being afflicted with, say, typhoid fever. As long as they are good at drawing lessons from mistakes in the future. On the contrary, people who have never made mistakes are especially prone to them, because they are too cocky. We must take note that if one excessively rectifies people who have committed mistakes, it often ends up having himself rectified. If we sincerely treat people who have made mistakes, we can gain popular support and solidarity with the people. Whether a hostile attitude or a helpful attitude is adopted in the treatment of comrades who have made mistakes will be a criterion by which to distinguish the good-hearted from the black-hearted people; The general policy of treating the illness in order to save the patient is the general policy uniting the whole Party. We must hold fast to this general policy.

18. The Question of Ten Fingers

It is permissible to arouse emotions, but not to give vent to them. Sometimes, due to inexperience, we cause the masses to suffer setbacks. For a time, mistakes occurred on a number of questions. Examples: There were people who said too many cooperatives had been organized and wanted to chop off 10,000 of them. The two-wheeled double-share plow was given a bad name in the South. Now take the lewd poetry of a lecherous man for instance. Sung Yu attacked one point and came up short of the rest. The method is not good. But it was with this method that the rightists attacked us. A person has 10 fingers. If a boil appears on one of them, he will have to ask a doctor to treat it. He cannot chop it off. The other nine fingers are still good. Frequently, when people see that one finger is injured, they will say all ten fingers are defective. The rightists have attacked us in this way. However, good people sometimes also look at it the same way and there are such people in the Communist Party. Be they members of the Communist Party or democratic

parties or business circles, or be they highly qualified intellectuals, the majority of people can make progress. Even the rightists, the majority of them can become good again. If you don't believe in the majority, then you have lost confidence. And it is not good to lose confidence in the cause of the people. Today, 70 percent to 80 percent of the university students come from families of the exploiting class. But rightists constitute only 2 percent to 3 percent of these students. Aside from individual cases, these students will not be expelled from school. By employing such a policy, we can reform them.

19. The Question of Nine Fingers and One Finger

Our comrades often are confused by their 10 fingers. Whenever something goes wrong, they will forget the 10 fingers. When shortcomings appear within the ranks of the labouring people, it is a question of nine fingers and one finger. When our comrades make mistakes, it is also like this. Here I am not talking about Ku Ta-ts'un, Li Shih-nung, P'an X X, Ch'n Tsai-li and Li Feng. Comrade Wu P'u-chih made a very fine speech. Why did the Anhwei provincial delegation not talk about Li Shih-nung in its speech? The Chekiang provincial delegation did talk about Sha Wen-han, but not enough. They should offer their valuable opinions and let everybody share their experience and knowledge. Why did they not talk about these people? These people are not a question of one finger and nine fingers. Sha Wen-han is a man with 10 black fingers. So is Ch'en Tsai-li. Li Shih-nung has nine black fingers only one of his finger's is clean. Comrades who have made mistakes and to whom I have referred as people with nine and one fingers, wavered in stormy times, but are now seeing clearly. I do not mean these people. We should unite with activists at various levels and protect them and persist in protecting them. Although they have made mistakes, they are activists. They were afraid of blaming themselves during the full and frank airing of views. If we insist on shielding them, then every thing will be all right. Their mistakes are only one-tenth. In the Rectification Campaign we should persist in protecting these cadres. The question of protecting the cadres is mentioned in the documents of the Tsing-tao conference. As in the past, contradictions within the ranks of the laboring people are by and large a relationship between nine fingers and one finger, individual cases excepted. Of the bourgeois middle-of-the roaders, those in dead center are bourgeois things with five and five fingers, those left of center are bourgeois things with six to seven good fingers and those right of center are bourgeois things with six to seven black fingers. They have opposed the ideology of the people for so long that they cannot wash themselves clean all at once and need cleansing over and over again. Bourgeois ideology will still seek restoration. There will be no big restoration, but small restoration is quite likely. Lo X X said that counter-revolutionary restoration would still come and mentioned the mass line. He spoke well. Indeed, the bourgeoisie are also capable of stirring up a storm. Some of our comrades will still waver in the face of a grade 12 typhoon. The moment unrest sets in, restoration will follow. But the whole party has gone through another year of tempering with the experience of last year and should be able to sit tight in its fishing boat in spite of the wind and the waves. During the Polish and Hungarian incidents we did not have any problem. And although last year's storm was so big, our boat did not capsize. Some people say that our editorial

entitled “Why Is This?” was written a bit too soon. It wasn’t too soon. If we had waited longer, some of the leftists would have rotted. As a matter of fact, after December last year, we still exposed among the primary school teachers over 100,000 rightists, who constituted one-half of the 300,000 rightists all over the country. They were then making frenzied attacks on us. Didn’t somebody say that after Chang and Lo delimited the rightists clearly, they would not attack us any more? They attacked just the same. As long as the temperature reaches a certain degree, these things will be let out in the same old manner. Don’t forget nine fingers and one finger. We precisely forgot this question during the anti-venturesome advance movement of 1956. We must not look at a problem in its essence. We should draw a lesson from it.

20. The Question of 10 Fingers

The question of 10 fingers. Man has 10 fingers. We must enjoin the cadres to be good at learning how to distinguish nine fingers from one finger, or the majority of fingers from the minority of fingers. There is a difference between nine fingers and one finger. This thing looks simple, but many people don’t understand it. We must publicize this viewpoint. There is a difference between general situation and local situation, between generally and individually and between main trend and side issues. We must be mindful of grasping the main trend. If we grasp the wrong thing, we will certainly fall head over heels. It is a question of recognition and a question of logic as well. We say one finger and nine fingers, because it is a more lively way of speaking and more in conformity with our work conditions. Unless mistakes arise in the basic line, we have always netted major achievements in our work. However, this way of speaking does not apply to some people. For example, almost all the 10 fingers of rightists, many of them ultra-rightists, have rotted. Among the students, the majority of ordinary rightists have more than one rotting fingers. But then not all of their fingers are rotting. That is why they still can remain in school.

“Attack one or several points, exaggerate as much as possible and come up short of the rest.” This is a metaphysical method, which is divorced from actual conditions. It was the method used by bourgeois rightists when they launched their frenzied attacks on socialism in 1957. Historically, our Party suffered great damage through the use of such a method. It was during the time when dogmatism reigned supreme. The Li Li-san line was also like this. Revisionism or right opportunism also employed this method. The Ch’en Tu-hsiu line and the Wang Ming line during the war of resistance against Japan were like this. In 1934, Chang Kuo-t’ao also used this method.

21. Dialectics is to Approach Problems Through Opposites and Unity, Hence in a Comprehensive Way

Life and death, war and peace are antagonistic and contradictory. Nevertheless, there is an inner connection between them. Hence, these opposites sometimes can be united. In our approach to problems, we cannot just look at one side. We should make a comprehensive analysis in order to see through its essence. Thus, so far as judging a person is concerned, it cannot be that all at once he is all good or he is all bad with not even one merit. Why is our Party correct? It is because we can start from objective conditions in assessing and resolving all problems. In this way it can be relatively complete and not absolute.

22. Theory of Uninterrupted Revolution and Theory of Revolution by Stages

The development of cooperatives requires that progress be made in wave-like fashion — one wave succeeding another with a trough in between, like a valley between two peaks.

The leadership should trim the sails according to the wind and adapt to the circumstances. And when conditions are unfavorable, they should immediately apply the brakes. At an opportune moment they should compress the people's heads, which is a necessary thing to do when heads swell. Some people ask whether we have need of concern or of taboos and commandments. Of course, we have need. We have need of the necessary concern and the necessary taboos and commandments. Chu-pa-chieh (Piggy) [character in the Ming dynasty novel, *"The Pilgrimage to the West"*] also has three taboos and five commandments. We have need of the necessary rest, the necessary pauses, the necessary braking or closing of the gate. The method to be tried when people start wagging their tails in the air is to set forth new tasks for them, like the quality emulation drive we are now putting forward, so that they won't have time to feel haughty.

23. Onesidedness is of Dual Nature

There are two kinds of onesidedness: dogmatism and opportunism (revisionism). Lu Ting-i has said so in an article. Dogmatists want to affirm everything and are 100 percent Bolshevik. Later we did some checking. After 10 years (1935-1945), they almost went out of existence. Dogmatists exist in China, as well as in foreign countries. To render onesided Marxism-Leninism, they explain it from metaphysics. About work, they let you talk about the good side, but not the bad side. You can only praise, but not criticize. In the "Encirclement and suppression of Wang Ming", I also gave a magnified account of the facts. Now let us lift the encirclement to relieve Wang Ming. There were defects in his writings, but could he not criticize bureaucratism like he did, or talk about people in official circles? In the past we definitely had much knowledge in talking about class struggle. But we also generated some over-simplification and administrative decrees. Earlier, due to urgency in organizing revolutionary struggles, we certainly could not spend a lot of time in discussions to find a solution to problems. That was our mode of action in the period of power seizure. Some comrades have cultivated this working style.

It is easy for them who have had only this kind of experience and known only this mode of action, especially those who have engaged in army work for a long time, to commit such faults. The encirclement and suppression of Wang Ming was the same as the Liberation Army transferring a few regiments to encircle the enemy in battle. The other kind of one-sidedness is to “negate everything” — negate the undertakings of the workers and peasants, negate the struggle of several hundred million people so as to make them lose confidence and render everything dark. This does not correspond with facts. That everything is well in the colossal task of building socialism also does not correspond with facts. Chung Tien-fei did a good thing in exposing the shortcomings in cinema work. We must take care to correct all the shortcomings that have already been exposed, but we must point out the one-sided ones. The article by Ch'en Ch'i-t'ung and three others have been mistransmitted. Today, I must say this to their face. I disagree very much with that article. I have said that their loyalty in trying to safeguard the interests of the Party and of the working class is sentiments of hatred against poisonous weeds. But after only several months of “blooming” there have appeared Wang Ming and other monsters and freaks. The opinion is expressed that achievements are few and mistakes are many. “Reporting to my lord, something, disastrous has happened! A ghost has appeared!” Conditions are such that it certainly doesn't look like its going to reach the end of the day. Now, this is an incorrect appraisal of the situation and an expression of doubts about the general policy of the Party. The method followed here is oversimplification. It doesn't have the power to persuade. The method used to criticize Wang Ming is the “brief shock” method. It leaves people who read it unconvinced. I am unconvinced. I have so far not made the acquaintance of Wang Ming. Nor does he have marriage relationships with my sons or daughters. But I am unconvinced. Dogmatism and opportunism are two kinds of one-sidedness. One affirms everything and the other denies everything. Both dogmatists and opportunists are metaphysical. However, we must help them to correct their mistakes. This is not just their personal problems. They represent a great number of people. There are dogmatists and opportunists among Communist Party members. Is there none outside the Party? There are dogmatists as well as opportunists among five million people. Within the Communist Party there are “leftists” and rightists. This means there are dogmatists and opportunists. Some people say that in writing it is impossible not to be one-sided. There is something to this statement. What I have just said is a lot of Marxist thought, which demands that everybody discard one-sidedness. This is not possible. Also it does not conform to reality. As a matter of fact, in making criticism, everybody speaks out in accordance with his own experience and standing on one side. But on the other hand, one-sidedness goes against dialectics. Can we or can we not ask that a little more dialectics be used? It is possible or not to popularize dialectics gradually so that more dialectics will be used gradually. I think it can, and should, be done. Day by day, year by year, there will be more people, more writers and professors, who take a more comprehensive approach to problems. That is why I say the existence of one-sidedness is a fact. But I ask that one-sidedness be overcome gradually. Is it so or not there will be one-sidedness in the future? There still will be. There will be one-sidedness even after 10,000 years. We have to popularize dialectics and dialectics has to be developed. In a word, I ask that dialectics be popularized step by step so that we will have 600 million dialecticians. With regard to affairs within the ranks of the people, it is necessary to analyze and to reason, not to rely on name calling, but to practice dialectics.

In writing, we must be persuasive. Also, we must not give ourselves bureaucratic airs or act in a bureaucratic manner, considering that we are heads of a ministry or bureau or department. These notions we must discard. We must forget we are officials; we must be on an equal footing with everybody. Your post may be high, but still it won't do when you make a mistake. Wasn't Stalin's post high enough? It wouldn't do when he made a mistake. Some people put on the airs of a veteran by saying: "When I was making revolution, you were still crawling under the table!" If you employ that line, people won't like to hear it. As dialectics increases little by little, metaphysics decreases little by little. This will get rid of ! one-sidedness gradually.

24. Two Kinds of Onesidedness

Within the ranks of the Communist Party there are all sorts of people. There are Marxists, who comprise the greater majority. They also have shortcomings; but these are not serious. A portion of the people harbor dogmatic misconceptions. For the most part, these people are loyal and devoted to Party and country. Only their method of approach to problems is one-sidedness of the "left." When they have put a stop to this kind of one-sidedness, they will have taken a big step forward. Another portion of the people entertains right opportunist or revisionist misconceptions. These people are relatively dangerous, because their thinking is a reflection of bourgeois ideology within the Party. They hanker after bourgeois liberalism and negate everything, and their relationship with the bourgeois intellectuals in society is extremely complicated. For several months now, people have been criticizing dogmatism, but have omitted revisionism. Dogmatism should be subjected to criticism. If dogmatism is not criticized, many misconceptions cannot be corrected. Now we should begin to see to it that revisionism is criticized. Dogmatists may head toward the opposites, that is either Marxism or revisionism. In the light of the experience of our Party, more dogmatists will head toward the former, while only isolated cases will head toward the latter. This is because they are an ideological faction of the proletariat, which has been affected by the frantic viewpoint of the petty bourgeoisie. Some of the "dogmatists" who were attacked were in fact people who have made mistakes in their work. Some "dogmatists" who were attacked were in fact Marxists; they were attacked by certain people who wrongly took them for "dogmatists." Real dogmatists have a reason to feel that "left" is better than right. The reason is that they want to make revolution. However, in terms of factual losses of the revolution, "left" is not better than right. Therefore, it should be ! corrected resolutely.

25. The Question of Red and White Joyful Events

— Sudden changes are the most fundamental laws of the universe —

The question of red and white joyful events. When in the past we spoke of coping with possible sudden great changes, we were referring principally to questions of war or

disruption within the Party. The Chinese people term weddings as red joyful events and funerals as white joyful events. It seems that there is something to it. The Chinese people understand dialectics. Because they will have children after getting married, mothers will split off three or two, or even as many as ten or eight of them, much the same as an aircraft carrier splits off airplanes.

Too many children are also no good. When a human being gives birth to a human being, it is a joyful event. One becomes two, two becomes four. As to death, people will cry over it and hold a funeral ceremony. It is also a joyful event. Man invariably will die. If Confucius were still alive and attending the meeting here at Huai-jen T'ang (Hall of Benevolence), he would have been over 2,000 years old. That would have been bad. Dialectically speaking, it is incorrect and metaphysical to have no deaths. When there is a disaster, it should be called a kind of natural phenomenon. Sudden changes are the most fundamental laws of the universe. Birth is a sudden change and so is death. If Chiang Kai-shek dies, we may clap our hands. If John Foster Dulles dies, we will shed no tears. But when new things die, like the defeat of the 1905 Russian revolution or the loss of our bases in the South, then it is no good. When seedlings are brought down by a storm or hail, this of course is no good, because the question of replacing the seedlings immediately arises. Our Communist Party hopes that things will . . .

26.

27. The Question of Two Possibilities

The question of two possibilities. Will messhalls, nurseries and communes be able to consolidate or not? It seems that they will be able to consolidate. But we also must be prepared against some of them collapsing. Two possibilities — consolidation and collapse — exist simultaneously. If we are not prepared, we may fail utterly. Our resolution is to make it possible for them to consolidate. If some of them do not collapse, then consolidation work cannot be done well. For example, several children have died in the nurseries and several elderly people have died in the happiness homes. When happiness can no longer be found in the happiness home, in what way are they still superior? A group of messhalls also will fail if they serve their rice cold or serve rice without the dishes that go with it. To think that none of them will fail is not in agreement with reality. They fail because of mismanagement. This is very reasonable. On the whole, failure will be partial and temporary. The general trend is development and consolidation. Our party also has two possibilities. One possibility is consolidation and the other is splits. when in Shanghai, one central committee was split into two. During the Long March, Chang Kuo-t'ao again split one central committee into two. Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih represented a partial split. Partial splits are frequent. Since last year, splits have occurred within the leading groups of one-half of the provinces in the country. Inside a human body cells die off every day. From childhood on this phenomenon occurs. Only in

this way can growth be benefited, If there are no deaths, man can no longer survive. If man does not die, then that is not possible. Death can be of benefit; fertilizer can result from it. Partial splits exist every day. Total extinction is also a historical inevitability. All in all, both party and state, which have served as the tools of class struggle, must perish. But before the historical task of the Party is completed, ! it is a question of consolidation. We do not hope for splits, but we should prepare against them. If we are prepared, we will possibly avoid big splits. Big and medium splits are temporary. The Hungarian incident was a big split, while the Kao and Mo incidents were medium splits. Every party branch is undergoing a change. Some members are being expelled, some are being admitted. Some are doing a very good job, some are committing mistakes. It is impossible not to ever undergo a change. Lenin often said that a thing invariably has two possibilities: either victory or extinction. Our People's Republic of China also has two possibilities: victory after victory or extinction. Since Lenin did not conceal the possibility of extinction, the People's Republic must not deny such a possibility. We do not have an atomic bomb in our hands. If the enemy occupies Peking, Shanghai and Wuhan, we will go into the mountains and engage in guerrilla warfare. We will go 10, 20 years backward and return to the Yen-an period. Therefore, we must make vigorous preparations, exert our energies to produce tens of million tons of steel within three or four years and establish an industrial base so that we will be more consolidated than now. At present our name is quite famous throughout the world. One, because of the shelling of Quemoy; two, because of the People's Communes; and three, 10.7 million tons of steel. It seems that because of these several things, our reputation is great. But our strength is not. We are still poor and blank. We have acquired tool of an inch long in our hands, and we have accomplished not a thing, though we now have an inch of iron, our country is actually weak. Politically we are a powerful country. Economically and militarily we are a weak country. That's why the task before us is to transform from weakness to strength. We must exert our energies to undergo a change for the better in three years time. Within three years we can bring about only a partial change, and not a basic change. After another four years, which makes it seven years altogether, everything will be better and our reputation will correspond to reality. Now our reputation is great and our strength insignificant. This we must understand thoroughly. Don't start walking on air the moment you are praised by a foreigner or the moment you open a newspaper and see that it is full of accounts of our soaring enthusiasm and our miraculous doings. In fact, good steel amounted to only 9 million tons. Rolled steel production should be figured at 30 percent less, hence only 6 million tons. We must not deceive ourselves. A lot of grain was produced. After reductions have been allowed, the production in all places was 860 billion *catties*. We have said it was 750 billion *catties*. This is to say that they turned up a little more after poking here and there. The 110 billion *catties* which they turned up have not been taken into account. Nobody suffers if we really have but do not take into account those 110 billion *catties*. Things will still be there. We were only afraid of being without and so we made a reduction. Granting that there were 860 billion *catties*, allowances should be made for one-fourth of the output being tuber crops. We might as well make this clear. A meeting should be held in every province, region or county to discuss this problem. Some people don't like to hear what I'm saying. But I insist on talking about this very unfortunate thing. Whether it is the collapse of the communes or public messhalls, splits in the Party, divorce from the

masses, occupation by the U.S., extinction of the nation, or engagement in guerrilla warfare, we have a Marxist law, which takes care of everything. And that is, all these unfortunate things are temporary and partial. Historically, our many defeats have proved this point. During the Long March, the reduction of our forces from 300,000 in number to a little over 20,000 and that of Party members from 30,000 to a few thousand were all temporary and partial. The extinction of the bourgeoisie and imperialism is permanent, however. The setbacks, defeat or extinction of socialism will be temporary because it will be restored before long. Even if restoration is defeated, it also will be temporary. After the great revolution of 1927 was defeated, we took up arms again to fight a guerrilla war. "Unforeseen wind and clouds may appear in the sky suddenly. Fortune or misfortune may befall man 'tween morn and evening." All of us must be prepared. "From of old, men of seventy years have rarely been seen." Man invariably will perish. A person always will die. He cannot live to 10,000 years. Man should prepare to set his affairs in order before he dies. This is all gloomy talk. All men will die. But mankind as a whole will grow and flourish. If die we must, we will die. As for socialism, we still want to occupy ourselves with it for a few more years...

28. Two Kinds of Practical Possibilities

There are two kinds of practical possibilities. One kind is realistic possibility and the other kind is unrealistic possibility. If one now wants to go to the planet Mars, it is an unrealistic possibility. However, it can be a realistic possibility in the future. Possibilities are of two kinds. If it is possible to transform into reality, it is realistic possibility. The other kind of possibility is something that is not possible to transform into reality. Like dogmatism in the past, was it not 100 percent proof? Was it not discarded everywhere? It seems to me that not marrying until production per *mou* reaches 800,000 *catties* is also an unrealistic possibility.

29. Wave-like Advance is Inevitable

Economic construction is not something which does not have the slightest forward and backward movements, but which advances surely and steadily. Construction also can be sometimes a little more in volume and sometimes a little less. A horse gallops sometimes a little faster, sometimes a little slower. Sometimes, one mounts the horse, sometimes he dismounts it. Such conditions are completely possible. This is because, firstly, we are inexperienced, and secondly, our economic construction devolves on circumstances. For example, economic construction was possibly completed at a somewhat faster rate in the past, because conditions of war existed at that time. If war is imminent, then it is imperative that we develop heavy industry on a greater scale. Economic construction proceeds in wave-like fashion with its ups and downs, and one wave chasing another. This is to say that there are balance, disruption, and balance restored after disruption. Of course, wave-like advances cannot be too big. If too big, suddenly it will become a

venturesome advance and suddenly it will become a conservative advance. Nevertheless, it is inevitable that economic construction will follow the law of wave-like advances and make progress. If you acknowledge this point, then it will no longer startle you when we make a venturesome advance this year and perform a little less next year. That is all there is to it. Taking it as a whole, our first Five-Year Plan was correct.

30. Everything Has its Unity and Independence

Now let us talk about the question of the independence of every factory under centralized leadership. Everything has its unity and independence. Man also has his unity and independence. Now that this meeting is going on, it is unity. After the meeting is over, it is independence. Some people will go for a stroll, some will go and read a book, some will go and have their meals. Everybody has his independence. A sense of discipline and a sense of non-discipline are mutually contradictory things. It is necessary to have a sense of discipline as well as a sense of non-discipline. It is necessary to have collectivism as well as “liberalism.” If we do not give an individual his post-meeting independence, a sense of non-discipline and “liberalism,” but continue the meeting without break or end, will the people not all die? Therefore, every factory, every cooperative, every person must have its or his independence — an independence that is linked up with unity. We must look after workers in the factories and all peasants in the collectives. This is a big problem, one which concerns 600 million people. We must call the Party’s attention to this.

31. We Want Unity and Also Specifics

We Want Unity, we also want specifics. Each place must have its specifics which are suited to local conditions for the purpose of bringing local initiative into full play. Such specifics will not be Kao Kang’s kind of specifics, but specifics in the interests of the collective and indispensable to the strengthening of national unity.

32. We Should Have the Proper Initiative and the Proper Independence

We should all have the proper initiative and the proper independence. Provinces, regions, counties, areas and townships should all have them. The Central Government should not grasp the provinces and municipalities too tightly, and in turn, the provinces and municipalities should not grasp the regions, counties, areas and townships too tightly. All that can be united should, and must, be united; all that cannot be united should not be united and must not be united by force. The different regions should fight for this right and not be afraid of being given the label of localism. This kind of fight for a right proceeds from the whole interests of the country and not from local interests. It cannot be

called localism. Independence sanctioned by the Central Government is proper independence. It cannot be called assertion of independence.

Notes

[1.] A reference to the 'leftist' line in the CPC during the early 30'. In this connection see "Resolution on Certain Questions in the History of our Party" *S.W.*, Vol. III, pp. 177-220 (1965, Peking).

[2.] A character in the novel *Story of the Stone*.

[3.] Chu-ko Liang (1818-234), prime minister of the Shu Han or Minor Han dynasty, was one of the most famous military strategists of ancient China. He is a central character in the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, and was, as Mao says, known throughout his career for his great prudence and foresight.

Note On The "Charter Of The Anshan Iron And Steel Company"[1]

March 22, 1960

[SOURCE: *Peoples Daily*, March 22, 1960.]

This report of the Anshan party committee is very good. The more one reads it the more delighted one gets. It doesn't strike one as too long, in fact, one would be willing to read it even if it were longer; this is because the problems raised in the report are factual, well reasoned, and very absorbing. With more than 100,000 workers and staff members, the Anshan Iron and Steel Company is the country's biggest enterprise. Formerly, people there thought that their enterprise was a modernized one and there was no need for technical revolution. They were opposed to launching vigorous mass movements, to the principle of cadre participation in productive labor and worker participation in management, of reform of irrational and outdated rules and regulations and of close cooperation among cadres, workers, and technicians, and opposed to putting politics in command.; they relied on just a few people working in seclusion. Many favored the system of placing responsibility solely on the factory director and were against the system of the factory director designated to undertake responsibility under the leadership of the party committee. They held that the "Charter of the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Combine" (a set of authoritative rules practiced in a big steel plant in the Soviet Union)

was sacred. That was the situation up to the Great Leap Forward in 1958, which marked the first stage. The year 1959 marked the second stage, when people began to think things over, began to have faith in the mass movement, and began to question the system of placing responsibility solely on the factory director and the Charter of the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Combine. During the Lushan Meeting of July 1959, the Central Committee received a good report from them, which spoke in favor of the Great Leap Forward, of opposing the right deviation and making utmost exertions; it also put forward a high but practicable target. The Central Committee was extremely pleased with the report and had it circulated ! to the comrades concerned with its comment. They immediately relayed it by telephone to their respective provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions, thus helping the struggle going on at the time to criticize right opportunism. The present report (March 1960) takes another step forward; it does not smack of the Charter of the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Combine, but has given birth to a Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company. Here emerges the Charter of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company in China, in the Far East. This marks the third stage. Now this report is being passed on to you and you are asked to transmit it to the large and medium-sized enterprises under your administration and to party committees of all large and medium-sized cities and, of course, you may also transmit it to prefectural party committees and other cities. It should be used as a document for study by cadres in order to stimulate their minds and make them think about the affairs in their own units, so that under due leadership a great Marxist-Leninist movement of economic and technical revolution will be carried out link by link and wave upon wave in the cities and the country side during the whole year of 1960.

Notes

[1.] The Anshan Iron and Steel Works, constructed in the period of Japanese rule in Manchuria was China's first large modern enterprise and the center of its heavy industry. The focus of industrialization during the first five-year plan, today it is an advanced complex with more than 100,000 workers supplying 25 percent of the nation's steel, the foundation of the industrial economy. The Charter of the Anshan Steel Company was proposed by the workers of Anshan.

On The Anti-China Question

March 22, 1960

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Comrades, please take a look at the appendix. This is a piece of material concerning the opening of an exhibition in Pakistan by our country. After all, who are the people of the so-called anti-China [movement]? How many are there? They are comprised of imperialist elements from certain Western countries, reactionaries and semi-reactionaries from some other countries, and revisionists and semi-revisionists from the international communist movement. The above three categories of people are estimated to constitute a small percentage, say 5 percent, of mankind. At the most they cannot be more than 10 percent. Let us assume that 10 out of every 100 people are against us. Of the world's population of 2.7 billion, no more than 270 million oppose us. The rest, and there are 2.43 billion, either support us, or are not against us, or are temporarily deceived by our enemies in suspecting us. The last condition is similar to the situation obtaining in China prior to 1949. Then the Kuomintang fabricated rumors to the effect that the Communist Party committed murder and arson and that its members shared property as well as wives. Most people did not believe them and were skeptical. Not long afterward, the real facts became clear. The Communist Party was recognized by the people as the most disciplined and most virtuous, and as having a line and a policy that best conformed to the wishes of the people. And the Kuomintang was the worst party. Among our own population of 650 million, those who are really anticommunist at the most constitute no more than 10 percent. This is to say no more than 65 million people. And 585 million people either stand up for us or are temporarily suspicious of us. The situation in Pakistan is like this, so is the situation in India. Those who are truly anti-China are no more than a handful. In the New Delhi exposition, the agricultural pavilions of the different countries were opened in a so-called anti-China atmosphere. However, people who visited the China pavilion numbered as many as 3.5 million, surpassing the attendance at the agricultural pavilion of any country. I advise you comrades to make an analysis of all three categories of elements, the imperialist elements of Western countries, reactionaries and semi-reactionaries of other countries, and the revisionists and semi-revisionists of the international communist movement. Firstly they are really small in number. Secondly their anti-China activities cannot harm even one hair on our head. Thirdly, their anti-China activities will instigate the entire party and the entire people to unite and set their ambition and determination to catch up with and surpass the most developed western countries economically and culturally. Fourthly, they will certainly lift a rock only to drop on their own feet. This is to say that they will expose their own ugliness before the more than 90 percent, who are good people. Therefore, so far as we are concerned, their anti-China activities are a good thing, and not a bad thing. They prove that we are true Marxist-Leninist and that our work is not bad. To them, it is a bad thing, not a good thing, and an unlucky omen. Bad luck began to dog Chiang Kai-shek the moment he opposed communism. In 1946, he launched an all-out attack against us. Only three and one half-years later, he was crushed by the people. Everybody understands this event. At present, when foreigners engage in anti-China activities, they merely abuse us verbally a little and do not beat us with their hands. If they try to beat us with their hands they will certainly not be able to escape the fate which befell Chiang Kai-shek, Hitler and Tojo. Comrades, please ponder this. Supposing that the above mentioned 10 percent bad people and semi-bad people are not anti-China but pro-China, they are friendly to us, they praise us and say good things about us, where will that put us? Could we not become revisionists who have betrayed Marxism and the people. Furthermore, the bad and semi-bad people of the

different countries are not engaging in anti-China activities on a daily basis. Rather, they are doing it intermittently and under various pretexts. For example, under the pretext of the Tibet question and the Sino-Indian border question they conducted anti-China activities for a while. But then they could not do so forever under the pretext of these questions. This is because they were short of reason and over 90 percent of the people did not believe what they said. If they continued their anti-China activities every day, their position would become more and more untenable. The hatred between the U.S. and us is somewhat deeper. But they do not engage in anti-China activities daily. They also do it intermittently. This is also because there is no reason for them to attack us every day. Their listeners will get disgusted with them. When the market dwindles, it can only be closed. After a time, when there is a new pretext, they will set their anti-China activities in motion again. Not only is there now a brief pause between two waves of anti-China activities, but also there may be a pause of a longer duration in the future. This will depend on how well we perform our work. For example: if the entire party and the entire people really unite as one and the gross output and per capita output in our main production items approximate or overtake theirs, then such pauses will be prolonged. This is to say that this will compel the Americans to establish diplomatic relations with us and do business with us on an equal basis, or else they will be isolated. We have the advanced experiences of the Soviet Union to go by. In the past several decades, no one has opposed the Soviet Union with good results. The most brutal opposition came in the form of an armed attack against the Soviet Union. This principally refers to Hitler's savage onslaught during the Second World war. His defeat was also the most disastrous. Therefore, I would like to advise you comrades to utilize this material on Pakistan to ponder our tasks and work and through the nature and significance of this so-called anti-China question, to make sufficient preparations mentally to accept the fact that about 10 percent of the people in the world will oppose us intermittently over a prolonged period of time. You have to contemplate what is called a prolonged period in terms of 10 years, at the very least, or even the entire balance of 40 years of the 20th century. If we are given the 40 years, the world situation will have greatly changed by the end of the century. The majority or vast majority of that 10 percent of bad people or semi-bad people most likely will have been overthrown by their own people. In our country, on the average, everybody most likely will have 1,000 tons of steel and 3,000 to 4,000 *catties* of grain and feed, and the majority of the people will have a college education. By then, the people's level of political consciousness and theoretical level will be far higher than now. Most likely, the whole society will pass over to a communist society at that time. In short, the heart of all questions lies in our own unity and how well we perform our work.

Comments On Vice Premier Nieh Jung-chen's Report On The Technical Revolution

March 25, 1960

The mass movements of technical revolution and cultural revolution on our industrial and communication fronts, agricultural, forestry, livestock, subsidiary products, and pisciculture fronts, finance and trade fronts, education and health fronts and national defense are fiercely developing. New hope and new things are emerging in abundance. We urge you to examine them carefully, be ready to sum up, and popularize them.

The People Of Asia, Africa And Latin America Should Unite And Drive American Imperialism Back To Where It Came From

May 7, 1959

[SOURCE: "Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Important Talks with Guests from Asia, Africa, and Latin America," Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1960, pp 2-8.]

(On 7 May, in Chengchow, Comrade Mao Tse-tung received public personages, workers for peace, trade union, youth, and student delegations and delegates from twelve African countries and regions who were then visiting China...)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung spoke of the ever-growing national and democratic movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. He said that what imperialism fears most is the awakening of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples, the awakening of the peoples of all countries. We should unite and drive U.S. imperialism from Asia, Africa and Latin America back to where it came from...

Comrade Mao Tse-tung on behalf of the 650 million Chinese people, expressed full sympathy and support for the heroic struggle of the African people against imperialism and colonialism. He also expressed sympathy and support for the patriotic and just

struggles of the South Korean people and the Turkish people against U.S. imperialism and its running dogs. He held that these struggles of the South Korean people and the Turkish people indicated that the storm of the struggles waged by the oppressed peoples of the various countries in Asia against imperialism and its running dogs will witness an even greater upsurge. These struggles will constitute a support to the just struggles of the African people, the Latin American people and people the world over. The just struggles of the peoples of various countries in the world support each other, Comrades Mao Tse-tung said. He thanked the African friends for their profound friendship for the Chinese people, hailed the great unity of the Chinese and African peoples and expressed firm confidence that ultimate victory will certainly be won in the common struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

(On 8 May, in Chengchow Comrade Mao Tse-tung received friends from eight Latin American countries then visiting China...)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung thanked them for their friendship for the Chinese people. The Chinese people, he said, just like the Latin American people had long suffered from imperialist oppression and exploitation. Relying on their own unity and support from the peoples of various countries, the Chinese people had carried on hard and prolonged struggles and ultimately had over-thrown the rule of imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic-capitalism in China. They are now building their own country and changing its appearance of 'poverty and blankness'. The Chinese people are fully confident that they can build their country and therefore they need time, peace, and friends. The Cuban people, the people of Latin America and the people of the whole world, he said, are all friends of the Chinese people; and imperialism and its running dogs are our common enemy, but they are a tiny minority. The winning of world peace, he said, depends primarily on the struggles of the peoples of the various countries. Comrade Mao Tse-tung expressed admiration for the heroic struggle of the Cuban people against U.S. imperialism. The struggles of the peoples of Cuba and other Latin American countries have helped the Chinese people, he said, and the struggle of the Chinese people has also helped the peoples of Cuba and other Latin American countries. The people are the decisive factor. Reliance on the unity and struggle of the people is bound to bring about the defeat of imperialism and its running dogs and achieve lasting world peace.

(On 9 May, Chairman Mao Tse-tung received in Chengchow friends from the Iraqi Cultural Delegation, the Iraqi workers Delegation, the Iranian Trade Union Delegation, and the Delegation of the Cyprus Confederation of Workers....)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said that U.S. imperialism is the biggest imperialism in the world today. It has its running dogs in many countries. Those backed by imperialism are precisely those discarded by the broad masses of the people. Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Kishi, Batista, Said, Menderes and their ilk have either been overthrown or will be overthrown by the people. The rising of the people in these countries against the running dogs of U.S. and other imperialism are also fights against the reactionary rule of imperialism itself. The Japanese people are rising in action, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said. The broad masses of the Japanese people are now holding demonstrations on a bigger

scale than ever to fight against the aggressive military alliance treaty signed between the Kishi Government and U.S. imperialism. The Chinese people resolutely support this struggle waged by the Japanese people. The just struggles of the peoples of the various countries in the world, he said, have received and will continue to receive firm support from the 650 million people of China. The days of imperialism are numbered, he said. The imperialists have committed all manners of evils and all the oppressed peoples of the whole world will never forgive them. To defeat the reactionary rule of imperialism, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said, it is necessary to form a broad front and unite with all forces, except the enemy, and continue to wage arduous struggles....

(On 14 May, in Wuhan, Comrade Mao Tse-tung received friends from Japan, Cuba, Brazil and Argentina...)

Summing Up Ten Years

June 18, 1960

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

The power of initiative is like “building tiles on a high roof and “breaking bamboo link by link.” This power of initiative is derived from the realistic and the practical, it comes from the honest reflection in objective conditions of the mind of the people, and it results from the people’s process of understanding the dialectic of the objective environment. In the course of this process there will be a good many mistaken understandings, a gradual correction of these errors, and finally a return to the correct.

It is impossible not to commit errors. As Lenin said, there has never been a man who did not commit errors. An earnest Party will view seriously the commission of errors, search out the reasons for the commission of the errors, and openly correct them. Our Party’s general line is correct, and actual work has basically been carried out well. There are some errors, which are difficult to avoid. Where is the so-called saint who never commits errors and who at once carries out truth to completion? Knowledge of truth is not achieved at once, but is gradually achieved. We are adherents of the theory of dialectical materialism, not of the theory of metaphysics. Freedom is inevitable knowledge; from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom is a flying leap, which is accomplished only gradually in the course of a long process of knowledge. We already have ten years of experience in our socialist revolution and construction and we already understand quite few things. But we still have insufficient experience in socialist construction. Remaining before us is a great, still unrecognized realm of necessity. We are still unable to understand it penetratingly. From now on we must continue to investigate and analyze it from practice; we must seek out its constant rules and beneficially utilize these rules in the service of the socialist cause.

Dissemination Of The CC, CPCs' Criticism Of The Shansi Provincial Party Committee's Report On The Rural Labor Force Problem

October 27, 1960

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

The Politburo of the Central Committee, party committees of the provinces, municipalities, and autonomous regions, party committees of the various central ministries, and party groups of the various central state organs:

Shansi Provincial Party Committees' report on the rural labor force problem is very good and is now being distributed for your scrutiny.

