

Mao Tsetung Thought Vs. Hoxha's Hollow Hatchetry

In Enver Hoxha's recently published counter-revolutionary book, Imperialism and the Revolution, he uses the method of superficial characterization and shoddy distortion to launch a barrage of slanderous attacks on the Marxist-Leninist line of Mao Tsetung. Hoxha tries to characterize Mao as a common liberal whose line defended and favored the bourgeoisie and capitalism and kept China from achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat and proceeding on the road of construction of socialism. In the January issue of Revolution we put forward our basic stand on Hoxha's book, based on the Albanian press release announcing its publication and summarizing its contents. Now we have seen the book itself, and although it offers no more profound analysis than did the eclectic and slipshod press release, we intend to analyze it and answer it more thoroughly in the future.

For now, however, to help refute Hoxha's slander we are simply printing some Chinese writings from the revolutionary Left which upheld and fought for Mao's line. They shed some light on what, in fact, Mao's line was—as it was forged and developed in the heat of intense class struggle against revisionism and the bourgeoisie inside China.

The first document, "On the Bourgeoisie in the Socialist Period" appeared on July 14, 1976 in the Shanghai journal Study and Criticism (now banned as a "mouthpiece of the 'gang of four'.") It deals with the development of the class struggle in China through various stages of the revolution, first in the transition period from the new democratic to the socialist revolution. It shows how, especially with the socialist transformation of ownership, the main focus of the class struggle against the bourgeoisie shifts from the old bourgeoisie to the new,

engendered bourgeoisie and particularly to the capitalist roaders inside the Communist Party itself.

The second piece is excerpted from the Chinese pamphlet Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front (1949-64), published in 1973. These excerpts come from the article, "The Theory of 'Synthesized Economic Base' Must Be Thoroughly Criticized." It deals with the struggle led by Mao against those in China who wanted to establish the domination of capitalism and the bourgeoisie under the banner of prolonging and consolidating the stage of new democracy. This bourgeois line, which Hoxha shamelessly tries to pin on Mao Tsetung, is exactly the line which Mao opposed and fought tooth and nail and made major practical and theoretical contributions to Marxism-Leninism in doing so.

On the Bourgeoisie in the Socialist Period

by Kang Li, Reprinted from *Study and Criticism*, No. 7, July 14, 1976

During the democratic revolution period there was the distinction between the comprador big bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. With changes in class relations under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the socialist period came new changes within the ranks of the bourgeoisie. In the present stage in China there are both old and new bourgeoisie while those Party persons in power taking the capitalist road are political representatives of the bourgeoisie, both old and new, inside the Party. To clearly recognize the nature, target, tasks and future of the socialist revolution, we must probe into the bourgeoisie's present condition.

First, take a look at the changes the old bourgeoisie has undergone. After the whole country was liberated, the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie suffered annihilating blows. However, the national bourgeoisie and its parties still maintained definite positions and strength both politically and economically. They stubbornly resisted the Party policy of using, restricting and remolding them, vainly trying to develop capitalism with "freedom." With the basic completion of socialist transformation of private industry and commerce in 1956, the bourgeoisie lost heart. In order to regain their lost paradise, the Rightist elements among them, such as Chang po-chun and Lo Lung-chi, openly became bourgeois oppositionists

with the coordination and support of the capitalist roaders in the Party to engage in a direct trial of strength with the proletariat. The great anti-Rightist struggle struck a heavy blow at this handful of reactionaries, making it difficult for this section of people among the bourgeoisie to openly gather together again to reenact the farce of "Chang-Lo alliance." Despite their odious character and continuous attempts to poison people with decadent bourgeois notions and way of life, they could be easily recognized by the brand of old vampire stamped on their bottoms. As regards the bourgeois intellectuals, a section of them achieved varying degrees of progress after having gone through successive political movements since liberation. However, quite a number of them continued to cling to the reactionary bourgeois stand and world outlook and make capital of their knowledge of culture, science and technology, vainly trying to resist the socialist revolution and use various ways to bring up their own successors for a continuing trial of strength with the proletariat.

