

## RED FLAG ESSAY SCORES USSR'S 'NEW ARISTOCRATS'

Peking NCNA in English 0720 GMT 9 Jul 76 OW

[Text] Peking, July 9, 1976 (HSINHUA)--This year's 7th issue of the journal RED FLAG carries an essay entitled "New Aristocrats Who Refuse to Be the Equal of Workers" by Fan I-ping on the Soviet play "From the Life of a Businesslike Woman". Excerpts from the essay read: In recent years, a "businesslike woman" called Anna Georgievna has been in the limelight of the theatre in the Soviet Union. She received lavish praise from Brezhnev in his report at the 35th Congress of the Soviet revisionist party. What made Brezhnev speak so highly of this woman? The reason is that this "businesslike woman" is exceptionally competent to the work of carrying out Brezhnev's counter-revolutionary line.

This "businesslike woman" is the director of a textile mill with a history of 140 years. When a workshop fails to fulfil its plan, she orders workers of all workshops to work overtime on holidays. When a worker does not submit himself to her regulations and rules, she rebukes, ridicules and abuses him and even threatens to withdraw his apartment house and sack him. In her relations with workers, she considers herself as the ruler. When Mania Valeeva and other veteran workers demand equality in housing allotments, she reads Mania a lecture: "No, Mania, we are not all equal. I'm not your equal. Don't feel offended. We had been equal before, but latter... I studied in a technical school for four years and in a college for another five and a half years. As a result, we have become unequal. Isn't it right? But you know that my rights are neither obtained by succession nor won in a lottery. Rights are the same to us all."

As known to all, Brezhnev has repeatedly boasted that in the Soviet Union, which is already under "the condition of developed socialism", "there are no antagonistic classes and exploitation", and that a "new, harmonious relationship" prevails everywhere. However, the competent woman director favoured by Brezhnev comes out openly with her dogma of doggedly defending her "inequality" with workers.

In the Soviet Union today, a handful of **bureaucrat-monopoly capitalists control the state** power and means of production, manipulate the distribution of social products and subsequently, rule the fate of workers. There is a new exploiting class formed of those up from the party general secretary, through the ministers down to the managers and directors of all enterprises. The relationship between them and Soviet workers has become one between oppressors and the oppressed and between exploiters and the exploited. Lenin put it well in his essay "The State": "So long as there is exploitation there cannot be equality. The landlord cannot be the equal of the worker, or the hungry man the equal of the full man." How can Anna living in a modern, high-class house and enjoying the right to oppress workers, be the equal of Mania living in a "barracks" of the 19th Century? In this sense, Anna is far more frank than Brezhnev.

What provides much food for thought is that Anna was a member of the working class and "once the equal" of the worker. How did "equality" turn into "inequality"? The change took place simply after she "studied in a technical school for four years and in a college for another five and a half years". It means that when one has received higher education, one cannot be the equal of the worker, should be raised from the position of being the equal of the worker to the position of a bigwig ruling over the workers and naturally, must enjoy all kinds of privileges. Under the rule of the revisionist new tsars, culture and knowledge, science and technology in the Soviet Union have all become commercialized.

To turn knowledge into a tool of placing people under domination and oppression is not anything created by Anna or discovered by Brezhnev, but represents a common feature of all exploiting classes both ancient and modern. As Lenin pointed out, in the capitalist society, the antithesis between mental and physical labour has become "one of the principal sources of modern social inequality". The duty of the proletariat revolution is to eliminate such inequality.

Another reason why Anna has become a great favourite of Brezhnev's is that both of them take higher education as a stepping-stone by which they can ride roughshod over the workers and peasants.

The capitalist readers inside the party are the most dangerous enemies of the proletariat. When opportunity arises, they usurp the power of the party and state, and restore capitalism in an all-round way. Cherishing a deep-seated hatred for workers, these new bourgeois elements suppress and exploit the people more ruthlessly than the old-line capitalists did. On the surface, their rights, as Anna argued, are not obtained "by secession". But their right of inheritance is safeguarded and upheld by the Soviet revisionist educational and social system. In order to be a high-ranking official, one must have a higher education. A higher education is the prerequisite to a high post. In his report to the 35th Party Congress, Brezhnev boasted that "at present, 99.5 per cent of the secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties, and the territorial and regional committees of the party have a higher education, and more than 70 per cent of them have engineering technical and agricultural training... Among the secretaries of city and district committees 99.2 per cent have a higher education, with 60 per cent of them specialists in industry and agriculture. This line should be further pursued with even greater persistence."

Anna is a natural production of this **counterrevolutionary** line and at the same time its fanatical pursuer. It is through this "businesslike woman" Anna and her doctrine of inequality the proletariat and the revolutionary people all over the world have come to see the harsh truth of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union and have come to realize that "this line" which Brezhnev vowed to pursue "with even greater persistence" means paradise for a handful of new aristocrats and hell for the labouring people.

The lesson of the Soviet Union going revisionist teaches us that after seizing power, the proletariat should not only carry out socialist revolution in the economic field, but also persist in exercising all-round dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure including all fields of culture. Because of the unavoidable existence of the differences between town and country, between worker and peasant and between mental and manual labour and the bourgeois right in a socialist society, there exists actual inequality between the intellectuals of higher learning and the masses of workers and peasants. These are vestiges of capitalism.

Around this inequality evolves an acute struggle between the two classes and the two lines: whether to restrict, reduce and create conditions to eliminate it step by step or to extol and expand it. Teng Hsiao-ping's line is in class nature identical with that of Brezhnev's. One may read this play if he wants to know what China would become if Teng Hsiao-ping succeeded in his plot.