The problem of the rural labor force is a great problem in the current development of agricultural production. It is a great problem which touches on the continuing leap forward of the entire national economy. It must receive the serious scrutiny of comrades in the entire party. The report of the Shansi Provincial Party Committee is stated very correctly. If we don't immediately change the current situation on the agricultural production front of a labor force which is too small and too weak, then the so-called "national economy with agriculture as the foundation" and "grain as the foundation of that foundation" will become empty talk. Man must eat every day, whether engaged in industry, communication, education, capital construction, or any other enterprise; no one can do without grain. No member of the communist party ought to forget this very simple and absolutely true and correct principle. For three months the Shansi Provincial Committee conscientiously adopted measures, reduced the labor force by 1.1 million and returned them to the agricultural production front. The situation of the agricultural labor force has taken a great turn for the better. The Central Committee requires that all levels of party committees and leading organs of various departments seriously study Shansi's report, use Shansi's experience as a reference, analyze from many sides, and comply strictly with the various directives promulgated by the Central Committee on conservation of labor force. On the basis of your actual conditions, adopt all effective measures, squeeze out all of the labor force that can be squeezed out, strengthen the first line of agricultural production, and speedily change the grave situation of the present insufficiency of labor force.

Opinion On The Free Supply System

1960

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

In handling the free supply system, the Marxist style of work and the bourgeois style of work stand opposed in communist life. In my view the rural area work style and the guerrilla attitude are still good; in 22 years of war these were victorious.

Why is building communism unacceptable? Why must we grasp a wages system? This is offering concessions to the bourgeoisie and borrowing the rural area work style and guerrilla attitude to debase us. The result is development of individualism. We have forgotten that we must persuade through words and not by oppression; is it the PLA unit leaders who have restored the free supply system?

We must eradicate bourgeois jurisdiction and ideology. For example, contesting for position, contesting for rank, wanting to increase wages and giving higher wages to the intellectual worker and lower wages to the physical laborer are all remnants of bourgeois ideology. To each according to his worth is prescribed by law and it is also a bourgeois thing. In the future do we want to have a division into classes when riding vehicles? We don't necessarily want to have a special car. We want to show some consideration toward the elderly and the weak, but we don't want different classes for the others.

Our party is a party which continuously fought a war for more than 20 years. For a long time it has implemented the free supply system. From several tens of thousands of persons it grew to several million, right up to liberation. In the very beginning the collective lived an egalitarian life. In work everyone was industrious and in warfare all were courageous. There was absolutely no reliance on material incentives, but rather a reliance on the drumbeat of revolutionary spirit.

Classical Works Recommended To High-Ranking Cadres

1960

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Marx:

- 1) The Communist Manifesto
- 2) Wage-Labour and Capital
- 3) Preface and Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy
- 4) The Class Struggles in France, 1848-50
- 5) The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte
- 6) To Kugelmann
- 7) Wages, Price and Profit
- 8) The Civil War in France
- 9) Critique of the Gotha Programme

Engels:

- 1) The 1852 War of the Holy Alliance Against France
- 2) Introduction to Dialectics of Nature
- 3) Socialism Utopian and Scientific
- 4) Anti-Duhring (the section on violence)
- 5) Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy

Lenin:

- 1) Philosophical Note books.
- 2) What is To Be Done?
- 3) Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution
- 4) Materialism and Empirio-Criticism
- 5) On Imperialism
- 6) The State and Revolution

7) The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky

8) “Left Wing” Communism an Infantile Disorder

9) Concerning Marx, Engels, and Marxism

Stalin:

1) Problems of Leninism

2) Concerning Reactionaries (*Collected Works*)

3) Short Course of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik)

4) Marxism and Problems of Linguistics

5) Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR

Plekhanov:

1) Concerning the Evolution of the Monist View of History

2) Concerning Literature and Art

Principles Of Educating Youth

1960

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

The principles of educating youth are:

1. Teach them to grasp Marxism-Leninism and to overcome petit-bourgeois consciousness.
2. Teach them to have discipline and organization and to oppose anarchism and libertarianism in organization.
3. Teach them to penetrate resolutely into the lower levels of practical work and to oppose looking down on practical experience.
4. Teach them to become close to the workers and peasants, to serve them resolutely, and to oppose the consciousness of looking down on workers and peasants.

Directive On The Question Of Class Distinction

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

It is necessary to determine class status. Although bad people are in the minority, they nevertheless occupy some of the crucial departments and are in authority. . . There should be distinction between one's class component and one's own performance, primarily the latter. To draw class lines is to ferret out the bad elements.

It also important to distinguish between class background and one's own performance, with emphasis on the latter. The exclusive component theory is incorrect. The question is whether you take the stand of your original class or take a changed class stand, that is, taking the side of workers and poor and lower-middle peasants. Moreover, you are not supposed to engage in sectarianism, but must unite with the majority, even including some of the landlords and rich peasants, as well as their children. There are some counter revolutionaries and saboteurs who should be transformed, and if they wish to transform, we should have them, one and all. But if we consider only the background, then even Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin would be unacceptable. For instance, Marx studied idealism first and Materialism later before he developed Marxism. Both Hegel and Fueurbach were his mentors in the field of philosophy.

In undertaking class determination in factories, our purpose is mainly to find out those Kuomintang secretaries, generals, reactionary officers, escaped landlords, and landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bad elements. As in Pai-Yin Factory, it was to check the bad people, not every body, and not the technical staff who came from exploitative classes. Some of them used to serve the exploitative class. If their present performances are good, we should trust them, and even though it is not too good, they must be transformed. Some of them have come from exploitative classes, and so we must see how their performance is.

In order to produce socialist theory, it behoves intellectuals to study the existing phenomena of class struggle, to enhance the results of their study theoretically, and to proselytize them, thus changing the working class from a diffused into an organized class, and from a self-developing in to a self-conscious class. The workers, because they have to work and earn their living everyday under exploitation and oppression, cannot produce Marxism by themselves. Marx was not a worker himself, but he could perceive the trend of development, and after studying analytically, succeeded in changing bourgeois philosophy into proletarian philosophy, and bourgeois political economy into proletarian political economy, thereby educating the workers. In point of fact, it is impossible for a worker to read so many books or to read such bulky volumes, though the advanced ones could perhaps read more. The phenomenon of class struggle has existed

for millenniums and even the bourgeoisie conceded that there was class struggle. It was only Marx and Engels who made it into a theory and systemized it. We must knock down the bourgeoisie. Socialism has succeeded capitalism. I myself also learned from the landlord class by studying Confucius's book for six years and by attending bourgeois schools for seven years, spending 13 years altogether. I was then only 20-odd years of age, and was basically ignorant about Marx. It was only after the October revolution that I heard of Marx and read his books.

Speech At The Ninth Plenum Of The Eighth CPC Central Committee

January 18, 1961

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Let me talk about investigation and study, as I did at the work conference. In the period of the Democratic Revolution we made many mistakes of line; those on the right did no investigation or study and neither did those on the left. The questions of what the circumstances in China were then, and of what line and what tactics to use, were not resolved. After the Great Revolution and the Second Revolutionary Civil War met defeat, we went through the Tsun-yi conference and the rectification movement of the Seventh Central Committee, and by 1949 we gained a revolutionary victory.

During the War of Liberation, the circumstances in the fight against Chiang Kai-shek were fairly clear; we were fairly familiarly with the various aspects of revolution and circumstances were relatively straightforward.

After the victory, dealing with the lives of several hundred million people, the situation was more complicated. With the mistakes of the past, it had been easy to educate the whole party. For several years everybody was doing investigation and study, but not much. We had no deep understanding of conditions. The restoration of the landlords was an example. It was not something we tried to pin on them — it was how things really were. They were flying the Communist Party flag, but what they were doing was in fact restoration. Only after disturbances broke out did we realize that all three levels of cooperative units had, on the whole, connections with the counterrevolution. Rigid bureaucrats were the allies of the Democratic Revolution; in addition there were some confused people who did not understand the three-level ownership system and did not understand that if the Communist wind cannot blow, the counter-revolution will use it to attain its evil ends.

In Honan we had the “four highs” — high targets, high production estimates, high rate of government purchase and high level of food use; but we are not using them any more

— instead we are lowering standards and taking the pressure off them. Things are going the other way, and this is more in accord with reality.

We have been talking for five years about “agriculture, light and heavy industry,” “simultaneous development of industry and agriculture,” “walking on two legs,” and last year these were not realized, but it appears that this year they may possibly be realized. We can only say “possibly,” because they haven’t yet been realized, but this fact is reflected in the plans.

Investigation and study were also lacking in regard to landlord restoration. We paid more attention to the urban counter-revolutionary elements. After the events in Hungary, we allowed scattered free expression of opinion and tens of thousands of little Hungaries appeared; little Hungaries appeared at Peking University, People’s University and Tsinghua University and over four hundred thousand rightists had to be purged. The rural areas were also purged, not thoroughly; but we never anticipated the problem of landlord restoration — or we did abstractly, for we always used to talk about contradictions between bourgeoisie and proletariat, and in the Eighth Central Committee resolution the contradiction between advanced production methods and backward production methods was cited.

The Lushan Conference anti-rightist program threw the movement for correction of “leftists” into disorder. At the time anti-rightism was an absolute necessity. The Communist wind began to blow again and we did some “large-scale undertakings.” Indeed, large-scale water conservancy and large-scale industry had great and undeniable achievements.

Of the problems of the Communist wind, rigid bureaucrats, confused people, and landlord restoration within the revolutionary ranks, some were not made clear, and some were discussed but without much result.

At the Lushan Conference, the problem of the movement for correction of “leftists” had not been made clear, but P’eng Te-huai forced us to accept the challenge and scatter the anti-Leftists.”

Last year the central leadership comrades devoted their main energy to international questions.

At Shanghai in January, Canton in February, Hangchow in March, Shanghai in May, Pei-tai-ho in September, and at Moscow Conference, the Central Committee paid attention to [international] matters and adversely influenced the local comrades.

Why was Khrushchev so anxious to convene the Bucharest Conference and in July the Soviet Plenum began to attack us? Because if he hadn’t done so he would have been in trouble: at home his position was none too solid, and they had incorrectly evaluated the situation. They feared the three articles like the plague, while we were not afraid of the “three don’t’s.” We reprinted several hundred thousand revisionist books — weren’t

afraid of all that, and they had to be studied. But they said we were stirring up factions, that China was stirring up factions, and that the three articles were our program for stirring things up against the Soviet Union.

Not only we, but many foreigners as well, said that the three articles were good.

Why was he so anxious to convene the Bucharest Conference? Because he wanted to secure his position, and they thought that this way they could force us down.

We have to summon up all our energies to deal with the situation at home. For the working class to unite with the majority of the peasants, it must start by relying upon poor and lower-middle peasants, and upon middle peasants with a good attitude.

The Moscow Conference abated the anti-Chinese trend, which originated with rightist opportunists in the fraternal parties in the U.S., India and Yugoslavia.

I agree with the opinion of Comrade Liu Hsiao that the problems have not been solved because they have a social basis.

In our party there are also those who represent the landlord class and the bourgeoisie.

We should not harm the interests of the well-to-do middle peasants. They cannot exploit the peasants. This would be anti-Marxist. Just as soon as we reimburse and indemnify them, the masses will be satisfied, and their mood will change.

This year we are not going to do “two accounts” or put more weights into the balance; in everything we will start out from reality. We will simply weigh and store foodstuffs; we will not use the “four highs”; we’ll lower them a bit and resolutely carry out a single account, equal-value exchange, distribution according to labor, work-more-get-more; and we will resolutely purge the “five habits.”

In the urban rectification we will run pilot programs. Cities have special urban characteristics, different from those of the rural areas.

This year it appears that the plans won’t be much higher than last year. Some people are suggesting there be no changes in steel production this year and that its output should stay at 18,500,000 tons, or possibly 19,000,000 tons, but not much above last year. This is a reasonable suggestion. Since the targets of the Second Five-Year Plan have long since been attained, quantity need not jump, but quality will. With steel not going up, the imperialists and revisionists may say that our Great Leap Forward has failed, They can run us down as much as they like, but in reality we are working on quality, technology, standards, management, rate of production... lowering production costs, the right material for each purpose, overcoming insufficiencies, adjustments, and consolidation, rounding out, upgrading, in reality it’s case of raising fat pigs in the hall.

England's steel output is greater than ours for the time being, but we will certainly be able to catch or even surpass England in seven more years. Can we catch West Germany (34 million tons)? We must wait and see. We lack experience in economic construction (I have discussed this with Edgar Snow), and our understanding of the laws will have to be repeated a few times, but we hope we will not take 28 years to be successful as the Democratic Revolution did. In reality, 28 years isn't very long. There are many fraternal parties that were founded at about the same time as ours, and they still have not succeeded. We can cut that number by eight years and still get our experience, but it cannot be cut by much more as we used to hope. We cannot transform what we do not know about. Finally, we have to urge people forward; we don't want to have to oppose rightism again at the March meeting — everybody ought to be genuinely revolutionary. We should hold resolutely to the general line, and aim high. Some people have said we should only stress "better and more economical results" now and not "greater and faster results." In food we need "greater and faster results," and also in industry with respect to material grades, standards and quality we need "greater and faster results."

On the question of unity, the unity of the Central Committee is the heart of the whole party's unity. At the Lushan Conference a small number of comrades opposed unity, but we hope to unite with them no matter how many errors they have made. If they say "you have made errors too," I say that's fine: everybody makes mistakes, in this we're alike; but there are differences in size and gravity, differences in nature, number and quality. If you've made a mistake, don't be afraid to hold your head up, and if some comrades' work positions are lowered that's all right.

P'eng Te-huai's letter reporting on his year of study is welcome regardless of whether or not he has progressed.[\[1\]](#)

Beyond this, when there are comrades working in the Central Committee and the local areas who have also made errors, we welcome their correcting themselves in the course of their work. The situation was grave in Shantung, Honan and Kansu. They didn't understand the circumstances at all, and so their resolution was not great, and their methods not very correct. Now that they understand the circumstances it's easier to manage. Hsin-yang, Honan, which we were all worried about, has now become a good area, a revolutionary area that has turned over a new leaf and seized political power, Kansu has also taken a turn for the better. Of the other places, about 20 percent have broken down. This is not only because of the food problem; according to Commander-in-Chief Lin's report, 400 out of 10,000 army units — 4 percent — have broken down, and this was not due to the food problem but to the fact that the leadership had fallen into the hands of the enemy. This was also the case in the cities, factories and schools.

According to our policy, we should get rid of the enemy. Rigid bureaucrats should be reformed into creative bureaucrats. If after a long time they can't become creative, then we should get rid of them.

More than 90 percent of the population are good people, but there are confused people among them. We have been confused ourselves — otherwise why did we have the Long March? Because we didn't understand circumstances and our policies were not suitable.

Now in handling the new questions of social revolution and social construction, we should institute training squads and train county, commune and brigade cadres, so that they will understand policy.

We can't say that most cadres are unreliable or are KMT people — we should unite everybody we can — but also we can't kill a lot of counter-revolutionary elements. We should be wary of killing people and should not repeat our past mistakes. The Soviet Union killed too many people. At Yen-an we declared that no cadre was to be killed. Even P'an Han-nien^[2] couldn't be killed, because one killing leads to another, and more and more people would be getting killed. If we wanted to practice the Buddhist injunction against killing — there are a few people who should be killed because otherwise the people's indignation could not be relieved. When the Central Committee makes a mistake, it does not involve the question of killing. We will not make Stalin's mistake, but we will also not make Khrushchev's more civilized mistake of dismissing the Central Committee.

We must unite with the Soviet Union, with fraternal parties, with the 87 national parties, no matter what charges they make against us. We shouldn't fear criticism, for there has been criticism ever since there has been a Communist Party, and without it we wouldn't be the Communist Party. No matter what their attitude, we should adopt a policy of unity. In time of necessity, for instance at a conference, in case of a departure from the right principles, any person, no matter who, should be criticized. They have upbraided us on five counts: being a paper tiger, "the east wind prevails over the west wind," the longer Nehru is anti-China the better, and the sinification of Marxism-Leninism.

Marxism-Leninism is basically one with different twigs and leaves, like a single tree that has many different twigs and leaves. Circumstances vary in different countries. In the past we suffered from having only paying attention to universal truths without paying attention to investigation and study. I hope this year will be a year of investigation and study, one in which investigation and study will flourish. When I talked about these things nobody opposed them, but not many people supported them either, or if they did, they didn't make good on their support. In investigation and study, it's fine to do specialized investigation and study. If you're in favor of them, you can make them work. But if you're not in favor of them, there's nothing to be done.

If we really arouse the masses, they can determine who are the good and bad elements. Some are landlord elements or bad elements who have seized leadership, some are cadres who have fallen away and been won over... The masses can determine, but we on the other hand have not been very well able to determine. We must have resolution, we must send out large numbers of cadres to profoundly link up and profoundly star the masses into action: otherwise we will not be able to solve the problem.

When we go into the work of inspection, we must see with our own eyes, not someone else's, and hear with our own ears, we must feel with our hands, discuss with our mouths, hold fact-finding meetings ... These last few years we haven't been investigating, we've been doing things on the basis of estimates; I urge the comrades to promote a resurgence of investigation. In everything we must start out from actuality, and not express an opinion or make a resolution if we are not sure of the situation. It's not that hard to do investigation, and it doesn't take that many people or that much time; in the rural areas, you can investigate one commune unit or in the city one or two factories, stores or schools, no more than a dozen or so in all. You don't have to do it all yourself: if you do one or two yourself you can organize a squad for the rest and lead it yourself... This is very important: party committee secretaries and members should all do investigation and study, or they may not have a clear understanding of conditions. You should understand good, average and bad typical cases.

In our work three things are required: understanding of circumstances, great determination and correct orientation. Clear understanding of circumstances comes first and is the basis of all work, because if circumstances are not understood there is no basis for discussion.

Even correct policy is no help if the circumstances are not understood. The policy of the Chengchow Conference was correct, but they said we would not settle accounts, and would not reimburse and indemnify anyone. But this was reversed later. The Shanghai conference adopted eighteen articles, criticized the Ma-cheng report, and said that we would make reimbursement and indemnification. In 1959 I put out thirty or forty thousand words of material, but it is clear that a mere "battle on paper" is useless, because circumstances were covered up. There were differences in understanding; but now the understanding of the comrades on the provincial and local committees is more profound.

In 1961 we wanted to have a year of "seeking the truth from reality". We have a tradition of "seeking the truth from reality" but probably as the pressure of official work increased we no longer paid attention to getting to the bottom of things. If you do not understand typical cases, then you will not be able to do your work easily. From now on everybody must do investigation and study and not just run other people down.

In the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal period of the Democratic Revolution, we emphasized investigation work, and the habit of investigation and study in the party as a whole was rather good. In the 10 years or so since Liberation, our work has rather fallen off in this respect. Why? We need to analyze this. Because in the period of the Democratic Revolution, we made several mistakes in line... both the right and the left failed to do investigation and study. For a long time the questions of what the circumstances were in China at the time and what strategy, tactics and policies to adopt were not solved. During the war of liberation, in the fight with Chiang Kai-shek, we paid a lot of attention to investigation, and circumstances were relatively clear. We were fairly familiar with the various aspects of waging revolution, and the problems were relatively straightforward. After Liberation the situation became more complicated. In the past when we had made

some mistakes, it was fairly easy to educate the whole party. After liberation for several years we did some investigation and study, but not enough, and we didn't have a very good understanding of circumstances, as for example in the case of landlord restoration. It was only after disturbances broke out that we realized that the landlords were being restored. Generally, all three levels, the counties, the communes and the brigades, were somewhat counter-revolutionary. Rigid bureaucratic elements who took no account of party policy or of whether the masses lived or died belonged to the third category of bad elements. In the second category are the degenerate elements; in the first category, the landlord elements. The first and second are contradictions between ourselves and the enemy.... contradictions with rigid bureaucrats are contradictions among the people, but they must be strictly dealt with, by removing them from leadership positions and educating and reforming them. All who wish to correct themselves may do so through their work. There is ! another category of those who don't know how to go about things, who are muddled and confused; this is the fourth category. In the fifth are those with an average knowledge on policy matters who are not clear on some questions. In the sixth category are those who are not clear in their minds, know what to do, and do it fairly well. Throughout the country, over 90 percent of the cadres are good or fairly good. Of communes and brigades, 80 percent are good or fairly good, Rigid bureaucrats subjectively are not necessarily aiding the counter-revolution, but in actuality they are aiding it, and a part of them are its direct allies. All three collective elements have connections with the counter-revolution. When rigid bureaucrats pay no attention to whether people live or die, then no matter how they are subjectively, they are in fact the allies of the counterrevolution. If there are people who do not understand the three-level ownership system, then the Communist wind cannot blow. The counter-revolution will make use of them to achieve its evil deeds.

We were lacking in investigation and study concerning the restoration of the landlord class, but we were better informed about the urban counterrevolution. After the events in Hungary in 1956, by means of free expression of opinion we got to the bottom of things and purged several hundred thousand rightists; we also did a purge of the collectives in the countryside, but we did not anticipate the landlord restoration. Theoretically speaking, we anticipated it, because we had discussed the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Is it the landlords' and bourgeoisie's world or the proletariat's world? But we didn't carry out investigation or study, and so we did not understand the circumstances and our determination was not great. In 1959 the Communist wind was blowing, but because we did not understand the circumstances, our determination was not great. In the interval came the Lushan Conference. There emerged the right opportunist anti-party clique. We could not but be forced into fighting the right opportunists and could not but oppose them. But afterwards the Communist wind began to blow unprecedentedly hard, and we did some great undertakings: large-scale water conservancy, large-scale industry, large-scale agriculture, large-scale socialized economy, large-scale local railroads. We won a great achievement, this is undeniable. But how did we manage to carry on such large-scale undertakings? After the Lushan Conference, circumstances were not very dear, and a gust of wind blew from the right, in response to international revisionism and internal right wing. Last year the comrades on the Central Committee concentrated their force on international questions, and the

circumstances were understood, the determination great, and the methods correct. We need to collect our forces to deal with internal problems too, to oppose counter-revolutionary elements and rigid bureaucratic elements, and to organize poor and lower-middle peasant committees to replace them, to unite the (poor and lower-middle) peasants. In our party there are elements representing the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie; we must cleanse the party of them.

As to the question of unity within the party: the unity of the Central Committee is the heart of the unity of the whole party. At the Lushan conference there was a small number of people who were opposed to unity. But we must stress unity. Making progress is well and good, but are we really making progress? They say “you have made mistakes too.” This is right. Everybody makes mistakes; but they differ in size and nature. If you make a mistake, don’t be afraid to hold up your head: the Central Committee and the locals have all made mistakes.

This year we will stress work on quality and on product variety. The figure of X X X tons is not small, but the problem is that the quality is not high enough, so we will not lay stress on increasing quantity but on variety, quality, standards.

There has been some achievements in industry. But we must continue to strive for new achievements. We must contract industry, heavy industry, particularly on the basic construction front, and we must extend the agriculture and light industry fronts. This year we will not inaugurate new basic construction; some parts of old construction we will continue to do, while other parts we will leave where they are. Judging from the present, socialist construction cannot be too fast; we have to stress wavelike advances. Comrade Chen Po-ta has raised the question whether socialism has a periodic law. Just like an army on the march, it must have long and short rests; in between battles it must rest and regroup, must combine hard work and relaxation.

I have talked about “light industry, heavy industry, agriculture,” “simultaneous development of industry and agriculture,” and “walking on two legs” for five years, but they have not been realized. Now they may possibly be realized. I only say “possibly,” because the 1961 plan reflects the relationships among agriculture, and light and heavy industry, so there is a possibility.

At this conference, circumstances have gotten steadily clearer and determination has gotten steadily greater, but they are still uneven. Some comrades have said that “when the Communist wind blows we will have to go bankrupt and pay back our debts.” This way of speaking sounds bad at first, but in reality we will have to go bankrupt and pay back our debts. Once the county and commune levels have gone bankrupt and paid off their debts they will then have to “build their house with their bare hands.” In the past they built their house with others’ work. We Marxist-Leninists cannot exploit the workers, we can only exploit the exploiters. This is the basic principle of Marxism. Building the house with others’ work is getting it through exploitation, and is contrary to Marxism-Leninism. The landlords and the bourgeoisie are the ones who exploit the people; their method is to gradually cause the working people to go bankrupt. We practice equalization and use this

method to set up a cooperative-ownership and public-ownership economy. If the state-run economy does not purchase goods at an equal price but at a lower price, they may be exploiting the peasants and may be causing the proletariat to desert its ally — the peasantry. It's easy to talk, but it's not very easy to put into practice. Has the First Secretary really the determination to break up the property and pay back the debts? If this is not practiced by even a single province, then the leadership is lacking in determination.

After the Chengchow Conference (March 1959) the sentiment for thorough reimbursement and indemnification had largely evaporated, but in some quarters it still exists. At the beginning of this fall, the Central Committee was not clear about various conditions; did not understand them, and still did not rectify them thoroughly. It was good that this kind of meeting was held last spring. Many meetings were held last year, but statements on the problems were not very concentrated, and conditions not very well understood, determination not very great, and methods not very correct.

Notes

[1.] For Peng's letter see [pp 237-238](#) of this volume.

[2.] Pan Han-nien, once served as a vice-mayor of Shanghai. Previously he had secretly capitulated to the Kuomintang and had become a member of the notorious CC Clique.

Preface To “Oppose Book Worship”[[1](#)]

March 11, 1961

This is an old article which was written to oppose dogmatism in the Red Army at that time. At that time we did not use the term *Chiao-t'iao-chu-i* (dogmatism) but rather *Pen-pen-Chu-I* (bookworship). The article was written approximately in the spring of 1930. It has already been 30 years since I have read it. In January 1961, I suddenly found it in the Central Revolutionary Museum. The Central Revolutionary Museum had found it in the Fukien Lung Yen Area committee. In reading it I find that it still has some use, so I have had printed a good many copies as reference for comrades.

Notes

[1.] For the article Oppose Book Worship, see [Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol VI](#), pp. 28-36 (Kranti Publications, 1990).

To The Communist Labour University In Kiangsi

August 1, 1961

Comrades

I wholeheartedly support your venture. Your schools, including your primary and secondary schools, and universities which follow the principle of part-time work and part-time study, hard work and hard study, thus costing the government nothing to run them, and which are situated on the mountain tops and in the plains of the province, are good schools indeed. Most of the students are young people, but there may also be some middle-aged cadres. I hope in other provinces besides Kiangsi there will be schools of this type. Other provinces should send competent and knowledgeable comrades in responsible positions to Kiangsi to investigate your schools and to absorb your experience. At the beginning there must not be too many students. Their number can be increased later to 50,000 as now in Kiangsi. Moreover the party, government and people's organizations (e.g. trade unions, youth league and women's associations) should also run their own schools on the principle of part-time work and part-time study. But there should be a difference [between] the work and study of your schools [and theirs]. Your work consists of agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry and so on; your studies are [also] on these subjects. The schools run by the party, government and people's organizations, on the other hand, should work in their own institutions and study cultural sciences, current affairs, Marxism-Leninism and so on. They are quite different from you. The central organizations have established two schools. One was created by the military police corps, which has been in existence for six or seven years. There the soldiers and cadres began by learning to read and write in the primary section, then they were promoted into the secondary section and finally entered the university section in 1960. They felt happy and wrote me a letter. I shall have the letter printed and show it to you. The other was established last year (1960) by the party institutions in Chungnanhai [Peking] on the same principle of part-time work and part-time study. Its work means the work in the institutions, [and its students] include senior members of the staff, members of the manual staff, members of the liaison staff, members of the medical staff, members of the security staff and others. The military police, on the other hand, is an

armed force whose work is security, i.e. sentry duties and so on. It also goes through military training. Naturally its school is different from civilian schools.

The Communist Labour University of Kiangsi celebrates its third anniversary on 1 August 1961 and I was asked to write a few words for the occasion. It is a big occasion for which I have written the above.

[Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung](#)

Talk At An Enlarged Working Conference Convened By The Central Committee Of The Communist Party Of China

January 30, 1962

[SOURCE: Extracted from *Peking Review*, No. 27, July 7, 1978.]

[Text and references are given here as provided by the Maoist Documentation Project. They are significantly different in at least one existing edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. VIII. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

Comrades! I have a few points to raise (*enthusiastic applause*). Altogether there are six points I want to talk about. The main substance of what I want to say is the problem of democratic centralism, but at the same time I want to talk about a number of other problems.

(1) *The way this conference is being run*

This enlarged central work conference is being attended by over 7,000 people. At the start of the conference Comrade Liu Shao-ch'i and several other comrades prepared a draft report. Before this draft had been discussed by the Political Bureau, I suggested to them that instead of first holding a meeting of the Political Bureau to discuss it, we should rather immediately issue it to the comrades who are participating in this conference so that everyone could comment on it and put forward ideas. Comrades, there are among you people from various fields and localities, various provincial, district and county committees, and from the Party committees of various enterprises. There are people from various departments at the Centre. The majority of you have more contact with the lower levels, and should have more understanding of situations and problems than us comrades on the Standing Committee, the Political Bureau and the Secretariat.

Furthermore, since you all hold different positions you can raise problems from different angles. That is why we invited you to put forward ideas and issued the draft report to you. The result has been a lively discussion in which many ideas have been put forward, not all of them along the lines of the basic policy of the Central Committee. Later Comrade Shao-ch'i presided over a drafting committee of twenty-one, including responsible members of the various central bureaux. After eight days of discussion they produced a second draft written report. It should be said that in this second draft report the Centre has collected together the results of over 7,000 people's discussion. Without your ideas this second draft could not have been written. In it both the first and second parts have many revisions. This is due to your efforts. I hear that you all consider the second draft to be not bad, and an improvement on the first. If we had not used this method, but held the conference in the usual manner, we would have heard the report first and held a discussion afterwards. Everyone would have approved it with a show of hands and we wouldn't have done as well as this.

This is a question of how to hold meetings. First of all, draft reports are distributed, and those present are invited to submit their ideas and amendments. Then a new report is prepared. When this report is presented it shouldn't be read out word by word, but some supplementary ideas should be expounded and the changes should be explained. In this way we can promote democracy more fully, gather wisdom from all directions, and compare all the different points of view. Also our meetings will be more lively. The purpose of this conference is to sum up the working experience of the past twelve years and especially the working experience of the last four years. There are many problems, so there may be many ideas being put forward, thus creating conditions favourable for this type of conference. Is it possible for all conferences to adopt this method? No, it is not possible. To use this method we must have plenty of time. We can sometimes use this method at meetings of our people's congresses. Comrades from provincial committees, district committees, and county committees, when you convene conferences in future you may also adopt this method under suitable conditions. Of course when you are busy you usually cannot spend a lot of time on conferences. But when conditions are right, why not try it out?

What sort of method is this? It is a democratic centralist method; it is a mass-line method. First democracy, then centralism; coming from the masses, returning to the masses; the unity of the leadership and the masses. This is the first point I wanted to talk about.

(2) The problem of democratic centralism

It seems that some of our comrades still do not understand the democratic centralism which Marx and Lenin talked of. Some of those comrades are already veteran revolutionaries, with a 'three eight style' [1] or some other style — anyway they have been Party members for several decades, yet they still do not understand this question. They are afraid of the masses, afraid of the masses talking about them, afraid of the masses criticizing them. What sense does it make for Marxist-Leninists to be afraid of the

masses? When they have made mistakes they don't talk about themselves, and they are afraid of the masses talking about them. The more frightened they are, the more haunted they become. I think one should not be afraid. What is there to be afraid of? Our attitude is to hold fast to the truth and be ready at any time to correct our mistakes. The question of right or wrong, correct or incorrect in our work has to do with the contradictions among the people. To resolve contradictions among the people we can't use curses or fists, still less guns or knives. We can only use the method of discussion, reasoning, criticism and self-criticism. In short, we can only use democratic methods, the method of letting the masses speak out.

Both inside and outside the Party there must be a full democratic life, which means conscientiously putting democratic centralism into effect. We must conscientiously bring questions out into the open, and let the masses speak out. Even at the risk of being cursed we should still let them speak out. The result of their curses at the worst will be that we are thrown out and cannot go on doing this kind of work — demoted or transferred. What is so impossible about that? Why should a person only go up and never go down? Why should one only work in one place and never be transferred to another? I think that demotion and transfer, whether it is justified or not, does good to people. They thereby strengthen their revolutionary will, are able to investigate and study a variety of new conditions and increase their useful knowledge. I myself have had experience in this respect and gained a great deal of benefit. If you do not believe me, why not try it yourselves. Ssu-ma Ch'ien said: Wen Wang was imprisoned and the result was the development of the *Chou I*; Confucius was in dire straits and so compiled the *Spring and Autumn Annals*; Ch'u Yüan was exiled and so wrote the *Li Sao*; Tso Ch'iu became blind and then wrote the *Kuo-yüi*; Sun-tzu was mutilated and mastered military strategy; Lu Pu-wei was transferred to the kingdom of Shu and so the world could read his work; Han Fei was imprisoned in the kingdom of Ch'in and wrote because he could not keep his anger to himself. Of the hundreds of poems and prose works written the majority were written by sages who were experiencing anger and frustration.[2]

In modern times people have had doubts about the truth of these statements about Wen Wang developing the *Chou I* and Confucius compiling the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, but we don't have to worry about that — let the experts study those problems! Ssu-ma Ch'ien believed that this was true, and it is a fact that Wen Wang was imprisoned and Confucius was in dire straits. The things which Ssu-ma Ch'ien mentioned, apart from the example of Tso Ch'iu's going blind, all referred to the incorrect handling of the people concerned by the top leadership of the time. In the past we have also handled some cadres in an incorrect way. No matter whether we were completely mistaken in our handling of these people, or only partially mistaken, they should all be cleared and rehabilitated according to the actual circumstances. But generally speaking, this incorrect treatment — having them demoted or transferred — tempers their revolutionary will and enables them to absorb much new knowledge from the masses.

I must point out that I am not advocating the indiscriminate wrong treatment of our cadres, our comrades, or anybody else, in the way in which the ancients detained Wen Wang, starved Confucius, exiled Ch'u Yüan, or cut off Sun-tzu's kneecaps. I am not in

favour of this way of doing things — I oppose it. What I am saying is that in every stage of mankind's history there have always been such cases of mishandling. In class societies such cases are numerous. Even in a socialist society such things cannot be entirely avoided either, whether it be in a period of leadership by a correct or an incorrect line. There is however one distinction: namely, that during a period of correct line of leadership, as soon as it has been discovered that things have been mishandled, people can be cleared and rehabilitated, apologies can be made to them, so that their minds can be set at rest and they can lift up their heads again. But during a time when leadership follows an incorrect line, this way of doing things becomes impossible. Then the only thing for those who represent the correct line, at a suitable opportunity to use the methods of democratic centralism to take the initiative to set mistakes right. As for those who have themselves made mistakes, after their mistakes have been criticized by comrades and their cases have been appraised by the higher levels and they are given correct treatment, then if they are demoted or transferred one hardly need say that this demotion or transfer may be helpful to them in correcting their mistakes and gaining new knowledge.

Now there are some comrades who are afraid of the masses initiating discussion and putting forward ideas which differ from those of the leaders and leading organizations. As soon as problems are discussed they suppress the activism of the masses and do not allow others to speak out. This attitude is extremely evil. Democratic centralism is written into our Party Constitution and State Constitution, but they don't apply it. Comrades, we are revolutionaries. If we have really committed mistakes of the kind which are harmful to the people's cause, then we should seek the opinions of the masses and of comrades and carry out a self-examination. This sort of self-examination should sometimes be repeated several times over. If once is not enough and people are not satisfied, then it should be done a second time. If they are still not satisfied, it should be done a third time until nobody has any more criticisms. Some provincial Party committees have done this. Some provinces are taking more initiative and letting everyone talk. Those who started self-criticism earlier did so as early as 1959. The late-starters started self-criticism in 1961. Some provincial Party committees were compelled to carry out self-examinations, such as Honan, Kansu and Chinghai. According to some reports there are other provinces which are only now starting on self-criticism. It does not matter whether you take the initiative on the question of self-examination, or whether you are forced into it. It does not matter whether you do it earlier or later, provided you look squarely at your mistakes and are willing to admit them and correct them, and you are willing to let the masses criticize you — provided only that you adopt this kind of attitude you will be welcomed.

Criticism and self-criticism is a kind of method. It is a method of resolving contradictions among the people and it is the only method. There is no other. But if we do not have a full democratic life and do not truly implement democratic centralism, then this method of criticism and self-criticism cannot be applied.

Do we not now have many difficulties? Unless we rely on the masses, and mobilize the enthusiasm of the masses and of the cadres, we cannot overcome these difficulties. But if you do not explain the situation to the masses and to the cadres, if we do not offer our

hearts to them and let them voice their own opinions, they will still be afraid of you and not dare to speak out. It would then be impossible to mobilize their enthusiasm. In 1957 I said: 'We must bring about a political climate which has both centralism and democracy, discipline and freedom, unity of purpose and ease of mind for the individual, and which is lively and vigorous.' We should have this political climate both within the Party and outside. Without this political climate the enthusiasm of the masses cannot be mobilized. We cannot overcome difficulties without democracy. Of course, it is even more impossible^[3] to do so without centralism, but if there's no democracy there won't be any centralism.

Without democracy there cannot be any correct centralism because people's ideas differ, and if their understanding of things lacks unity then centralism cannot be established. What is centralism? First of all it is a centralization of correct ideas, on the basis of which unity of understanding, policy, planning, command and action are achieved. This is called centralized unification. If people still do not understand problems, if they have ideas but have not expressed them, or are angry but still have not vented their anger, how can centralized unification be established? If there is no democracy we cannot possibly summarize experience correctly. If there is no democracy, if ideas are not coming from the masses, it is impossible to establish a good line, good general and specific policies and methods. Our leading organs merely play the role of a processing plant in the establishment of a good line and good general and specific policies and methods. Everyone knows that if a factory has no raw material it cannot do any processing. If the raw material is not adequate in quantity and quality it cannot produce good finished products. Without democracy, you have no understanding of what is happening down below; the situation will be unclear; you will be unable to collect sufficient opinions from all sides; there can be no communication between top and bottom; top-level organs of leadership will depend on one-sided and incorrect material to decide issues, thus you will find it difficult to avoid being subjectivist; it will be impossible to achieve unity of understanding and unity of action, and impossible to achieve true centralism. Is not the main item for discussion at this session of our conference opposition to dispersionism and the strengthening of centralized unification? If we fail to promote democracy in full measure, then will this centralism and this unification be true or false? Will it be real or empty? Will it be correct or incorrect? Of course it must be false, empty and incorrect.

Our centralism is built on democratic foundations; proletarian centralism is based on broad democratic foundations. The Party committee at various levels is the organ which implements centralized leadership. But the leadership of the Party committees is a collective leadership; matters cannot be decided arbitrarily by the first secretary alone. Within Party committees democratic centralism should be the sole mode of operation. The relationship between the first secretary and the other secretaries and committee members is one of the minority obeying the majority. For example, in the Standing Committee and the Political Bureau situations like this often arise: when I say something, no matter whether it is correct or incorrect, provided that everyone disagrees with me, I will accede to their point of view because they are the majority. I am told that the situation exists within some provincial Party committees, district Party committees and county Party committees, whereby in all matters whatever the first secretary says goes.