Then, let us look at the new bourgeoisie, a group of newborn bourgeois elements in the socialist period. Long before cooperativization, there were new property holders and new rich peasants thriving on speculation and exploitation. They were engendered not only from a section of workers and government

functionaries, but were also engendered constantly and in large numbers from small producers. Responding to and colluding with landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad people and Rightists, they engaged in corruption and stealing, speculation and manipulation, and perpetrated every misdeed. It is quite easy to discern this category of newly born bourgeois elements. Another category of new bourgeois elements are of good family origin, matured under the red flag and joined the Party; having received university education, they become so-called Red experts and leading cadres. However, they have turned bourgeois from thinking to living. They regard as their creed and maxim such bourgeois notions as "science is supreme," "knowledge is private property," "go to school to become an official," "join the Party to become an official" and "proficiency in mathematics, physics and chemistry will fill one in any niche." When the bourgeois Rightists launched attacks on the Party in 1957, Liu Shao-tang, a Rightist element who vowed "to fight for 10,000 yuan in writing fee," was a typical example. A number of people in the Lin Piao anti-Party clique, such as Lin Li-ko and his little "fleet," also belonged to this category of newly engendered bourgeois and counter-revolutionary elements. Politically, they were as rapacious as the double-dealers and

upstarts when seeking to seize the means of production they did not have before and were particularly anxious to swallow up all the wealth belonging to the state or the collective. The ruthlessness with which they resorted to whatever means at their disposal was beyond the reach of even the old generation of capitalists.

As regards the bourgeoisie inside the Party, some of them are secret agents, renegades and alien class elements who sneaked into the Party and some are former bourgeois democrats who joined the revolutionary ranks of the proletariat. However, most of them are newly engendered bourgeois elements. As political representatives of the bourgeoisie, old and new, the Party persons in power taking the capitalist road are as fanatical as the old bourgeoisie who vainly tried to regain its lost paradise and as adventurous as the new bourgeois elements, thus combining the former's craftiness with the latter's insatiable greed. This reflects in a concentrated way the class characteristics of the bourgeoisie in the socialist period.

The principal contradiction in the socialist period is that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Because the bourgeoisie outside the Party is in the position of the ruled and as a result of the changes in the balance of class forces with the deepening of the socialist revolution, it has become rather difficult for them to push out their front men to engage the proletariat in an open trial of strength. In these circumstances the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie finds increasing expression in the Party. The bourgeoisie inside the Party and the Party persons in power taking the capitalist road thus become the force at the core of the bourgeoisie as a whole, being commanders of all social forces and groups opposed to the socialist revolution and engaged in a trial of strength with the proletariat. The bourgeois headquarters is located inside the Party, not outside, it. Our struggles against opportunist chieftains such as Kao Kan, P'eng Te-huai, Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping are all struggles waged against the bourgeoisie inside the Party.

In old China the comprador big bourgeoisie represented the most backward and reactionary relations of production which seriously hampered the development of productive forces in the country. This position has today been taken over by the bourgeoisie inside the Party. The capitalist roaders are the representatives of decadent capitalist relations of production. Those "high officials" who practice revisionism like Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping hold a very large portion of the Party and state power and are in a position to formulate and push a counter-revolutionary revisionist line in the name of the "state," the "Party," the "higher-ups" and the "leadership," in a determined bid to turn the instruments of the dictatorship of the proletariat into those of the bourgeois dictatorship and to carry out oppression of and impose a white terror on the workers, peasants, soldiers, students and minor officials. Therefore, as early as the socialist education movement Chairman Mao sharply pointed out: "Those leading cadres who are taking

the capitalist road have turned, or are turning, into bourgeois elements sucking blood of the workers."

Why is it that in socialist society the bourgeoisie is engendered inside the Party? What makes it possible for the bourgeoisie to continue to exist and to arise? Economically speaking, it is due to the existence of bourgeois rights, which in terms of ownership in the socialist period have not been completely abolished. They still persist in a considerable degree in respect of men's interrelations and dominate the area of distribution. Thus bourgeois rights protect the old bourgeoisie as well as conceiving and nurturing the new.