This is quite wrong. It is nonsense if whatever one person says goes. I am referring to important matters, not to the routine work which comes in the wake of decisions. All important matters must be discussed collectively, different opinions must be listened to seriously, and the complexities of the situation and partial opinions must be analysed. Account must be taken of various possibilities and estimates made of the various aspects of a situation: which are good, which bad, which easy, which difficult, which possible and which impossible. Every effort must be made to be both cautious and thorough. Otherwise you have one-man tyranny. Such first secretaries should be called tyrants and not 'squad leaders' of democratic centralism. Once upon a time there was a certain Hsiang Yü, who was called the Tyrant of Western Ch'u. He hated listening to opinions which differed from his. He had a man called Fan Tseng working for him who offered him advice, but Hsiang Yü did not listen. There was another man called Liu Pang, who became Emperor Kao-tsu of Han, who was better at accepting ideas different from his own. An intellectual called Li I-chi went to see Liu Pang, and announced himself as a scholar of the school of Confucius. Liu Pang said: 'There's a war on, I don't want to see scholars.' Li I-chi flared up. He said to the gatekeeper: 'You bloody well go in and say that I am a drinking man from Kaoyang and not a scholar at all.' The gatekeeper went in and announced him as he was told. Liu Pang said: 'Good, ask him in.' He was invited in. Liu Pang was washing his feet at the time, but he quickly got up to welcome him. But Li I-chi was still furious because Liu Pang had refused to see a scholar and he gave Liu Pang a telling off. 'Do you want to conquer the world or don't you? Why do you look down on your elders? At that time Li I-chi was over sixty and Liu Pang was younger, so Li called himself 'your elder'. At these words Liu Pang apologized and at once accepted his plan of seizing the county of Ch'en-liu. This incident can be read in the biographies of Li I-chi and Chu Chien in the Shi-chi.^[4]

Liu Pang was a hero whom the historians of the feudal period called a straightforward, open-minded man, who listened to advice and was as relaxed as a flowing river. Liu Pang fought Hsiang Yü for many years. In the end Liu Pang won and Hsiang Yü was defeated. This was no mere chance. We now have some first secretaries who cannot even match Liu Pang of the feudal period, and are somewhat like Hsiang Yü. If these comrades don't reform, they will lose their jobs. You all know the play called *The Tyrant Bids His Lady Farewell*;^[5] if these comrades don't reform, the day will surely come when they too will be saying farewell to their ladies (*laughter*). Why do I say this so bluntly? It is because I intend to be mean and make some comrades feel sore so that they think over things properly. It wouldn't be a bad thing if they couldn't sleep for a night or two. If they were able to sleep, then I wouldn't be pleased because it would mean that they have not yet felt sore.

There are some comrades who cannot bear to listen to ideas contrary to their own, and cannot bear to be criticized. This is very wrong. During this conference one province held a meeting which started off in a very lively manner, but as soon as the provincial Party secretary arrived a hush fell on the proceedings and nobody spoke. Comrade provincial Party secretary, what is the purpose of your attendance at meetings? Why don't you stay in your own room and think about problems and let others all take part in the discussion? When this kind of atmosphere is engendered and people don't dare to speak in your

presence, then it is up to you to keep away. If you have made mistakes, then you should carry out self-criticism, let others speak, let others criticize you. On 12 June last year, during the last day of the Peking Conference called by the Central Committee, I talked about my own shortcomings and mistakes. I said I wanted the comrades to convey what I said to their various provinces and districts. I found out later that many districts did not get my message, as if my mistakes could be hidden and ought to be hidden. Comrades, they mustn't be hidden. Any mistakes that the Centre has made ought to be my direct responsibility, and I also have an indirect share in the blame because I am the Chairman of the Central Committee. I don't want other people to shirk their responsibility. There are some other comrades who also bear responsibility, but the person primarily responsible should be me. All you who are our provincial committee secretaries, district Party committee secretaries, county Party committee secretaries, down to ward Party and other secretaries, enterprise committee secretaries and commune Party committee secretaries, since you have taken on the job of first secretary you must bear the responsibility for mistakes and shortcomings in the work.

Those of you who shirk responsibility or who are afraid of taking responsibility, who do not allow people to speak, who think you are tigers, and that nobody will dare to touch your arse, whoever has this attitude, ten out of ten of you will fail. People will talk anyway. You think that nobody will really dare to touch the arse of tigers like you? They damn well will!

Unless we fully promote people's democracy and inner-Party democracy in our country, and unless we fully implement the system of proletarian democracy, it will be impossible to achieve a true proletarian centralism. Without a high degree of democracy, it is impossible to achieve a high degree of centralism, and without a high degree of centralism, it is impossible to establish a socialist economy. If our country does not establish a socialist economy, what kind of situation shall we be in? We shall become a country like Yugoslavia, which has actually become a bourgeois country; the dictatorship of the proletariat will be transformed into a bourgeois dictatorship, into a reactionary fascist type of dictatorship. This is a question which demands the utmost vigilance. I hope comrades will give a great deal of thought to it.

Without the system of democratic centralism, the proletarian dictatorship cannot be consolidated. To practise democracy among the people and to practise dictatorship over the enemies of the people, these two aspects are inseparable. When these two aspects are combined, this is then proletarian dictatorship, or it may be called people's democratic dictatorship. Our slogan is: 'A people's democratic dictatorship, led by the proletariat, and based on the alliance of the workers and peasants.' How does the proletariat exercise leadership? It leads through the Communist Party. The Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat. The proletariat unites with all classes and strata who approve of, support and participate in the socialist revolution and socialist construction, and exercises dictatorship over the reactionary classes or the remnants thereof. In our country the system of exploitation of man by man has already been eliminated. The economic foundations of the landlord class and the bourgeoisie have been eliminated. The reactionary classes are now no longer as ferocious as hitherto. For example, they are no

longer as ferocious as in 1949 when the People's Republic was founded, nor as ferocious as in 1957 when the right-wing bourgeoisie madly attacked us.^[6] Therefore we speak of them as the remnants of the reactionary classes. But we may on no account underestimate these remnants. We must continue to struggle against them. The reactionary classes which have been overthrown are still planning a come-back. In a socialist society, new bourgeois elements may still be produced. During the whole socialist stage there still exist classes and class struggle, and this class struggle is a protracted, complex, sometimes even violent affair. Our instruments of dictatorship should not be weakened; on the contrary they should be strengthened. Our security system is in the hands of comrades who follow the correct line. It is possible that the security departments in some places may be in the hands of bad people. There are also some comrades engaged on security work who do not rely on the masses or on the Party. In the work of purging counter-revolutionaries, they do not follow the line of purging them with the help of the masses under the leadership of the Party committee. They rely solely on secret work, on so-called professional work. Professional work is necessary; it is absolutely necessary to use the methods of detection and trial to deal with counter-revolutionary elements, but the most important thing is to carry out the mass line under the leadership of the Party committee. When we are concerned with dictatorship over the whole reactionary class, it is especially important to rely on the masses and the Party. To exercise dictatorship over the reactionary classes does not mean that we should totally eliminate all reactionary elements, but rather that we should eliminate the classes to which they belong. We should use appropriate methods to remould them and transform them into new men. Without a broad people's democracy, proletarian dictatorship cannot be consolidated and political power would be unstable. Without democracy, without the mobilization of the masses, without mass supervision, it will be impossible to exercise effective dictatorship over the reactionary and bad elements, and it will be impossible effectively to remould them. Thus they would continue to make trouble and might still stage a come-back. This problem demands vigilance, and I hope comrades will give a great deal of thought to this too.

(3) Which classes should we unite with?

Which classes should we unite with? Which classes should we repress? This is a question of basic standpoint.

The working class should unite with the peasant class, the urban petit bourgeoisie, and the patriotic national bourgeoisie; first of all it should unite with the peasant class. The intellectuals such as, for example, scientists, engineers and technicians, professors, writers, artists, actors, medical workers and journalists, do not constitute a class; they are either appendages of the bourgeoisie or of the proletariat. As regards the intellectuals, do we unite only with those who are revolutionary? No. As long as they are patriotic we will unite with them and let them get on with their work. Workers, peasants, urban petit-bourgeois elements, patriotic intellectuals, patriotic capitalists and other patriots together comprise more than ninety-five per cent of the whole country's population. Under our

people's democratic dictatorship, all of these come within the classification of the people. And among the people we must practise democracy.

Those whom the people's democratic dictatorship should repress are: landlords, rich peasants, counterrevolutionary elements, bad elements and anti-communist rightists. The classes which the counter-revolutionary elements, bad elements and anti-communist rightists represent the landlord class and the reactionary bourgeoisie. These classes and bad people comprise about four or five per cent of the population. These are the people we must compel to reform. They are the people whom the people's democratic dictatorship is directed against.

On which side do we stand? Do we stand on the side of the popular masses, who comprise over ninety-five per cent of the whole country's population? Or do we stand on the side of the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionary elements, bad elements and rightists who comprise four or five per cent of the whole country's population? We must stand on the side of the popular masses and absolutely mustn't stand on the side of the people's enemies; this is a question of the basic standpoint of a Marxist-Leninist.

This holds true both within our country and in the international sphere. The people of all countries, the great masses of the people who comprise more than ninety-five per cent of the [world's] population certainly want revolution, they certainly support Marxism-Leninism and cannot support revisionism. Some may support revisionism temporarily, but later they will finally reject it. They will all gradually awaken and oppose imperialism and the reactionaries of various nations; they will all oppose revisionism. A true Marxist-Leninist must stand resolutely on the side of the popular masses who comprise over ninety-five per cent of the world's population.

(4) Acquiring an understanding of the objective world

In acquiring an understanding of the objective world, in making a flying leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom, man must pass through a process. On the question of how China was to carry out the democratic revolution, from the founding of the Party in 1921 to the Seventh Congress in 1945 it was altogether twenty-four years before our Party's understanding reached complete unity. In the meantime we had the experience of the Rectification Movement on an all-party scale which lasted from the spring of 1942 to the summer of 1945, altogether three and a half years. This was a very searching movement, which adopted the method of democracy, which is to say that no matter who it was who had made mistakes, provided he acknowledged them and corrected them, things would be all right, and everybody helped him to acknowledge and correct his mistakes. This is called 'taking warning from the past in order to be more careful in future; treating the illness in order to save the patient', 'taking the desire for unity as a starting-point, passing through criticism or struggle, distinguishing between right and wrong, and reaching a new unity on a new basis'. The formula 'unity-criticism-unity' was created at that time. The Rectification Movement helped the comrades of the

whole Party to reach unity of understanding. The question of how to carry out the democratic revolution, how to devise the Party line and various concrete policies were all completely solved at that time, and especially after the Rectification Movement.

Between the founding of the Party and the War of Resistance to Japan came the Northern Expeditionary War and the ten years' Agrarian Revolutionary War, when we experienced two victories and two defeats. The Northern Expeditionary War was victorious, but in 1927 the revolution suffered a defeat. In the Agrarian Revolutionary War we won great victories, the Red Army grew to a strength of 300,000, but later we again met with setbacks and after the Long March these 300,000 men were reduced to some 20,000-odd. After we reached North Shensi the numbers increased a little, but still did not reach 30,000; that is to say they were still less than a tenth of the original 300,000. In the final analysis which was the stronger the army of 300,000 or the army of under 30,000? Having suffered such great setbacks and encountered such hardships we had become hardened, we had acquired experience, we had corrected our wrong line and restored the correct line. Therefore the army of under 30,000 was stronger than the previous army of 300,000. Comrade Liu Shao-ch'i said in his report that in the past four years our line was correct. and that our achievements were the main feature; we made some mistakes in our practical work and suffered some hardships, but we gained experience; therefore we are stronger than before, not weaker. This is how things actually are. During the period of the democratic revolution, it was only after experiencing first victory, then defeat, victory again and again defeat, and after comparing the two [victories and defeats], that I came to understand this objective world of China. On the eve of the War of Resistance to Japan and during that war I wrote a number of articles, such as 'Strategic Problems of China's Revolutionary War', 'On Protracted War', 'On New Democracy', 'Forward to the *Communist*', and I drafted a number of documents on policy and strategy for the Central Committee. All these served to summarize revolutionary experience. These articles and documents could only have been produced at that time, and not before, because until I had been through these great storms and had been able to compare our two victories with our two defeats, I did not yet have sufficient experience, and could not yet fully understand the laws of the Chinese revolution.

Speaking generally, it is we Chinese who have achieved understanding of the objective world of China, not the comrades concerned with Chinese questions in the Communist International. These comrades in the Communist International simply did not understand, or we could say they utterly failed to understand^[7] Chinese society, the Chinese nation, or the Chinese revolution. For a long time even we did not have a clear understanding of the objective world of China, let alone the foreign comrades!

It was not until the period of the Resistance to Japan that we formulated a general line for the Party and a complete set of concrete policies which were appropriate to the actual situation. By this time we had been making revolution for more than twenty years. For so many years previously we were working very much in the dark. If anyone were to claim that any comrade, for example any member of the Central Committee, or I myself, completely understood the laws of the Chinese revolution right from the beginning, then that comrade would be talking through his hat. He should definitely not be believed. It

was not like that at all. In the past, and especially at the beginning, all our energies were directed towards revolution, but as for how to make revolution, what we wanted to change, which should come first and which later, and which should wait until the next stage — for a fairly long time none of these questions were properly understood, or we could say they were not thoroughly understood.

When I explain how our Chinese Communist Party during the period of democratic revolution, after much difficulty successfully came to understand the laws of the Chinese revolution, my aim in bringing up these historical facts is to help our comrades to appreciate one thing: that understanding the laws of socialist construction must pass through a process. It must take practice as its starting-point, passing from having no experience to having some experience; from having little experience to having more experience; from the construction of socialism, which is in the realm of necessity as yet not understood, to the gradual overcoming of our blindness and the understanding of objective laws, thereby attaining freedom, achieving a flying leap in our knowledge and reaching the realm of freedom.

With regard to socialist construction we still lack experience. I have discussed this problem with delegations of fraternal parties from quite a few countries, and I said to them that we have no experience of the construction of a socialist economy.

I have also discussed this problem with several journalists from capitalist countries, among whom there was an American called Snow. For a long time he had wanted to come to China, and in 1960 we let him come. I had a discussion with him. I said: 'As you know, we have a set of experiences, general and specific policies and methods on politics, military affairs and class struggle; but as for socialist construction we have never done any in the past, and we still have no experience. You may say: "Haven't you done it for eleven years?" Yes, we have done it for eleven years, and we still lack knowledge and experience. Even if we are beginning to have a little, it still isn't much.' Snow wanted me to say something about China's long-term construction plan. I said: 'I don't know.' He said: 'You are being too prudent.' I said: 'It's not a question of being prudent. It's just that I really don't know, we just haven't any experience, that's all.' Comrades, it's true that we don't know; we really do lack experience and it is a fact that we have no such long-term plan. 1960 was the year when we ran into a lot of difficulties. In 1961 I had a discussion with Montgomery, at which we talked about these ideas again. He said: 'In another fifty years you will be terrific.' What he meant was that after fifty years we might become powerful and 'invade' other countries, but not within fifty years. He had expounded his opinions to me when he came to China in 1960. I said: 'We are Marxist-Leninists, our state is a socialist state, not a capitalist state, therefore we wouldn't invade in a hundred years, or even ten thousand years. As for the construction of a strong socialist economy, in China fifty years won't be enough; it may take a hundred years or even longer. In your country the development of capitalism took several hundred years. We won't count! the sixteenth century, which was still in the Middle Ages. From the seventeenth century to now is already 360 years. In our country, the construction of a great and mighty socialist economy I reckon will take more than one hundred years.' What period was the seventeenth century? It was the end of the Ming and the beginning

of the Ch'ing dynasties in China. A century later, in the first half of the eighteenth century, was the Ch'ien-lung period of the Ch'ing dynasty. The author of the *Dream of the Red Chamber*, Ts'ao Hsüeh-ch'in, lived in that period. It was the period which produced the character Chia Pao-yü, who was dissatisfied with the feudal system. In China, in the Ch'ien-lung period, the sprouts of capitalist relationships of production already existed, but it was still a feudal society. This is the social background of the characters who appeared in Prospect Garden.[8] Before this, in the seventeenth century, a number of European countries were already in the process of developing capitalism. It has taken over 300 years for capitalist productive forces to develop to their present pattern. Socialism is superior in many respects to capitalism, and the economic development of our country may be much faster than that of capitalist countries. But China has a large population, our resources are meagre, and our economy backward so that in my opinion, it will be impossible to develop our productive power so rapidly as to catch up with, and overtake, the most advanced capitalist countries in less than one hundred years. If it requires only a few decades, for example only fifty years as some have conjectured, then that will be a splendid thing, for which heaven and earth be praised. But I would advise, comrades, that it is better to think more of the difficulties and so to envisage it as taking a longer period. It took from three to four hundred years to build a great and mighty capitalist economy; what would be wrong with building a great and mighty socialist economy in our country in about fifty or a hundred years? The next fifty or hundred years from now will be an epic period of fundamental change in the social system of the world, an earth-shaking period, with which no past era can be compared. Living in such a period, we must be prepared to carry out great struggles, differing in many respects from the forms of struggle of previous periods. In order to carry out this task, we must do our very best to combine the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete reality of Chinese socialist construction and with the concrete reality of future world revolution and, through practice, gradually come to understand the objective laws of the struggle. We must be prepared to suffer many defeats and set-backs as a result of our blindness, thereby gaining experience and winning final victory. When we see things in this light, then there are many advantages in envisaging it as taking a long period; conversely, harm would result from envisaging a short period.

In our work of socialist construction, we are still to a very large extent acting blindly. For us the socialist economy is still in many respects a realm of necessity not yet understood. Take me as an example: there are many problems in the work of economic construction which I still don't understand. I haven't got much understanding of industry and commerce. I understand a bit about agriculture, but this is only relatively speaking — I still don't understand much. In order to have a deeper understanding of agriculture one should understand pedology, botany, crop cultivation, agricultural chemistry, agricultural mechanization, etc. There are also different forms of agricultural production such as food grains, cotton, oil, hemp, silk, tea, sugar, vegetables, tobacco, fruit, medical herbs, and miscellaneous grain crops, etc. There are also animal husbandry and forestry. I myself am a believer in Vilensky's penology. In his works on penology Vilensky advocated the combination of farming, forestry and animal husbandry. I think we must have this three-way combination or agriculture will suffer. I advise, comrades, when you have some moments to spare after work, please will you seriously study all these problems of

agricultural production. I myself also would like to study more. Up to now however my knowledge of these matters has been very scanty. I have paid rather more attention to problems relating to the system, to the productive relationships. As for the productive forces, I know very little. As regards our Party as a whole, our knowledge of socialist construction is extremely inadequate. We should from now on spend a period of time in summarizing our experiences and in hard study, and in the course of practice gradually deepen our understanding of it through clarifying its laws. We must put in a lot of hard work and make thorough investigations. We must go down to the countryside to squat on a selected spot. We must go and squat in the production brigades and ! production teams, and go to the factories and shops. As to making investigations and studies, we used to do them rather well but since we came into the cities we have no longer taken them seriously. In 1961 we did advocate it once again, and now there have already been some changes. But amongst the leading cadres, especially the higher-level leading cadres, some districts, departments and enterprises still haven't adopted this style. There are some provincial Party secretaries who have still not gone down to squat on selected spots. If the provincial Party secretaries don't go, how can they ask district Party secretaries and county Party secretaries to go down to squat? This is no good — it must be changed.

Since the founding of the Chinese People's Republic, twelve years have already gone by. These twelve years can be divided into a first period of eight years and a second period of four years: 1950 to the end of 1957 constitute the first eight years; 1958 to now is the second four years. In this conference of ours, we have already initially summarized the experiences of our past work, mainly the experiences of the second period of four years. This summary is reflected in the report by Comrade Liu Shao-ch'i. We have already formulated, or are formulating, or shall formulate, concrete policies in various fields. What we have already formulated are things such as sixty regulations on work in the countryside, seventy regulations on industrial enterprises, sixty regulations on higher education, and forty regulations on scientific research. All these draft regulations have already been implemented or are being experimented with; they will be revised in future — some may have to be greatly revised. Among those regulations which are in the process of formulation are the regulations on commerce. Among the regulations which are going to be formulated in future are the regulations on middle-school and primary-school education.^[9] We should also formulate some regulations on the work of our Party, government and mass organizations. The army has already formulated some regulations. In short, in industry, agriculture, commerce, education, army, government and Party, in those seven aspects of the work we must properly summarize experience and formulate a complete set of general and specific policies and methods suited to our conditions, so that they may progress along correct lines.

It is not enough to have the General Line; it is also necessary that, under the leadership of the General Line, in the domains of industry, agriculture, commerce, education, army, government and Party, there should be a complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods which are suited to our conditions. Only then is it possible to persuade the masses and the cadres. We should use these as teaching materials to educate them, so that they may be united in understanding and action. Only then will it be possible to attain victory in the task of revolution and construction; otherwise it is

impossible. On this point, even as far back as the War of Resistance to Japan, we already had a profound understanding. At that time we acted in this way, and therefore the cadres and masses had a unified understanding of the complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods of the democratic revolutionary period, and thus there was unified action and we therefore attained victory in the democratic revolutionary task of that period. This everybody knows. During the period of socialist revolution and construction, our revolutionary tasks in the first few years were: in the countryside to complete the reform of the feudal land system and then to implement agricultural cooperation; in the cities to implement the socialist transformation of capitalist industrial and commercial enterprises. In the field of economic construction our task then was to rehabilitate the economy and implement the first five-year plan. Both in the revolution and in construction at that time we had a General Line which was appropriate to the objective conditions and which had abundant persuasive power. We also had a complete set of general and specific policies and methods under the leadership of the General Line. Therefore we could educate the cadres and masses, unify their understanding, and the work was carried out relatively well. This everybody also knows. But in those days the situation was such that, since we! had no experience in economic construction, we had no alternative but to copy the Soviet Union. In the field of heavy industry especially, we copied almost everything from the Soviet Union, and we had very little creativity of our own. At that time it was absolutely necessary to act thus, but at the same time it was also a weakness — a lack of creativity and lack of ability to stand on our own feet. Naturally this could not be our long-term strategy. From 1958 we decided to make self-reliance our major policy and striving for foreign aid a secondary aim. At the Second Session of the Party's Eighth Congress in 1958, we adopted the General Line of 'going all out and aiming high to achieve greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism'. In the same year the people's communes were also established, and the slogan of a 'Great Leap Forward' was issued. For a certain period after the General Line of socialist construction was proclaimed, we still hadn't had the time nor the possibility to formulate a complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods which were appropriate to the conditions, since our experience was still not sufficient. Under these circumstances the cadres and the masses still did not have a complete set of teaching materials, nor had they received any systematic education on policy and so it wasn't possible to have genuinely unified understanding and action. It only became possible after the passage of time, the experience of setbacks and difficulties, and the gaining of both positive and negative experience. Now it's all right, we already have these things or are now formulating them. Thus we can now more judiciously carry out the socialist revolution and socialist construction. In order to formulate a complete set of concrete general and specific policies and methods under the guidance of the General Line, it is necessary to allow ideas to come from the masses and to adopt the method of systematic and thorough investigation and study, and examine historically the successful and unsuccessful experiences in our work. Only then may we discover the laws inherent in objective things and not created by people's subjective imaginations; and only then may we be able to formulate various regulations which are appropriate to the circumstances. This is a very important matter. Will you comrades please pay attention to this point.

In industry, agriculture, commerce, education, military affairs, government and Party, in all these seven domains the Party leads in all things. The Party has to lead industry, agriculture, commerce, culture, education, the army and government. Generally speaking, our Party is very good. Our Party is mainly composed of workers and poor peasants. The great majority of our cadres are good, they all work industriously, but we must also see that in our Party there still exist some problems; we mustn't imagine that everything is good with the state of our Party. At present we have over seventeen million Party members, and among these members almost eighty per cent became members after the founding of the state: they joined the Party in the fifties. Only twenty per cent joined before the founding of our state, and among these twenty per cent of our members, those who joined the Party before 1930, that is to say those who joined the Party during the twenties according to the estimate of eight years ago were some 800-odd people. Some of these have died in the past two years so now I am afraid there may only be 700-odd people left. Among both old and new Party members — especially among the new members there are always some people whose characters and working styles are impure. Those people are individualists, bureaucrats, subjectivists: some have even become degenerate elements. There are some people who adopt the guise of Communist Party members, but they in no way represent the working class; instead they represent the bourgeoisie. All is not pure within the Party. We must see this point, otherwise we shall suffer.

The above is my fourth point. Our understanding of the objective world must pass through a process. First of all we do not understand, or do not completely understand it, but after repeated practice and after we have obtained results through practice, when we have won victories and also had tumbles and setbacks, we are able to compare our victories and defeats. Only then is there a possibility of developing to the point of achieving complete understanding or relatively complete understanding. By that time we shall be exercising more initiative, we shall be more free and we shall become more intelligent. Freedom means the recognition of necessity and it means transforming the objective world. Only on the basis of recognizing necessity can man enjoy freedom of activity; this is the dialectical law of freedom and necessity. What we call necessity is an objectively existing law. Before we recognize it our behaviour cannot be conscious; it has elements of blindness. At this time we are stupid; during the last few years haven't we made many stupid blunders?

(5) *The international communist movement*

On this question I am only going to say a few simple sentences. No matter whether in China or in other countries of the world, over ninety per cent of the people will support Marxism-Leninism in the long run. In this world at present there are still many people being deceived by social-democratic parties, by the revisionists, the imperialists, or by the reactionary elements of various countries, who have not yet awakened. But eventually little by little they will awaken, they will support Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is truth; it cannot be resisted. The masses want revolution; the world revolution will

finally be victorious. Those who forbid revolution such as the characters in Lu Hsün's book, Squire Chao, Squire Ch'ien and the Fake Foreign Devil who did not allow Ah Q to make revolution, will finally be defeated.

The Soviet Union was the first socialist country, and the Soviet Communist Party was the party created by Lenin. Although the Party and the state leadership of the Soviet Union have now been usurped by the revisionists, I advise our comrades to believe firmly that the broad masses, the numerous Party members and cadres of the Soviet Union are good; that they want revolution, and that the rule of the revisionists won't last long. No matter when: now, in the future, in our generation or our descendants', we should all learn from the Soviet Union, study the experiences of the Soviet Union. If we don't learn from the Soviet Union, we will make mistakes. People may ask: since the Soviet Union is under the rule of the revisionists, should we still learn from them? What we should learn is about the good people and good things of the Soviet Union, the good experiences of the Soviet Communist Party. As for the bad people and bad things of the Soviet Union and the Soviet revisionists, we should treat them as teachers by negative example and learn lessons from them.

We should always uphold the principle of the unity of proletarian internationalism. We always advocate that the socialist countries and the world communist movement must unite firmly on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The international revisionists are ceaselessly cursing us. Our attitude is, let them go on cursing us. When it becomes necessary we can give them some appropriate answers. Our Party has become accustomed to being cursed. Leaving aside those who attacked us in the past, what about the present? Abroad, the imperialists curse us, the reactionary nationalists curse us, the revisionists curse us; in our country Chiang Kai-shek curses us, the landlords, rich peasants, reactionaries, bad elements and rightists curse us. They had always done so in the past . . . Are we isolated? I myself don't feel isolated. In this room alone there are already over 7,000 people; how can we be isolated with over 7,000 people? The popular masses of all countries of the world are already standing, or are going to stand, together with us. Can we be isolated?

(6) *We must unite the whole Party and the whole people*

We must unite the progressive elements and active elements within and without the Party, and unite the middle elements in order to bring forward those who lag behind. Only in this way can we unite the whole Party and the whole country; only by relying on such unity can we carry out our work, overcome difficulties and properly build up China. To unite the whole Party and the whole people is not at all to suggest that we do not have our own definite orientation. Some people say that the Communist Party is 'a party of the whole people', but we do not see things in this way. Our Party is a proletarian party; it is the vanguard of the proletariat; it is a fighting force armed with Marxism-Leninism. We stand on the side of the popular masses who comprise over ninety-five per cent of the total population. We definitely don't stand on the side of the landlords, rich peasants,

reactionaries, bad elements and rightists who constitute four to five per cent of the total population. It is the same in the international sphere, we speak of unity with all Marxist-Leninists, all revolutionary comrades, the whole people. We definitely do not speak of unity with the anti-communist, anti-popular imperialists and reactionaries of various countries. Whenever possible we also want to establish diplomatic relations with these people, and strive to have peaceful coexistence with them on the basis of the five principles. But these matters are in a different category from the matter of uniting with the people of all countries. In order to unite the whole Party and the whole people it is necessary to promote democracy and let the people speak out. It should be so within the Party; it should also be so outside the Party. Comrades from provincial Party committees, comrades from district Party committees, and comrades from county Party committees, when you return, you must definitely let people speak out. Those of you who are present here must act and those who are not here must also act thus. All leading members ! within the Party must promote democracy and let people speak out. What are the limits? One is that we must observe Party discipline, the minority must obey the majority, and the whole Party should obey the Centre.

Another limit is the prohibition on organizing secret factions. We are not afraid of open opposition groups, we are only afraid of secret opposition groups. Such people do not speak the truth to your face; what they say to your face is all falsehood and deceit. They do not express their real aims. But as long as they do not break discipline, as long as they are not carrying on any secret factional activities, we should always allow them to speak and even if they should say the wrong things we should not punish them. If people say the wrong things they can be criticized, but we should use reason to convince them. What should we do if we persuade them and they are not convinced? We can let them reserve their opinions. As long as they obey resolutions and obey decisions taken by the majority, the minority can be allowed to reserve their various opinions. Both within and outside the Party there is advantage in allowing the minority to reserve their opinions. If they have incorrect opinions they can reserve them temporarily and they will change their minds in future. Very often the ideas of the minority will prove to be correct. History abounds with such instances. In the beginning truth is not in the hands of the majority of people, but in the hands of a minority. Marx and Engels held the truth in their hands, but in the beginning they were in the minority. Lenin for a very long period was also in the minority. We had this kind of experience within our own Party. Both under the rule of Ch'en Tu-hsiu and during the period of rule of the 'Left-wing' Line truth was not in the hands of the majority in the leading organs, but rather in the hands of the minority. In history doctrines of natural scientists such as Copernicus, Galileo and Darwin were for a very long period not recognized by the majority of people, but instead were thought to be incorrect. In their time they were in the minority. When our Party was founded in 1921 we only had a few dozen members; we were also in the minority, but! these few people represented the truth and represented China's destiny.

There is also the question of arrests and executions on which I want to say something. At present, only a dozen or so years after the victory of the Revolution, while elements of the overthrown reactionary classes have not yet been reformed, and while there are people still attempting a restoration, a few people have to be arrested and executed;

otherwise the people's anger cannot be appeased and the people's dictatorship cannot be consolidated. But we must not arrest people lightly, and we must especially not execute people lightly. There are some bad people, bad elements and degenerate people who have infiltrated into our ranks, and degenerate elements who sit on the heads of the people and piss and shit on them, behaving in a vicious and unrestrained way, seriously disobeying laws and discipline. Those people are petty Chiang Kai-sheks. We must find a way to deal with this type of people, and arrest some and execute a few of the worst who have committed the biggest crimes and the greatest evils, because if we do not arrest or execute any of this type of people, we won't be able to appease the anger of the people. This is what we mean when we say: 'We cannot refrain from arresting them, we cannot refrain from executing them.' But we must not on any account arrest too many and must not execute too many. All those who might be arrested but need not be arrested, and all those who might be executed but need not be executed, we must resolve not to arrest or to execute. There was a man called P'an Han-nien who had once been vice-mayor of Shanghai. In the past he had secretly surrendered to the Kuomintang. He was a man of the C.C. Clique.[10] Now he is detained in custody; we have not executed him. If we kill one person like P'an Han-nien and thereby break the ban on executions, then we would have to kill all people like him. There was another man called Wang Shih-wei who was a secret agent working for the Kuomintang. When he was in Yen-an, he wrote a book called *The Wild Lily*, in which he attacked the revolution and slandered the Communist Party.[11] Afterwards he was arrested and executed. That incident happened at the time when the army was on the march, and the security organs themselves made the decision to execute him; the decision did not come from the Centre. We have often made criticisms on this very matter; we thought that he shouldn't have been executed. If he was a secret agent and wrote articles to attack us and refused to reform till death, why not leave him there or let him go and do labour? It isn't good to kill people. We should arrest and execute as few people as possible. If we arrest people and execute people at the drop of a hat, the end result would be that everybody would fear for themselves and nobody would dare to speak. In such an atmosphere there wouldn't be much democracy.

Also we mustn't put hats on people indiscriminately. Some of our comrades are in the habit of persecuting people with hats. As soon as they open their mouths hats come flying out; they frighten people so that they don't dare speak. Of course one cannot avoid hats altogether. Are there not many hats in the report made by Comrade Liu Shao-ch'i? Isn't 'dispersionism' a hat? But we mustn't put hats on people without due consideration, so that every Tom, Dick and Harry is labelled with 'dispersionism', and everybody becomes labelled with 'dispersionism'. It is better that hats should be put on by people themselves and they should fit the wearers, rather than that they should be put on them by others. If people put a few hats on themselves and other people don't agree that they should wear those hats, then they should be removed. This will make for a very good democratic atmosphere. We advocate not to grasp at others' faults, not to put hats on people, not to flourish the big stick. The aim is to make people unafraid in their hearts and let them dare to express their opinions.

We should adopt a well-intentioned helpful attitude towards those who have made mistakes, and towards those who do not allow people to speak out. We must not create

the kind of atmosphere in which people feel that they cannot afford to make mistakes and that there would be terrible consequences if they made any mistakes, and if once they made mistakes they would never raise their heads again. When a person has made mistakes, as long as he sincerely wants to make amends, as long as he has really made a self-criticism, then we must show that we accept him. When people make their self-criticism the first or second time, we must not ask too much of them. It does not matter if their self-examinations are not yet thorough, we should allow them to think again and give them well-intentioned help. People need help from others; we should help those comrades who have made mistakes to understand their mistakes. If people sincerely carry out self-criticism and are willing to correct mistakes, then we should forgive them and adopt a lenient policy towards them. As long as their achievements are still of primary importance, as long as they are competent, they can be allowed to continue in their posts.

Here in my speech I have criticized certain phenomena and criticized certain comrades, but I have not named them. I have not pointed out who Tom, Dick and Harry are. You yourselves must have some ideas in your minds (*laughter*). For shortcomings and mistakes made in the last few years, the primary responsibility should be borne by the Centre; at the Centre the primary responsibility is mine; next the responsibility belongs to the provincial committees, municipal committees, and autonomous region Party committees; and third, to the regional committee level; fourth, to county committee level; and fifth, to the enterprise Party committees and commune Party committees. In short everyone has his share of the responsibility.

Comrades, when you have gone back you must build up democratic centralism. The comrades of the county committees should lead the commune Party committees to build up and strengthen democratic centralism. First of all we must establish and strengthen collective leadership, and not practise the type of leadership which has long been diagnosed as 'dispersionism'. Under this method the Party committee secretaries and members do their bits separately; they cannot have real collective discussions, nor can they have real collective leadership.

If we are to promote democracy we must encourage others to criticize us and listen to their criticisms. To be able to withstand criticism we must first take measures to carry out self-criticism. We must examine whatever needs examining for one hour or at most two hours. If everything is to be brought out in the open, it will take as long as that. If others consider we have not done enough, then let them say so. If what they say is right, we will accept their opinion. When we allow others to speak, should we be active or passive in our attitude? Of course it is better to be active. What can we do if we are forced on to the defensive? In the past we were undemocratic and so we find ourselves on the defensive. No matter. Let everybody criticize us. As for me, I will not go out during the day; I will not go to the theatre at night. Please come and criticize me day and night (*laughter*). Then I will sit down and think about it carefully, not sleep for two or three nights, think about it until I understand it, and then write a sincere self-examination. Isn't that the way to deal with it? In short, let other people speak out. The heavens will not fall and you will not be thrown out. If you do not let others speak, then the day will surely come when you are thrown out.

Today I will confine myself to the above matters. The central point that I have spoken about is the question of how to realize democratic centralism and how to promote democracy within and without the Party. I recommend comrades to consider this question carefully. Some comrades still do not think in terms of democratic centralism. Now is the time to adopt this way of thinking and begin to acquire some understanding of this question. If we do our utmost to promote democracy, then we can mobilize the enthusiasm of the broad masses of people within and without the Party. We can unite the broad popular masses who comprise more than ninety-five per cent of our total population. When we have achieved this, our work will get better and better and we will more quickly overcome the difficulties we encounter. Our cause will develop much more favourably (*enthusiastic applause*).

Notes

[1.] The work style of the PLA, defined by Mao Tse-tung in 1960 in three phrases calling for a correct political orientation, an industrious and thrifty work style, and flexible and mobile strategy and tactics, and in eight characters (four pairs) meaning unity, earnestness, seriousness and liveliness. The use of precisely these figures echoed the 'Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points for Attention' originally laid down in 1928, which guided the conduct of the Red Army during the struggle for power, and thus represented an attempt to establish a symbolic link with the past. For the earlier rules, see Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Vol. IV, pp. 155-6.

[2.] Ssu-ma Ch'ien (c. 145-90 B.C.) was China's first great historian who compiled the *Shih-chi* (*Historical Records*) relating the history of China from the origins to his own day. The foregoing passage is from his autobiography, appended to that work.

[3.] This reading, 'even more impossible' (*keng pu-hsing*), is that of *Wen-hsüan* and of *Wan-sui* (1969). The version in *Wan sui!* says merely that it is 'also impossible' (*yu pu-hsing*) without centralism.

[4.] This story is indeed recounted in the *Shi-chi* in the biographies of Li I-chi and Chu Chien, and also in that of Liu Pang, the founder of the Han dynasty. See Burton Watson's translation, *Records of the Grand Historian of China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), Vol. I, pp. 86-7, 269-70, and 283. Mao has drawn on all three versions, taking some picturesque details (such as the remark, 'I am a drinking man') from the biography of Chu Chien, which is commonly regarded as a later interpolation and is therefore not translated by Watson.

[5.] A Peking opera, based on the account in the *Shi-chi* (Watson *op. cit.*, pp. 70-71) about Hsiang Yü's farewell from his favourite the lady Yü, on the eve of his final defeat. Mao alluded with admiration to the first two lines of the poem composed by Hsiang Yü

on this occasion in his own first article of 1917: *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, pp. 157, 160.

[6.] The reference is, of course, to the sharp criticism of the Party and the regime in April and May 1957, before a halt was called to the policy of 'blooming and contending'.

[7.] This is the reading in *Wen-hsüan Wan-sui* (1969) has rather 'did not understand very well' (*pu hen liao-chieh* instead of *hen pu liao-chieh*).

[8.] Chia Pao-yü is the chief male character in the *Dream of the Red Chamber*. Mao's criticism of Yü P'ing-po's interpretation of this novel related precisely to the point that, in his view, the book should be regarded as a condemnation of feudal society as a whole, and not, as Yü held, simply as a lament about individual misfortune. The new garden was created for the use of the imperial concubine on the occasion of a visit to her family (*The Story of the Stone*, Ch. 18), and it is here that much of the subsequent action takes place. Regarding the relationship between the novel and the author's own family background, see David Hawkes's introduction, especially pp. 22-32.

[9.] For the revised text of the sixty articles on rural work adopted at the Tenth Plenum in September 1962, and a summary of the seventy articles on industrial work drafted in December 1961, see *Documents of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, September 1956 - April 1969* (Hong Kong: URI, 1971), pp. 689-725. For the regulations on middle and primary schools drafted in 1963, see the article by Susan Shirk in *China Quarterly*, No. 55, July - September 1973, pp. 511-46.

[10.] A reactionary Kuomintang faction led by the two Ch'en brothers, nephews of Chiang Kai-shek's first patron Ch'en Ch'i-meï, who played a role in creating the quasi-fascist 'Blue Shirts' in the 1930s.

[11.] For details on Wang Shih-wei, see *Literary Dissent in Communist China*, pp. 25-7 and passim.

Speech At The Tenth Plenum Of The Eighth Central Committee

(The morning of 24 September 1962 in the Huai-Jen Hall)

It is now ten o'clock. The meeting is in session.

This plenary session of the Central Committee has solved a number of important problems. One is the problem of agriculture, another is that of commerce. Both of these are important problems. There are also the problems of industry and of planning which

are secondary problems. The third is the problem of inner-Party unity. Several comrades have made speeches. The agricultural problem was explained by Comrade Ch'en Po-ta, the problem of commerce by Comrade Li Hsien-nien, and the problems of industry and planning by Comrades Li Fu-ch'un and XXX. In addition to these problems we also had the questions of increasing the membership of the Control Commission and of the vertical and horizontal interchange of cadres.

This conference did not open today: it has already been in session for over two months. It met for a month in Peitaiho and has continued for almost a month since transferring to Peking. The practical problems were discussed and clarified in August and September by various small groups (all of you present participated) which were in fact large groups. So now the plenary session will not take too long — three to five days will probably suffice. If we cannot finish by the twenty-seventh, we will stay over until the twenty-eighth, by which date the meeting must adjourn.

At Peitaiho I presented three problems: those of class, the situation and contradictions. I raised the problem of class because this problem had not been solved. Leaving aside the internal situation, internationally there are imperialism, nationalism, and revisionism. I am talking about capitalist countries which have not solved the class problem. So we have an anti-imperialist task. We have the task of supporting national liberation movements, that is to say we must support the broad masses of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, including workers, peasants, the revolutionary national bourgeoisie, and the revolutionary intellectuals. We want to unite with so many people. But they do not include the reactionary national bourgeoisie like Nehru, nor the reactionary bourgeois intellectuals like the Japanese renegade communist Shojiro Kasuga^[1] who, with seven or eight others, supports the theory of structural reforms.

Now then, do classes exist in socialist countries? Does class struggle exist? We can now affirm that classes do exist in socialist countries and that class struggle undoubtedly exists. Lenin said: After the victory of the revolution, because of the existence of the bourgeoisie internationally, because of the existence of bourgeois remnants internally, because the petit bourgeoisie exists and continually generates a bourgeoisie, therefore the classes which have been overthrown within the country will continue to exist for a long time to come and may even attempt restoration. The bourgeois revolutions in Europe in such countries as England and France had many ups and downs. After the overthrow of feudalism there were several restorations and reversals of fortune. This kind of reversal is also possible in socialist countries. An example of this is Yugoslavia which has changed its nature and become revisionist, changing from a workers' and peasants' country to a country ruled by reactionary nationalist elements. In our country we must come to grasp, understand and study this problem really thoroughly. We must acknowledge that classes will continue to exist for a long time. We must also acknowledge the existence of a struggle of class against class, and admit the possibility of the restoration of reactionary classes. We must raise our vigilance and properly educate our youth as well as the cadres, the masses and the middle- and basic-level cadres. Old cadres must also study these problems and be educated. Otherwise a country like ours can still move towards its opposite. Even to move towards its opposite would not matter too much because there

would still be the negation of the negation, and afterwards we might move towards our opposite yet again. If our children's generation go in for revisionism and move towards their opposite, so that although they still nominally have socialism it is in fact capitalism, then our grandsons will certainly rise up in revolt and overthrow their fathers, because the masses will not be satisfied. Therefore, from now on we must talk about this every year, every month, every day. We will talk about it at congresses, at Party delegate conferences, at plenums, at every meeting we hold, so that we have a more enlightened Marxist-Leninist line on the problem.

The situation in our country has not been very good for the past few years, but now it is starting to take a turn for the better. In 1959 and 1960 a number of things were done wrongly, mainly because most people had no experience to enable them to understand the problems. The most serious fault was that our requisitioning was excessive. When we did not have very much grain, we insisted on saying that we had. Blind commands were issued in both industry and agriculture. There were also some other large-scale mistakes. In the second half of 1960 we started to put these right — in point of fact it was quite early on, starting at the First Chengchow Conference in October 1958. Next came the Wuhan Conference in November and December 1958, while in February and March 1959 we held the Second Chengchow Conference. At the Shanghai Conference in April of that year we also paid attention to correcting our mistakes. Meanwhile there was a period in 1960 when we did not pay enough attention to it because revisionism came and put pressure on us. Our attention was diverted to opposing Khrushchev. From the second half of 1958 he wanted to blockade the Chinese coastline. He wanted to set up a joint fleet so as to have control over our coastline and blockade us. It was because of this question that Khrushchev came to our country. After this, in September 1959 during the Sino-Indian border dispute, Khrushchev supported Nehru in attacking us and Tass issued a communique. Then Khrushchev came to China and at our Tenth Anniversary Celebration banquet in October, he attacked us on our own rostrum. At the Bucharest Conference in 1960 they tried to encircle and annihilate us.^[2] Then came the conference of the Two Communist Parties, the Twenty-six-Country Drafting Committee, the Eighty-one-Country Moscow Conference, and there was also a Warsaw Conference, all of which were concerned with the dispute between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. We spent the whole of 1960 fighting Khrushchev. So you see that among socialist countries and within Marxism-Leninism a question like this could emerge. But in fact its roots lie deep in the past, in things which happened very long ago. They did not permit China to make revolution: that was in 1945. Stalin wanted to prevent China from making revolution, saying that we should not have a civil war and should cooperate with Chiang Kai-shek, otherwise the Chinese nation would perish. But we did not do what he said. The revolution was victorious. After the victory of the revolution he next suspected China of being a Yugoslavia, and that I would become a second Tito. Later when I went to Moscow to sign the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance, we had to go through another struggle. He was not willing to sign a treaty. After two months of negotiations he at last signed. When did Stalin begin to have confidence in us? It was at the time of the Resist America, Aid Korea campaign, from the winter of 1950. He then came to believe that we were not Tito, not Yugoslavia. But now we have become 'Left adventurers', 'nationalists', 'dogmatists', 'sectarians', while the Yugoslavs have become

‘Marxist-Leninists’. Nowadays Yugoslavia is quite all right, she’s doing fine. I hear that she has become ‘socialist’ again. So the socialist camp is internally highly complicated too. It is, in fact, also very simple. There is only one principle involved: that is the problem of the class struggle — the problem of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the problem of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and anti-Marxism-Leninism, the problem of the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.

As for the situation, it is good both internationally and domestically. In the initial period after the founding of our state, some people, including myself as well as Comrade X X, took the view that the parties and trade unions of Asia and the parties of Africa might suffer serious damage. It was later proved that this point of view was incorrect: it did not turn out as we expected. Since the Second World War, thriving national liberation struggles have developed in Asia, Africa and Latin America year by year. There was the Cuban revolution, the independence of Algeria, the Asian Games in Indonesia; tens of thousands of people demonstrated and smashed the Indian consulate and India became isolated; West Irian was handed over by the Netherlands; armed struggle developed in South Vietnam — a very good armed struggle. There was also the victory of armed struggle in Algeria, the victorious struggle in Laos, the Suez Canal affair, the independence of Egypt. The United Arab Republic is inclined towards the right, but then Iraq emerged. Both are to the right of centre, but both oppose imperialism. Although the population of Algeria is less than ten million, and France had an army of 800,000 fighting for seven or eight years, yet Algeria won in the end. Thus the international situation is excellent. Comrade Ch’en I has given a very good report on this.

The contradiction I want to talk about is that between us and imperialism. The contradiction between the people of the whole world and imperialism is the primary one. There is the opposition of the people of all countries to the reactionary bourgeoisie and to reactionary nationalism. There are also the contradictions between the people of all countries and revisionism, the contradictions among imperialist countries, the contradiction between nationalist countries and imperialism, internal contradictions within imperialist countries, and the contradiction between socialism and imperialism. I think that right-wing opportunism in China should be renamed: it should be called Chinese revisionism. The two months’ conference at Peitaiho and Peking has been concerned with problems of two different kinds. One kind was the problem of political work; the other was the problem of class struggle — that is to say, the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. The problem of work is also the problem of struggle against bourgeois ideas, which is identical with struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism. There are several documents on problems of work: in industry, agriculture, commerce, etc. Various comrades have spoken on those questions.

As for how the Party should tackle the problem of revisionism within the country and within the Party and the problem of the bourgeoisie, I think we should adhere to former policies without changing them. No matter what sort of errors a comrade has committed, we should follow the line of the Rectification Campaign of 1942-5.^[3] So long as comrades admit their mistakes and reform, we will welcome them. We must unite with

them and cure the disease in order to save the patient; take warning from the past in order to safeguard the future. Unity-criticism-unity. But we must be quite specific about what is right and what is wrong. We must not mince words, or only spit out one word at a time. Why does the monk knock the wooden fish drum when he chants his sutra? The *Journey to the West* explains it by telling how the sutras collected in India were devoured by the black fish demon, who would spit out just one word each time it was knocked. This is the explanation of the wooden fish. We must not take this attitude and behave like the black fish demon. We must think things over carefully. We will unite with you, comrades, who have made mistakes, provided that you recognize your errors and return to a Marxist standpoint. Some of you comrades here present, I welcome you too. Do not be shy because you have made mistakes. We permit people to make mistakes and, having made them, we also permit you to correct them. Do not be intolerant of mistakes and do not prevent people from correcting them. Many comrades have corrected them well, which is excellent. The speech of Comrade Li Wei-han.[4] is a case in point. Comrade Li Wei-han has corrected his mistakes and we trust him. We must be resolute first in observing people, and then in helping them. There are many other comrades. I have also committed mistakes. I talked about that last year. You must also let me make mistakes, and let me correct them. When I correct them, you should welcome it. Last year I said that we must be analytical towards people. No man can be without error. Consider the sages: to say that they were without shortcomings would be a metaphysical point of view, not a Marxist dialectical-materialist point of view. Anything can be analysed. I urge comrades, no matter whether you have had connections with foreign countries, or whether you belong to secret anti-Party groups — as long as you spill the beans and tell the whole truth we welcome you and will give you work to do. We must on no account take the attitude of ignoring such people, still less resort to the method of execution. We cannot break our ban on executions so there have been many counter-revolutionaries whom we have not killed. Wasn't the Hsüan T'ung emperor[5] a counter-revolutionary? There were also war criminals like Wang Yao-wu, K'ang Tse, Tu Yü-ming, Yang Kuang, and a whole lot of others whom we did not kill. Many people corrected their mistakes and we relieved them. We didn't kill them. Those rightists who have corrected their mistakes have had their hats removed.[6] The recent trend towards the reversal of verdicts is incorrect. Only those verdicts which were truly incorrect can be reversed. Those verdicts which were correct cannot be reversed. As for the reversal of those verdicts which were truly wrong, when they were wholly wrong they should be wholly reversed, when they were partly wrong they should be partly reversed. When they were not wrong they should not be reversed. We cannot reverse all of them indiscriminately.

On the question of work, comrades will please take care that the class struggle does not interfere with our work. The first Lushan Conference of 1959 was originally concerned with work. Then up jumped P'eng Te-huai and said: 'You fucked my mother for forty days, can't I fuck your mother for twenty days?' All this fucking messed up the conference and the work was affected. Twenty days was not long enough and we abandoned the question of work. We really mustn't do that this time, we must really pay attention. In transmitting their reports of the conference, all localities and departments should take care to put work first. Work and the class struggle should proceed simultaneously. The class struggle must not be placed in a very prominent position. We

have now formed two Special Case Review Commissions to clarify problems, to elucidate the problems and then convince people. We have to engage in the class struggle, but there are special people to take care of this kind of work. The security departments are specially charged with carrying on the class struggle. P'an Han-nien[7] is a counter-revolutionary! Hu Feng and Jao Shu-shih are also counter-revolutionaries We haven't killed any of them! We must not let the class struggle interfere with our work. We can wait until the next Plenum or the one after that and then make another attempt to clarify these matters. The main task [of the security organs] is to deal with enemy sabotage.[8] If people engage in sabotage, then we will break our ban on executions. But this is only directed at people who destroy factories or bridges, throw bombs in the vicinity of Canton, who kill people or commit arson. The task of security is to defend our cause, to defend factories, enterprises, communes, production brigades, schools, the government, the army, the Party, mass organizations, and also cultural organs such as newspa! pers, publishing houses and news agencies; i.e. to protect the superstructure.

Writing novels is popular these days, isn't it? The use of novels for anti-Party activity is a great invention. Anyone wanting to overthrow a political régime must create public opinion and do some preparatory ideological work. This applies to counter-revolutionary as well as to revolutionary classes. Our ideology is revolutionary Marxism-Leninism; it is the combination of the universal truth of Marxism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. If these are well combined then the problems will be more easily solved. If they are not well combined, then we will meet with failure and setbacks. As regards socialist construction, this is also a combination of universal truth with the practice of construction. Have we combined them well or not? We are in the process of solving this problem. The same thing is true in military construction. For example, the military line of a few years ago is not the same as the military line today. Comrade Yeh Chien-ying[9] wrote a book which is very sharp; it is never confused on crucial points. I have always criticized you for not being sharp enough, but this time you wore sharp. Here are a couple of sentences for you: 'Chu-ko Liang was cautious all his life, while Lu Tuan was clear-headed in big matters.'[10]

Will Comrade XX please announce the names of those who are not attending this plenum? The Standing Committee of the politburo decided that five people should not attend.

(Comrade XX intervened to say: The Standing Committee of the Politburo decided that five people should not attend the Plenum. P'eng, Hsi, Chang, Huang and Chou[11] are important individuals presently under investigation. While they are under investigation, they are not qualified to attend meetings.)

Because their crimes are really too great, they are not qualified to attend meetings, and should not attend important meetings, nor be allowed to appear on the T'ien An Men, until the situation has been clarified through investigation. We must distinguish through analysis between important and unimportant individuals, there is a difference between them. Unimportant individuals have attended our meeting today. When unimportant individuals have thoroughly corrected their errors, they should be given work to do. If

important individuals have thoroughly corrected their errors, they should also be given work to do. We are particularly hopeful that unimportant individuals will become conscious [of their errors]; naturally we hope that important elements will also become conscious.

Notes

[References are given here as provided by the Maoist Documentation Project. They are significantly different in at least one existing edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. VIII. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1.] A Japanese ‘revisionist’ who founded a new party in the aftermath of de-Stalinization.

[2.] The term ‘encircle and annihilate’ (*wei-ch’ao*) is the same as that employed in the 1930s to designate the campaigns of extermination launched by Chiang Kai-shek against the communists. Its use here vividly reflects the degree of hostility which Mao perceived in his erstwhile comrades.

[3.] The *cheng-feng* or ‘rectification’ movement of 1942-5 was the first great campaign for the ideological remoulding of the Chinese Communist Party, and for the establishment of Mao Tse-tung’s thought as the standard of orthodoxy. For the documents studied at the time, see Boyd Compton (ed.), *Mao’s China* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1950). The most recent account of the political context as a whole is contained in Mark Selden, *The Yen-an Way in Revolutionary China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 177-276. For my own interpretation, see the introduction to *Authority, Participation, and Cultural Change in China* (Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 17-22.

[4.] Li Wei-han (1897-), a Hunanese, played a leading role in the Chinese Communist Party from its foundation in 1921. From 1944 until his eclipse in December 1964, he was Director of the Party’s United Front Work Department. It is not clear exactly why he was criticized by Mao in 1962, but the charge was probably related to the ‘capitulationism’ of which he was accused two years later.

[5.] The last Manchu emperor, deposed in 1911, and restored by the Japanese in the 1930s as the emperor of the puppet country of ‘Manchukuo’. For his own story, see *From Emperor to Citizen: the Autobiography of Aisin-Gioro Pu Yi*, 2 vols. (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1964-5.)

[6.] i.e., they have had their social dignity restored by the removal of the dunce-caps, real or metaphorical, which they had been wearing.

[7.] P'an Han-nien, a former Comintern representative, was Vice-Mayor of Shanghai from 1949 until 1955, when he was expelled from the Party and arrested.

[8.] In the early 1960s, in the tense conditions created by the economic difficulties which arose after the Great Leap Forward, Kuomintang commando raids on the coast and other subversive activities were a particularly serious problem.

[9.] Yeh Chien-ying (1898-), a professional soldier who joined the Chinese Communist Party in 1927 and participated in the Nanchang Uprising, became a member of the Central Committee in 1945. During the early stages of the Cultural Revolution, in 1966-7, he was appointed to the Secretariat and the Politburo. At the Tenth Congress in August 1973, he became one of the five vice-chairmen of the Central Committee.

[10.] Chu-ko Liang (181-234), prime minister of the Shu Han or Minor Han dynasty, was one of the most famous military strategists of ancient China. He is a central character in the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, and was, as Mao says, known throughout his career for his great prudence and foresight. Lü Tuan was a minister of Emperor T'ai Tsung of the Sung dynasty in the tenth century who used to say of him that he was a fool in small matters, but not in great ones.

[11.] Four of these men have long been known as members of the 'P'eng-Huang-Chang-Chou Anti-Party Group'. (See above, [Speech at the Enlarged Session of the Military Affairs Committee and the External Affairs Conference, note 1.](#)) The other person named, Hsi [Chung-hsün] (1903-), remained in public view as a vice-premier until 1962, but had lost all his posts by 1965. This reference confirms that, as some observers had guessed, his fall was linked to that of P'eng Te-huai, with whom he had been closely associated in the early 1950s.

[Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung](#)

Reading Notes On The Soviet Text *Political Economy*

1961-62

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Part I.
Chapters 20-23

1. From Capitalism to Socialism

The text says on pages 327-28 that socialism will “inevitably” supersede capitalism and moreover will do so by “revolutionary means.” In the imperialist period clashes between the productive forces and the production relations have become sharper than ever. The proletarian socialist revolution is an “objective necessity.” Such statements are quite satisfactory and should be made this way. “Objective necessity” is quite all right and is agreeable to people. To call the revolution an objective necessity simply means that the direction it takes does not hinge on the intentions of individuals. Like it or not, come it will.

The proletariat will “organize all working people around itself for the purpose of eliminating capitalism.” (p. 327) Correct. But at this point one should go on to raise the question of the seizure of power. “The proletarian revolution cannot hope to come upon ready-made socialist economic forms.” “Components of a socialist economy cannot mature inside of a capitalist economy based on private ownership.” (p. 328) Indeed, not only can they not “mature”; they cannot be born. In capitalist societies a cooperative or state-run economy can not even be brought into being, to say nothing of maturing. This is our main difference with the revisionists, who claim that in capitalist societies such things as municipal public enterprises are actually socialist elements, and argue that capitalism may peacefully grow over to socialism. This is a serious distortion of Marxism.

2. The Transition Period

The book says, “The transition period begins with the establishment of proletarian political power and ends with the fulfilment of the responsibility of the socialist revolution — the founding of socialism, communism’s first stage.” (p. 328) One must study very carefully what stages, in the final analysis, are included in the transition period. Is only the transition from capitalism to socialism included, or the transition from socialism to communism as well?

Here Marx is cited: from capitalism to communism there is a “period of revolutionary transformation.” We are presently in such a period. Within a certain number of years our people’s communes will have to carry through the transformation from ownership by the basic team to ownership by the basic commune,^[1] and then into ownership by the whole people.^[2] The transformation to basic commune ownership already carried out by the people’s communes remains collective ownership [and is not yet ownership by the whole people: *Note in brackets inserted by translator for clarity*].

In the transition period “all social relations must be fundamentally transformed.” This proposition is correct in principle. All social relations includes in its meaning the production relations and the superstructure — economics, politics, ideology and culture, etc.

In the transition period we must “enable the productive forces to gain the development they need to guarantee the victory of socialism.” For China, broadly speaking, I would say we need 100-200 million tons of steel per year at the least. Up to this year our main accomplishment has been to clear the way for the development of the productive forces. The development of the productive forces of China’s socialism has barely begun. Having gone through the Great Leap Forward of 1958-1959, we can look to 1960 as a year promising great development of production.

3. Universal and Particular Characteristics of the Proletarian Revolution in Various Countries

The book says, the October Revolution “planted the standard,” and that every country “has its own particular forms and concrete methods for constructing socialism.” This proposition is sound. In 1848 there was a Communist Manifesto. One hundred and ten years later there was another Communist Manifesto, namely the Moscow Declaration made in 1957 by various communist parties. This declaration addressed itself to the integration of universal laws and concrete particulars.

To acknowledge the standard of the October Revolution is to acknowledge that the “basic content” of the proletarian revolution of any country is the same. Precisely here we stand opposed to the revisionists.

Why was it that the revolution succeeded first not in the nations of the West with a high level of capitalist productivity and a numerous proletariat, but rather in the nations of the East, Russia and China for example, where the level of capitalist productivity was comparatively low and the proletariat comparatively small? This question awaits study.

Why did the proletariat win its first victory in Russia? The text says because “all the contradictions of imperialism came together in Russia.” The history of revolution suggests that the focal point of the revolution has been shifting from West to East. At the end of the eighteenth century the focal point was in France, which became the center of the political life of the world. In the mid-nineteenth century the focal point shifted to Germany, where the proletariat stepped onto the political stage, giving birth to Marxism. In the early years of the twentieth century the focal point shifted to Russia, giving birth to Leninism. Without this development of Marxism there would have been no victory for the Russian Revolution. By the mid-twentieth century the focal point of world revolution had shifted to China. Needless to say, the focal point is bound to shift again in the future.

Another reason for the victory of the Russian Revolution was that broad masses of the peasantry served as an allied force of the revolution. The text says, “The Russian proletariat formed an alliance with the poor [Only in the 1969 text: *Note by translator.*] peasants.” (p. 328-29, 1967 edition) Among the peasants there are several strata, and the poor peasant is the one the proletariat relied on. When a revolution begins the middle peasants always waver; they want to look things over and see whether the revolution has any strength, whether it can maintain itself, whether it will have advantages to offer. But the middle peasant will not shift over to the side of the proletariat until he has a

comparatively clear picture. That is how the October Revolution was. And that is how it was for our own land reform, cooperatives, and people's communes.[\[3\]](#)

Ideologically, politically, and organizationally the Bolshevik-Menshevik split prepared the way for the victory of the October Revolution. And without the Bolsheviks' struggle against the Mensheviks and the revisionism of the Second International, the October Revolution could never have triumphed. Leninism was born and developed in the struggle against all forms of revisionism and opportunism. And without Leninism there would have been no victory for the Russian Revolution.

The book says, "Proletarian revolution first succeeded in Russia, and prerevolutionary Russia had a level of capitalist development sufficient to enable the revolution to succeed." The victory of the proletarian revolution may not have to come in a country with a high level of capitalist development. The book is quite correct to quote Lenin. Down to the present time, of the countries where socialist revolution has succeeded only East Germany and Czechoslovakia had a comparatively high level of capitalism; elsewhere the level was comparatively low. And revolution has not broken out in any of the Western nations with a comparatively high level of development. Lenin had said, "The revolution first breaks out in the weak link of the imperialist world." At the time of the October Revolution Russia was such a weak link. The same was true for China after the October Revolution. Both Russia and China had a relatively numerous proletariat and a vast peasantry, oppressed and suffering. And both were large states. . . . [Ellipsis in original: *Note by translator.*] But in these respects India was much the same. The question is, why could not India consummate a revolution by breaking imperialism's weak link as Lenin and Stalin had described? Because India was an English colony, a colony belonging to a single imperialist state. Herein lies the difference between India and China. China was a semicolony under several imperialist governments. The Indian Communist Party did not take an active part in its country's bourgeois democratic revolution and did not make it possible for the Indian proletariat to assume the leadership of the democratic revolution. Nor, after independence, did the Indian Communist Party persevere in the cause of the independence of the Indian proletariat.

The historical experience of China and Russia proves that to win the revolution having a mature party is a most important condition. In Russia the Bolsheviks took an active part in the democratic revolution and proposed a program for the 1905 revolution distinct from that of the bourgeoisie. It was a program that aimed to solve not only the question of overthrowing the tsar, but also the question of how to wrest leadership from the Constitutional Democratic Party in the struggle to overthrow the tsar.

At the time of the 1911 revolution China still had no communist party. After it was founded in 1921, the Chinese Communist Party immediately and energetically joined the democratic revolution and stood at its forefront. The golden age of China's bourgeoisie, when their revolution had great vitality, was during the years 1905-1917. After the 1911 revolution the Nationalist Party was already declining. And by 1924 they had no alternative but to turn to the Communist Party before they could make further headway. The proletariat had superseded the bourgeoisie. The proletarian political party superseded

the bourgeois political party as the leader of the democratic revolution. We have often said that in 1927 the Chinese Communist Party had not yet reached its maturity. Primarily this means that our party, during its years of alliance with the bourgeoisie, failed to see the possibility of the bourgeoisie betraying the revolution and, indeed, was utterly unprepared for it.

Here (p. 331) the text goes on to express the view that the reason why countries dominated by precapitalist economic forms could carry through a socialist revolution was because of assistance from advanced socialist countries. This is an incomplete way of putting the matter. After the democratic revolution succeeded in China we were able to take the path of socialism mainly because we overthrew the rule of imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism. The internal factors were the main ones. While the assistance we received from successful socialist countries was an important condition, it was not one which could settle the question of whether or not we could take the road of socialism, but only one which could influence our rate of advance after we had taken the road. With aid we could advance more quickly, without it less so. What we mean by assistance includes, in addition to economic aid, our studious application of the positive and negative experiences of both the successes and the failures of the assisting country.

4. The Question of “Peaceful Transition”

The book says on page 330, “In certain capitalist countries and former colonial countries, for the working class to take political power through peaceful parliamentary means is a practical possibility.” Tell me, which are these “certain countries”? The main capitalist countries of Europe and North America are armed to the teeth. Do you expect them to allow you to take power peacefully? The communist party and the revolutionary forces of every country must ready both hands, one for winning victory peacefully, one for taking power with violence. Neither may be dispensed with. It is essential to realize that, considering the general trend of things, the bourgeoisie has no intention of relinquishing its political power. They will put up a fight for it, and if their very life should be at stake, why should they not resort to force? In the October Revolution as in our own, both hands were ready. Before July 1917 Lenin did consider using peaceful methods to win the victory, but the July incident demonstrated that it would no longer be possible to transfer power to the proletariat peacefully. And not until he had reversed himself and carried out three months’ military preparation did he win the victory of the October Revolution. After the proletariat had seized political power in the course of the October Revolution Lenin remained inclined toward peaceful methods, using “redemption” to eliminate capitalism and put the socialist transformation into effect. But the bourgeoisie in collusion with fourteen imperialist powers launched counter-revolutionary armed uprisings and interventions. And so before the victory of the October Revolution could be consolidated, three years of armed struggle had to be waged under the leadership of the Russian party.

5. From the Democratic Revolution to the Socialist Revolution — Several Problems

At the end of page 330 the text takes up the transformation of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution but does not clearly explain how the transformation is effected. The October Revolution was a socialist revolution which concomitantly fulfilled tasks left over from the bourgeois democratic revolution. Immediately after the victory of the October Revolution the nationalization of land was proclaimed. But bringing the democratic revolution to a conclusion on the land question was yet to take a period of time.

During the War of Liberation China solved the tasks of the democratic revolution. The founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 marked the basic conclusion of the democratic revolution and the beginning of the transition to socialism. It took another three years to conclude the land reform, but at the time the Republic was founded we immediately expropriated the bureaucratic capitalist enterprises — 80 percent of the fixed assets of our industry and transport — and converted them to ownership by the whole people.

During the War of Liberation we raised antibureaucratic capitalist slogans as well as anti-imperialist and antifeudal ones. The struggle against bureaucratic capitalism had a two sided character: it had a democratic revolutionary character insofar as it amounted to opposition to comprador capitalism,[\[4\]](#) but it had a socialist character insofar as it amounted to opposition to the big bourgeoisie.

After the war of resistance was won, the Nationalist Party [KMT] took over a very large portion of bureaucratic capital from Japan and Germany and Italy. The ratio of bureaucratic to national [i.e., Chinese] capital was 8 to 2. After liberation we expropriated all bureaucratic capital, thus eliminating the major components of Chinese capitalism.[\[5\]](#)

But it would be wrong to think that after the liberation of the whole country “the revolution in its earliest stages had only in the main the character of a bourgeois democratic revolution and not until later would it gradually develop into a socialist revolution.” [No page reference]

6. Violence and the Proletarian Dictatorship

On page 333 the text could be more precise in its use of the concept of violence. Marx and Engels always said that “the state is by definition an instrument of violence employed to suppress the opposing class.” And so it can never be said that “the proletarian dictatorship does not use violence purely and simply in dealing with the exploiter and may even not use it primarily.”

When its life is at stake the exploiting class always resorts to force. Indeed, no sooner do they see the revolution start up than they suppress it with force. The text says, “Historical experience proves that the exploiting class is utterly unwilling to cede political power to the people and uses armed force to oppose the people's political power.” This is not a complete way of stating the matter. It is not only after the people have organized revolutionary political power that the exploiting class will oppose it with force, but even

at the very moment when the people rise up to seize political power, the exploiters promptly use violence to suppress the revolutionary people.

The purpose of our revolution is to develop the society's forces of production. Toward this end we must first overthrow the enemy. Second we must suppress its resistance. How could we do this without the revolutionary violence of the people?

Here the book turns to the "substance" of the proletarian dictatorship and the primary responsibilities of the working class and laboring people in general in the socialist revolution. But the discussion is incomplete as it leaves out the suppression of the enemy as well as the remoulding of classes. Landlords, bureaucrats, counter-revolutionaries, and undesirable elements have to be remoulded; the same holds true for the capitalist class, the upper stratum of the petit bourgeoisie, and the middle [Only in the 1969 text. *Note by translator.*] peasants. Our experience shows that remoulding is difficult. Those who do not undergo persistent repeated struggle can not be properly remoulded. To eliminate thoroughly any remaining strength of the bourgeoisie and any influence they may have will take one or two decades at the least and may even require half a century. In the rural areas, where basic commune ownership has been put into effect, private ownership has been transformed into state ownership. The entire country abounds with new cities and new major industry. Transportation and communications for the entire country have been modernized. Truly, the economic situation has been completely changed, and for the first time the peasants' worldview is bound to be turned around completely step by step. (Here in speaking of "primary responsibilities" the book uses Lenin's words differently from his original intention.)

To write or speak in an effort to suit the tastes of the enemy, the imperialists, is to defraud the masses and as a result to comfort the enemy while keeping one's own class in ignorance.

7. The Form of the Proletarian State

On page 334 the book says, "the proletarian state can take various forms." True enough, but there is not much difference essentially between the proletarian dictatorship in the people's democracies and the one established in Russia after the October Revolution. Also, the soviets of the Soviet Union and our own people's congresses were both representative assemblies, different in name only. In China the people's congresses included those participating as representatives of the bourgeoisie, representatives who had split off from the Nationalist Party, and representatives who were prominent democratic figures. All of them accepted the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. One group among these tried to stir up trouble, but failed.^[6] Such an inclusive form may appear different from the soviet, but it should be remembered that after the October Revolution the soviets included representatives of the Menshevik rightist Social Revolutionary Party, a Trotskyite faction, a Bukharin faction, a Zinoviev faction, and so forth. Nominally representatives of the workers and peasants, they were virtual representatives of the bourgeoisie. The period after the October Revolution was a time when the proletariat accepted a large number of personnel from the Kerensky government

— all of whom were bourgeois elements. Our own central people's government was set up on the foundation of the North China People's Government. All members of the various departments were from the base areas, and the majority of the mainstay cadres were Communist Party members.

8. Transforming Capitalist Industry and Commerce

On page 335 there is an incorrect explanation of the process by which capitalist ownership changed into state ownership in China. The book only explains our policy toward national capital but not our policy toward bureaucratic capital (expropriation). In order to convert the property of the bureaucratic capitalist to public ownership we chose the method of expropriation.

In paragraph 2 of page 335 the experience of passing through the state capitalist form in order to transform capitalism is treated as a singular and special experience; its universal significance is denied. The countries of Western Europe and the United States have a very high level of capitalist development, and the controlling positions are held by a minority of monopoly capitalists. But there are a great number of small and middle capitalists as well. Thus it is said that American capital is concentrated but also widely distributed. After a successful revolution in these countries monopoly capital will undoubtedly have to be expropriated, but will the small and middle capitalists likewise be uniformly expropriated? It may well be the case that some form of state capitalism will have to be adopted to transform them.

Our northeast provinces may be thought of as a region with a high level of capitalist development. The same is true for Kiangsu (with centers in Shanghai and the southern part of the province). If state capitalism could work in these areas, tell me why the same policy could not work in other countries which resemble these provincial sectors?

The method the Japanese used when they held our northeast provinces was to eliminate the major local capitalists and turn their enterprises into Japanese state-managed, or in some cases monopoly capitalist enterprises. For the small and middle capitalists they established subsidiary companies as a means of imposing control.

Our transformation of national capital passed through three stages: private manufacture on state order, unified government purchase and sale of private output, joint state private operation (of individual units and of whole complexes). Each phase was carried out in a methodical way. This prevented any damage to production, which actually developed as the transformation progressed. We have gained much new experience with state capitalism; for one example, the providing of capitalists with fixed interest after the joint state-private operation phase.[\[7\]](#)

9. Middle Peasants

After land reform, land was not worth money and the peasants were afraid to "show themselves." There were comrades who at one time considered this situation

unsatisfactory, but what happened was that in the course of class struggles which disgraced landlords and rich peasants, the peasantry came to view poverty as dignified and wealth as shameful. This was a welcome sign, one which showed that the poor peasants had politically overturned the rich peasants and established their dominance in the villages.

On page 339 it says that the land taken from the rich peasants and given to the poor and middle peasants was land the government had expropriated and then parcelled out. This looks at the matter as a grant by royal favour, forgetting that class struggles and mass mobilizations had been set in motion, a right deviationist point of view. Our approach was to rely on the poor peasants, to unite with the majority of middle peasants (lower middle peasants) and seize the land from the landlord class. While the party did play a leading role, it was against doing everything itself and thus substituting for the masses. Indeed, its concrete practice was to “pay call on the poor to learn of their grievances,” to identify activist elements, to strike roots and pull things together, to consolidate nuclei, to promote the voicing of grievances, and to organize the class ranks — all for the purpose of unfolding the class struggle.

The text says “the middle peasants became the principal figures in the villages.” This is an unsatisfactory assertion. To proclaim the middle peasants as the principals, commending them to the gods, never daring to offend them, is bound to make former poor peasants feel as if they had been put in the shade. Inevitably this opens the way for middle peasants of means to assume rural leadership.

The book makes no analysis of the middle peasant. We distinguish between upper and lower middle peasants and further between old and new within those categories, regarding the new as slightly preferable. Experience in campaign after campaign has shown that the poor peasant, the new lower middle peasant, and the old lower middle peasant have a comparatively good political attitude. They are the ones who embrace the people’s communes. Among the upper middle peasants and the prosperous middle peasants there is a group that supports the communes as well as one that opposes them. According to materials from Hopei province the total number of production teams there comes to more than forty thousand, 50 percent of which embrace the communes without reservation, 35 percent of which basically accept them but with objections or doubts on particular questions, 15 percent of which oppose or have serious reservations about the communes. The opposition of this last group is due to the fact that the leadership of the teams fell to prosperous middle peasants or even undesirable elements. During this process of education in the struggle between the two roads, if the debate is to develop among these teams, their leadership will have to change. Clearly, then, the analysis of the middle peasant must be pursued. For the matter of whose hands hold rural leadership has tremendous bearing on the direction of developments there.

On page 340 the book says, “Essentially the middle peasant has a twofold character.” This question also requires concrete analysis. The poor, lower middle, upper middle, and prosperous middle peasants in one sense are all workers, but in another they are private owners. As private owners their points of view are respectively dissimilar. Poor and

lower middle peasants may be described as semiprivate owners whose point of view is comparatively easily altered. By contrast, the private owner's point of view held by the upper middle and the prosperous peasants has greater substance, and they have consistently resisted cooperativization.

10. The Worker-Peasant Alliance

The third and fourth paragraphs on page 340 are concerned with the importance of the worker-peasant alliance but fail to go into what must be done before the alliance can be developed and consolidated. The text, again, deals with the need of the peasants to press forward with the transformation of the small producers but fails to consider how to advance the process, what kinds of contradictions may be found at each stage of the transformation, and how they may be resolved. And, the text does not discuss the measures and tactics for the entire process.

Our worker-peasant alliance has already passed through two stages. The first was based on the land revolution, the second on the cooperative movement. If cooperativization had not been set in motion the peasantry inevitably would have been polarized, and the worker-peasant alliance could not have been consolidated. In consequence, the policy of "unified government purchase and sale of private output"[\[8\]](#) could not have been persevered in. The reason is that that policy could be maintained and made to work thoroughly only on the basis of cooperativization. At the present time our worker-peasant alliance has to take the next step and establish itself on the basis of mechanization. For to have simply the cooperative and commune movements without mechanization would once again mean that the alliance could not be consolidated. We still have to develop the cooperatives into people's communes. We still have to develop basic ownership by the commune team into basic ownership by the commune and that further into state ownership. When state ownership and mechanization are integrated we will be able to begin truly to consolidate the worker-peasant alliance, and the differences between workers and peasants will surely be eliminated step by step.