Bourgeois rights mainly embrace the commodity system, exchange through money, distribution according to work, the eight-grade wage scale, and so forth. In view of the existence in socialist society of two types of socialist ownership, ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, it is still necessary to enforce the commodity system. With the exception of those capital goods and social products that are placed under state unified planning and allocation and certain items distributed according to need, exchange of commodities and exchange through money that are not much different from those of the old society are still practiced between and within the systems of ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between the state, the collective and the individual, and practically in every segment of socio-economic life. Of course, with changes in the ownership systems, China's commodity system is restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat, not aimed at obtaining surplus value. Nevertheless, it is still the economic basis for generating capitalism. Lenin pointed out: "The bourgeoisie is engendered from commodity production." ("The Seventh Congress of All-Russia Soviets") As long as the commodity system still exists in socialist society and the principle of commodity exchange continues to operate the possibility of capitalist restoration inevitably exists. Prior to the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the old bourgeois elements continued to draw fixed interest, enjoyed higher wages, and had more commodities and money. Pinning their hopes on those bourgeois rights that had not been abolished, they strongly demanded and extended bourgeois rights. New bourgeois elements were hatched in large numbers from the commodity system. They either turned public property into private, engaged in corruption and stealing, and took into their own possession money and commodities that belonged to the people or engaged in speculation and manipulation to obtain excessive profits, or turned commodities and money into capital, treated labor power as commodity and directly carried out capitalist exploitation. This inevitably led to polarization. If it is said that the first generation of the bourgeoisie was born of commodity production several hundred years ago, then at the present stage the last generation of the bourgeoisie will also be begotten from commodities.

The most dangerous enemies are the Party persons in power taking the capitalist road.

Pushing the revisionist line is the most basic political characteristic of capitalist roaders. They extend and strengthen bourgeois rights and strive to apply the principle of commodity exchange to all spheres. Preaching "profit in command" and "production value first," they use the capitalist law of value to abolish planned economy and replace socialist production goals with capitalist production goals. This in essence alters the nature of socialist ownership. When it comes to enterprise management, they twist Chairman Mao's instruction "management itself is a matter of socialist education." They have never referred to the workers as masters of factories and enterprises, avoid mentioning such questions as the need for cadres to practice "three-togetherness" with the workers and to learn from them, let alone the sharp antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie inside the Party. They impose "control, check and repression" on the workers and turn the relationships between the leadership and the masses and between the higher and lower levels into relationships between the cat and the mouse and between the ruler and the ruled in a vain attempt to restore the capitalist system of wage labor. They practice "material incentives" and the "bonus system" not only to enable the few privileged people to swallow up conveniently large amounts of social wealth but to corrupt the broad laboring masses and turn the relations between men into commodity and cash relations between the buyer and the seller. In the political and ideological spheres, they also attend to all things according to the principle of commodity exchange. They regard themselves as commodities and look upon participation in the revolution as "stock-purchase" and ask for their "share of dividend" on the basis of "merit," "sweat labor" and "fatigue" in a bid to upgrade themselves as commodities to be sold to the proletariat at a higher price. They promise high official posts and offer rewards on the basis of merit, substituting the principle of commodity exchange for the Party's organizational principle. In short, they personify commodities and capital in the same way the past capitalists did, everything existing for the sake of commodities. When their economic and political strength develops to a certain stage, they will demand the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system, and restore the capitalist system openly and in an all-round manner.

Whether to restrict or extend and strengthen bourgeois rights is a vital aspect of the struggle between Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and the revisionist line. If the proletariat fails to adopt effective measures to restrict bourgeois rights during the socialist period, these rights will undermine and disintegrate the socialist economic base and alter the nature of the socialist system of ownership. At the present stage, however, we can only restrict but not abolish bourgeois rights. As long as social class divisions and the three major differences still exist, as long as labor has not become people's "prime need of life" and as long as productive forces have not developed to the extent of providing an abundance of social products,

it will still be necessary to continue to practice or even protect bourgeois rights that embrace the commodity system, exchange through money and distribution according to work. Since we have built such a bourgeois state without capitalists, restricting the commodity system in no way means not to develop commodity production. In our country commodities are not plentiful; we don't have a great abundance of them. However, we now develop commodity production for the purpose of eventually abolishing it, and the defects that arise in the course of developing commodity production must be restricted with appropriate measures so as to prevent the principle of commodity exchange from eroding the socialist economic base, the political life and even Party life. We must therefore pay full attention to questions related to interrelations and the superstructure, particularly work of carrying out education in the ideological and political line. This means at the moment we must criticize Teng. Practice proves that in those units or departments where bourgeois rights are not sufficiently taken to task the bourgeois wind prevails to hamper the criticism of Teng and stall the study of the theory of proletarian dictatorship.