11. The Transformation of Intellectuals

Page 341 is devoted exclusively to the problem of fostering the development of intellectuals who are the workers' and peasants' own, as well as the problem of involving bourgeois intellectuals in socialist construction. However, the text fails to deal with the transformation of intellectuals. Not only the bourgeois intellectuals but even those of worker or peasant origin need to engage in transformation because they have come under the manifold influence of the bourgeoisie. Liu Shao-t'ang, of artistic and literary circles, who, after becoming an author, became a major opponent of socialism, exemplifies this. Intellectuals usually express their general outlook through their way of looking at knowledge. Is it privately owned or publicly owned? Some regard it as their own property, for sale when the price is right and not otherwise. Such are mere "experts" and not "reds"[\[9\]](#) who say the party is an "outsider" and "cannot lead the insiders." Those involved in the cinema claim that the party cannot lead the cinema. Those involved in musicals or ballet claim that the party cannot offer leadership there. Those in atomic

science say the same. In sum, what they are all saying is that the party cannot lead anywhere. Remoulding of the intellectuals is an extremely important question for the entire period of socialist revolution and construction. Of course it would be wrong to minimize this question or to adopt a concessive attitude toward things bourgeois.

Again on page 341 it says that the fundamental contradiction in the transition economy is the one between capitalism and socialism. Correct. But this passage speaks only of setting struggles in motion to see who will emerge the victor in all realms of economic life. None of this is complete. We would put it as follows: a thoroughgoing socialist revolution must advance along the three fronts of politics, economics, and ideology.

The text says that we absorb bourgeois elements so that they may participate in the management of enterprises and the state. This is repeated on page 357. [Page 341, according to the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] But we insist on the responsibility for remoulding the bourgeois elements. We help them change their lifestyle, their general outlook, and also their viewpoint on particular issues. The text, however, makes no mention of remoulding.

12. The Relationship Between Industrialization and Agricultural Collectivization

The book sees socialist industrialization as the precondition for agricultural collectivization. This view in no way corresponds to the situation in the Soviet Union itself, where collectivization was basically realized between 1930 and 1932. Though they had then more tractors than we do now, still and all the amount of arable land under mechanized cultivation was under 20.3 percent. Collectivization is not altogether determined by mechanization, and so industrialization is not the precondition for it.

Agricultural collectivization in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe was completed very slowly, mainly because after land reform, they did not strike while the iron was hot but delayed for a time. In some of our own old base areas too, a section of the peasantry was satisfied with the reform and unwilling to proceed further. This situation did not depend at all on whether or not there was industrialization.

13. War and Revolution

On pages 352-54 it is argued that the various people's democracies of Eastern Europe "were able to build socialism even though there was neither civil war nor armed intervention from abroad." It is also argued that "socialist transformation in these countries was realized without the ordeal of civil war." It would have been better to say that what happened in these countries is that a civil war was waged in the form of international war, that civil and international war were waged together. The reactionaries of these countries were ploughed under by the Soviet Red Army. To say that there was no civil war in these countries would be mere formalism that disregards substance.

The text says that in the countries of Eastern Europe after the revolution “parliaments became the organs for broadly representing the people’s interests.” In fact, these parliaments were completely different from the bourgeois parliaments of old, bearing resemblance in name only. The Political Consultative Conference we had during the early phase of Liberation was no different in name from the Political Consultative Conference of the Nationalist period. During our negotiations with the Nationalists we were indifferent to the conference but Chiang Kai-shek was very interested in it. After Liberation we took over their signboard and called into session a nationwide Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference, which served as a provisional people’s congress.[\[10\]](#)

The text says that China “in the process of revolutionary struggle organized a people’s democratic united front.” (p. 357) Why only “revolutionary struggle” and not “revolutionary war?” From 1927 down to the nationwide victory we waged twenty-two years of long-term uninterrupted war. And even before that, starting with the bourgeois revolution of 1911, there was another fifteen years’ warfare. The chaotic wars of the warlords under the direction of imperialists should also be counted. Thus, from 1911 down to the War to Resist America and Aid Korea, it may be said that continual wars were waged in China for forty years — revolutionary warfare and counter-revolutionary warfare. And, since its founding, our party has joined or led wars for thirty years.

A great revolution must go through a civil war. This is a rule. And to see the ills of war but not its benefits is a onesided view. It is of no use to the people’s revolution to speak onesidedly of the destructiveness of war.

14. Is Revolution Harder in Backward Countries?

In the various nations of the West there is a great obstacle to carrying through any revolution and construction movement i.e., the poisons of the bourgeoisie are so powerful that they have penetrated each and every corner. While our bourgeoisie has had, after all, only three generations, those of England and France have had a 250-300 year history of development and their ideology and *modus operandi* have influenced all aspects and strata of their societies. Thus the English working class follows the Labour Party, not the Communist Party.

Lenin says, “The transition from capitalism to socialism will be more difficult for a country the more backward it is.” This would seem incorrect today. Actually, the transition is less difficult the more backward an economy is, for the poorer they are the more the people want revolution. In the capitalist countries of the West the number of people employed is comparatively high, and so is the wage level. Workers there have been deeply influenced by the bourgeoisie, and it would not appear to be all that easy to carry through a socialist transformation. And since the degree of mechanization is high, the major problem after a successful revolution would not be advancing mechanization but transforming the people. Countries of the East, such as China and Russia, had been backward and poor, but now not only have their social systems moved well ahead of those of the West, but even the rate of development of their productive forces far

outstrips that of the West. Again, as in the history of the development of the capitalist countries, the backward overtake the advanced as America overtook England, and as Germany later overtook England early in the twentieth century.

15. Is Large-Scale Industry the Foundation of Socialist Transformation?

On page 364 [Page 349, according to the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] the text says, “Countries that have taken the road of socialist construction face the task of eliminating as quickly as possible the after-effects of capitalist rule in order to accelerate the development of large industry (the basis for the socialist transformation of the economy).” It is not enough to assert that the development of large industry is the foundation for the socialist transformation of the economy. All revolutionary history shows that the full development of new productive forces is not the prerequisite for the transformation of backward production relations. Our revolution began with Marxist-Leninist propaganda, which served to create new public opinion in favor of the revolution. Moreover, it was possible to destroy the old production relations only after we had overthrown a backward superstructure in the course of revolution. After the old production relations had been destroyed new ones were created, and these cleared the way for the development of new social productive forces. With that behind us we were able to set in motion the technological revolution to develop social productive forces on a large scale. At the same time, we still had to continue transforming the production relations and ideology.

This textbook addresses itself only to material preconditions and seldom engages the question of the superstructure, i.e., the class nature of the state, philosophy, and science. In economics the main object of study is the production relations. All the same, political economy and the materialist historical outlook are close cousins. It is difficult to deal clearly with problems of the economic base and the production relations if the question of the superstructure is neglected.

16. Lenin’s Discussion of the Unique Features of Taking the Socialist Road

On page 375 a passage from Lenin is cited. It is well expressed and quite helpful for defending our work methods. “The level of consciousness of the residents, together with the efforts they have made to realize this or that plan, are bound to be reflected in the unique features of the road they take toward socialism.” Our own “politics in command” is precisely for raising the consciousness in our neighbourhoods. Our own Great Leap Forward is precisely an “effort to realize this or that plan.”

17. The Rate of Industrialization Is a Critical Problem

The text says, “As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the rate of industrialization is a critical problem.” At present this is a critical problem for China, too. As a matter of fact,

the problem becomes more acute the more backward industry is. This is true not only from country to country but also from one area to another in the same country. For example, our northeastern provinces and Shanghai have a comparatively strong base, and so state investment increased somewhat less rapidly there. In other areas, where the original industrial base was slight, and development was urgently needed, state investment increased quite rapidly. In the ten years that Shanghai has been liberated 2.2 billion Chinese dollars^[11] have been invested, over 500 million by capitalists. Shanghai used to have over half a million workers, now the city has over 1 million, if we do not count the hundreds of thousands transferred out. This is only double the earlier worker population. When we compare this with certain new cities where the work force has increased enormously we can see plainly that in areas with a deficient industrial base the problem of rate is all the more critical. Here the text only says that political circumstances demand the high rate and does not explain whether or not the socialist system itself can attain the high rate. This is onesided. If there is only the need and not the capability, tell me, how is the high rate to be achieved?^[12]

18. Achieve a High Rate of Industrialization by Concurrent Promotion of Small, Medium, and Large Enterprise

On page 381 the text touches on our broad development of small- and medium-scale enterprise but fails to reflect accurately our philosophy of concurrent promotion of native and foreign, small, medium, and large enterprise. The text says we “determined upon extensive development of small and medium-scale enterprises because of the utter backwardness of our technological economy, the size of our populations and very serious employment problems.” But the problem by no means lies in technological age, population size, or the need to increase employment. Under the guidance of the larger enterprises we are developing the small and the medium; under the guidance of the foreign we are adopting native methods wherever we can — mainly for the sake of achieving the high rate of industrialization.

19. Is Long-Term Coexistence Between Two Types of Socialist Ownership Possible?

On page 386 it says, “A socialist state and socialist construction can not be established on two different bases for any length of time. That is to say, they can not be established on the base of socialist industry, the largest and most unified base, *and* on the base of the peasant petty commodity economy, which is scattered and backward.” This point is well taken, of course, and we therefore extend the logic to reach the following conclusion: The socialist state and socialist construction cannot be established for any great length of time on the basis of ownership by the whole people *and* ownership by the collective as two different bases of ownership.

In the Soviet Union the period of coexistence between the two types of ownership has lasted too long. The contradictions between ownership of the whole people and collective ownership are in reality contradictions between workers and peasants. The text fails to recognize such contradictions.

In the same way prolonged coexistence of ownership by the whole people with ownership by the collectives is bound to become less and less adaptable to the development of the productive forces and will fail to satisfy the ever increasing needs of peasant consumption and agricultural production or of industry for raw materials. To satisfy such needs we must resolve the contradiction between these two forms of ownership, transform ownership by the collectives into ownership by the whole people, and make a unified plan for production and distribution in industry and agriculture on the basis of ownership by the whole people for an indivisible nation.

The contradictions between the productive forces and the production relations unfold without interruption. Relations that once were adapted to the productive forces will no longer be so after a period of time. In China, after we finished organizing the advanced cooperatives, the question of having both large and small units came up in every special district and in every county.

In socialist society the formal categories of distribution according to labor, commodity production, the law of value, and so forth are presently adapted to the demands of the productive forces. But as this development proceeds, the day is sure to come when these formal categories will no longer be adapted. At that time these categories will be destroyed by the development of the productive forces; their life will be over. Are we to believe that in a socialist society there are economic categories that are eternal and unchanging? Are we to believe that such categories as distribution according to labor and collective ownership are eternal — unlike all other categories, which are historical [hence relative]?

20. The Socialist Transformation of Agriculture Cannot Depend Only on Mechanization

Page 392 states, “The machine and tractor stations are important tools for carrying through the socialist transformation in agriculture.” Again and again the text emphasizes how important machinery is for the transformation. But if the consciousness of the peasantry is not raised, if ideology is not transformed, and you are depending on nothing but machinery — what good will it be? The question of the struggle between the two roads, socialism and capitalism, the transformation and re-education of people — these are the major questions for China.

The text on page 395 says that in carrying through the tasks of the early stages of general collectivization the question of the struggle against hostile rich peasants comes up. This of course is correct. But in the account the text gives of rural conditions *after* the formation of cooperatives the question of a prosperous stratum is dropped, nor is there any mention of such contradictions as those between the state, the collectives, and individuals, between accumulation and consumption^[13] and so forth.

Page 402 says, “Under conditions of high tide in the agricultural cooperative movement the broad masses of the middle peasantry will not waver again.” This is too general.

There is a section of rich middle peasants that is now wavering and will do so in the future.

21. So-Called Full Consolidation

“. . . fully consolidated the collective farm system,” it says on page 407. “Full consolidation” — a phrase to make one uneasy. The consolidation of anything is relative. How can it be “full”? What if no one died since the beginning of mankind, and everyone got “fully consolidated”? What kind of a world would that be! In the universe, on our globe, all things come into being, develop, and pass away ceaselessly. None of them is ever “fully consolidated.” Take the life of a silkworm. Not only must it pass away in the end, it must pass through four stages of development during its lifetime: egg, silkworm, pupa, moth. It must move on from one stage to the next and can never fully consolidate itself in any one stage. In the end, the moth dies, and its old essence becomes a new essence (as it leaves behind many eggs). This is a qualitative leap. Of course, from egg to worm, from worm to pupa, from pupa to moth clearly are more than quantitative changes. There is qualitative transformation too, but it is *partial* qualitative transformation. A person, too, in the process of moving through life toward death, experiences different stages: childhood, adolescence, youth, adulthood and old age. From life to death is a quantitative process for people, but at the same time they are pushing forward the process of partial qualitative change. It would be absurd to think that from youth to old age is but a quantitative increase without qualitative change. Inside the human organism cells are ceaselessly dividing, old ones dying and vanishing, new ones emerging and growing. At death there is a complete qualitative change, one that has come about through the preceding quantitative changes as well as the partial qualitative changes that occur during the quantitative changes. Quantitative change and qualitative change are a unity of opposites. Within the quantitative changes there are partial qualitative changes. One cannot say that there are no qualitative changes within quantitative changes. And within qualitative changes there are quantitative changes. One cannot say that there are no quantitative changes within qualitative changes.

In any lengthy process of change, before entering the final qualitative change, the subject must pass through uninterrupted quantitative changes and a good many partial qualitative changes. But the final qualitative change cannot come about unless there are partial qualitative changes and considerable quantitative change. For example, a factory of a given plant and size changes qualitatively as the machinery and other installations are renovated a section at a time. The interior changes even though the exterior and the size do not. A company of soldiers is no different. After it has fought a battle and lost dozens of men, a hundred-soldier company will have to replace its casualties. Fighting and replenishing continuously — this is how the company goes through uninterrupted partial qualitative change. As a result the company continues to develop and harden itself.

The crushing of Chiang Kai-shek was a qualitative change which came about through quantitative change. For example, there had to be a three-and-a-half-year period during which his army and political power were destroyed a section at a time. And, within this quantitative change qualitative change is to be found. The War of Liberation went

through several different stages, and each new stage differed qualitatively from the preceding stages. The transformation from individual to collective economy was a process of qualitative transformation. In our country this process consisted of mutual aid teams, early-stage cooperatives, advanced cooperatives, and people's communes.^[14] Such different stages of partial qualitative change brought a collective economy out of an individual economy.

The present socialist economy in our country is organized through two different forms of public ownership, ownership by the whole people and collective ownership. This socialist economy has had its own birth and development. Who would believe that this process of change has come to an end, and that we will say, "These two forms of ownership will continue to be fully consolidated for all time?" Who would believe that such formulas of a socialist society as "distribution according to labor," "commodity production," and "the law of value" are going to live forever? Who would believe that there is only birth and development but no dying away and transformation and that these formulas unlike all others are ahistorical?

Socialism must make the transition to communism. At that time there will be things of the socialist stage that will have to die out. And, too, in the period of communism there will still be uninterrupted development. It is quite possible that communism will have to pass through a number of different stages. How can we say that once communism has been reached nothing will change, that everything will continue "fully consolidated," that there will be quantitative change only, and no partial qualitative change going on all the time.

The way things develop, one stage leads on to another, advancing without interruption. But each and every stage has a "boundary." Every day we read from, say, four o'clock and end at seven or eight. That is the boundary. As far as socialist ideological remoulding goes, it is a long-term task. But each ideological campaign reaches its conclusion, that is to say has a boundary. On the ideological front, when we will have come through uninterrupted quantitative changes and partial qualitative changes, the day will arrive when we will be completely free of the influence of capitalist ideology. At that time the qualitative changes of ideological remoulding will have ended, but only to be followed by the quantitative changes of a new quality.

The construction of socialism also has its boundary. We have to keep tabs: for example, what is to be the ratio of industrial goods to total production, how much steel is to be produced, how high can the people's living standard be raised, etc.? But to say that socialist construction has a boundary hardly means that we do not want to take the next step, to make the transition to communism. It is possible to divide the transition from capitalism to communism into two stages: one from capitalism to socialism, which could be called underdeveloped socialism; and one from socialism to communism, that is, from comparatively underdeveloped socialism to comparatively developed socialism, namely, communism. This latter stage may take even longer than the first. But once it has been passed through, material production and spiritual prosperity will be most ample. People's

communist consciousness will be greatly raised, and they will be ready to enter the highest stage of communism.

On page 409 it says that after the forms of socialist production have been firmly established, production will steadily and rapidly expand. The rate of productivity will climb steadily. The text uses the term *steadily* or *without interruption* a good many times, but only to speak of quantitative transformation. There is little mention of partial qualitative change.

22. War and Peace

On page 408 it says that in capitalist societies “a crisis of surplus production will inevitably be created, causing unemployment to increase.” This is the gestation of war. It is difficult to believe that the basic principles of Marxist economics are suddenly without effect, that in a world where capitalist institutions still exist war can be fully eliminated.

Can it be said that the possibility of eliminating war for good has now arisen? Can it be said that the possibility of plying all the world’s wealth and resources to the service of mankind has arisen? This view is not Marxism, it has no class analysis, and it has not distinguished clearly between conditions under bourgeois and proletarian rule. If you do not eliminate classes, how can you eliminate war?

We will not be the ones to determine whether a world war will be waged or not. Even if a non-belligerency agreement is signed, the possibility of war will still exist. When imperialism wants to fight no agreement is going to be taken into account. And, if it comes, whether atomic or hydrogen weapons will be used is yet another question. Even though chemical weapons exist, they have not been used in time of war; conventional weapons were used after all. Even if there is no war between the two camps, there is no guarantee war will not be waged within the capitalist world. Imperialism may make war on imperialism. The bourgeoisie of one imperialist country may make war on its proletariat. Imperialism is even now waging war against colony and semicolon. War is one form of class conflict. But classes will not be eliminated except through war. And war cannot be eliminated for good except through the elimination of classes. If revolutionary war is not carried on, classes cannot be eliminated. We do not believe that the weapons of war can be eliminated without destroying classes. It is not possible. In the history of class societies any class or state is concerned with its “position of strength.” Gaining such positions has been history’s inevitable tendency. Armed force is the concrete manifestation of the real strength of a class. And as long as there is class antagonism there will be armed forces. Naturally, we are not wishing for war. We wish for peace. We favor making the utmost effort to stop nuclear war and to strive for a mutual nonaggression pact between the two camps. To strive to gain even ten or twenty years’ peace was what we advocated long ago. If we can realize this wish, it would be most beneficial for the entire socialist camp and for China’s socialist construction as well.

On page 409 it says that at this time the Soviet Union is no longer encircled by capitalism. This manner of speaking runs the risk of lulling people to sleep. Of course the

present situation has changed greatly from when there was only one socialist country. West of the Soviet Union there are now the various socialist countries of Eastern Europe. East of the Soviet Union are the socialist countries of China, Korea, Mongolia, and Vietnam. But the guided missiles have no eyes and can strike targets thousands or tens of thousands of kilometers away. All around the socialist camp American military bases are deployed, pointed toward the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Can it be said that the Soviet Union is no longer inside the ring of missiles?

23. Is Unanimity the Motive Force of Social Development?

On page 413 and 417 it says that socialism makes for the “solidarity of unanimity” and is “hard as a rock.” It says that unanimity is the “motive force of social development.”

This recognizes only the unanimity of solidarity but not the contradictions within a socialist society, nor that contradiction is the motive force of social development. Once it is put this way, the law of the universality of contradiction is denied, the laws of dialectics are suspended. Without contradictions there is no movement, and society always develops through movement. In the era of socialism, contradictions remain the motive force of social development. Precisely because there is no unanimity there is the responsibility for unity, the necessity to fight for it. If there were 100 percent unanimity always, then what explains the necessity for persevering in working for unity?

24. Rights of Labor Under Socialism

On page 414 we find a discussion of the rights labor enjoys but no discussion of labor’s right to run the state, the various enterprises, education, and culture. Actually, this is labor’s greatest right under socialism, the most fundamental right, without which there is no right to work, to an education, to vacation, etc.

The paramount issue for socialist democracy is: Does labor have the right to subdue the various antagonistic forces and their influences? For example, who controls things like the newspapers, journals, broadcast stations, the cinema? Who criticizes? These are a part of the question of rights. If these things are in the hands of right opportunists (who are a minority) then the vast nationwide majority that urgently needs a great leap forward will find itself deprived of these rights. If the cinema is in the hands of people like Chung Tien-p’ei,[\[15\]](#) how are the people supposed to realize their own rights in that sector? There is a variety of factions among the people. Who is in control of the organs and enterprises bears tremendously on the issue of guaranteeing the people’s rights. If Marxist-Leninists are in control, the rights of the vast majority will be guaranteed. If rightists or right opportunists are in control, these organs and enterprises may change qualitatively, and the people’s rights with respect to them cannot be guaranteed. In sum, the people must have the right to manage the superstructure. We must not take the rights of the people to mean that the state is to be managed by only a section of the people, that the people can enjoy labor rights, education rights, social insurance, etc., only under the management of certain people.

25. Is the Transition to Communism a Revolution?

On page 417 it says, “Under socialism there will be no class or social group whose interests conflict with communism and therefore the transition to communism will come about without social revolution.”

The transition to communism certainly is not a matter of one class overthrowing another. But that does not mean there will be no social revolution, because the superseding of one kind of production relations by another is a qualitative leap, i.e., a revolution. The two transformations — of individual economy to collective, and collective economy to public — in China are both revolutions in the production relations. So to go from socialism’s “distribution according to labor” to communism’s “distribution according to need” has to be called a revolution in the production relations. Of course, “distribution according to need” has to be brought about gradually. Perhaps when the principal material goods can be adequately supplied we can begin to carry out such distribution with those goods, extending the practice to other goods on the basis of further development of the productive forces.

Consider the development of our people’s communes. When we changed from basic ownership by the team to basic ownership by the commune, was a section of the people likely to raise objections or not? This is a question well worth our study. A determinative condition for realizing this changeover was that the commune-owned economy’s income was more than half of the whole commune’s total income. To realize the basic commune-ownership system is generally of benefit to the members of the commune. Thus we estimate that there should be no objection on the part of the vast majority. But at the time of changeover the original team cadres could no longer be relatively reduced under the circumstances. Would *they* object to the changeover?

Although classes may be eliminated in a socialist society, in the course of its development there are bound to be certain problems with “vested interest groups” which have grown content with existing institutions and unwilling to change them. For example, if the rule of distribution according to labor is in effect they benefit from higher pay for more work, and when it came time to change over to “distribution according to need” they could very well be uncomfortable with the new situation. Building any new system always necessitates some destruction of old ones. Creation never comes without destruction. If destruction is necessary it is bound to arouse some opposition. The human animal is queer indeed. No sooner do people gain some superiority than they assume airs . . . it would be dangerous to ignore this.

26. The Claim That “for China There Is No Necessity to Adopt Acute Forms of Class Struggle”

There is an error on page 419. After the October Revolution Russia’s bourgeoisie saw that the country’s economy had suffered severe damage, and so they decided that the proletariat could not change the situation and lacked the strength to maintain its political power. They judged that they only had to make the move and proletarian political power

could be overthrown. At this point they carried out armed resistance, thus compelling the Russian proletariat to take drastic steps to expropriate their property. At that time neither class had much experience.

To say that China's class struggle is not acute is unrealistic. It was fierce enough! We fought for twenty-two years straight. By waging war we overthrew the rule of the bourgeoisie's Nationalist Party, and expropriated bureaucratic capital, which amounted to 80 percent of our entire capitalist economy. Only thus was it possible for us to use peaceful methods to remold the remaining 20 percent of national capital. In the remoulding process we still had to go through such fierce struggles as the "three-antis" and the "five-antis" campaigns.[\[16\]](#)

Page 420 incorrectly describes the remoulding of bourgeois industrial and commercial enterprises. After Liberation the national bourgeoisie was forced to take the road of socialist remoulding. We brought down Chiang Kai-shek, expropriated bureaucratic capital, concluded the land reform, carried out the "three-antis" and "five-antis" campaigns, and made the cooperatives a working reality. We controlled the markets from the beginning. This series of transformations forced the national bourgeoisie to accept remoulding step by step. From yet another point of view, the Common Program stipulated that various kinds of economic interests were to be given scope. This enabled the capitalists to try for what profits they could. In addition, the constitution gave them the right to a ballot and a living. These things helped the bourgeoisie to realize that by accepting remoulding they could hold onto a social position and also play a certain role in the culture and in the economy.

In joint state-private enterprises the capitalists have no real managerial rights over the enterprise. Production is certainly not jointly managed by the capitalists and representatives of the public. Nor can it be said that "Capital's exploitation of labor has been limited." It has been virtually curtailed. The text seems to have missed the idea that the jointly operated enterprises we are speaking of were 75 per cent socialist. Of course at present they are 90 percent socialist or more.

The remoulding of capitalist industry and commerce has been basically concluded. But if the capitalists had the chance they would attack us without restraint. In 1957 we pushed back the onslaught of the right.[\[17\]](#) In 1959, through their representatives in the party, they again set in motion an attack against us.[\[18\]](#) Our policy toward the national capitalists is to take them along with us and then to encompass them.

The text uses Lenin's statement that state capitalism "continues the class struggle in another form." This is correct. (p. 421)

27. The Time Period for Building Socialism

On page 423 it says that we "concluded" the socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts in 1957.[\[19\]](#) We would rather say that we won a decisive victory.

On the same page it says that we want to turn China into a strong socialist country within ten to fifteen years. Now this is something we agree on! This means that after the second five-year plan we will have to go through another two five-year plans until 1972 (or 1969 if we strive to beat the schedule by two or three years). In addition to modernizing industry and agriculture, science and culture, we have to modernize national defence. In a country such as ours bringing the building of socialism to its conclusion is a tremendously difficult task. In socialist construction we must not speak of “early.”

28. Further Discussion of the Relationship Between Industrialization and Socialist Transformation

On page 423 it says that reform of the system of ownership long before the realization of industrialization was a circumstance created by special conditions in China. This is an error. Eastern Europe, like China, “benefited from the existence of the mighty socialist camp and the help of an industrialized country as developed as the Soviet Union.” The question is, what was the reason Eastern European countries could not complete the socialist transformation in the ownership system (including agriculture) before industrialization became a reality? [Cf. Chapter 28, paragraph 1, of the 1967 edition: Page 423 says, “Given the special conditions in China, before socialist industrialization became a reality, it was thanks to the existence of the mighty socialist camp and the help of a powerful, highly developed industrial nation like the Soviet Union that the reform of the ownership system (including agriculture) achieved victory.” This is an error. The countries of Eastern Europe no less than China “had the existence of the powerful socialist camp and the help of as highly developed an industrial nation as the Soviet Union.” Why could they not complete socialist transformation in the ownership system (including agriculture) before industrialization became a reality? *Note by translator.*] Turning to the relationship between industrialization and socialist transformation, the truth is that in the Soviet Union itself the problem of ownership was settled before industrialization became a reality.

Similarly, from the standpoint of world history, the bourgeois revolutions and the establishment of the bourgeois nations came before, not after, the Industrial Revolution. The bourgeoisie first changed the superstructure and took possession of the machinery of state before carrying on propaganda to gather real strength. Only then did they push forward great changes in the production relations. When the production relations had been taken care of and they were on the right track they then opened the way for the development of the productive forces. To be sure, the revolution in the production relations is brought on by a certain degree of development of the productive forces, but the major development of the productive forces always comes after changes in the production relations. Consider the history of the development of capitalism. First came simple coordination, which subsequently developed into workshop handicrafts. At this time capitalist production relations were already taking shape, but the workshops produced without machines. This type of capitalist production relations gave rise to the need for technological advance, creating the conditions for the use of machinery. In England the Industrial Revolution (late eighteenth-early nineteenth centuries) was carried through only after the bourgeois revolution, that is, after the seventeenth century. All in

their respective ways, Germany, France, America, and Japan underwent change in superstructure and production relations before the vast development of capitalist industry.

It is a general rule that you cannot solve the problem of ownership and go on to expand development of the productive forces until you have first prepared public opinion for the seizure of political power. Although between the bourgeois revolution and the proletarian revolution there are certain differences (before the proletarian revolution socialist production relations did not exist, while capitalist production relations were already beginning to grow in feudal society), basically they are alike.

Part II.

Chapters 24-29

29. Contradictions Between Socialist Production Relations and Productive Forces

Page 433 discusses only the “mutual function” of the production relations and the productive forces under socialism but not the contradictions between them. The production relations include ownership of the means of production, the relations among people in the course of production, and the distribution system. The revolution in the system of ownership is the base, so to speak. For example, after the entire national economy has become indivisibly owned by the whole people through the transition from collective to people’s ownership, although people’s ownership will certainly be in effect for a relatively long time, for all enterprises so owned important problems will remain. Should a central-local division of authority be in effect? Which enterprises should be managed by whom? In 1958 in some basic construction units a system of fixed responsibility for capital investment was put into effect. The result was a tremendous release of enthusiasm in these units. When the center cannot depend on its own initiative it must release the enthusiasm of the enterprise or the locality. If such enthusiasm is frustrated it hurts production.

We see then that contradictions to be resolved remain in the production relations under people’s ownership. As far as relations among people in the course of labor and the distribution relations go, it is all the more necessary to improve them unremittingly. For these areas it is rather difficult to say what the base is. Much remains to be written about human relations in the course of labor, e.g., concerning the leadership’s adopting egalitarian attitudes, the changing of certain regulations and established practices, “the two participations” [worker participation in management and management participation in productive labor], “the three combinations” [combining efforts of cadres, workers, and technicians], etc. Public ownership of primitive communes lasted a long time, but during that time people’s relations to each other underwent a good many changes, all the same, in the course of labor.

30. The Transition from Collective to People's Ownership Is Inevitable

On page 435 the text says only that the existence of two forms of public ownership is objectively inevitable, but not that the transition from collective to people's ownership is also objectively inevitable. This is an inescapable objective process, one presently in evidence in certain areas of our country. According to data from Cheng An county in Hopei province, communes growing industrial crops are thriving, accumulation levels have been raised to 45 percent,^[20] and the peasants' living standard is high. Should this situation continue to develop, if we do not let collective ownership become people's ownership and resolve the contradiction, peasant living standards will surpass those of the workers to the detriment of both industrial and agricultural development.

On page 438 it says that "state-managed enterprises are not fundamentally different from cooperatives. . . . there exist two forms of public ownership. . . . sacred and inviolable." There is no difference between collective and people's ownership with reference to capitalism, but the difference becomes fundamental within the socialist economy. The text speaks of the two forms of ownership as "sacred and inviolable." This is allowable when speaking of hostile forces, but when speaking of the process of development of public ownership it becomes wrong. Nothing can be regarded as unchanging. Ownership by the whole people itself also has a process of change.

After a good many years, after ownership by the people's communes has changed into ownership by the whole people, the whole nation will become an indivisible system of ownership by the whole people. This will greatly spur the development of the productive forces. For a period of time this will remain a socialist system of ownership by the whole people, and only after another period will it be a communist system of ownership by the whole people. Thus, people's ownership itself will have to progress from distribution according to labor to distribution according to need.

31. Individual Property

On page 439 it says, "Another part is consumer goods. . . . which make up the personal property of the workers." This manner of expression tends to make people think that goods classified as "consumer" are to be distributed to the workers as their individual property. This is incorrect. One part of consumer goods is individual property, another is public property, e.g., cultural and educational facilities, hospitals, athletic facilities, parks, etc. Moreover, this part is increasing. Of course they are for each worker to enjoy, but they are not individual property.

On page 440 we find lumped together work income and savings, housing, household goods, goods for individual consumption, and other ordinary equipment. This is unsatisfactory because savings, housing, etc. are all derived from working people's incomes.

In too many places this book speaks only of individual consumption and not of social consumption, such as public welfare, culture, health, etc. This is one-sided. Housing in our rural areas is far from what it should be. We must improve rural dwelling conditions in an orderly fashion. [Only in the 1969 text.: *Note by translator.*] Residential construction, particularly in cities, should in the main use collective social forces, not individual ones. If a socialist society does not undertake collective efforts what kind of socialism is there in the end? Some say that socialism is more concerned with material incentives than capitalism. Such talk is simply outrageous.

Here the text says that the wealth produced by collective farms includes individual property as well as subsidiary occupations. If we fail to propose transforming these subsidiary occupations into public ownership, the peasants will be peasants forever. A given social system must be consolidated in a given period of time. But consolidation must have a limit. If it goes on and on, the ideology reflecting the system is bound to become rigidified, causing the people to be unable to adjust their thinking to new developments.

On the same page there is mention of integrating individual and collective interests. It says, "Integration is realized by the following method: a member of society is compensated according to the quantity and quality of his labor so as to satisfy the principle of individual material interest." Here, without discussion of the necessary reservations, the text places individual interest first. This is one-sided treatment of the principle of individual material interest.

According to page 441, "Public and individual interests are not at odds and can be gradually resolved." This is spoken in vain and solves nothing. In a country like ours, if the contradictions among the people are not put to rights every few years, they will never get resolved.

32. Contradiction Is the Motive Force of Development in a Socialist Society

Page 443, paragraph 5, admits that in a socialist society contradictions between the productive forces and the production relations exist and speaks of overcoming such contradictions. But by no means does the text recognize that contradictions are the motive force.

The succeeding paragraph is acceptable; however, under socialism it is not only certain aspects of human relations and certain forms of leading the economy, but also problems of the ownership system itself (e.g., the two types of ownership) that may hinder the development of the productive forces.

Most dubious is the viewpoint in the next paragraph. It says, "The contradictions under socialism are not irreconcilable." This does not agree with the laws of dialectics, which hold that all contradictions are irreconcilable. Where has there ever been a reconcilable

contradiction? Some are antagonistic, some are non-antagonistic, but it must not be thought that there are irreconcilable and reconcilable contradictions.

Under socialism [*The transcriber of the 1967 text comments that Comrade Mao may have meant "under communism".*] there may be no war but there is still struggle, struggle among sections of the people; there may be no revolution of one class overthrowing another, but there is still revolution. The transition from socialism to communism is revolutionary. The transition from one stage of communism to another is also. Then there is technological revolution and cultural revolution. Communism will surely have to pass through many stages and many revolutions.

Here the text speaks of relying on the "positive action" of the masses to overcome contradictions at the proper time. "Positive action" should include complicated struggles.

"Under socialism there is no class energetically plotting to preserve outmoded economic relations." Correct, but in a socialist society there are still conservative strata and something like "vested interest groups." There still remain differences between mental and manual labor, city and countryside, worker and peasant. Although these are not antagonistic contradictions they cannot be resolved without struggle.

The children of our cadres are a cause of discouragement. They lack experience of life and of society, yet their airs are considerable and they have a great sense of superiority. They have to be educated not to rely on their parents or martyrs of the past but entirely on themselves.

In a socialist society there are always advanced and backward persons, those who are steadfastly loyal to the collective effort, diligent and sincere, fresh of spirit and lively, and those who are acting for fame and fortune, for the personal end, for the self, or who are apathetic and dejected. In the course of socialist development each and every period is bound to have a group that is more than willing to preserve backward production relations and social institutions. On many many questions the prosperous middle peasants have their own point of view. They cannot adapt to new developments, and some of them resist such developments, as proved by the debate over the Eight-Word Constitution^[21] with the prosperous peasants of the Kuangtung rural areas.

Page 453, the last paragraph, says, "Criticism and self-criticism are powerful motive forces for the development of socialist society." This is not the point. Contradictions are the motive forces, criticism and self-criticism are the methods for resolving contradictions.

33. The Dialectical Process of Knowledge

Page 446, paragraph 2, says that as ownership becomes public "people become the masters of the economic relations of their own society," and are "able to take hold of and apply these laws fully and consciously." It should be observed that this requires going through a process. The understanding of laws always begins with the understanding of a

minority before it becomes the knowledge of the majority. It is necessary to go through a process of practice and study to go from ignorance to knowledge. At the beginning no one has knowledge. Foreknowledge has never existed. People must go through practice to gain results, meet with failure as problems arise; only through such a process can knowledge gradually advance. If you want to know the objective laws of the development of things and events you must go through the process of practice, adopt a Marxist-Leninist attitude, compare successes and failures, continually practicing and studying, going through multiple successes and failures; moreover, meticulous research must be performed. There is no other way to make one's own knowledge gradually conform to the laws. For those who see only victory but not defeat it will not be possible to know these laws.

It is not easy "to possess and apply these laws fully and consciously." On page 446 the text quotes Engels. "Only at this time does the fully conscious self begin to create history. For the first time to a great extent and to an ever greater extent people can create the effects they aspire after." "Begin to" and "to an ever greater extent" are relatively accurate.

The text does not recognize the contradictions between appearances and essences. Essences always lie behind appearances and cannot be disclosed except through appearances. The text does not express the idea that for a person to know the laws it is necessary to go through a process. The vanguard is no exception.

34. Unions and the Single Leadership System

On page 452 when speaking of the mission of trade unions, the text does not say that the primary task of the unions is to develop production; it does not discuss ways to strengthen political education; it merely overemphasizes welfare.

Throughout, the text speaks of "managing production according to the principle of the single-leader system." All enterprises in capitalist countries put this principle into effect. There should be a basic distinction between the principles governing management of socialist and capitalist enterprises. We in China have been able to distinguish our methods strictly from capitalist management by putting into effect factory leader responsibility under the guidance of the party.

35. Starting From Fundamental Principles and Rules Is Not the Marxist Method

From the second chapter on a great many rules are set up. The analysis of capitalist economy in *Das Kapital* commences with appearances, searches out essences, and only then uses the essence to explain the appearance, making through this method effective summaries and outlines. But the text does not pursue an analysis. Its composition lacks order. It always proceeds from rules, principles, laws, definitions, a methodology Marxism-Leninism has always opposed. The *effects* of principles and laws must be subjected to analysis and thorough study; only then can principles and laws be derived.

Human knowledge always encounters appearances first. Proceeding from there, one searches out principles and laws. The text does the opposite. Its methodology is deductive, not analytical. According to formal logic, "People all will die. Mr. Chang is a person. Therefore Mr. Chang will die." This is a conclusion derived from the premise that all human beings die. This is the deductive method. For every question the text first gives definitions, which it then takes as a major premise and reasons from there, failing to understand that the major premise should be the result of researching a question. Not until one has gone through the concrete research can principles and laws be discovered and proved.

36. Can Advanced Experience Be Popularized Effortlessly?

Page 461, paragraph 2, says, "In a socialist national economy science's latest achievements, technical inventions, and advanced experience can be popularized in all enterprises without the slightest difficulty." This is far from necessarily so. In a socialist society there are still "academic overlords" who control the organs of scientific research and repress new forces. This is why science's latest achievements are not simply popularized without the slightest difficulty. Such a manner of speaking essentially fails to recognize that there are contradictions within a socialist society. Whenever something new appears it is bound to meet with obstacles, perhaps because people are unaccustomed to it or do not understand it, or because it conflicts with the interests of a particular group. For example, our practices of close planting and deep furrowing have no class nature in and of themselves, yet they have been opposed and resisted by a particular group. Of course, in a socialist society such inhibiting conditions are fundamentally different from those in a capitalist society.

37. Planning

Page 465 quotes Engels as saying, "Under socialism it will become possible to carry out social production according to a predetermined plan." This is correct. In capitalist society equilibrium of the national economy is achieved through economic crises. In socialist society there is the possibility of making equilibrium a reality through planning. But let us not deny, because of this possibility, that knowledge of the required proportions must come through a process. Here the text says, "Spontaneity and *laissez faire* are incompatible with public ownership of the means of production." It should not be thought, however, that spontaneity and *laissez faire* do not exist in a socialist society. Our knowledge of the laws is not perfect all at once. Actual work tells us that in a given period of time there is such and such a plan by such and such people, or by a different group. No one can say that one particular group's plan conforms to the laws. Surely, some plans will accord or basically accord, while others will not or basically will not.

To think that knowledge of the proportions does not require a process — comparison between successes and failures, a tortuous course of development — is a metaphysical point of view. Freedom is the recognition of necessity, but necessity is not perceived in a glance. The world has no natural sages, nor upon attaining a socialist society does everyone become prescient. Why was not this text on political economy published at

some earlier time? Why has it been revised time and again after its publication? And after all, is not the reason for this that knowledge was imperfect in the past and even now remains so? Take our own experiences — at the beginning we did not understand how to make socialism work; gradually, through practice, we came to understand a little, but not enough. If we think it is enough then nothing will be left to do!

On page 466 it says that an outstanding feature of socialism is “the conscious regular maintaining of due proportion.” This is both a responsibility and a demand, and a difficult one to fulfill. Even Stalin said that the plans of the Soviet Union could not be regarded as already fully reflecting what the laws demanded.

The “regular maintaining of due proportion” is at the same time the regular appearance of imbalances. For when due proportion is not achieved then the task of keeping things in proportion arises. In the course of the development of a socialist economy the regular appearance of imbalances requires us to balance things by holding to proportionality and comprehensiveness. For example, as the economy develops, shortages of technical personnel and cadres are felt all over, and a contradiction between needs and supply appears. This in turn spurs us to operate more schools and train more cadres to resolve this contradiction. It is after the appearance of imbalances and disproportion that people further understand the objective laws.

In planning, if no accounting is made, if we let things run their course, or are overly cautious insisting on everything being foolproof, then our methods will not succeed, and as a result proportionality will be destroyed.

A plan is an ideological form. Ideology is a reflection of realities, but it also acts upon realities. Our past plans stipulated that no new industry would be built on our coasts, and up to 1957 there was no construction there. We wasted seven years. Only after 1958 did major construction begin. These past two years have seen great developments. Thus, ideological forms such as plans have a great effect on economic development and its rate.

38. Priority Growth in Producing the Means of Production; Concurrent Promotion of Industry and Agriculture

On page 466 the problem of priority growth in producing the means of production is addressed.

Priority growth in producing the means of production is an economic rule for expanded reproduction common to all societies. If there are no priorities in producing the means of production in capitalist society there can be no expanded reproduction. In Stalin’s time, due to special emphasis on priority development of heavy industry, agriculture was neglected in the plans. Eastern Europe has had similar problems in the past few years. Our approach has been to make priority development of heavy industry the condition for putting into effect concurrent promotion of industry and agriculture, as well as some other concurrent programs, each of which again has within it a leading aspect. If agriculture does not make gains few problems can be resolved. It has been four years now

since we proposed concurrent promotion of industry and agriculture, though it was truly put into effect in 1960. How highly we regard agriculture is expressed by the quantity of steel materials we are allocating to agriculture. In 1959 we allocated only 590,000 tons but this year (including water conservancy construction) we allocated 1.3 million tons. This is truly concurrent promotion of industry and agriculture.

Here the text mentions that between 1925 and 1958 production of the means of production in the Soviet Union increased 103 times, while consumer goods increased 15.6 times. The question is, does a ratio of 103:15.6 benefit the development of heavy [Only in 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] industry or not? If we want heavy industry to develop quickly everyone has to show initiative and maintain high spirits. And if we want that then we must enable industry and agriculture to be concurrently promoted, and the same for light and heavy industry.

Provided that we enable agriculture, light industry, and heavy industry to develop at the same time and at a high rate, we may guarantee that the people's livelihood can be suitably improved together with the development of heavy industry. The experience of the Soviet Union, no less than our own, proves that if agriculture does not develop, if light industry does not develop, it hurts the development of heavy industry.

39. "Distribution Is Determinative" — An Erroneous View

In chapter 20 it says, "The precondition for the high tide in state-managed industry was utilizing the workers' concern for their individual material interest in the development of socialist production." In chapter 21 it says, "Fully carry out economic accounting using the economic law of distribution according to labor (a law which combines workers' individual material interest with the interests of socialist production) to serve an important function in the struggle for national industrialization." In chapter 25 it says, "The goals of socialist production cause workers to be keenly concerned to make vigorous efforts to raise production and project personnel to be concerned with the fruits of their own labor, out of material interest. This is a powerful motive force for the development of socialist production." To make an absolute out of "concern for individual material interest" in this fashion is bound to entail the danger of increasing individualism.

Page 452 says that the law of distribution according to labor "is one of the determining motive forces for socialist production in that it causes all workers out of material interest to be concerned for the carrying out of plans to raise productivity." One cannot help asking, "If the fundamental economic laws of socialism determine the direction of development of socialist production, then how does it follow that individual material interest is alleged to be a determining motive force of production?" To treat distribution of consumer goods as a determining motive force is the erroneous view of distribution as determinative. Marx said, in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, "Distribution in the first place should be distribution of the means of production: in whose hands are the means of production? This is the determinative question. Distribution of the means of production is what determines distribution of consumer goods." To regard distribution of

consumer goods as the determining motive force is a distortion of Marx's correct view and a serious theoretical error.

40. "Politics in Command and Material Incentive"

Page 452, paragraph 2, places party organization after local economic organs; these latter become the heads under the direct administration of the central government. Local party organizations cannot take the political lead in those areas, making it virtually impossible for them to mobilize all positive forces sufficiently. The text on page 457, although conceding the creative activities of the masses, nonetheless says, "One of the most important conditions for accelerating communist construction is the participation of the masses in the struggle to fulfill and overfulfill plans for national economic development." Page 447 also says, "Initiative of farm personnel is one decisive factor in developing agriculture." To regard the mass struggle as "one important factor" flies in the face of the principle that the masses are the creators of history. Under no circumstances can history be regarded as something the planners rather than the masses create.

Immediately afterward the text raises this point: "To begin with, we must utilize material incentives." This makes it seem as if the masses' creative activity has to be inspired by material interest. At every opportunity the text discusses individual material interest as if it were an attractive means for luring people into pleasant prospects. This is a reflection of the spiritual state of a good number of economic workers and leading personnel and of the failure to emphasize political-ideological work. Under such circumstances there is no alternative to relying on material incentives. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his labor." The first half of the slogan means that the very greatest effort must be expended in production. Why separate the two halves of the slogan and always speak one-sidedly of material incentive? This kind of propaganda for material interest will make capitalism unbeatable!

41. Balance and Imbalance

Page 432, paragraph 1, is mistaken. The development of capitalist technology is balanced in certain respects, unbalanced in others. The point is that balance and imbalance in technological development is essentially different under capitalism and under socialism. Under socialism there is balance and imbalance; for example, in the first period of Liberation we had barely over 200 geological project workers, and prospecting was altogether out of phase with the needs of the development of the national economy. After several years' intense efforts the situation was practically rectified when fresh imbalances arose. At present there is in China an overwhelming preponderance of manual labor, a situation quite out of phase with our needs for developing production and raising labor productivity. This is why we have to launch a broad technological revolution and resolve this imbalance. With the appearance of every new technical department imbalance of technological development is bound to become noticeable again. For example, we are now tackling higher technology so we are conscious of the incompatibility of many things. But this Soviet text not only denies a degree of balance under capitalism but also a degree of imbalance under socialism.

Technology and the economy both develop in this way. The text seems to be unacquainted with the wavelike advances of the development of socialist production and speaks of the development of socialist economy as perfectly linear, free of dips. This is unthinkable. No line of development is straight; it is wave or spiral shaped. Even our studying has this pattern. Before studying we do something else. Afterward we have to rest for a few hours. We cannot continue studying as if there were neither day nor night. We study more one day, less the next. Moreover in our daily study sometimes we find more to comment upon, sometimes less. These are all wavelike patterns, rising and falling. Balance is relative to imbalance. Without imbalance there is no balance. The development of all things is characterized by imbalance. That is why there is a demand for balance. Contradiction between balance and imbalance exists in all parts of the various areas and departments, forever arising, forever being resolved. When there is a plan for the first year there has to be one for the next year as well. An annual plan requires a quarterly plan, which in turn requires a monthly plan. In every one of the twelve months contradictions between balance and imbalance have to be resolved. Plans constantly have to be revised precisely because new imbalances recur.

But the text has not adequately applied the dialectical method to research the various problems. The chapter devoted to the laws of planned proportional development of the national economy is quite long, yet no mention is made of the contradiction between balance and imbalance.

The national economy of a socialist society can have planned proportional development which enables imbalances to be regulated. However, imbalance does not go away. "Unevenness is in the nature of things." Because private ownership was eliminated it was possible to have planned organization of the economy. Therefore, it was possible to control and utilize consciously the objective laws of imbalance to create many relative temporary [Only in the 1969 text.: *Note by translator.*] balances.

If the productive forces run ahead, the production relations will not accord with the productive forces; the superstructure will not accord with the production relations. At that point the superstructure and the production relations will have to be changed to accord with the productive forces. Between superstructure and production relations, between production relations and productive forces — some say balance is only relatively attainable, for the productive forces are always advancing, therefore there is always imbalance. Balance and imbalance are two sides of a contradiction within which imbalance is absolute and balance relative. If this were not so, neither the superstructure nor the production relations, nor the productive forces, could further develop; they would become petrified. Balance is relative, imbalance absolute. This is a universal law which I am convinced applies to socialist society. Contradiction and struggle are absolutes; unity, unanimity, and solidarity are transitional, hence relative. The various balances attained in planning are temporary, transitional, and conditional, hence relative. Who can imagine a state of equilibrium that is unconditional, eternal?

We need to use balance and imbalance among the productive forces, the production relations, and the superstructure as a guideline for researching the economic problems of socialism.

The main object of study in political economy is the production relations. But to study clearly the production relations it is necessary to study concomitantly the productive forces and also the positive and negative effects of the superstructure on the production relations. The text refers to the state but never studies it in depth. This is one omission. Of course, in the process of studying political economy, the study of the productive forces and the superstructure should not become overdeveloped. If the study of the productive forces goes too far it becomes technology and natural science. If the study of the superstructure goes too far it becomes nation-state theory, class struggle theory. Under the heading of socialism (one of Marxism's three component parts) what we study are: theories of class struggle, theories of the state, theories of revolution and the party, as well as military strategies and tactics, etc.

There is nothing in the world that cannot be analyzed. But circumstances differ and so do essences. Many fundamental categories and laws — e.g., unity of contradiction — are applicable. If we study problems in this way, if we observe problems in this way, we will then have a solid, integral worldview and methodology.

42. "Material Incentives"

Page 486 says, "In the socialist stage labor has not yet become the primary necessity in the lives of all members of society, and therefore material incentives to labor have the greatest significance." Here "all members" is too general. Lenin was a member of the society. Had *his* labor not become a "primary necessity" of his life?

Page 486 raises this point: there are two kinds of individuals in socialist society, the great majority who faithfully discharge their duties and the few who are dishonest about their duties. This is correctly analyzed. But if we want to bring around this latter group we can not rely exclusively on material incentives. We still have to criticize and educate them to raise their consciousness.

This section of the text speaks of workers who are comparatively diligent and positive. Conditions being equal, these are the ones who will produce more. Plainly, whether a worker is diligent and enthusiastic or not is determined by political consciousness, not by the level of technical or cultural expertise. Some whose technical and cultural level is high are nonetheless neither diligent nor enthusiastic; others whose level is lower are quite diligent and enthusiastic. The reason lies in the lower political consciousness of the former, the higher political consciousness of the latter.

The book says that material incentive to labor "spurs increases in production" and "is one of the decisive factors in stimulating the development of production." But material incentive does not necessarily change every year. People may not require such incentive daily, monthly, or yearly. In times of difficulty when incentives are reduced people must

still carry on, and that satisfactorily. By making material incentive a one-sided absolute the text fails to give due importance to raising consciousness, and cannot explain why there are differences among the labor of people in the same pay scale. For example, in scale no. 5,[\[22\]](#) one group may carry on very well, another rather poorly, and a third tolerably well on the whole. Why, with similar material incentive, such differences occur is inexplicable according to their way of reasoning.

Even if the importance of material incentive is recognized, it is never the sole principle. There is always another principle, namely, spiritual inspiration from political ideology. And, while we are on the subject, material incentive can not simply be discussed as individual interest. There is also the collective interest to which individual interest should be subordinated, long-term interests to which temporary interests should be subordinated, and the interests of the whole to which partial interests should be subordinated.

In the section “Material Incentives to Labor, Socialist Emulation,” there are some fairly well written passages concerning emulation. What is missing is the discussion of politics!

First, don't work people to death. Second, don't ruin their health, but even bring about gradual strengthening. These two points are basic. As for other things, if we can have them, fine, if not, well and good! We want the people to have some consciousness. The text seems to lay almost no emphasis on the future, the generations to come, only emphasizing material interest, constantly taking the road of material interest and rashly turning it into the principle of individual interest, as if it were a magic wand.

What they do not say is that individual interest will be satisfied when the interests of the whole people are satisfied. The individual material interest they emphasize is in reality myopic individualism, an economistic tendency from the period of proletarian class struggle against capitalism manifesting itself in the period of socialist construction. During the era of bourgeois revolutions a number of bourgeois revolutionaries made heroic sacrifices for the interests of their class and future generations of their class, but certainly not for immediate individual interest.

When we were in the base areas we had a free [nonmarket] supply system.[\[23\]](#) People were tougher then, and there was no wrangling at all on account of seeking preferential treatment. After liberation we had a wage system, and agreed upon scales, but our problems only multiplied. Many people wrangled frequently in a struggle for status, and we had to do a lot of persuading.

Our party has waged war for over twenty years without letup. For a long time we made a nonmarket supply system work. Of course at that time the entire society of the base areas was not practicing the system. But those who made the system work in the civil war period reached a high of several hundred thousand, and at the lowest still numbered in the tens of thousands. In the War of Resistance Against Japan the number shot up again from over a million to several millions. Right up to the first stage of Liberation our people lived an egalitarian life, working hard and fighting bravely, without the least dependence on material incentives, only the inspiration of revolutionary spirit. At the end of the

second period of the civil war we suffered a defeat, although we had victories before and after. This course of events had nothing at all to do with whether we had material incentives or not. It had to do with whether or not our political line and our military line were correct. These historical experiences have the greatest significance for solving our problems of socialist construction.

Chapter 26 says, “Workers in socialist enterprises who, out of material interest, are concerned with the results of their own work are the motive forces developing socialist production.” (p. 482)

Chapter 27 says, “Compensation for skilled labor is comparatively high. . . . And this stimulates workers to raise their cultural and technical level, causing the essential difference between manual and mental labor to diminish.” (pp. 501-03)

The point here is that higher compensation for skilled labor has spurred unskilled workers to upgrade themselves continuously so they can enter the ranks of skilled workers. This means that they studied culture and technology in order to earn more money. In a socialist society every person entering school to study culture and technology should recognize before anything else that they are studying for socialist construction, for industrialization, to serve the people, for the collective interest, and not above all for a higher wage.

Chapter 28 says, “Distribution according to labor is the greatest force propelling the development of production.” (p. 526) And at the end of this page, after explaining that wages rise steadily under socialism, the unrevised third edition of this textbook even goes so far as to say, “Socialism is fundamentally superior to capitalism precisely in this.” Now to say that socialism is fundamentally superior to capitalism because wages steadily rise is very wrong. Wages are distribution of consumer goods. If there is no distribution of the means of production, there can be no distribution of the goods produced, of consumer goods. The latter is predicated on the former.

43. Interpersonal Relations in Socialist Enterprises

Page 500 says, “Under socialism the prestige of economic leaders is contingent upon the trust the masses have in them.” This is well said indeed. But to reach this goal it will take work. In our experience, if cadres do not set aside their pretensions and identify with the workers, the workers will never look on the factory as their own but as the cadres’. “Master-of-the-house” attitudes make the workers reluctant to observe labor discipline in a self-conscious way. Do not think that under socialism creative cooperation between the workers and the leadership of the enterprises will emerge all by itself without the need to work at it.

If manual workers and enterprise leaders are both members of a unified production collective then “why do socialist enterprises have to put ‘single leadership’ into effect rather than leadership under collective guidance” i.e., the system of factory head responsibility under party committee guidance?

It is when politics is weakened that there is no choice but to talk about material incentive. That is why the text follows right up with “fully putting into effect the principle of having workers deeply concerned with the results of their own labor out of individual material interest is the mainspring for progressively grasping and raising socialist production.”

44. Crash Programs, Accelerated Work

Page 505 says, “Do away with the phenomenon of accelerated work. Carry on production in a well-balanced way according to the blueprints.” In the unrevised third edition this sentence reads, “We must fight against ‘crash programs’ and work in a well-balanced way according to predetermined schedules.” This utter repudiation of crash programs and accelerated work is too absolute.

We can not completely repudiate crash programs. Their use or nonuse constitutes a unity of opposites. In nature there are gentle breezes and light rains, and there are high winds and violent rains. Use of crash programs appears and disappears, wavelike. In the technological revolution in production the need for them continually arises. In agriculture we must grapple with the seasons. The drama must have its climax. To gainsay crash programs is in reality to deny the climax. The Soviet Union wants to overtake the United States. We expect to reach the Soviet’s level in less time than it took the Soviets. That is a kind of crash program.

Socialist emulation means that the backward overtakes the advanced. This is possible only through crash programs. Relations between individuals, between units, between enterprises, as well as between nations, are all competitive. If one wants to overtake the advanced, one cannot help having crash programs. If construction or revolution is attacked with executive orders (e.g., carrying out land reform or organizing cooperatives by administrative order) there is bound to be a reduction in production because the masses will not have been mobilized, and not because of crash programs.

45. The Law of Value and Planning

On page 521 there is a small print passage that is correct; it is critical, it joins the issues.

The law of value serves as an instrument of planning. Good. But the law of value should not be made the main basis of planning. We did not carry through the Great Leap on the basis of the demands of the law of value but on the basis of the fundamental economic laws of socialism and the need to expand production. If things are narrowly regarded from the point of view of the law of value the Great Leap would have to be judged not worth the losses and last year’s all-out effort to produce steel and iron as wasted labor. The local steel produced was low in quantity and quality, and the state had to make good many losses. The economic results were not significant, etc. The partial short-term view is that the campaign was a loss, but the overall long-term view is that there was great value to the campaign because it opened wide a whole economic construction phase. Throughout the country many new starts in steel and iron were made, and many industrial centers were built. This enabled us to step up our pace greatly.

In the winter of 1959 over 75 million people were working on water conservancy nationwide. The method of organizing two large-scale campaigns could be used to solve our basic water conservancy problems. From the standpoint of one, two, or three years the value of the grain to pay for so much labor was naturally quite high. But in the longer view the campaign could considerably increase grain production and accelerate it too, and stabilize agricultural production, and so the value of commodities per unit gains. All this then goes toward satisfying the people's need for grain. The continuing development of agriculture and light industry creates further accumulation for heavy industry. This too benefits people in the long run. So long as the peasants and the people of the entire country understand what the state is doing, whether money is gained or lost, they are bound to approve and not oppose. From among the peasants themselves the slogan of supporting industry has been put forward. There is the proof! Stalin as well as Lenin said, "In the period of socialist construction the peasantry must pay tribute to the state." The vast majority of China's peasants is "sending tribute" with a positive attitude. It is only among the prosperous peasants and the middle peasants, some 15 percent of the peasantry, that there is any discontent. They oppose the whole concept of the Great Leap and the people's communes.

In sum, we put plans ahead of prices. Of course we cannot ignore prices. A few years ago we raised the purchase price for live pigs, and this had a positive effect on pig-breeding. But for the kind of large-scale, nationwide breeding we have today, planning remains the main thing we rely on.

Page 521 refers to the problem of pricing in the markets of collective farms. Their collective farm markets have too much freedom. It is not enough to use only state economic power to adjust prices in such markets. Leadership and control are also necessary. In our markets, during the first stage, prices were kept within certain bounds by the government. Thus small liberties were kept from becoming big ones.

Page 522 says, "Thanks to our command of the law of value, the kind of anarchy in production or waste of social labor power the law entails under capitalism is not found in a socialist economy." This makes too much of the effects of the law of value. In socialist society crises do not occur, mainly because of the ownership system: the basic laws of socialism, national planning of production and distribution, the lack of free competition or anarchy, etc., and not because we command the law of value. The economic crises of capitalism, it goes without saying, are determined by the ownership system too.

46. Forms of Wages

Page 530, in its discussion of wage forms, advocates taking piecework wages as primary and the time-rate as supplementary. We do the reverse. One-sided emphasis on piece rates is bound to create contradictions between older and younger, stronger and weaker laborers, and will foster among the workers a psychology of "going for the big ones." This makes the primary concern not the collective cause but the individual income. There is even evidence that the piece-rate wage system impedes technological innovation and mechanization.

The book concedes that with automation, piece-rate wages are unsuitable. On the one hand they say they want automation widely developed; on the other they say they want piece-rate wages used widely. This involves a contradiction.

We have put into effect the time-rate system, plus rewards. The year-end “leap forward” bonuses of the last two years are an example. With the exception of governmental and educational workers, all staff and workers have had year-end leap forward bonuses in varying amounts determined by the staff and workers themselves in the particular units.

47. Two Questions About Prices

There are two questions that deserve study.

The first is the pricing of consumer goods. The text says, “Socialism has all along been putting into practice a policy of lowering the prices of consumer goods for the people.” Our approach is to stabilize prices, generally neither letting them rise nor lowering them. Although our wage levels are comparatively low, universal employment and low prices and rents have kept the living standard of staff and workers decent enough. In the last analysis whether it is preferable to keep lowering prices or neither to raise nor lower them is a problem deserving study.

The other question concerns pricing of products of heavy and light industry. Relatively speaking, they have low prices for the former, and higher ones for the latter. We do the reverse. Why? Which is the better way in the last analysis is another problem deserving study.

Part III.

Chapters 30-34

48. Concurrent Promotion of the Foreign and the Native, the Large, Medium, and Small

Page 547 expresses opposition to dispersing construction funds. If they mean that not too many major projects should be undertaken at one time lest none can be completed on schedule, then of course we agree. But if the conclusion is to be that during major construction small- and medium-scale projects should be opposed, then we disagree. The principal new industrial centers in China were established on the basis of medium- and small-scale enterprises developed in large numbers in 1958. According to initial arrangements in the steel and iron industry, construction of twenty-nine large, nearly a hundred medium, and several hundred small-scale centers will be completed over the next eight years. The medium- and small-scale ones have already had a major effect on the steel and iron industry. Speaking from the standpoint of 1959, raw iron production

nationwide has exceeded 20 million tons, half of which was produced by medium- and small-scale enterprises. In the future the medium- and the small-scale enterprise will continue to have major importance for the development of the steel and iron industry. Many small ones will become medium, many medium, large; backward ones will become advanced, local models will become like foreign ones — this is the objective law of development.

We will adopt advanced technology, but this cannot gainsay the necessity and the inevitability of backward technology for a period of time. Since history began, revolutionary wars have always been won by those whose weapons were deficient, lost by those with the advantage in weapons. During our civil war, our War of Resistance Against Japan, and our War of Liberation, we lacked nationwide political power and modernized arsenals. If one cannot fight unless one has the most modern weapons, that is the same as disarming one's self.

Our desire to make all-around mechanization such as the text describes a reality (p. 420) in our second decade appears still short of fulfillment; probably it will be in our third decade. In a future time, because of inadequate machinery, we will be calling for partial mechanization and improvement of our tools. For now we are holding off on general automation. Mechanization has to be discussed, but with a sense of proportion. If mechanization and automation are made too much of it is bound to make people despise partial mechanization and production by native methods. In the past we had such diversions, when everybody was demanding new technology, new machinery, the large scale, high standards; the native, the medium, or small in scale were held in contempt. We did not overcome this tendency until we promoted concurrently native *and* foreign, large *and* medium *and* small.

At the present time we have not proposed chemicalization of agriculture. One reason is that we do not expect to be able to produce much fertilizer in the next however many years. (And the little we have is concentrated on our industrial crops.) Another reason is that if the turn to chemicals is proposed everybody will focus on that and neglect pig-breeding. Inorganic fertilizers are also needed but they have to be combined with organic; alone they harden the soil.

The text speaks of adopting new techniques in every department. But this is not so easy to do. There must always be a process of gradual development. Moreover, even as some new machine is being adopted many old ones remain. The text is correct when it says that as you build new enterprises and renew equipment in existing factories, you should put existing machinery and mechanical equipment to use rationally and to the fullest extent. (p. 427) Things will be no different in the future.

As to the “large” and the “foreign,” we must work on these in a spirit of “self reliance for new growth.” In 1958 we proposed slogans on ridding ourselves of superstition and working with our own hands. The facts show that working on our own is quite feasible. In the past backward capitalist countries relied on the application of new techniques to catch up with advanced capitalist countries in production. The Soviet Union likewise

relies on the application of advanced technology to catch up with the capitalist countries. We too must do the same, and we can.

49. Which First, Tractors or Cooperatives?

Page 563 says, “In 1928 on the eve of overall collectivization, spring crop areas were tilled 99 percent with wood or horse-drawn ploughs.” This fact refutes the text’s repeated assertion that “tractors must precede cooperatives.” On the same page we find, “Socialist production relations cleared a wide field for the development of agricultural productive forces and progress in agricultural technology.” That is true.

First the production relations have to be changed, then and only then the productive forces can be broadly developed. This rule is universal. In some countries of Eastern Europe the cooperatives were not organized very energetically, and even today they remain uncompleted. The main reason is not that they lacked tractors (they had many more than we, comparatively speaking) but that their land reform was a top-down royal favor. Land was expropriated by quota (in some countries no expropriation was carried out on farms under 100 hectares); the work of expropriation was carried out by executive order; and after the land reform instead of striking while the iron was hot they let a full five or six years go by without doing much. We did quite the reverse. We put a mass line^[24] into effect, roused the poor and lower-middle peasants to launch class struggle and seize all the land of the landlord class and distribute the surplus land of rich peasants, apportioning land on a per-capita basis. (This was a tremendous revolution in the rural areas.) Immediately afterward, we followed up with the mutual aid and cooperative movements. And from that point, steadily advancing step by step, we led the peasants on to the road to socialism. We had a massive party and army. When our forces went south a full complement of cadre squads had been set in place in every province to do local work at provincial, regional, county, and district levels. As soon as our forces would arrive they would penetrate deeply into the agricultural villages, “paying call on the poor to learn of their grievances,” “striking roots and pulling things together,” and getting the active elements of the poor and lower middle peasants organized.

50. Two Goals: Large and Public

The collective farms of the Soviet Union have undergone merger twice. Over 250,000 farms were merged into over 93,000, then these were again merged into about 70,000. In the future they will surely expand again. The text says (p. 568), “We must strengthen and develop the production relations of the various collective farms and organize publicly used production enterprises among the collective farms.” Here, actually, there are many similarities to our own methods, they simply express things differently. In the future, even if their approach is like ours, it appears doubtful they will use the term commune. Differences in expression and terminology do include a substantive issue, namely, whether or not a mass line is being put into effect.

To be sure, the large scale of the Soviet Union’s collective farms may never approach ours in terms of households and population because their rural population is sparse and

their land area great. But who can say that for this reason their collective farms now need no further expansion? In places like Sinkiang and Ch'inghai the communes still need to enlarge even though there are few people for much land. Some counties in our southern provinces (e.g., northern Fukien) got large communes together under like conditions.

Enlarging the communes is a major issue. Changes in quantity are bound to bring on changes in quality, to stimulate such changes. Our people's communes are a good example — “Large! and Public!” First comes “Large!” — it will raise the level of “Public.” This means that quantitative changes bring on partial qualitative changes.

51. What Is the Fundamental Reason for the Special Emphasis on Material Interest

In the chapter on the collective farm system there is continual discussion of individual material interest. (pp. 565, 571, etc.) The present special emphasis on material interest is for a reason. In the time of Stalin there was excessive emphasis on collective interest; individual gain was neglected. The public was overemphasized, the private underemphasized. Now they have gone to the opposite extreme, overemphasizing material incentive, neglecting collective interest. And if they persist in this course it will surely go to the opposite side again.

“Public” is in relation to “private,” and vice-versa, a unity of opposites. One without the other is impossible. We have always spoken of joint consideration of public and private and long ago made the point that there is no such thing as all the one or the other, but that the public takes precedence over the private. The individual is a part of the collective. If the collective interest advances, the individual's lot will improve in consequence.

Duality is an attribute of all things, and for all time. Of course, duality is manifested through different concrete forms, and so the character of things varies. Heredity and mutation are a duality of opposites in unity. If there were only the latter without the former the succeeding generation would be utterly unlike the prior. Rice would no longer be that which makes it rice, nor dogs, nor people. The conservative side can have a good, a positive function. It can give living things in the midst of uninterrupted change a provisional constancy or stability. So, improved rice is still rice. But heredity without mutation would mean no advance, and development would come to a halt.

52. It Is for the People to Act

Page 577 says, “Collective farms offer the natural and economic conditions for allowing differential rent to be arranged.” Differential rent is not altogether determined by objective conditions. Actually the matter rests with the people's doing. For example, in Hopei province there are many mechanized wells along the Peking-Hankow Railway, but very few along the Tientsin-Pukow. The natural conditions are similar, the communications equally convenient, but land improvements are never the same from place to place. There may have been reasons why the one locale was receptive (or

unreceptive) to improvement, or there might have been varying historical reasons. But after all, the main thing is that it is for people to act.

While we are on the subject, some of the outlying districts of Shanghai are able to breed pigs properly, others not. In Ch'ung Ming county it was originally thought that certain natural conditions, e.g., the large number of lakes, would not be favorable for pigbreeding. But after getting rid of people's fears of difficulties, and after people adopted a positive attitude toward the business of breeding, it was realized that far from presenting an obstacle, these very natural conditions offered advantages. Actually, whether it is a matter of deep ploughing, fine horticulture, mechanization, or collectivization, it is for people to act.

Ch'ang P'ing county, Peking, has always been plagued by flood and drought. But things changed after the construction of the reservoir at the Ming Tombs. Does not this again illustrate that it is for people to act? In Honan they are planning after 1959 and 1960 to spend another three years to tame the Yellow River by completing construction of several large-scale conduits. All this shows again that it is for people to act.

53. Transport and Commerce

Transport and packaging do not increase use value, but they do increase value. The labor they use is a part of socially necessary labor. For without transportation and packaging the process of production would remain incomplete, would not enter the stage of consumption, and the use value produced could not be said to have been realized. Take coal. After the ore is mined, if it is left around the site and not delivered to the consumer by rail, steamer, or truck, its use value is completely unrealizable.

Page 585 says that they have two systems of commerce, state-operated and cooperative. In addition, they have "unorganized markets," i.e., the collective farm markets. We have only one system. We merged the cooperative trade into the state-operated trade, and the system now seems easy enough to run. There are lots of economies on all sides.

Page 587 refers to public supervision of commerce. For this we rely on party guidance in the main; with politics in command there is supervision by the masses. The labor of commercial workers is socially necessary and without it production cannot culminate in consumption (including productive consumption and individual consumption).

54. Concurrent Promotion of Industry and Agriculture

Page 623 discusses the rule of giving priority to increasing the means of production. The unrevised third edition mentions particularly here, "giving priority to increasing the means of production means that industry will develop at a faster rate than agriculture."

"Industry developing faster than agriculture" has to be posed in an appropriate way. One cannot emphasize industry to an inappropriate degree or trouble is sure to occur. Take our Liaoning: with its many industries, this province has an urban population that is one-third

the total. In the past they had always put industry in first place, without attending at the same time to the vigorous development of agriculture. The result was that the province's agriculture could not guarantee supplies of grain, meats, and vegetables for the urban markets, and they always had to ship these items in from other provinces. The key issue is that agricultural labor is under great strain and is short of needed machinery. This limits the development of production; growth is comparatively slow. What we had failed to understand was that it was precisely in such places as the Northeast, particularly Liaoning, where we should have taken firm hold of agriculture. So one cannot emphasize only taking firm hold of industry.

Our position is that industry and agriculture should be developed together with priority given to developing heavy industry. The phrase "concurrent promotion" in no way denies priority in growth or faster development of industry than agriculture. At the same time, "concurrent promotion" is not equal utilization of our strength. For example, this year we estimate we can produce about 14 million tons of steel materials, of which 10 percent is to be applied to agricultural technological transformation and water conservancy construction. The remaining 90 percent is to be used mainly in heavy industry and communications and transportation construction. Under this year's conditions this is concurrent promotion of industry and agriculture. This should not be detrimental to priority growth of heavy industry or accelerating development of industry. [Agriculture in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*]

Poland has 30 million people, but only 450,000 pigs. Now meat supplies are badly strained. Even today it would seem that Poland has not placed agricultural development on its agenda.

Page 624 says, "At different times it is necessary to accelerate the development of backward agriculture, light industry, and the food industry." Well and good, but imbalances and maladjustments created by backwardness in agriculture and light industry cannot be alleged to be merely "partial imbalances and maladjustments." These are questions of the totality.

Page 625 says, "Rational allocation of capital is necessary to maintain, at whatever time, correct proportions between heavy and light industry." This paragraph speaks only of heavy and light industry, not of industry and agriculture.

55. Standards for Accumulation

This has become a major issue in Poland. At the start Gomulka emphasized material incentive. He raised workers' wages but neglected to raise their consciousness, with the result that workers thought only of making more money but did not take the right spirit to their tasks. Increases of wages outstripped increases in productivity, and wages were eating up capital. The pressure has now forced them to come out in opposition to material incentive and to champion spiritual inspiration. Gomulka has even said, "Money cannot buy people's minds."

Overemphasis on material incentive always seems to lead to the opposite. Writing lots of checks naturally keeps the high-salary strata happy, but when the broad masses of workers and peasants want to cash in and find they cannot, the pressure to go to the “spiritual” is no surprise.

According to what is described on page 631, in the Soviet Union accumulated capital amounts to one-fourth of the national income. In China the figures were as follows: 27 per cent in 1957, 36 percent in 1958, 42 percent in 1959, and it appears that in the future it will be possible to maintain regularly a figure of over thirty percent. The main problem lies in the vast development of production. Only if production increases and the percentages of accumulation go up a bit can people’s livelihoods be finally improved.

It is our regular responsibility to practice economies and to accumulate large amounts of materials and wealth. It would be wrong to think that this should be done only in adverse conditions. It is difficult to believe that when hardships ease economies and accumulation are not needed.

Part IV.

Chapter 35 To The Conclusion

56. The Communist State

Page 639 says, “In the higher stages of communism the state will become unnecessary and gradually diminish.” Nonetheless this will require certain international conditions. If someone else has state machinery and you do not, it is dangerous. Page 640 says that even after communism is established, as long as imperialist countries exist, the state will continue to be necessary. This position is correct. Immediately after, the book says, “But the nature and the form of such a state will be determined by the particular features of the communist system.” This sentence is hard to understand. The nature of the state is that it is a machinery for suppressing the opposed forces. Even if such a function is no longer needed internally, the coercive nature of the state will not have changed with respect to external opposing forces. The so-called form of the state means nothing more than armed forces, prisons, arrests, executions, etc. As long as imperialism still exists, what differences in form will there be when communism is reached?

57. Transition to Communism

Page 641 says, “In a socialist society there are no antagonistic classes,” but “there are still vestiges of antagonistic classes.” The transition from socialism to communism need not be made a reality through social revolution. All that can be said is that there is no need for a social revolution in which one class overthrows another, but there will be a social revolution in which new production relations and social institutions supersede old ones.

Here the text goes on to declare, “This certainly does not mean that society, as it develops along the road to communism, will not need to conquer internal contradictions.” This declaration is merely incidental. Though there are places where this text recognizes contradictions, it does so only incidentally. One thing missing from this text is that it does not proceed from the analysis of contradictions in explaining issues. As a branch of science, political economy should begin its analysis with contradictions.

When a communist society is attained, labor discipline is bound to be even more strict than it is presently because the high level of automation will require ever higher exactitude of people’s labor and conduct.

For now we are speaking of communist society as divided into two stages, a lower and a higher. This is what Marx and his circle foresaw based on conditions of social development at that time. After entering the higher stage communist society will develop into a new stage, and new goals and tasks will assuredly present themselves.

58. The Future Development of Collective Ownership

Page 650 says, “The production relations of the collective farms and the cooperatives have forms which accord fully with the present level and the present needs of the productive forces in the rural areas.” I wonder if this is indeed true.

Introducing the Red October collective farm, a Soviet article says, “Before merger, some farms were difficult to manage in a good many respects. Afterward the problems cleared up.” The article says that the farm has a population of ten thousand and that a housing project for three thousand residents is planned. This suggests that the present form of the farm is no longer fully compatible with the development of the productive forces.

The same passage says, “We must bend every effort to strengthening and further developing the cooperatives and the collective farm ownership system.” If development is needed, a process has to be gone through, so why “bend every effort to strengthen?” Socialist production relations, social systems — of course one must speak in terms of consolidating them, but not to the point of ruining them. The text speaks vaguely of the road ahead, but the moment it comes to concrete measures it loses all clarity. In many ways (mainly production) the Soviets continue to progress, but with respect to the production relations fundamentally they have ceased to progress.