Lenin pointed out: **"Between capitalism and communism is a transition period and in theory this is beyond any doubt. This transition period cannot but embody the characteristics or traits of these two types of socio-economic structure. It cannot but be a period of struggle between moribund capitalism and nascent communism, in other words, a period of struggle between defeated**

but not yet eliminated capitalism and the already born but still very fragile communism." (*Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*) Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, bourgeois rights reflect moribund capitalism while socialist new things represent growing communism. Direct participation of worker-peasant masses in management and formation of revolutionary committees combining the old, the middle-aged and the young; "May 7" cadre schools and cadre participation in collective productive labor to give impetus to the reform of state organs; sending tens of millions of educated youths to mountainous and rural areas to integrate with worker-peasant masses; the appearance of large numbers of barefoot doctors and the widespread introduction of the cooperative medical service—these communist shoots restrict bourgeois rights from various aspects, sweeping away the traces of capitalism left over from the old society and promoting the vigorous development of socialist revolution and construction on all fronts. Even now the issue of two kinds of future and fate, that is, whether socialist society, which is in the process of motion of contradictions, should advance toward communism or retreat back to capitalism, has not been finally decided. Here, the key question is whether or not there is a correct ideological and political line. Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line reflects the objective law of socialism passing over to communism, and provides the fundamental guarantee for eventually realizing com-

munist. On the other hand, the revisionist line pushed by Liu Shao-chi, Lin Biao and Teng Hsiao-ping represents the decaying capitalist relations of production and embodies the desire of the bourgeoisie as a whole to restore capitalism. The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie. It is imperative for us to adhere to the Party's basic line, study the theory of proletarian dictatorship well, wholeheartedly support socialist new things, continuously criticize and restrict bourgeois rights, and fulfill the task of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat in every factory, village, government office and school.

In analyzing and comparing the various wings of the bourgeoisie, we can clearly see that the object of the socialist revolution is the bourgeoisie, with those Party persons in power taking the capitalist road as the main target. In making socialist revolution, we should not only be aware of the existence of the old bourgeoisie and its intellectuals in society at large, but also should pay attention to the birth of new bourgeois elements. We should in particular recognize the capitalist roaders inside the Party as the main danger for subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, we must always bear firmly in mind Chairman Mao's teaching: **"You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party—those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road."** ■

The Theory of "Synthesized Economic Base" Must Be Thoroughly Criticized

Reprinted from "Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front (1949-64)"

Shortly after the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, Liu Shao-chi instigated Yang Hsien-chen, his agent in the philosophical circles, to put out a theory of "synthesized economic base," starting a major struggle on China's philosophical front. It was a struggle of principle concerning the road China was to take, the socialist or the capitalist, whether China was to have a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie...

Product of the Counter-Revolutionary Revisionist Line

The founding of the People's Republic heralded a new era in China, that of the socialist revolution and the proletarian dictatorship.

In his Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in March 1949, Chairman Mao Tsetung made a penetrating analysis of the class relations and economic conditions prevailing in China at that time, clearly pointing out that following the coun-

trywide seizure of power by the proletariat the principal internal contradiction was **"the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie."** The focus of the struggle remained the question of state power. Chairman Mao called upon the whole Party to continue the revolution, rely on and strengthen the people's democratic dictatorship, that is, the proletarian dictatorship, develop the socialist state economy and carry out step by step the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce and socialist industrialization so as to **"build China into a great socialist state."**

At this turning point of the revolution, Liu Shao-chi waved the tattered banner of the reactionary "theory of productive forces" in hysterically opposing the socialist revolution. To counteract the resolution of the Second Plenary Session of the Party's Seventh Central Committee, he flaunted his counter-revolutionary programme calling for "cooperation among the five sectors of the economy to consolidate the new-democratic system." Liu Shao-chi and other such

swindlers went about drumming up trade for the development of capitalism, babbling, "Our country's production is undeveloped and backward. Today it is not that there are too many factories run by private capital, but too few. Now, not only must private capitalism be allowed to exist, but it needs to be developed, needs to be expanded." "Socialism in China is a matter for two or three decades later." They advocated preserving the rich-peasant economy for a long time and developing it energetically, called for "consolidating the peasants' private property" and attacked agricultural cooperation as "a kind of wrong, dangerous and utopian agrarian socialism."