The text says that it is necessary to make a transition from collective ownership to indivisible ownership by the whole people. But from our point of view it is first necessary to turn collective ownership into socialist ownership by the whole people, i.e., to make the agricultural means of production entirely state owned, and to turn the peasants entirely into workers under uniform contract to the state for wages. At present, nationwide, each Chinese peasant has an average annual income of 85 [65 in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] yuan. In the future, when this amount will reach 150 yuan and the majority of workers are paid by the commune, it will be possible to make a commune

ownership system basically work. In this way taking the next step to state ownership should be easy.

59. Eliminating the Difference Between Urban and Rural

The last paragraph on page 651 has a good position on rural construction. Since they want to eliminate the difference (the book says “basic difference”) between urban and rural, why does the text make a point of saying that it is not “to reduce the functions of the big cities?” The cities of the future need not be so large. Residents of large cities should be dispersed into the rural areas. Building many smaller cities is a relative advantage in case of nuclear war.

60. The Problem of the Various Socialist Countries Setting Up an Economic System

Page 659 says, “Each country could concentrate its own manpower and material resources to develop its own most advantageous natural and economic conditions and departments with production experience and cadre. The respective countries would not need to produce goods which other countries could supply.”

This is not a good idea. We do not suggest this even with respect to our own provinces. We advocate all-round development and do not think that each province need not produce goods which other provinces could supply. We want the various provinces to develop a variety of production to the fullest extent, provided there is no adverse effect on the whole. One of the advantages Europe enjoys is the independence of the various countries. Each is devoted to a set of activities, causing the European economy to develop comparatively quickly. Since the time of the Chin, China has taken shape as a major power, preserving its unity on the whole over a long period of time. One of the defects was bureaucratism, under the stifling control of which local regions could not develop independently, and with everyone temporizing, economic development was very slow. Now the situation is completely different. Within the unity we want to work toward, the various provinces will also have independence. This is relative unity and it is relative independence.

The provinces resolve their own problems independently while submitting to the resolutions of the central authorities and accepting their control. On the other hand, the center’s resolutions on major issues are all made in common, through consultation between the center and the provinces. The resolutions of the Lushan Conference were like this, for example.[\[25\]](#) Not only did they accord with the needs of the whole country, they accorded with the needs of the various provinces. Who could take the position that only the center, not the localities, needs to oppose right opportunism? We champion having the provinces devote themselves fully to a set of activities under a unified plan for the whole country. Provided there are raw materials and markets, provided materials can be obtained and sales made locally, whatever can be done should be done to the fullest possible extent. Previously, our concern was that after the provinces had developed, a variety of industry, industrial goods (e.g., from a place like Shanghai) would in all

likelihood not be wanted. Now it appears this is not the case. Shanghai has already proposed developing toward higher, larger scale, finer, and more excellent production. They still have things to do!

I wonder why the text fails to advocate each country's doing the utmost for itself rather than not producing goods which other countries could supply? The correct method is each doing the utmost for itself as a means toward self-reliance for new growth, working independently to the greatest possible extent, making a principle out of not relying on others, and not doing something only when it really and truly cannot be done. Above all, agriculture must be done well as far as possible. Reliance on other countries or provinces for food is most dangerous.

Some countries are so small that, exactly as the text says, "To develop all industrial departments would be economically irrational, a task to which their strength is unequal." In that case of course a country should not force it through. It would be very difficult for some of our own provinces with low population — Ch'inghai or Ninghsia — to have comprehensive development.

61. Can the Development of the Various Socialist Countries Be Evened Up?

Paragraph 3 on page 660 says, ". . . to have the overall level of economic and cultural development of the various socialist countries gradually draw parallel." The populations, resource bases, and historic conditions of these countries are not the same. Some of their revolutions were more backward, others more advanced. How can they be evened up? If a father has some dozen children, some tall, some short, some big some small, some bright, some slow, how can they be evened up? This is Bukharin's theory of balance. The economic development of the various socialist countries is not in balance, nor is that of the provinces within a country, or the counties within a province. Take public health in Kuangtung province. Fo Shan city and Chihlo commune have done a good job. Consequently Fo Shan is not in balance with the whole province. Chihlo is not in balance with Shaokuan. To oppose imbalances is wrong.

62. The Ultimate Question Is One of System

Page 668 says that socialist loans are different from imperialist loans. This tallies with the facts. Socialist countries are always preferable to capitalist ones. We understand this principle. The ultimate question is systemic, institutional. Systems determine the direction a country will take. Socialist systems determine that socialist countries will always stand opposed to imperialist countries and that their compromises are always provisional.

63. Relations Between the Two Economic Systems in the World

Page 658 speaks of "competition between the two world systems." In *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Stalin offered arguments about the two world

markets. The text here emphasizes peaceful competition between the two systems and building up “peacefully developing” economic relations. This turns the actually existing two world markets into two economic systems within a unified world market — a step back from Stalin’s view.

Between the two economic systems there is in fact not only competition but also fierce, broad-ranging struggle, a struggle the text has kept its distance from.

64. Criticism of Stalin

Stalin’s *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, like his other works, contains erroneous arguments. But the two accusations referred to on page 681 are not convincing.

One accusation is that Stalin held that “circulation of commodities seems to have already become an obstacle to the development of the productive forces. The necessity for gradually making the transition to direct exchanges of production between industry and agriculture is fully formed.”

In this book Stalin said that when there are two kinds of ownership system then there is commodity production. He said that in the enterprises of the collective farms, although the means of production (land, tools, etc.) belong to the state, the goods produced are all the property of the separate collectives. The reason is that the labor on the collectives (like the seeds) is owned by the collectives, while the land that the state has given them for permanent use is in fact controlled by the collectives as if it were their own property. Under such conditions “the collective farms are willing to release into circulation what they produce only in the commodity form, in expectation of obtaining the commodities they need in exchange. At the present time the collective farms will not enter into any economic relations other than exchange through purchase and sales.” Stalin criticized the current view in the Soviet Union that advocated doing away with commodity production, holding that commodity production was no less necessary than it was thirty years earlier when Lenin declared the need for bending every effort to develop commodity circulation.

The text says that Stalin seemed to be advocating instant elimination of commodities. This accusation is difficult to make good. As to the question of commodity exchange, for Stalin it was only a hypothesis. For he had even said, “There is no need to promote this system with urgency; it must be decided according to the degree of accumulation of goods manufactured in the cities.”

Another accusation is that Stalin underestimated the workings of the law of value in the sphere of production and especially with reference to the means of production. “In the sphere of socialist production the law of value plays no regulating role. This role is played by the law of planned proportional development and state planned economy.” This argument offered by the text is in reality Stalin’s own argument. Even though the text says that the means of production are commodities, nonetheless, in the first place, it must say that they are in the category of ownership by the whole people. Purchase and sale of the means of production in no way changes ownership. In the second place, the

text ought to concede that the law of value functions differently in the sphere of production and in the process of circulation. All these arguments are consistent with Stalin's. One real difference between Stalin and Khrushchev is that Stalin opposed selling such means of production as tractors, etc. to the collective farms while Khrushchev sold them.

65. The Text's General Point of View

Do not think there is no Marxism-Leninism in this text, for it contains a good many views that are Marxist-Leninist. On the other hand, do not think it is entirely Marxist-Leninist, for it contains a good many views that deviate. We are not, however, ready to conclude that this text is basically negative.

The text emphasizes that a socialist economy serves the whole people, not the profit calculations of a minority of exploiters. The basic economic laws of socialism discussed in the text cannot be regarded as wholly in error. And these laws are the fundamental subject of the book. Also, the text explains planning, proportionality, high rate of development, etc., and in these respects is still socialist and Marxist. But once planning and proportionality are acknowledged, how these things are done is quite another matter. Each of us has his own approach.

Notwithstanding, this text has certain fundamental arguments that are in error. "Politics in command" and the "mass line" are not stressed. There is no discussion of "walking on two legs," and individual material interest is one-sidedly emphasized. Material incentives are proclaimed and individualism is far too prominent.

In studying socialist economy the text does not proceed from contradictions. In truth, it does not acknowledge the universality of contradiction nor that social contradictions are the motive force of social development. The truth is that in their own society [Socialist society in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] there is still class struggle, that is, struggle between socialism and capitalist remnants. But this they do not concede. Their society [Socialist society in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] has three types of ownership: by the whole people, by the collective, and by the individual. Of course, such individual ownership is unlike individual ownership before collectivization, when the peasants' livelihood was entirely based on individual ownership. Now they have one foot on the boat and one still on shore, mainly relying on the collective but on the individual at the same time. If there are three types of ownership, there will be contradiction and struggle. But the text has no discussion of this. There is no encouraging of the mass movement. There is no acknowledgment of having collective ownership under socialism make the transition to public ownership under socialism, of turning the whole society into the indivisible possession of the whole people as a precondition for the transition to communism.

The text uses such vague terms as "rapprochement" and "concord" to take the place of the conception that one ownership system becomes another, one kind of production

relations becomes another. In these respects the book has serious faults and serious errors and has partially deviated from Marxism-Leninism.

The text is very poorly written, neither persuasive nor interesting to read. It does not proceed from concrete analysis of the contradictions between the productive forces and the production relations nor the contradiction between the economic base and the superstructure. In posing questions, in researching problems, it always proceeds from general concepts or definitions. It gives definitions without making reasoned explanations. In fact, a definition should be the result, not the starting point, of an analysis. Quite without foundation the book offers a series of laws, laws which are not discovered and verified through analysis of concrete historical development. Laws cannot be self-explanatory. If one does not work from the concrete processes, the concrete historical development, laws will not be clearly explained.

The book does not deal with problems masterfully, with overall control of its subject. Issues do not stand forth clearly. The composition is not persuasive but is dull and illogical, lacking even formal logic. It appears as if written by different authors, each taking a chapter — a division of labor without unity. It lacks the systemic order a textbook should have. On top of this, its method is to proceed from definitions, and it reads like an economics dictionary. The authors are passive, contradicting one another in many places, later chapters at odds with earlier ones. Cooperative division of labor and collective authorship is one method. But the best method is to have one leader writing alongside of several assistants. This is the way Marx and his circle wrote, and their works were integral, and strictly, systematically scientific.

When writing the result will be exciting only if there is a target of criticism. Although this text has some correct things to say, it does not unfold a critique of views considered wrong. This makes the reading tedious.

In many places one feels as if a scholastic is speaking, not a revolutionary. The economist who does not understand economic practice is not a true expert. The book seems to reflect the following kind of situation: there are those who do practical work but lack the ability to generalize, as they lack concepts and laws; on the other hand, those who do theoretical work lack practical experience. These two types have not been integrated; that is, theory and practice have not been integrated.

The book shows that its authors do not have a dialectical method. One has to think philosophically to write an economics text. Philosophers should participate in the writing, otherwise it will not be possible to produce a satisfactory text.

The first edition of this text appeared in early 1955. But the basic framework seems to have been set even before then. And it looks as if the model Stalin set at that time was not very enlightening.

In the Soviet Union there are presently those who disagree with how the book was done. G. Kozlov wrote an article called “A Scientific Course of Study of Socialist Political

Economy” which criticized this book. His views go to the root of the matter. He points out methodological faults of the book and calls for explanations of laws that proceed from an analysis of the process of socialist production. He also makes suggestions as to structure.

In view of the criticism of Kozlov and others it is possible that another textbook with an opposite approach will be produced in the Soviet Union. Opposition is always to the good.

From a first reading of this text one comes to realize its method and viewpoint. But that is not yet thorough study. What would be best in the future is to take the issues and arguments as the core, do some meticulous research, bring together some materials, and look over other available articles, books, reports, etc., with views that differ from those in this text. One should get an idea of the different opinions on controversial issues. To clarify issues the views of at least two sides have to be understood.

We must criticize and oppose wrong opinions, but we must also protect all correct things. Both courage and caution are needed.

No matter what, for them to have written a socialist political economy is a great task on the whole. Regardless how many problems it contains, this book at the least furnishes us with material for debate, and thanks to this has led to further study.

66. How to Write a Text on Political Economy

In principle it is permissible for the text to proceed from the ownership system. But there is an even better way. In researching the capitalist economy Marx, too, studied mainly ownership of the means of production under capitalism, examining how distribution of the means of production determined the distribution of commodities. In capitalist society the social nature of production and the private nature of ownership is a fundamental contradiction. Marx began with the commodity and went on to reveal the relations among people hidden behind commodities (the relations among things). Commodities in socialist society still have duality; nonetheless, thanks to the establishment of public ownership of the means of production and the fact that labor power is no longer a commodity, duality of commodities under socialism is not the same as their duality under capitalism. The relations among people are no longer hidden behind commodity relations. Thus, if socialist economy is studied beginning with the duality of commodities, copying Marx’s method, it may well have the opposite effect of confusing the issues, making things harder for people to understand.

Political economy aims to study the production relations. As Stalin saw it, the production relations include three things: ownership, relations among people during labor, and the distribution of commodities. In writing a political economy of our own we could also begin with the ownership system. First, we describe the conversion of ownership of the means of production from private to public: how we converted private ownership of bureaucratic capital and the capitalist ownership system into socialist ownership by the

whole people; how private ownership of the land by the landlords was turned first into private ownership by individual peasants and then into collective ownership under socialism; only then could we describe the contradiction between the two forms of public ownership under socialism and how collective ownership under socialism could make the transition to people's ownership under communism. At the same time, we must describe how people's ownership itself changes: the system of transferring cadres to lower levels, administration by different levels, right of autonomy of enterprises, etc. Although alike in being owned by the whole people, our enterprises are variously administered, some by departments of the center, others through provinces, municipalities, or autonomous regions, yet others through local special districts or counties. Some commune-run enterprises are semi-owned by the whole people, semi-owned by the collective. But whether centrally or locally administered, the enterprises are all under unified leadership and possess specific autonomous rights.

Turning to the problem of the relations among people during productive labor, the text, aside from such comments as "relations of comradesly cooperation and mutual assistance," has completely failed to come to grips with the substantive issues, having conducted no research or analysis into this area. After the question of the ownership system is solved, the most important question is administration — how enterprises owned either by the whole people or the collective are administered. This is the same as the question of the relations among people under a given ownership system, a subject that could use many articles. Changes in the ownership system in a given period of time always have their limits, but the relations among people in productive labor may well, on the contrary, be in ceaseless change. With respect to administration of enterprises owned by the whole people, we have adopted a set of approaches: a combination of concentrated leadership and mass movement; combinations of party leaders, working masses, and technical personnel; cadres participating in production; workers participating in administration; steadily changing unreasonable regulations and institutional practices.

As to the distribution of commodities, the text has to be rewritten, changing its present approach altogether. Hard, bitter struggle, expanding reproduction, the future prospects of communism — these are what have to be emphasized, not individual material interest. The goal to lead people toward is not "one spouse, one country house, one automobile, one piano, one television." This is the road of serving the self, not the society. A "ten-thousand-league journey begins where you are standing." But if one looks only at the feet without giving thought to the future, then the question is: What is left of revolutionary excitement and ardor? ["What energy is left for travelling?" in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*]

67. How to Study Appearances to Reach Essences

In studying a problem one must begin with the appearances that people can see and feel, in order to research the essences that lie behind them, and then go on from there to reveal the substance and contradiction of objective things and events.

At the time of the civil war and the War of Resistance Against Japan our study of the problems of war proceeded from appearances. The enemy was big and strong, we were small and weak. This was the most obvious appearance at that time, one which all could see. We were the ones who studied and resolved problems, proceeding from appearances to study how the side which was small and weak might defeat an enemy which was big and strong. We pointed out that although we were small and weak we had mass support, and that the enemy, though big and strong, was vulnerable to thrusts in certain areas. Take the civil war period, when the enemy had several hundred thousand men, we had several tens of thousands. Strategically, the enemy was strong and on the offensive, we were weak and on the defensive. But to attack us they had to divide their forces into columns, and the columns again into detachments. Typically, one company would attack a strong point while the others were still maneuvering. We would then concentrate several tens of thousands to attack one column, even concentrating the majority of our forces to take a single point of the enemy column, as another group would divert those enemy troops still maneuvering. In this way we achieved superiority at the particular point. The enemy had become small and weak, and we large and strong. Another thing is that when they would arrive at a place conditions would be unfamiliar to them, the masses would not support them, and so we would be able to wipe out an enemy group completely.

Ideology becomes systematic, generally speaking, in the wake of the movements of phenomena. The reason is that thought and understanding are reflections of material movements. Laws are things which appear over and over, not accidentally, in the movements of phenomena. It is only after the repeated appearance of something that it becomes a law and thus an object to be understood. For example, crises of capitalism occurred about every ten years. When this had happened over and over it then became possible for us to understand the laws of economic crisis in capitalist society. In land reform we had to distribute land according to population rather than labor power. But we did not understand this clearly until we had done it many times. In the late period of the second civil war “left” adventurist comrades called for distribution of land according to labor power and disapproved of distribution of land per capita. In their view even distribution of land according to population was not rigorous as to class outlook and not sufficiently from the outlook of the masses. Their slogan was: no land to the landlord, poor land to the rich peasant; to all others land according to labor power. Facts proved this approach to be wrong. How land should be distributed was made clear only after we had gone through experiences repeated over and over again.

Marxism requires that logic be consistent with history. Thought is the reflex of objective existence. Logic comes from history. Though this textbook has an abundance of materials, there is no analysis, there is no logic, the laws are not discernible, and it is not satisfactory. But a lack of materials is also unsatisfactory. Then people will see only logic and not history. Moreover, it will be only subjective logic. Here exactly are the faults of this text.

It is vital to produce a history of the development of Chinese capitalism. If those who study history do not study the different societies, the different historical eras, they will surely be unable to produce good comprehensive histories. Studying the different

societies means having to find the particular laws governing those societies. Once the particular laws have been studied and made clear, it will be easy to know the general laws of society. It is necessary to discern the general from the study of many particularities. If the particular laws are not understood clearly, the general cannot be either. For example, in studying the general laws governing animals it is necessary to study separately those governing vertebrates, invertebrates, etc.

68. Philosophy Must Serve the Political Tasks Facing Us

Any philosophy is in the service of its contemporary tasks.

Capitalist philosophy has this function. And every nation, every era has new theoreticians producing new theory for the political tasks of the day. In England such bourgeois materialists as Bacon and Hobbes appeared; materialists like the Encyclopedists then appeared in eighteenth-century France; the German and Russian bourgeoisie also had their materialists. All of these were bourgeois materialists, all of whom served the political tasks of the bourgeois class. Thus the existence of English or bourgeois materialism certainly did not make French bourgeois materialism unnecessary, nor did the existence of English and French bourgeois materialism make the German or the Russian unnecessary.

The Marxist philosophy of the proletarian class is even more vitally concerned to serve contemporary political tasks. For China, Marx, Lenin, and Stalin [Omitted in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] are necessary reading. That comes first. But communists of any country and the proletarian philosophical circles of any country must create new theory, write new works, produce their own theoreticians to serve the political tasks facing them.

No nation can at any time rely only on what is old. Having Marx and Engels without Lenin's [*Two Tactics*](#) and other works could not have solved the new problems of 1905 and afterward. Having only [*Materialism and Empirico-Criticism*](#) of 1907 would not have sufficed to cope with the new issues that arose before and after the October Revolution. To meet the needs of this time Lenin wrote [*Imperialism, State and Revolution*](#) and other works. After Lenin, Stalin was needed to write *Foundations of Leninism* and *Problems of Leninism* to deal with reactionaries and preserve Leninism. At the end of our second civil war and the beginning of the War of Resistance Against Japan we wrote [*On Practice*](#) and [*On Contradiction*](#). They had to be written to meet the needs of the times.

Now that we have entered the period of socialism a whole new series of problems has appeared. If we do not meet the new needs, write the new works, give form to new theory, it will not do!

Supplement

1. China's Industrialization Problems

After the Soviet Union's first five-year plan had been completed, when the value of all large industrial production was 70 percent of the value of all industrial and agricultural production, they promptly declared that industrialization had been made a reality. We too could quickly reach such a standard, but even if we did, we still would not claim that industrialization had become a reality, because we have over 500 million peasants devoting themselves to agriculture. If industrialization is claimed when industrial production is 70 per cent, not only would we be unable to reflect accurately the actual conditions of our national economy, but we could even create a mood of laxity.

At the first plenary session of the Eighth National People's Congress we spoke of the necessity to establish a firm foundation for socialist industrialization in the second five-year plan. We also said that within fifteen years or so we would build an integrated industrial system. These two statements are somewhat contradictory, for without a fully equipped industrial system how can we speak of having a "firm foundation" for socialist industrialization? As things now stand, in another three years we may surpass England in output of primary industrial products. In another five years we can fulfill our task of establishing the industrial system as a practical reality.

In the long term, we expect to be known as an industrial agricultural nation. ["... we will not be known as an industrial nation" in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] Even if we make over 100 million tons of steel it will still be so. If our per capita output were to surpass Great Britain's we would need to be producing 350 million tons of steel at least!

There is a special significance to picking out a country and competing with it. We are always talking about catching up with England. Our first step is to catch up in terms of primary product output, next in terms of per capita output. In shipbuilding and motor vehicle manufacture we are still far behind that country. We must strive to overtake it in all respects. Even so small a country as Japan has 4 million tons' capacity of commercial shipping. It is inexcusable for a country as large as ours to lack the shipping to move our own goods.

In 1949 we had 90,000 or more sets of machine tools. By 1959 the number had increased to 490,000. In 1957 Japan had 600,000. The number of machine tools is an important index of the level of industrial development. Our level of mechanization still is quite low, as one can tell simply from Shanghai, where, according to the most recent survey mechanized labor, semi-mechanized labor, and manual labor each constituted one-third.

Labor productivity in Soviet industry has not as yet surpassed that of the United States. We are even further behind. Though our population is very large our labor productivity is a long way from comparing with that of others. From 1960 on we will still have to work intensively for thirteen years.

2. Social Position and Individual Capacity

On page 488 it says that in a socialist society a person's position is determined only by labor and individual capacity. This is not necessarily so. Keen-minded people are always coming from among those in a lower position. They are looked down on by others, they have suffered indignities, and they are young. Socialist society is no exception. In the old society it was always the case that the oppressed had scant culture but were a bit keener; the oppressors had higher culture but were a little on the slow side. There is some danger of this today. The higher salaried strata of a socialist society have a bit more cultural knowledge but tend to be a trifle slow when compared to the lower strata. Thus our cadres' sons and daughters do not quite compare with the children of non-cadres.

From small plants have come many creations and discoveries. Larger factories may have superior facilities, newer technology, and for that very reason the staff all too often assume airs of self-importance, are satisfied with things as they are and do not seek to advance and reach out ambitiously. All too often their creativity does not compare at all with that of the staff of the smaller factory. Recently in Ch'angchou there was a textile mill in which the workers created devices that raised the efficiency of the looms. This will help cotton spinning, textile weaving, and printing and dyeing achieve a balanced capability. The new technique did not come from Shanghai or Tientsin but from a small place called Ch'angchou.

Knowledge is gained by coming through adversity. If Ch'u Yuan had remained in office his writings would not exist.^[1] Only because he lost his position and was "transferred downward to perform labor" was it possible for him to get close to the life of society and produce so fine a work of literature as the *Li Sao*. And it was not until he had been rebuffed in many states that Confucius also turned around and devoted himself to his studies. He rallied a group of the unemployed who expected to go from place to place to sell their labor power. But no one would have them. Frustrated at every turn, he had no alternative but to collect the folk songs now known as the *Book of Odes* and put in order the historical materials known as the *Spring and Autumn*.

Historically, many advanced things came not from advanced countries but from comparatively backward ones. Marxism did not come from the comparatively developed capitalist countries of the time — England, France — but from Germany, whose level of capitalist development was in between. There is a reason for this.

Scientific inventions likewise do not necessarily come from those with a high level of culture and education. At present there are many university professors who have not invented anything. Of course, this is not to deny the difference between an engineer and a worker. It is not that we do not want engineers. But there is a real question here. Historically it is usually a case of the culturally inferior defeating the culturally superior. In our civil war our commanders at various levels were culturally inferior to the Kuomintang officers, who came from military academies at home or abroad. But we defeated them.

The human animal has this flaw: looking down on others. Those who have accomplished some small thing look down on those who have yet to. Great powers, rich nations look

down on the smaller, poorer ones. The Western nations looked down on Russia, historically. China is still in a similar position. There is reason for this, for we are still nothing much; such a large country, so little steel. So much illiteracy. It can do us good to have people look down on us! It will drive us to exert ourselves, to push forward.

3. Relying on the Masses

Lenin put it well when he said, “Socialism is vigorous, spirited, creative — the creation of the masses of the people themselves.” Our mass line is like this. Does it not agree with Leninism? After quoting this statement the text says, “The broad laboring masses increasingly participate in a direct active way in the management of production, in the work of state bodies, in the leadership of all departments in the country’s social life.” (p. 332) This is also well put. But saying is one thing and doing another. And to do this is by no means easy.

In 1928 the Central Committee of the CPSU passed a resolution which said: “We will be able to solve the task of overtaking and surpassing the capitalist countries technically and economically only when the party and the worker and peasant masses get mobilized to the limit.” (p. 337) This is very well put. And this is exactly what we are now doing. At that time Stalin had nothing else to rely on except the masses, so he demanded all-out mobilization of the party and the masses. Afterward, when they had realized some gains this way, they became less reliant on the masses.

Lenin said, “Truly democratic centralism requires that the manifold paths, forms, and methods by which local creativity and spirit of initiative attain general goals have a sufficiently unhindered development.” (p. 454). Well said. The masses can create the paths. The masses created Russia’s soviets. And they created our people’s communes.

4. The Soviet Union and China: A Few Points to Compare in the Development Process

On page 422 the text quotes Lenin: “If state power is in the hands of the working class it is possible to make the transition to communism through state capitalism.” And so forth. This is well put. Lenin was a solid worker. Because he realized that the proletariat after the October Revolution had no experience in managing the economy, he attempted to develop the proletariat’s competence in this area by using the ways and means of state capitalism. The Russian bourgeoisie underestimated the strength of the proletariat at that time. Refusing Lenin’s conditions, they carried out slowdowns and destructive activities, forcing the workers to confiscate their properties. That is why state capitalism could not develop.

During the civil war period Russia’s problems were truly enormous. Agriculture was in ruins. Commercial links were disrupted. Communications and transport were hardly functioning. Raw materials could not be obtained, and many factories that had been expropriated could not commence operations. Because they really had no answer to this they had no choice but to turn to a system of requisitioning the peasants’ surplus grain.

Actually, this was a means of taking the fruits of the peasants' labor without compensation, a method that meant ransacking the jars and boxes of the peasants — not a sound practice. Only when the civil war ended was this system replaced with a grain tax.

Our civil war lasted much longer than theirs. For twenty-two years it was our practice in the base areas to collect public grain and to purchase surplus grain. We had a correct strategy toward the peasantry and during the war we relied heavily on them.

For twenty-two years we developed our political power in the base areas, and we accumulated experience in managing the economy of the base areas. We trained cadres to manage the economy and built an alliance with the peasantry, so that after the whole country was liberated we speedily carried to its completion the work of economic recovery. Immediately after that we raised the general line of the transition period, namely, putting our primary effort into socialist revolution while beginning construction under the first five-year plan. As we carried out socialist transformation we worked together with the peasantry to deal with the capitalists. There was, however, a time when Lenin said that he could bear to negotiate even with the capitalists in hopes of turning capitalism into state capitalism as a means of coping with the spontaneity of the petty bourgeoisie. Different policies arise in different historical conditions.

In the New Economic Policy (NEP) period the Soviet Union had a restrained policy toward the rich peasants because they needed the grain. We had a similar policy toward the national bourgeoisie in the early stages after liberation. Not until the collective farms and the state farms had produced in all 400 million food of grain did they move against the rich peasants, putting forward the slogan of eliminating the rich peasants and making overall collectivization a reality.^[*] What about us? We did things differently, actually eliminating the rich peasant economy as early as land reform.

In the Soviet Union cooperative movement “agriculture paid a heavy price at the beginning.” (p. 397) This is what caused many of the East European countries to have plenty of anxiety over the question of cooperativization and to be fearful of organizing big. When they did get started they moved slowly. Our production was not reduced by the cooperatives. On the contrary, it increased enormously. At the beginning many were dubious. Now the number of converts is slowly increasing.

5. The Process of Forming and Consolidating a General Line

These past two years we have been conducting a great experiment.

In the early stages of Liberation we had no experience of managing the economy of the entire nation. So in the period of the first five-year plan we could do no more than copy the Soviet Union's methods, although we never felt altogether satisfied about it. In 1955, when we had basically completed the “three transformations”^[2] (at the end of the year and in the spring of the following year), we sought out over thirty cadres for consultation. As a result of those discussions we proposed the “ten great relationships” and “More!

Faster! Better! More economically!” At that time we had read Stalin’s 1949 election speech, which stated that tsarist Russia was producing 4 million tons of steel annually. The figure increases to 18 million by 1940. If one reckons from 1921, there is an increase of only 14 million tons in twenty years. And to think they were socialist the whole time! Could we not do a little better, faster? After that we put forward the question of “two methods” and at the same time we worked out a forty-article program for agricultural development.^[3] No other measures were proposed at the time.

After the forward leap of 1956, opposition to [Only in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] adventurous advances appeared. Bourgeois rightists took us by our pigtails and attacked savagely in an attempt to negate the accomplishment of socialist construction. In June 1957, at the National People’s Congress, Premier Chou En-lai’s report struck back at the rightists. In September the same year the party’s third plenary session of the Central Committee revived such slogans as “More! Faster! Better! More economically!” the general program in forty articles, the society for the promoting of progress, [“Great Leap Forward” in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] etc. In November in Moscow we revised a *People’s Daily* editorial on “More! Faster! Better! More economically!” Thus, in the winter we launched a nationwide mass movement for large-scale water conservancy.

In 1958 there were meetings, first in Nanning, then in Ch’engtu. We tore into our problems, criticizing those opposed to daring advances. We decided not to allow further opposition to daring advances. We proposed a general line for socialist construction. If there had been no Nanning meeting we could not have come up with a general line. In May a representative [Liu Shao-Ch’i in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] of the Central Committee reported to the Eighth National People’s Congress, second session. And the assembly officially passed the general line. But the line was not consolidated, so we followed with concrete measures, mainly concerning division of authority between the center and the local areas. In Peitaiho we proposed doubling steel output and got a mass movement in steel and iron underway — what the Western papers called backyard steel. At the same time we launched the people’s communes. Right after came the shelling of Quemoy. These things perturbed some and offended others. Errors appeared in our work. By not paying for food we ate ourselves into a crisis in grains and nonstaple foods. The ultracomunist wind was blowing. A certain percent [12 percent in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*] of daily necessities could not be supplied. Steel output for 1959 was set at 30 million tons at Peitaiho. The Wuchang meeting lowered this to 20 million. The Shanghai meeting lowered it to 16.5 million tons. Sometime in June 1959 it was cut again to 13 million. All this was seized upon by those who disagreed with us. But when the Central Committee was opposing the “left” they did not raise their objections, nor did they do so at the two Ch’engchou conferences, the Wuchang Conference, the Peking Conference, or the Shanghai Conference. They waited until the “left” had been opposed out of existence and goals had been confirmed. Further opposition to the “left” made opposition to the right necessary. At the Lushan Conference, when we needed opposition to the right, they came out against the “left.”^[4]

All this goes to show that things were far from peaceful in our world, and the general line was certainly not consolidated. Now that we have come through a period of difficult

zigzags and the Lushan Conference, the general line is comparatively consolidated. But “things come in threes,” so perhaps we have to prepare for a third period of zigzags. If so, we can expect that the line will be consolidated even further. According to Chekiang Provincial Committee information “equalization” and “indiscriminate transfers of property” have reappeared very recently in certain communes. The ultracommunist wind may yet appear again!

The incidents in Poland and Hungary occurred in 1956, the time of the zigzags of the campaign against “daring advances.” Then the world turned against the Soviet Union. During the zigzags of 1959 the world turned against us.

The two rectification and antirightist campaigns, one in 1957, one at Lushan, subjected the effects of bourgeois ideology and remaining bourgeois influences to comparatively thoroughgoing criticism, enabling the masses to be liberated from the danger. At that time we also struck down many superstitions, including the so-called Ma Anshan Iron and Steel Constitution. [“An authoritarian refining method at a major Soviet mill” — note in the 1967 text.: *Note by translator.*][\[5\]](#)

In the past we did not know how to get a socialist revolution going. We thought that after the cooperatives, after joint public-private management, the problem would be solved. The savage attacks of the bourgeois rightists caused us to put forward socialist revolution as a political and an ideological line. Actually, the Lushan Conference carried forward this revolution, and it was a sharp revolution. It would have been very bad if we had not beaten down the right opportunist line at Lushan.

6. Contradictions Among the Imperialist Nations and Other Matters

Struggles among the respective imperialisms should be seen as a major thing. That is how Lenin saw them and Stalin too, something they called the indirect reserve force of the revolution. In getting the revolutionary base areas going China enjoyed this advantageous circumstance. In the past we had contradictions among various factions of the landlord and comprador classes. Behind these domestic contradictions lay contradictions among the imperialists. It was because of these contradictions among the imperialists that only a part of the enemy rather than all of them would do battle with us directly in a particular time, so long as we utilized the contradictions properly. In addition, we usually had time to rest and reorganize. Contradictions among the imperialists was one important reason why the October Revolution could be consolidated. Fourteen nations sent intervention forces at the time. But none alone sent much. Moreover, their purposes were not coordinated. They were engaged in intrigues. During the Korean war American purposes were not coordinated with those of their allies. The war was not fought on the largest scale. Not only could America not determine its own course, France and England were not so eager.

Internationally the bourgeoisie are now extremely uneasy, afraid of any wind that might stir the grass. Their level of alertness is high, but they are in disarray.

Since the Second World War the economic crises in capitalist society are different from those of Marx's day. Generally speaking, they used to come every seven, eight or ten years. During the fourteen years between the end of the Second World War and 1959 there were three.

At present the international scene is far more tense than after the First World War, when capitalism still had a period of relative stability, the revolution having failed everywhere except Russia. England and France were full of high spirits and the various national bourgeoisies were not all that afraid of the Soviet Union. Aside from the taking away of Germany's colonies the entire imperialist colonial system was still in tact. After the Second World War three of the defeated imperialisms collapsed. England and France were weakened and in decline. Socialist revolution had triumphed in over ten countries. The colonial system was breaking apart. The capitalist world would never again enjoy the relative stability it had after the First World War.

7. Why China's Industrial Revolution Can Be Very Rapid

In Western bourgeois public opinion there are now those who acknowledge that "China is one of the countries having the most rapid industrial development." (The U.S. Conlon report on United States diplomatic policy mentions this.)

There are many countries that have carried through an industrial revolution. Compared to all previous national industrial revolutions China promises to have one of the most rapid.

The question is, why? One of the main reasons is that our socialist revolution was carried through fairly thoroughly. We carried through the revolution against the bourgeoisie thoroughly, doing our utmost to eradicate all bourgeois influences. We struck down superstitions and energetically sought to enable the masses to win thoroughgoing liberation in all areas.

8. Population [This section is found in the 1969 text only.: *Note by translator.*]

In eliminating the problem of excess population, rural population is the major problem, the solution of which calls for vast development of production. In China over 500 million people are devoting themselves to agriculture. But they do not eat their fill, although they toil year in year out. This is most unreasonable. In America the agricultural population is only 13 percent and on the average each person has 2,000 catties^[6] of grain. We do not have so much. What shall we do to reduce the rural population? If we do not want them crowding into the cities we will have to have a great deal of industry in the countryside so that the peasants can become workers right where they are. This brings us to a major policy issue: do we want to keep rural living conditions from falling below that in the cities, keep the two roughly the same, or keep the rural slightly higher than the urban? Every commune has to have its own economic center, its own upper-level schools to train its own intellectuals. There is no other way to solve the problem of excess rural population really and truly.

Notes

[References given here have been compiled from sources other than the Maoist Documentation Project as well. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1] There are three levels of collective ownership in the Chinese countryside. The smallest unit, the production team, usually consists of between fifteen and thirty-five families. The team is the basic ownership and production unit, owning the land it works, a number of draught animals, and small agricultural tools such as threshers and crushers. The next unit, the production brigade, is made up of from five to fifteen teams. The brigade owns larger means of production too expensive for the team to buy and too large for them to use effectively, such as tractors and irrigation equipment. The brigade also takes care of tasks, such as hill terracing, for which the team is too small. The commune, with a population from several thousand to some fifty thousand, is composed of ten to thirty brigades. In addition to providing overall coordination among the brigades, the communes own and run large industrial enterprises and projects too large for the brigade to handle, such as large water conservancy projects.

[2] The various forms of collective ownership, taken as a whole, are distinct from ownership by the whole people. Collective ownership signifies that the means of production are owned by a sector of the total population. This sector, be it a team, brigade, or commune, basically organizes and runs production. The product of a collectively owned unit, aside from taxes, belongs to the units which produced it. The unit uses part of the product for reproduction and investment and the remainder for worker income.

Ownership by the whole people, on the other hand, signifies ownership by the whole society, not a sector of it. Such enterprises are subject to direct central planning and organization. Their products are owned by the whole society and can be distributed according to need within the whole system of units under ownership by the whole people. Since these various production units are treated as a unified accounting unit, the profits or losses of an individual production unit do not affect either investment in the unit or the income of its workers.

In 1973, industry under the ownership of the whole people accounted for 97 percent of total fixed assets, 63 percent of the people engaged in industry, and 86 percent of total industrial output. Industry under collective ownership covered 3 percent of fixed assets, 36.2 percent of the industrial workforce, and 14 percent of total output. Individual handicrafts made up the other 8 percent. In commerce, 92.5 percent of retail sales were under ownership of the whole people with collectively owned units accounting for 7.3 percent of total retail sales. In agriculture, on the other hand, 80 to 90 percent of the means of production were still under collective ownership.

[3] The land reform movement refers specifically to the post-Liberation land reform campaign of 1949-1952. The agricultural producers' cooperatives were established for the most part during the high tide of collectivization in 1955 and early 1956. The people's communes were organized throughout China in the fall of 1958 during the initial stages of the Great Leap Forward.

[4] Comprador capitalism refers to foreign commercial establishments in China staffed by Chinese who served these foreign interests.

[5] For Comrade Mao's discussions of the importance of bureaucratic capital and policy toward it at that time, see "[The Present Situation and Our Tasks](#)," December 25, 1947, and "[Report to the Second Session of the Seventh Central Committee](#)," March 5, 1949, in *Selected Works of Mao Tsetung*, vol. 4 (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1961), pp. 167-68 and 361-75.

[6] Here Comrade Mao is referring to the activities of Chang Po-chün (Zhang Pojun) and Lo Lung-chi (Luo Longji). In the summer of 1957 Chang suggested giving more power to the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, which consisted largely of members of the various democratic parties. This unit would serve as an "upper house" with veto power over the CCP-dominated National People's Congress. Lo proposed a set of "rehabilitation committees" to examine the treatment of democratic persons who he argued were unfairly treated in the anti-counter-revolutionary campaigns of the early 1950s.

[7] Fixed interest was a specific part of the CCP's strategy of "buying out" the national bourgeoisie. After Liberation, policy toward them went through several stages. The first stage was the placing of orders by the state with private enterprises for manufacturing and processing and the unified purchase and distribution of products produced by these enterprises. After the rectification campaign in private industry in 1952, a second phase of "dividing the profits into four shares" was implemented. The four relatively equal shares were: (1) taxes paid to the state; (2) contributions to the worker welfare fund; (3) enterprise development funds; and (4) profits for the capitalists.

The third stage was the implementation of joint state-private ownership, first of individual enterprises and then of entire trades. In this "highest phase of state capitalism," the income of the capitalists would come from the income they received for the work they did within the units and from "fixed interest." Fixed interest was to be paid for twenty years at the annual rate of 5 percent of the value of the assets of the enterprises regardless of the annual profits or losses of the individual firms. Fixed interest payments were terminated during the Cultural Revolution.

[8] The policy of unified purchase and supply meant that the government would buy certain products at fixed prices, thus eliminating the private market and conditions for speculation in these goods. Unified purchase and supply of grain, edible oils, and oilseeds was instituted in March 1954, and in September 1954 the policy was instituted for cotton and cotton cloth.

Under the system of unified purchase and supply, there are three categories of goods. Goods in the first category (which, as of April 1959, included 38 products) are sold to state companies at fixed prices. Second category goods (293 products as of April 1959) are sold to the state according to quotas reached on a contractual basis. Above-quota production can, but need not, be sold to the state. Third category goods (those not included in the first or second categories) may still be sold on the market.

[9] “Red and expert” describes a unity of opposites in building a socialist society. Redness suggests political and ideological aspects of work; expertness the technical aspects. Both are necessary aspects of all work. But in line with his reasoning that every contradiction must have a primary aspect, Comrade Mao has long held that “ideological and political work is the guarantee . . . the ‘soul’” of economic and technical work. On the other hand if redness is emphasized to the exclusion of expertness, then the unity of opposites will be destroyed and the task of building socialism will become impossible.

[10] In March 1949 the CCP began to organize a People’s Political Consultative Conference representing twenty-three parties and groups. In September 1949 the Preparatory Committee of the People’s Political Consultative Conference met and passed the Common Program, a general statement of the aims of the new government, and the Organic Law of the Central People’s Republic which made the working class the leaders of the Republic. Subsequently, the National People’s Congress, first convened in 1954, was established as the dominant long-term national legislative body in China.

[11] One Chinese dollar (yuan) has a value of U.S. \$.53 (April 1977). The value of the yuan has been stable at approximately U.S. \$.50 for over twenty years, the variations coming mainly as a result of devaluations of the U.S. dollar.

[12] Here Comrade Mao is probably referring to his own experiences during the Great Leap Forward. At Wuchang (Wuzhang) in November 1958, Comrade Mao admitted that at the Peitaiho (Beitaihe) Conference in August 1958, during the height of enthusiasm for the Great Leap, he had made a similar error of considering only need and not capacity.

[13] This formulation of these crucial contradictions is contained in Comrade Mao’s April 1956 speech, “[On the Ten Major Relationships](#).”

[14] Mutual aid teams were an early form of collective agricultural organization. Based on traditional peasant seasonal labor-sharing practices in parts of China, they were extensively implemented in the early 1950s. In 1955, nearly 60 percent of China’s peasant households were in mutual aid teams.

These teams were supplanted in 1955 by elementary agricultural producers’ cooperatives (APCs). Each APC contained several mutual aid teams; land and other capital goods continued to be privately owned, but other resources were pooled and used according to annual plans prepared by cooperative decision-making. By June 1956, however, 63 percent of the peasant households had progressed to larger, advanced APCs in which land, labor, and the means of production were pooled.

[15] Chang Tien-p'ei (Zhong Dian-pei) was a film critic in the mid-1950s who later took part in the antiparty, antisocialist current of 1957.

[16] The “three-antis” (Sanfan) campaign, begun in the northeast in August 1951 and nationally in January 1952, was directed against corruption, waste, and bureaucratism among government employees, many of whom were still carryovers from the Nationalist regime. The “five-antis” (Wufan) campaign was directed at the national bourgeoisie. Its specific foci were the elimination of bribery, theft of state property, tax evasion, theft of state economic secrets, and embezzlement in carrying out government contracts.

[17] Here Comrade Mao is referring to the rightist criticisms of the CCP during the “blooming and contending” period in the spring of 1957, shortly after he had delivered his talk, “[On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People](#),” in February 1957.

[18] In July 1959, at the Lushan Conference, a group of party leaders headed by then Defense Minister P'eng Teh-huai (Peng De-huai) criticized the Great Leap Forward and its leadership as “petty bourgeois fanaticism.” They argued that it had created far more damage than good. After a major struggle at the plenum conference, P'eng and other rightists were removed from their positions of responsibility in the party and the government.

[19] The argument presented by the textbook that the socialist revolution in the ideological and political fronts was concluded in 1957 is similar to the argument in the Resolution of the Eighth Party Congress in 1956. That is to say, the main contradiction in China was no longer that between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, but between the advanced relations of production (the ideological and political fronts on which the revolution was “concluded”) and the backward forces of production.

[20] The 45 percent rate of accumulation noted here by Comrade Mao is an exceptionally high one used to demonstrate an exemplary advanced situation. During the Great Leap Forward, Comrade Mao had consistently argued against excessive rates of accumulation which would reduce the peasants' incentives to produce. As a general rule, he prescribed the following breakdown for agricultural production: taxes (7 percent); production expenses (20 percent); accumulation (18 percent); distribution to the masses (55 percent).

[21] The Eight-Character Charter for Agriculture, propagated during the Great Leap Forward, called for paying attention to water, fertilizer, soil (conservation), seeds (selection), closeness (in planting), protection (of plants), implements, and (field) management.

[22] Here Comrade Mao is referring to the fifth grade in China's present eight-grade wage system.

[23] During the War of Liberation, cadres received goods according to need, not according to work done. These goods were distributed directly for use, not through any

market mechanism based on exchange value. Under these circumstances, however, needs were defined quite spartanly.

[24] The mass line is the method of leadership which the CCP strives to achieve. Its classic formulation by Comrade Mao is as follows:

In all the practical work of our Party, all correct leadership is necessarily “from the masses, to the masses.” This means: take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them, and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are persevered in and carried through. And so on, over and over again in an endless spiral, with the ideas becoming more correct, more vital, and richer each time.

From: “[Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership](#),” June 1, 1943, *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p. 119.

[25] Comrade Mao is referring again to the July-August 1959 Lushan Conference at which the conflict with P’eng Teh-huai came to the fore.

Supplement

[1] Ch’u Yuan (Qu Yuan) was an aristocrat of the Chou period who lived during the beginning of the third century B.C. After being dismissed from the royal court, he wrote the *Li Sao*, an allegorical, fanciful search for an understanding ruler. He subsequently drowned himself out of despair.

[2] The “three transformations” refers to the transformation of agriculture, private industry, and handicrafts production.

[3] The forty-articles program represented a plan for agricultural development supported by Comrade Mao. The forty articles advocated relying on agricultural production and the domestic agricultural market, rather than foreign markets, to provide the primary accumulation needed to finance China’s industrialization. The articles also advocated changing the relations of production as a condition for further developing the forces of production and increasing cooperativization. The vast majority of the peasants were to increase their income through this process. Although the forty articles were shelved during 1956 and most of 1957, they became an integral part of the Great Leap Forward.

[4] As Comrade Mao here indicates, a series of meetings were held from November 1958 through early 1959. At these meetings the errors of the Great Leap were criticized and efforts made to correct them. However, it was only after these errors had been criticized

and corrections made that, in July 1959, the rightists launched what Comrade Mao saw as an opportunist attack on the Great Leap and the leadership who had supported it. This perception of the rightist criticisms is reflected in the titles of the two talks Comrade Mao gave at the Lushan Conference “Why Do the Right Opportunists Now Launch an Offensive?” and “Machine Guns, Mortars, and Other Things” (reflecting the antagonistic nature of the attack.)

[5] The Ma Anshan Iron and Steel Constitution refers to the authoritarian constitution of the Soviet Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Works, which the Anshan Works, China’s most advanced iron and steel works, had adopted in the 1950s. This constitution remained unchallenged until 1958. During the Great Leap Forward, the “Ma-An” principles of one person in command and technology in command were challenged in a report to the central leadership.

By March 1960, with Comrade Mao’s participation, a new Anshan Constitution had been written. It combined the five principles of (1) politics in command; (2) strengthening party leadership; (3) launching vigorous mass movements; (4) instituting the “two participations, one reform, and three combinations” (cadre participation in productive labor and worker participation in management; reform of irrational and outdated rules; cooperation between workers, cadres, and technicians); and (5) go full speed ahead with technical innovations and the technical revolution. Although Comrade Mao authorized the issue, publication, and implementation of the new Anshan Constitution in March 1960, it was not until the Cultural Revolution that it was publicized in a big way.

[6] A catty is 1.1 pounds.

[*] In “Several Questions Concerning Soviet Land Policy” (December 1929) Stalin said, “In 1927 the rich peasants produced over 600 million food of grain, of which 130 million were sold through rural exchange. This is a substantial force which we can not slight. Tell me, how much had our collective and state farms produced at that time? About 80 million food, of which 30 million were commodity grains.” So Stalin decided, “Under these circumstances we can not resolutely attack the rich peasants.” And Stalin continued, “Now we have a sufficient material basis to attack them.” That was because in 1929 the collective and state farms produced no less than 400 million food, of which over 130 million were commodity grains. (Josef Stalin, *Complete Works*, vol 12, p. 142.)
[*Transcriber’s Note*: See Stalin’s “Concerning Questions of Agrarian Policy in the U.S.S.R.”.]

Concerning *Economic Problems Of Socialism In The USSR*

November 1958 [\[1\]](#)

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

Provincial and regional committees must study this book. [\[1\]](#) In the past everyone read it without gaining a deep impression. It should be studied in conjunction with China's actual circumstances. The first three chapters contain much that is worth paying attention to, much that is correct, although there are places where perhaps Stalin himself did not make things clear enough. For example, in chapter 1 he says only a few things about objective laws and how to go about planning the economy, without unfolding his ideas; or, it may be that to his mind Soviet planning of the economy already reflected objective governing principles. On the question of heavy industry, light industry, and agriculture, the Soviet Union did not lay enough emphasis on the latter two and had losses as a result. In addition, they did not do a good job of combining the immediate and the long-term interests of the people. In the main they walked on one leg. Comparing the planning, which of us after all had the better adapted "planned proportionate development?" Another point: Stalin emphasized only technology, technical cadre. He wanted nothing but technology, nothing but cadre; no politics, no masses. This too is walking on one leg! And in industry they walk on one leg when they pay attention to heavy industry but not to light industry. Furthermore, they did not point out the main aspects of the contradictions in the relationships among departments of heavy industry. They exaggerated the importance of heavy industry, claiming that steel was the foundation, machinery the heart and soul. Our position is that grain is the mainstay of agriculture, steel of industry, and that if steel is taken as the mainstay, then once we have the raw material the machine industry will follow along. Stalin raised questions in chapter 1: he suggested the objective governing principles, but he failed to provide satisfactory answers.

In chapter 2 he discusses commodities, in chapter 3 the law of value. Relatively speaking, I favor many of the views expressed. To divide production into two major departments and to say that the means of production are not commodities — these points deserve study. In Chinese agriculture there are still many means of production that should be commodities. My view is that the last of the three appended letters [\[2\]](#) is entirely wrong. It expresses a deep uneasiness, a belief that the peasantry cannot be trusted to release agricultural machinery but would hang on to it. On the one hand Stalin says that the means of production belong to state ownership. On the other, he says that the peasants cannot afford them. The fact is that he is deceiving himself. The state controlled the

peasantry very, very tightly, inflexibly. For the two transitions Stalin failed to find the proper ways and means, a vexing matter for him.

Capitalism leaves behind it the commodity form, which we must still retain for the time being. Commodity exchange laws governing value play no regulating role in our production. This role is played by planning, by the great leap forward under planning, by politics-in-command. Stalin speaks only of the production relations, not of the superstructure, nor of the relationship between superstructure and economic base. Chinese cadres participate in production; workers participate in management. Sending cadres down to lower levels to be tempered, discarding old rules and regulations — all these pertain to the superstructure, to ideology. Stalin mentions economics only, not politics. He may speak of selfless labor, but in reality even an extra hour's labor is begrudged. There is no selflessness at all. The role of people, the role of the laborer — these are not mentioned. If there were no communist movement it is hard to imagine making the transition to communism. "All people are for me, I for all people." This does not belong. It ends up with everything being connected to the self. Some say Marx said it. If he did let's not make propaganda out of it. "All people for me," means everybody for me, the individual. "I am for all." Well, how many can you be for?

Bourgeois right is manifested as bourgeois law and education. We want to destroy a part of the ideology of bourgeois right, the lordly pose, the three styles [the bureaucratic, the sectarian, and the subjective] and the five airs [the officious, the arrogant, the apathetic, the extravagant, and the precious]. But commodity circulation, the commodity form, the law of value, these, on the other hand, cannot be destroyed summarily, despite the fact that they are bourgeois categories. If we now carry on propaganda for the total elimination of the ideology of bourgeois right it would not be a reasonable position, bear in mind.

There are a few in socialist society — landlords, rich peasants, right-wingers — who are partial to capitalism and advocate it. But the vast majority are thinking of crossing over to communism. This, however, has to be done by steps. You cannot get to heaven in one step. Take the people's communes: on the one hand, they have to develop self-sufficient production, on the other, commodity exchange. We use commodity exchange and the law of value as tools for the benefit of developing production and facilitating the transition. We are a nation whose commodity production is very underdeveloped. Last year we produced 3.7 trillion catties of food grains. Of that number, commodity grains amounted to about 800 or 900 billion catties. Apart from grain, industrial crops like cotton and hemp are also underdeveloped. Therefore we have to have this [commodity] stage of development. At present there are still a good many counties where there is no charge for food but they cannot pay wages. In Hopei there are three such counties, and another that can pay wages, but not much: three or five yuan. So we still have to develop production, to develop things that can be sold other than foodgrains. At the Sian Agricultural Conference this point was insufficiently considered. In sum, we are a nation whose commerce is underdeveloped, and yet in many respects we have entered socialism. We must eliminate a part of bourgeois right, but commodity production and exchange must still be kept. Now there is a tendency to feel that the sooner communism comes the

better. Some suggest that in only three or five years we will be making the transition. In Fan county, Shantung, it was suggested that four years might be a little slow!

At present there are some economists who do not enjoy economics — Yaroshenko[3] for one. For now and until some time in the future we will have to expand allocation and delivery to the communes. And we will have to expand commodity production. Otherwise we will not be able to pay wages or improve life. Some of our comrades are guilty of a misapprehension when, coming upon commodities and commodity production, they want to destroy bourgeois rule every single day, e.g., they say wages, grades, etc., are detrimental to the free supply system. In 1953 we changed the free supply system into a wage system.[4] This approach was basically correct. We had to take one step backward. But there was a problem: we also took a step backward in the matter of grades. As a result there was a furor over this matter. After a period of rectification grades were scaled down. The grade system is a father-son relation, a cat-and-mouse relation. It has to be attacked day after day. Sending down the cadres to lower levels, running the experimental fields [5] — these are ways of changing the grade system; otherwise, no great leaps!

In urban people's communes capitalists can enter and serve as personnel. But the capitalist label should stay on them. With respect to socialism and communism, what is meant by constructing socialism? We raise two points:

(1) The concentrated manifestation of constructing socialism is making socialist, all-embracing public ownership[6] a reality. (2) Constructing socialism means turning commune collective ownership into public ownership. Some comrades disapprove of drawing the line between these two types of ownership system, as if the communes were completely publicly owned. In reality there are two systems. One type is public ownership, as in the Anshan Iron and Steel Works, the other is commune-large collective ownership. If we do not raise this, what is the use of socialist construction? Stalin drew the line when he spoke of three conditions. These three basic conditions make sense and may be summarized as follows: increase social output; raise collective ownership to public ownership; go from exchange of commodities to exchange of products, from exchange value to use value.

On these two abovementioned points we Chinese are (1) expanding and striving to increase output, concurrently promoting industry and agriculture with preference given to developing heavy industry; and (2) raising small collective ownership to public ownership, and then further to all-embracing public ownership. Those who would not draw these distinctions [among types of ownership] would seem to hold the view that we have already arrived at public ownership. This is wrong. Stalin was speaking of culture when he proposed the three conditions, the physical development and education of the whole people. For this he proposed four conditions: (a) six hours' work per day; (b) combining technical education with work; (c) improving residential conditions; (d) raising wages. Raising wages and lowering prices are particularly helpful here, but the political conditions are missing.

All these conditions are basically to increase production. Once output is plentiful it will be easier to solve the problem of raising collective to public ownership. To increase production we need “More! Faster! Better! More economically!” And for this we need politics-in-command, the four concurrent promotions, the rectification campaigns, the smashing of the ideology of bourgeois right. Add to this the people’s communes and it becomes all the easier to achieve “More! Faster! Better! More economically!”

What are the implications of all-embracing public ownership? There are two: (1) the society’s means of production are owned by the whole people; and (2) the society’s output is owned by the whole people.

The characteristic of the people’s commune is that it is the basic level at which industry, agriculture, the military, education, and commerce are to be integrated in our social structure. At the present time it is the basic-level administrative organization. The militia deals with foreign threats, especially from the imperialists. The commune is the best organizational form for carrying out the two transitions, from socialist (the present) to all-embracing public, and from all-embracing public to communist ownership. In future, when the transitions have been completed, the commune will be the basic mechanism of communist society.

Notes

[References given here have been compiled from sources other than the Maoist Documentation Project as well. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1] The book at issue in this critique is [Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR](#) by J.V. Stalin. The full contents of this work are available through the [Joseph Stalin Reference Archive](#). The Marxists Internet Archive version of *Economic Problems* is a transcription of the edition published by Foreign Languages Press, Peking: 1972 (First Edition)

The date for this document in the 1967 edition of *Selected Works*, Volume 6 is 1959. The 1969 edition dates it in 1958. There was no Ch’engchou (Chengzhou) Conference in November 1959, but there was one in November 1958. The document almost certainly dates from this earlier time.

[2] [Reply to Comrades A. V. Sanina and V. G. Venzher](#), included in *Economic Problems*.

[3] Recipient of Stalin’s [second letter](#), included in *Economic Problems*.

[4] The wage system established in 1953 emphasized predominately short-term individual material incentives. It established an eight-grade wage point system ranging

from 139 to 390 wage points per month. Similar work in different regions would receive an equal number of work points, but the value of work points varied according to regional costs of living. By 1956, the wage point system had been replaced by a wage system, but the eight-grade structure was retained.

[5] Experimental fields sought to develop new and advanced techniques, such as close planting, early planting, deep ploughing, etc. If successful in increasing output, the techniques would be popularized throughout China. By increasing production and thus the total wage fund, the experimental field concept could help undermine the ideological base of the graded wage system by demonstrating that specialists could learn from the peasants.

[6] This is identical, in Chinese, to ownership by the whole people.

Critique of Stalin's *Economic Problems Of Socialism In The USSR*

[SOURCE: *Long Live Mao Zedong Thought*, a Red Guard Publication.]

[Stalin's book](#) from first to last says nothing about the superstructure. It is not concerned with people; it considers things, not people. Does the kind of supply system for consumer goods help spur economic development or not? He should have touched on this at the least. Is it better to have commodity production or is it better not to? Everyone has to study this. Stalin's point of view in his last letter^[*] is almost altogether wrong. The basic error is mistrust of the peasants.

Parts of the first, second, and third chapters are correct; other parts could have been clearer. For example, the discussion on planned economy is not complete. The rate of development of the Soviet economy is not high enough, although it is faster than the capitalists' rate. Relations between agriculture and industry, as well as between light and heavy industry, are not clearly explained.

It looks as if they have had serious losses. The relationship between long- and short-term interests has not seen any spectacular developments. They walk on one leg, we walk on two. They believe that technology decides everything, that cadres decide everything, speaking only of "expert," never of "red," only of the cadres, never of the masses. This is walking on one leg. As far as heavy industry goes, they have failed to find the primary contradiction, calling steel the foundation, machinery the heart and innards, coal the food. . . . For us steel is the mainstay, the primary contradiction in industry, while foodgrains are the mainstay in agriculture. Other things develop proportionally.

In the first chapter he discusses grasping the laws, but without proposing a method. On commodity production and the law of value he has a number of views that we approve of ourselves, but there are problems as well. Limiting commodity production to the means of subsistence is really rather doubtful. Mistrust of the peasants is the basic viewpoint of the third letter. Essentially, Stalin did not discover a way to make the transition from collective to public ownership. Commodity production and exchange are forms we have kept, while in connection with the law of value we must speak of planning and at the same time politics-in-command. They speak only of the production relations, not of the superstructure nor politics, nor the role of the people. Communism cannot be reached unless there is a communist movement. [\[**\]](#)

1. These comrades . . . it is evident . . . confuse laws of science, which reflect objective processes in nature or society, processes which take place independently of the will of man, with the laws which are issued by governments, which are made by the will of man, and which have only juridical validity. But they must not be confused.

1. This principle is basically correct, but two things are wrong: first, the conscious activity of the party and the masses is not sufficiently brought out; second, it is not comprehensive enough in that it fails to explain that what makes government decrees correct is not only that they emerge from the will of the working class but also the fact that they faithfully reflect the imperatives of objective economic laws.

2. Leaving aside astronomical, geological, and other similar processes, which man really is powerless to influence, even if he has come to know the laws of their development. . . .

2. This argument is wrong. Human knowledge and the capability to transform nature have no limit. Stalin did not consider these matters developmentally. What cannot now be done, may be done in the future.

3. The same must be said of the laws of economic development, the laws of political economy — whether in the period of capitalism or in the period of socialism. Here, too, the laws of economic development, as in the case of natural science, are objective laws, reflecting processes of economic development which take place independently of the will of man.

3. How do we go about planning the economy? There is not enough attention given to light industry, to agriculture.

4. That is why Engels says in the same book: “The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to, and dominating, him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him.” ([Anti-Dühring](#))

4. Freedom is necessary objective law understood by people. Such law confronts people, is independent of them. But once people understand it, they can control it.

5. The specific role of Soviet government was due to two circumstances: first, that what Soviet government had to do was not to replace one form of exploitation by another, as was the case in earlier revolutions, but to abolish exploitation altogether; second, that in view of the absence in the country of any ready made rudiments of a socialist economy, it had to create new, socialist forms of economy, “starting from scratch,” so to speak.

5. The inevitability of socialist economic laws — that is something that needs to be studied. At the Ch’engtu Conference I said that we would have to see whether or not our general program (“More! Faster! Better! More economically!” the three concurrent promotions, and the mass line) would flop;[\[1\]](#) or if it could succeed. This can not be demonstrated for several or even as many as ten years. The laws of the revolution, which used to be doubted by some, have now been proved correct because the enemy has been overthrown. Can socialist construction work? People still have doubts. Does our Chinese practice conform to the economic laws of China? This has to be studied. My view is that if the practice conforms generally, things will be all right.

6. This [creating new, socialist forms of economy “from scratch”] was undoubtedly a difficult, complex, and unprecedented task.

6. With respect to the creating of socialist economic forms we have the precedent of the Soviet Union and for this reason should do a bit better than they. If we ruin things it will show that Chinese Marxism does not work. As to the difficulty and complexity of the tasks, things are no different from what the Soviet Union faced.

7. It is said that the necessity for balanced (proportionate) development of the national economy in our country enables the Soviet government to abolish existing economic laws and to create new ones. That is absolutely untrue. Our yearly and five-yearly plans must not be confused with the objective economic law of balanced, proportionate development of the national economy.

7. This is the crux of the matter.

8. That means that the law of balanced development of the national economy makes it *possible* for our planning bodies to plan social production correctly. But *possibility* must not be confused with *actuality*. They are two different things. In order to turn the possibility into actuality, it is necessary to study this economic law, to master it, to learn to apply it with full understanding, and to compile such plans as fully reflect the requirements of this law. It cannot be said that the requirements of this economic law are fully reflected by our yearly and five-yearly plans.

8. The central point of this passage is that we must not confuse the objective law of planned proportionate development with planning. In the past we too devised plans, but they frequently caused a storm. Too much! Too little! Blindly we bumped into things, never sure of the best way. Only after suffering tortuous lessons, moving in U-shaped patterns, everyone racking their brains to think of answers, did we hit upon the forty-article agricultural program which we are now putting into effect. And we are in the

midst of devising a new forty articles. After another three years' bitter struggle we will develop further; after full and sufficient discussions we will again proceed. Can we make it a reality? It remains to be proved in objective practice. We worked on industry for eight years but did not realize that we had to take steel as the mainstay. This was the principal aspect of the contradiction in industry. It was monism. Among the large, the medium, and the small, we take the large as the mainstay; between the center and the regions, the center. Of the two sides of any contradiction one is the principal side. As important as eight years' achievements are, we were feeling our way along, nonetheless. It cannot be said that our planning of production was entirely correct, that it entirely reflected the objective laws. Planning is done by the whole party, not simply the planning committee or the economics committee, but by all levels; everyone is involved. In this passage Stalin is theoretically correct. But there is not yet a finely detailed analysis, nor even the beginnings of a clear explanation. The Soviets did not distinguish among the large, the medium, and the small, the region and the center; nor did they promote concurrently industry and agriculture. They have not walked on two legs at all. Their rules and regulations hamstrung people. But we have not adequately studied and grasped our situation, and as a result our plans have not fully reflected objective laws either.

9. Let us examine Engels' formula. Engels' formula cannot be considered fully clear and precise, because it does not indicate whether it is referring to the seizure by society of *all* or only part of the means of production; that is, whether *all* or only part of the means of production are converted into public property. Hence, *this* formula of Engels' may be understood either way.

9. This analysis touches the essentials! The problem is dividing the means of production into two parts. To say the means of production are not commodities deserves study.

10. In this section, Commodity Production Under Socialism, Stalin has not comprehensively set forth the conditions for the existence of commodities. The existence of two kinds of ownership is the main premise for commodity production. But ultimately commodity production is also related to the productive forces. For this reason, even under completely socialized public ownership, commodity exchange will still have to be operative in some areas.

11. It follows from this that Engels has in mind countries where capitalism and the concentration of production have advanced far enough both in industry and agriculture to permit the expropriation of *all* the means of production in the country and their conversion into public property. Engels, consequently, considers that in *such* countries, parallel with the socialization of all the means of production, commodity production should be put an end to. And that, of course, is correct.

11. Stalin's analysis of Engels' formula is correct. At present there is a strong tendency to do away with commodity production. People get upset the minute they see commodity production, taking it for capitalism itself. But it looks as if commodity production will have to be greatly developed and the money supply increased for the sake of the solidarity of several hundred million peasants. This poses a problem for the ideology of

several hundred thousand cadres as well as for the solidarity of several hundred million peasants. We now possess only a part of the means of production. But it appears that there are those who wish to declare at once ownership by the whole people, divesting the small and medium producers. But they fail to declare the category of ownership! Is it to be commune-owned or county-owned? To abolish commodities and commodity production in this way, merely by declaring public ownership, is to strip the peasantry. At the end of 1955, procurement and purchase got us almost 90 billion catties of grain, causing us no little trouble. Everyone was talking about food, and household after household was talking about unified purchase. But it was purchase, after all, not allocation. Only later did the crisis ease when we made the decision to make this 83 billion catties of grain. I cannot understand why people have forgotten these things so promptly.

12. I leave aside in this instance the question of the importance of foreign trade to Britain and the vast part it plays in her national economy. I think that only after an investigation of this question can it be finally decided what would be the future [fate] of commodity production in Britain after the proletariat had assumed power and *all* the means of production had been nationalized.

12. Fate depends on whether or not commodity production is abolished.

13. But here is a question: What are the proletariat and its party to do in countries, ours being a case in point, where the conditions are favorable for the assumption of power by the proletariat and the overthrow of capitalism [where capitalism has so concentrated the means of production in industry that they may be expropriated and made the property of society, but where agriculture, notwithstanding the growth of capitalism, is divided up among numerous small and medium owner-producers to such an extent as to make it impossible to consider the expropriation of these producers?][***] . . . [This] would throw the peasantry into the camp of the enemies of the proletariat for a long time.

13. In sum, the principle governing commodity production was not grasped. Chinese economists are Marxist-Leninist as far as book learning goes. But when they encounter economic practice Marxism-Leninism gets shortchanged. Their thinking is confused. If we make mistakes we will lead the peasantry to the enemy side.

14. Lenin's answer may be briefly summed up as follows: (a). Favorable conditions for the assumption of power should not be missed — the proletariat should assume power without waiting until capitalism has succeeded in ruining the millions of small and medium individual producers;

15(b). The means of production in industry should be expropriated and converted into public property;

16(c). As to the small and medium individual producers, they should be gradually united in producers' cooperatives, i.e., in large agricultural enterprises, collective farms;

17(d). Industry should be developed to the utmost and the collective farms should be placed on the modern technical basis of large-scale production, not expropriating them, but on the contrary generously supplying them with first-class tractors and other machines;

18(e). In order to ensure an economic bond between town and country, between industry and agriculture, commodity production (exchange through purchase and sale) should be preserved for a certain period, it being the form of economic tie with the town which is *alone acceptable* to the peasants, and Soviet trade — state, cooperative, and collective-farm — should be developed to the full and the capitalists of all types and descriptions ousted from trading activity.

The history of socialist construction in our country has shown that this path of development, mapped out by Lenin, has fully justified itself.

19. There can be no doubt that in the case of all capitalist countries with a more or less numerous class of small and medium producers, this path of development is the only possible and expedient one for the victory of socialism.

14. This passage has a correct analysis. Take conditions in China. There is development. These five points are all correct.

15. Our policy toward the national bourgeoisie has been to redeem their property.

16. We are developing the people's communes on an ever larger scale.

17. This is precisely what we are doing now.

18. There are those who want no commodity production, but they are wrong. On commodity production we still have to take it from Stalin, who, in turn, got it from Lenin. Lenin had said to devote the fullest energies to developing commerce. We would rather say, devote the fullest energies to developing industry, agriculture, and commerce. The essence of the problem is the peasant question. There are those who regard the peasant as even more conscious than the workers. We have carried through or are in the process of carrying through on these five items. Some areas still have to be developed, such as commune-run industry or concurrent promotion of industry and agriculture.

19. Lenin said the same thing.

20. Commodity production must not be regarded as something sufficient unto itself, something independent of the surrounding economic conditions. Commodity production is older than capitalist production. It existed in slave-owning society, and served it, but did not lead to capitalism. It existed in feudal society and served it, yet, although it prepared some of the conditions for capitalist production, it did not lead to capitalism.

21. Bearing in mind that in our country commodity production is not so boundless and all-embracing as it is under capitalist

22. conditions, being confined within strict bounds thanks to such decisive economic conditions as social ownership of the means of production, the abolition of the system of wage labor, and the elimination of the

23. system of exploitation, why then, one asks, cannot commodity production similarly serve our socialist society for a certain period without leading to capitalism?

20. This statement is a little exaggerated. But it is true that commodity production was not a capitalist institution exclusively.

21. The second plenary session of the Central Committee suggested policies of utilizing, restricting, and transforming (commodity production.)

22. This condition is fully operative in China.

23. This point is entirely correct. We no longer have such circumstances and conditions. There are those who fear commodities. Without exception they fear capitalism, not realizing that with the elimination of capitalists it is allowable to expand commodity production vastly. We are still backward in commodity production, behind Brazil and India. Commodity production is not an isolated thing. Look at the context: capitalism or socialism. In a capitalist context it is capitalist commodity production. In a socialist context it is socialist commodity production. Commodity production has existed since ancient times. Buying and selling began in what history calls the Shang [“commerce”] dynasty. The last king of the Shang dynasty, Chou, was competent in civil and military matters, but he was turned into a villain along with the first emperor of the Ch’in[2] and Ts’ao Ts’ao.[3] This is wrong. “Better to have no books than complete faith in them.”[****] In capitalist society there are no socialist institutions considered as social institutions, but the working class and socialist ideology do exist in capitalist society. The thing that determines commodity production is the surrounding economic conditions. The question is, can commodity production be regarded as a useful instrument for furthering socialist production? I think commodity production will serve socialism quite tamely. This can be discussed among the cadres.

24. It is said that, since the domination of social ownership of the means of production has been established in our country, and the system of wage labor and exploitation has been abolished, commodity production has lost all meaning and should therefore be done away with.

24. Change “our country” to “China” and it becomes most intriguing.

25. Today there are two basic forms of socialist production in our country: state, or publicly owned production, and collective farm production, which cannot be said to be publicly owned.

25. "Today" refers to 1952, thirty-five years after their revolution. We stand but nine years from ours.

He refers to two basic forms. In the communes not only land and machinery but labor, seeds, and other means of production as well are commune-owned. Thus the output is so owned. But don't think the Chinese peasants are so wonderfully advanced. In Hsiuwu county, Honan, the party secretary was concerned whether or not, in the event of flood or famine, the state would pay wages after public ownership was declared and the free supply system instituted. He was also concerned that in times of bumper harvest the state would transfer away public grain but not pay wages either, leaving the peasants to suffer whether the harvest succeeds or fails. This represents the concerns of the peasants. Marxists should be concerned with these problems. Our commodity production should be developed to the fullest, but it is going to take fifteen years or more and patience as well. We have waged war for decades. Now we still have to have patience, to wait for Taiwan's liberation, to wait for socialist construction to be going well. Don't hope for early victories!

26. [How the two basic forms of ownership will ultimately become one] is a special question which requires separate discussion.

26. Stalin is avoiding the issue, having failed to find a method or suitable formulation [on the transition from collective to public ownership.]

27. Consequently, *our* commodity production is not of the ordinary type, but is a special kind of commodity production, commodity production without capitalists, which is concerned mainly with the goods of associated socialist producers (the state, the collective farms, the cooperatives), the sphere of action of which is confined to items of personal consumption, which obviously cannot possibly develop into capitalist production, and which, together with its "money economy," is designed to serve the development and consolidation of socialist production.

27. The "sphere of action" is not limited to items of individual consumption. Some means of production have to be classed as commodities. If agricultural output consists of commodities but industrial output does not, then how is exchange going to be carried out? If "our country" is changed to "China," the paragraph becomes all the more interesting to read. In China not only consumer goods but agricultural means of production have to be supplied. Stalin never sold means of production to the peasants. Khrushchev changed that.

28. (Chairman Mao commented on page 13 of the original text): Let us not confuse the problem of the dividing line between socialism and communism with the problem of the dividing line between collective and public ownership. The collective ownership system leaves us with the problem of commodity production, the goal of which is consolidating the worker-peasant alliance and developing production. Today there are those who say that the communism of the peasants is glorious. After one trip to the rural areas they think the peasantry is simply wonderful, that they are about to enter paradise, that they are

better than the workers. This is the surface phenomenon. We shall have to see if the peasants really have a communist spirit, and more than that, we shall have to examine the commune ownership system, including the extent to which the means of production and subsistence belong to communal collective ownership. As the county party committee secretary of Hsiuwu, Honan, said, we still have to develop commodity production, and not charge blindly ahead.

29. Further, I think that we must also discard certain other concepts taken from Marx's *Capital* — where Marx was concerned with an analysis of capitalism — and artificially applied to our socialist relations. . . . It is natural that Marx used concepts (categories) which fully corresponded to capitalist relations. But it is strange, to say the

30. least, to use these concepts now, when the working class is not only not bereft of power and means of production, but, on the contrary, is in possession of the power

31. and controls the means of production. Talk of labor power being a commodity, and of "hiring" of workers sounds rather absurd now, under our system, as though the working class, which possesses means of production, hires itself and sells its labor power to itself.

29. In particular, the means of production in the industrial sector.

30. Commodity production has to be vastly developed, not for profits but for the peasantry, the agricultural-industrial alliance, and the development of production.

31. Especially after rectification. After the rectification and anti-rightist campaigns labor power was no longer a commodity. It was in the service of the people, not the dollar. The labor power question is not resolved until labor power is no longer a commodity.

32. It is sometimes asked whether the law of value exists and operates in our country, under the socialist system.

32. The law of value does not have a regulative function. Planning and politics-in-command play that role.

33. True, the law of value has no regulating function in our socialist production.

33. In our society the law of value has no regulative function, that is, has no determinative function. Planning determines production, e.g., for hogs or steel we do not use the law of value; we rely on planning.

[References given here have been compiled from sources other than the Maoist Documentation Project as well. — *Transcriber, MIA.*]

[1] Mao is here talking about the excessive purchase of grain at the end of 1954 and the consequent rural grain shortages in the spring of 1955. Subsequently, the quota for state purchases was reduced by 7 billion catties and tension in the countryside eased. These occurrences, however, took place in the spring of 1955, not at the end of that year, which was characterized by the continuing high tide of collectivization in China's countryside.

[2] Ch'in Shih Huang Ti (Qin Shi Huangdi), the first emperor, was a king of the state of Ch'in who, between 230 and 221 B.C., conquered the neighboring states and unified China. Under his rule, a feudal system was established, weights and measures and coinage were standardized. The legalist philosophy was the philosophical basis of the Ch'in. The first emperor is remembered for his burning of all non-utilitarian, "subversive" literature in 213 B.C.

[3] Ts'ao Ts'ao (Cao Cao) was a famous general and chancellor of the latter Han dynasty (25-220 A.D.) who played a significant role in the wars which finally toppled the Han and led to the epoch of divided empire called the three kingdoms.

[*] Reply to comrades A. V. Sanina and V. G. Venzher.

[**] These first four paragraphs comment critically on the entire text. There follows a series of comments criticizing specific sections. Before each comment Stalin's original text is given, as translated for *Jen min ch'u pan she*, 3rd ed., January 1938. [This is an obvious misprint; it should be 1958: *Transcriber's note.*] (We used the English edition of Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1972).

[***] Material in brackets added from Stalin's text to clarify the point.

[****] Mencius. Mao seems to mean "Let's not make a stock villain out of commodity production pedantically."