Chairman Mao waged a sharp, tit-for-tat struggle against Liu Shao-chi and his gang who mulishly plotted to take the capitalist road. In 1953, in a talk on the Party's general line for the period of transition, Chairman Mao thoroughly discredited their counter-revolutionary programme of "consolidating the new-democratic system." He pointed out: **"After the success of the democratic revolution, some people stand still. Failing to**

realize the change in the character of the revolution, they continue with their 'new democracy' instead of undertaking socialist transformation. Hence their Rightist errors."

"After the success of the democratic revolution, some people stand still. . . they continue with their 'new democracy' instead of undertaking socialist transformation. . ." Mao Tsetung, 1953

As for the so-called formulation of "consolidating the new-democratic system," Chairman Mao said that it was "harmful" and was "at variance with the realities of the struggle and hinders the development of the socialist cause."

Still these renegades did not give up. At a time when the whole Party was studying and applying the Party's general line for the transition period, Yang Hsien-chen, given his cue by swindler Liu Shao-chi *et al.*, refurbished the sinister programme of "consolidating the new-democratic system" and came up with the theory of "synthesized economic base." This variety of the reactionary "theory of productive forces" he spread everywhere in his feverish effort to oppose the Party's general line.

However, guided by the Party's general line, the poor and lower-middle peasants' socialist initiative mounted as never before so that the movement for agricultural co-operation flourished; likewise, the socialist transformation of the capitalist industry and commerce accelerated. In their futile attempt to brake the wheel of history, Liu Shao-chi and his like drew up, in 1955, their vicious scheme of "opposing rashness" and set forth their counter-revolutionary policy of "holding up," "contraction" and "checking up" which drastically slashed the number of co-operatives. . .

At a critical point in the grave struggle between the two lines, Chairman Mao made his report *On the Question of Agricultural Co-operation*, shattering in theory and practice the revisionist "theory of productive forces" and the counter-revolutionary plot of Liu Shao-chi & Co. An immediate upsurge in the socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry and commerce swept the country, characterized by: **Opportunism is falling, socialism is on the rise.** China's socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production won a great victory, while the reactionary theory of "synthesized economic base" met with total bankruptcy.

Reactionary Fallacy for Overthrowing Proletarian Dictatorship

What, after all, was the theory of "syn-

thesized economic base" made of?

Yang Hsien-chen asserted: "In the period of transition the economic base of the state power of the socialist type" was of a "synthesized nature," "embracing both the socialist sector and the capitalist sector, and the sector of individual peasant economy as well"; they "can develop in a balanced and co-ordinated way"; the socialist superstructure should "serve the entire economic base," including the capitalist economy, and "also serve the bourgeoisie." This was an altogether reactionary and fallacious theory for overthrowing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

According to Marxism-Leninism, "state power of the socialist type" can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the concentrated expression of the fundamental interests of the working class and other labouring people, and its economic base can only be **"the socialist economic base, that is, . . . socialist relations of production"** (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*). The capitalist economy is a paradise where the bourgeois amass fortunes, while for the proletariat and other labouring people it is a hell on earth. It is the economic base of the bourgeois dictatorship. Capitalist economy and proletarian dictatorship are as incompatible with each other as fire with water. How is it conceivable that the proletarian dictatorship can rest on any so-called "synthesized economic base" which includes the capitalist economy?

Yang Hsien-chen's fallacy becomes even more preposterous when viewed against the historical mission of the proletarian dictatorship, which aims at abolishing capitalism and all other systems of exploitation, at ending private ownership. Referring to the economy in the transition period, Lenin pointed out: **"As long as private ownership of the means of production . . . and freedom to trade remain, so does the economic basis of capitalism. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the only means of successfully fighting for the demolition of that basis, the only way to abolish classes. . ."** (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31). In China, it is precisely by using this means of proletarian dictatorship that the struggle against capitalism is waged. We took a series of measures to confiscate bureaucrat-monopoly capital, carry out socialist transformation of medium-sized and small capitalist industry and commerce, and set up agricultural and handicraft co-operatives in order gradually to abolish capitalism and private ownership and establish a socialist economic base. Only thus can the victory of the revolution be consolidated, can we have the proletarian dictatorship. How can our proletarian state power take as its economic base the so-called "synthesized economic base" embracing the capitalist economy?

In fact, any so-called "synthesized economic base" simply doesn't exist, but is a mere fabrication by Yang Hsien-chen and his like. For historical reasons, China's proletariat did face five sectors of the economy after seizing state power, and these boiled down to the socialist and the capitalist sectors. Diametrically opposed to each other,

the socialist and the capitalist sectors do not and cannot exist peacefully side by side, as Yang Hsien-chen claimed, or combine to form any so-called "synthesized economic base," still less can they "develop in a balanced and co-ordinated way." Lenin said: **"This transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism—or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble"** (*Collected Works*, Vol. 30). And Chairman Mao pointed out: **"The period of transition is full of contradiction and struggle. Our present revolutionary struggle is even more profound than the armed revolutionary struggles of the past. It is a revolution that will forever bury the capitalist system and all other systems of exploitation."**

Precisely so. Events in China's transition period testify to an intense, life-and-death struggle between the two sectors of the economy, socialist and capitalist. One swallows up the other. Either progress towards socialism or retrogress to capitalism: There is absolutely no room for compromise in the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines. Yang Hsien-chen's "synthesization" was a clear case of attempting to "combine two into one," to deny the contradiction and struggle between socialism and capitalism, and allow the latter to swallow up the former. So-called "balanced development" was, in essence, development of capitalism and reversion to semi-feudal, semi-colonial society. Did not Liu Shao-chi & Co., taking as the point of departure their reactionary "theory of productive

One swallows up the other. Either progress toward socialism or retrogress to capitalism. There is absolutely no room for compromise in the struggle.

forces," openly declare that they would work along with the capitalists for several decades and then go in for socialism "when China's industrial production shows a surplus"?. . .

Yang Hsien-chen said shamelessly that the socialist superstructure should "serve the entire economic base," including the capitalist economy; that it should "also serve the bourgeoisie." What a statement—"it should also serve the bourgeoisie"!

Marxism tells us that superstructure has class character; that state power which is at the very centre of the superstructure is an instrument of class struggle, an apparatus with which one class oppresses another. Every state power is a dictatorship by a certain class: either a proletarian dictatorship with which the proletariat and other labouring people oppress the bourgeoisie and other ex-

plotting classes, or a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes with which these class oppress the proletariat and other labouring people. Yang Hsien-chen went to the length of trying to make the socialist superstructure "serve the entire economic base," including the capitalist economy, and make our state of proletarian dictatorship "serve the bourgeoisie." What is this if not meeting the counter-revolutionary needs of overthrowing the proletarian dictatorship?

Of course, Liu Shao-chi, Yang Hsien-chen *et al.*, did not stop just at words. Hell-bent on "serving the bourgeoisie," they enforced nothing less than a reactionary, fascist dictatorship in the departments where they had usurped power. Politically, they plotted to usurp the Party, military and government power in a vain attempt to reduce China to a colony of imperialism and social-imperialism. Economically, they tried to restore capitalism by large-scale practice of the "four freedoms,"¹ *san zi yi bao*,² profit in command, material incentives, technique first, and exclusive reliance on specialists in running factories. Ideologically and culturally, they did their best to peddle the vicious feudal, capitalist and revisionist wares and glorify feudal emperors and princes, generals and ministers, scholars and beauties so as to mould public opinion in favour of their counter-revolutionary activities. Organizationally, they formed an underground bourgeois headquarters by recruiting deserters and renegades, protecting one another and working hand in glove...

"Fitting The Character of China's Productive Forces" Refuted

The principal argument fabricated by Yang Hsien-chen to justify his theory of "synthesized economic base" was that the five kinds of production relations in the transition period "fit the character of China's productive forces." This was a gross exposure of Yang Hsien-chen and his sort as peddlers of the reactionary "theory of productive forces."

The five kinds of production relations in question covered socialist economy and capitalist economy, and also individual economy. Was it possible that all these "fit the character of China's productive forces"? As early as 1940 Chairman Mao pointed out that the Great October Socialist Revolution changed the whole course of world history, and ushered in a new era. The ideological and social system of capitalism throughout the world resembled "a dying person who is sinking fast, like the sun setting beyond the western hills, and will soon be relegated to the museum" (*On New Democracy*). In the 1950s, especially when China had established the proletarian dictatorship and entered the stage of socialist revolution, how could it still be said that capitalist relations of production

"fit the character of China's productive forces"? After seizing state power, we proceeded at once to confiscate bureaucrat-capital—the principal part of China's capitalism—and change it into state owned. Towards the industry and commerce of the national bourgeoisie, we adopted the policy of using, restricting and transforming them, but this never implied that capitalism "fit the character of China's productive forces." On the contrary, it showed that capitalism did not suit the character of the productive forces and that it was necessary to transform it step by step into socialist ownership by the state. In fact, it was inevitable that the bourgeoisie's reactionary profit seeking nature and the growing contradictions between capitalism and socialism seriously hamstrung the expansion of social productive forces. People still remember the frantic attack the bourgeoisie, aided and abetted by Liu Shao-chi & Co., made shortly after the founding of the People's Republic against the proletariat by spreading the five evils of bribery of government workers, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing economic information from government sources for private speculation, seriously undermining China's industrial and agricultural production. With all this, how could one say that capitalist relations of production "fit the character of China's productive forces"?

As to the individual economy, it was, as Chairman Mao described, scattered and backward, not much different from that of ancient times. It is true that our land reform had broken the bonds of the feudal system of exploitation and liberated the productive forces in Chinese agriculture, but individual economy afforded very little room for their expansion. In fact, the marketable grain and raw materials supplied by peasants farming individually had, to an ever increasing

degree, fallen short of the growing needs of the people and of socialist industrialization. Moreover, individual economy is unstable but engenders capitalism daily and hourly. Such being the case, could individual economy "fit the character of China's productive forces"?

Yang Hsien-chen's argument, "fitting the character of China's productive forces," boiled down to this: Because of its backward productive forces, China was destined to develop only capitalism and build a capitalist economic base; it should not, nor could it, carry out socialist revolution and build a socialist economic base. It must then set up a bourgeois dictatorship to serve a capitalist economic base; it should not, and could not, institute proletarian dictatorship. This is the thoroughly revisionist "theory of productive forces."

The "theory of productive forces" is an international revisionist trend that makes a fetish of spontaneity. It absurdly exaggerates the decisive role of productive forces, which it reduces to means of production plus techniques. It completely negates the factor of man and denies the effect of revolution on the development of production, of production relations on productive forces and of the superstructure on the economic base. Such a fallacy would make it appear as if social development were merely the natural outcome of the development of productive forces, that when the productive forces are highly developed a new society would naturally appear, that if the productive forces are not yet highly developed it would be futile for the proletariat consciously to carry out socialist revolution. This fallacy, substituting vulgar evolutionism for revolutionary dialectics, and class conciliation for class struggle, opposes the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. It is historical idealism unalloyed...

AVAILABLE IN APRIL

Joint Declaration of Marxist-Leninist Parties of Latin America

*Communist Party of Columbia (Marxist-Leninist)
Communist Party Marxist-Leninist of Ecuador
Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile
Red Flag Party of Venezuela*

Adopted at a meeting of the delegations of the leadership of the above Parties in Latin America, September 29-30, 1978.

The Revolutionary Communist Party, USA believes that the Joint Declaration of Marxist-Leninist Parties of Latin America represents an important development in the international communist movement. It contains much that can be united with and much that should be seriously studied by revolutionaries in the U.S.

Order from: RCP Publications
P.O. Box 3486
Merchandise Mart
Chicago, IL 60654

\$1.00
Please include 50¢ for postage

(Also available in Spanish)

¹ Freedom of land sale, of hiring labour, of usury, and of trading.

² This means the extension of free markets, the extension of plots for private use, the promotion of small enterprises with sole responsibility for their own profits or losses, and the fixing of output quotas on a household basis.